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Boomershine’s excellent survey introduces the possibility that the discussion of orality and literacy in New Testament texts may finally find its appropriate home in detailed analysis and comparison of analogies and relationships between Israelite-Jewish and Greco-Roman cultures in the context of Mediterranean culture. The special creativity in his investigation lies beyond a discussion of the contexts where Greco-Roman culture and Israelite-Jewish culture were working symbiotically with one another (namely, the Hellenistic era). The creativity comes to full force when he analyzes contexts that reveal significant analogies with one another.

First, after observing the emergence of “writing as a dominant factor in the formation of culture” in Athens (ca. 500 BCE) and the subsequent “watershed between orality and literacy” from the fourth to the third centuries BCE, Boomershine notices the integration of reading and writing in the covenant renewal in Judah in 444 BCE and the subsequent integration of reading and writing “into the fabric of Israel’s religious life” from 400 to 300 BCE. This is a profound coincidence that interpreters must investigate further.

Second, Boomershine identifies a significant analogy between the relation of the oral activity of Socrates and Jesus in contexts where writing had become a prominent factor in the formation of culture. This observation is, in my view, directly on target. This insight guided my systematic reading of Plato’s Dialogues and Xenophon’s Memorabilia in relation to the Gospel of Mark in Jesus the Teacher in the early 1980s (Robbins 1992a, 1994a: 228-42).

Third, Boomershine introduces an intriguing analogy between Plato’s disassociation of himself from the poets and the rabbis’ disassociation from the literary traditions of the Second Temple period. Dewey, in addition, observes the manner in which Plato wanted to control the “storymakers” (her own discourse changes this to “storytellers”).

Boomershine’s analysis could be taken yet further by exploring analogies between Xenophon’s construction of Book 4 of the Memorabilia and the construction of the Gospel of Mark (Robbins 1992a: 60-68, 126-28,
of terms in the current discussion, which not only leads to inaccuracy but also obstructs an open discussion of its value-laden presuppositions (see Moore). If a traditional value system presupposes that “nonliterate” are ignorant, Dewey’s terminology introduces a “contracultural” inversion of this traditional system (Robbins 1993b: 451-54). In Dewey’s essay “nonliterate” refers to people who have never learned to read or write, but it does not simply mean this. Nonliterate leaders are better than literate leaders. They give “spirit-led oral leadership open to all regardless of status or education.” Literate leaders, by contrast, have a natural inclination toward evil. They exercise “heirarchical authority” that subordinates “all women,” as well as others. This is a form of romanticism that inverts the common tradition that nonliterate people are unintelligent. This inversion re-enacts, with a slightly different emphasis, the romanticism Dibelius perpetuated from the nineteenth century about the oral genius of lowly folk (Mack and Robbins: 10). Dewey’s statement presupposes that oral leaders are kinder and better people than literate people. In actual practice, “oral leaders” can be exceptionally hierarchal and some “literate” leaders are exceptionally egalitarian.

The first thing I plead for, therefore, is more precise terminology. We need a refined taxonomy that distinguishes between kinds of speaking, reading, and writing in different contexts. I recommend the following terminology when speaking about culture:

1. oral culture
2. scribal culture
3. rhetorical culture
4. reading culture
5. literary culture
6. print culture
7. hypertext culture.

This is an expansion of the taxonomy I introduced in a recent volume in honor of George A. Kennedy (Robbins 1991b: 145). Bernard Brandon Scott and Margaret E. Dean’s discussion of “recitation” in Mediterranean culture (Scott and Dean: 672-78) as well as a paper written recently by Robert M. Fowler, call for an expansion of my earlier list. I will discuss these cultures in reverse order from their appearance in the list.

Hypertext culture is the newest kind of oral-literacy culture in our midst, according to recent analysts (Fowler). Hypertext culture features “non-sequential writing—text that branches and allows choices to the reader, best read at an interactive screen. As popularly conceived, this is a series of text chunks connected by links which offer the reader different pathways” (Nelson: 0/2; Fowler: 2). Hypertext “demands an active
Neither Jesus nor Paul lived in a hypertext culture. Fowler points out, however, that those of us who use computers regularly may be experiencing what he calls a “second orality.” This kind of orality may sensitize interpreters to things they have not been able to see, hear, think, touch, and feel in texts when they were dominated by print culture.

Print culture distributes multiple copies of written text in verbatim form (errors and all). A significant number of people possess exact copies of the same written text, even if they do not read them regularly. The ease with which the wording of passages can be compared with one another creates an environment for “authoritative versions” of written text outside of localized settings in the culture.

Neither Jesus nor Paul lived in a print culture. Multiple copies of exactly the same text did not exist during the first century. As a result, the perception of “text” was different during the first century than it became after the invention of the printing press. This is one of the basic presuppositions of both Boerumshine and Dewey, and they both correctly presuppose that there are some interpreters who have not moved away from the images and presuppositions of print culture as they interpret New Testament texts.

Literary culture uses written text as a means of inclusion within its benefits. Ronald Hock’s careful analysis of Ulpius’ “literary” dinner parties as recounted in Athenaeus’s Deipnosophistae gives us an excellent place to begin an understanding of literary culture (Hock). Ulpius invited people to dinner and would not let anyone eat until someone could identify a passage in written literature containing the word of the food before them, like “appetizer” (29). Cynulus, a Cynic participant in this “literary” culture, criticized Ulpius for being a “word-hunter” (ὀνοματοθηρας). The report of the “disputations” (χτηνοεις) in the setting always contain at least one quotation from literature, and Cynulus, who criticizes virtually everyone else at one time or another, himself regularly quotes one or two lines verbatim from literature (30-35). A literary culture presupposes that people read texts regularly and can recite extensive passages in them from memory. A literary culture can exist without the support of printing presses that produce multiple copies of exactly the same text.

Boerumshine presents an excellent summary of Neusner’s conclusions about rabbinic Mishnah-Talmud culture. This is a literary culture and, interestingly enough, the date of the cultivation of rabbinic culture coincides with the date of elite literate culture in Rome as described by Athenaeus’s Deipnosophistae (the last years of the second century CE). The manuscript traditions of early Christian literature also emerged during this time (late second-fourth centuries), as both Boerumshine and Dewey note. Participation in literary culture can create the possibility for certain individuals to begin, at least occasionally, to read silently. One reason for this is that the person often is “looking for” certain words in a text that the reader already knows well. The reader, then, may engage in a process akin to “skimming” a text.

Did Jesus or Paul participate in a literary culture? Boerumshine thinks Jesus probably was able to read Scripture. Even if he was able, he would not necessarily be a participant in literary culture. In order to do this, Jesus would have needed to be in a context where he and his associates recited extensive line segments verbatim among one another, like the people at Ulpius’s dinners and like the rabbis after the second century CE. Boerumshine implies that a literary culture may have developed in second–fourth century Christianity, but his emphasis on the distinctiveness of rabbinic culture leaves the nature of Christian culture at this time unclear. Dewey, influenced by Botha (1992b:22-23), questions Paul’s “literacy,” by which he would mean that he could neither read nor write. Dewey, then, is proposing that Paul was not a participant in a literary culture. Nor does he posit such a culture in the Pauline communities. She thinks a few people would have read things like letters “to” members of the community; Scripture was possibly read on occasion to them; and some Scripture was used in debate. This is not enough to suggest a significant literary culture in the communities Paul founded.

Reading culture authorizes spoken statement through verbatim reading of written text. In the first instance, reading means “being read to” by someone. Therefore, there are two essential components to a reading culture in late antiquity: a “reciter” and “hearers of the recitation” (Scott and Dean). Reading cultures in late antiquity are local cultures. It appears that people in the inner circle described in Qumran literature read to one another. P. J. J. Botha has gathered significant data concerning reading contexts in antiquity (Botha 1990; 1991a; 1991b; 1992a; 1992b; 1993), and Dewey profitably uses some of his observations as noted above.

Did Jesus hear Scripture read aloud? Most people think he did, and I think this probably was the sole source of his knowledge of Scripture. I myself doubt that he was a reader of Scripture—which, again, would mean that he regularly read “to” other people. Two intriguing passages, Luke 4, which Boerumshine discusses, and the Infancy Gospel of Thomas, which he does not discuss, raise the issue of Jesus as a reader. I think the evidence suggests that he did not regularly read to anyone, and he
certainly would not have read simply to himself at this time in antiquity (Robbins 1991b: 323-26).

Did Paul hear Scripture and other things read aloud? The answer surely is yes. Did Paul read to others? The evidence is that he did not.

**Rhetorical culture** features comprehensive interaction between spoken and written statement. In David Cartlidge’s words, which Dewey quotes, “The evidence from late antiquity is that oral operations (presentation and hearing) and literary operations (reading and writing) were (1) inescapably interlocked, and (2) they were communal activities” (Cartlidge: 14). In practice this means that writing in a rhetorical culture imitates both speech and writing, and speech in a rhetorical culture imitates both speech and writing (Robbins 1991b, 1993a; Scott and Dean). As Dewey further notes, Ong describes the first century media world as “a manuscript culture with high residual orality” (Ong: 158). This means that Ong’s works do not presuppose that first-century Mediterranean culture was an “oral” culture. Rather, first-century Mediterranean culture was a “rhetorical” culture. Ong’s works presuppose this as part of his major scholarly discipline, namely Greco-Roman rhetoric.

Boomershine pursues the epistemological dimensions of Jesus’ parables, in the tradition of Plato, without using the broader resources of rhetoric in his discussion. Dewey includes some useful comments about rhetoric in her essay, but she also makes some global statements that need to be tested. I will turn below to some of these.

Did Jesus participate in rhetorical culture? This is a question that raises the issue of Jesus’ imitation of written text in his speech. Boomershine analyzes a parable that makes no reference to Scripture (written text), and his further discussion of Jesus’ speech does not pursue the issue. Did Paul participate in rhetorical culture? Decidedly yes. The issue is how, and we must perform careful rhetorical analysis of the discourse in his letters to answer this question.

**Scribal culture** reproduces speech or writing for various purposes. A scribal culture is a local culture in the service of certain kinds of officially sanctioned practices or institutions. In the first instance, a scribal culture produces records of grain supplies, accounts of battles and victories, agreements to pay tribute, renting of camels/sheds, agreements to clean an irrigation ditch at appropriate times or to support others in particular activities, and laws sanctioned by one person or another. At this stage, the scribal activity creates a “copying” and “editing” culture: a scribe writes down what is seen or heard, editing only as necessary to make things fit.

In the second instance, a scribal culture becomes a “rhetorical scribal culture” producing “progymnastic compositions” (Robbins 1991b; 1993a). “Recitation” is the initial form of progymnastic scribal activity. Moving beyond copying and editing, writers either hear recited or they themselves read aloud a portion of text, then they write either the same or different words (Bonner: 254). The difference between this and scribal copying is that writers have the freedom to write as they wish. The one requirement is that the composition be “clear” (Hock and O’Neil: 95). After learning recitation composition, the writer learns the techniques of addition, expansion, and abbreviation (Hock and O’Neil: 98-103; Robbins 1993a: 118-21). After these stages of progymnastic writing, a person learns the art of “elaboration,” which takes the person toward essays and speeches (Mack and Robbins: 31-67; Robbins 1993a: 121-31).

Only in a third instance do writers engage in activities by which they acquire the skills to write “eloquent rhetorical composition” (Bonner: 277-327). The only writer of New Testament texts who clearly achieved this ability is the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, though the author of Luke and Acts was well on his way. Most of the issues concerning “scribal” activity in New Testament interpretation, therefore, concern “scribal copying” and “scribal progymnastic composition” rather than “eloquent rhetorical composition.”

Did Jesus copy in a scribal manner or compose in a progymnastic rhetorical manner? All of our evidence suggests that he did not. Did Paul copy or compose in a progymnastic rhetorical manner? Our evidence suggests that Paul did not himself engage in “scribal copying.” Was he involved in progymnastic composition? Two parties usually are involved in such composition. Regularly one person states something aloud and the “scribe” writes down in “as clear a manner as possible” the substance of the person’s statement (Hock and O’Neil: 95). Botha thinks Paul participated in the composition of his letters only from the side of the speaker. This would mean that a significant amount of the style in Paul’s letters would come from the writer rather than Paul’s speech itself. Undoubtedly a majority of New Testament interpreters still presuppose that Paul himself wrote most of his letters. Only detailed analysis of the progymnastic techniques in Pauline discourse could produce an answer to this question, and this kind of analysis is only at its beginning stages in New Testament scholarship (Mack 1990; Sisson). The issue is whether Paul may have alternated between writing and speaking the kind of progymnastic composition that exists in the letters attributed to him, or whether he participated only from the side of the speaker.

**Oral culture** proceeds on the basis of spoken word alone. This culture has no “written literature” in view (Robbins 1991b: 145). Oral culture as Lord and Ong appropriately have described it refers to a cultural setting in which written texts are not present or presupposed in relation to speech performance. Ong, as indicated above, never presupposed that
first-century Mediterranean culture was an oral culture. Rather, it was “a manuscript culture with high residual orality” (Ong: 158). Oral culture exists apart from, thus without any kind of interaction with, written texts. The only kind of “text” that exists is “oral text.”

Did Jesus participate in oral culture? Most interpreters attempt to get an emphasis on orality in a context where Scripture is recited in synagogue settings. Boermershine presents a highly ambiguous picture. On the one hand he thinks Jesus could probably read. When Boermershine makes this statement, he seems to stray from his own principle that this would mean that Jesus “read to” other people. His emphasis, instead, is on the kind of knowledge Jesus would have attained by reading (as we do). On the other hand, Boermershine analyzes a parable that has no relation to written text. Again, the concept of a “rhetorical culture” could help Boermershine clarify his position.

Was Paul a vigorous participant in oral culture? Dewey thinks he was, speaking forcefully in marketplaces as well as in community assemblies. Paul himself says he was not a good speaker (e.g., 1 Cor 2:1; 2 Cor 11:6), and it is quite possible that he was not (Merritt: 113-52). Judged from a perspective of “oral culture,” he very possibly did not speak well, in contrast to Jesus. On the other hand, quite clearly Paul had significant “progymnastic” skills in the context of “rhetorical culture.” I do not agree with the impression Dewey’s comments give about the interaction of Pauline discourse with “written text.” One of the achievements of Pauline discourse is to “imitate written text.” To explain with greater precision what this means, I will turn to the next point.

The most natural way to test our assertions about the orality and literacy of Jesus and Paul is through systematic use of the rhetorical treatises and resources available, from antiquity to the present, to investigate the oral-scribal texture of early Christian texts (Mack 1990; Watson and Hauser). These two essays refer only casually to the rhetorical aspects of early Christian literature, and they never explicitly analyze the oral-scribal texture of these texts. My investigations suggest the presence of the following rhetorical spectrum of oral-scribal texture in New Testament texts (Robbins 1994b:179-81):

1. reference
2. recitation
3. recontextualization
4. reconfiguration
5. echo.

This spectrum is informed especially by the discussions of expansion and elaboration of the chreia, narrative, and fable in the Greco-Roman

*Progymnasmata* (Hock and O’Neil), along with the actual wording in rewritten traditions during the first and second century CE (Robbins 1991b).

Reference is the occurrence of a word or phrase that refers to a personage or tradition known to people on the basis of an authoritative text. “The days of Noah” in Matt 24:37/Luke 17:26 is an example: “As it was in the days of Noah, so will it be in the days of the Son of man.” This phrase is an intertextual reference that invokes the story of Noah. This reference does not replicate an actual “text” of the story. Reference like this can occur in strictly oral culture, namely where nothing but “oral text” exists, and it is also common in rhetorical culture. There is no reference like this in the parable Boermershine analyzes to describe the epistemological revolution in Jesus’ speech. Does Boermershine think Jesus spoke this saying about Noah (cf. Funk and Hoover: 251, 365-67)? He does not discuss the presence or absence of “scriptural wording” in Jesus’ speech. Paul’s discourse contains references to people like Abraham and traditions like “covenant.” Dewey says these are “secondary” in all of Paul’s letters except Romans and Galatians. This assertion needs to be tested through systematic analysis.

Recitation extends beyond the use of a word or phrase that refers to something in Scripture. Recitation is an extensive phenomenon, for it includes the transmission of both speech and narrative, either from oral or written tradition, in exact or different words from which the person has received them. Recitation (ἀπαγγελία) is the first exercise of the transmission in his section on the chreia (Hock and O’Neil: 94-95; Robbins 1993a: 120).

(a) Recitation may replicate exact words of a written text. An example is Mark 7:10a: For Moses said, “Honor your father and your mother.” This is an especially interesting example, since it replicates a string of eight words that stand in common between Exodus 20:12 and Deut 5:16 (Dean-Otting and Robbins: 113). This is a verbatim wordstring that people easily and regularly committed to memory in antiquity. The attribution to Moses signals the awareness of a written text that was probably read regularly to people in the synagogue. The transmission of such a verbatim string of words in the context of a clause of attribution (making it a “chreia”) is a common characteristic of rhetorical culture, and discourse like this is attributed both to Jesus and Paul in New Testament texts.

(b) Recitation may occur with an omission of words that gives the word string the force of an authoritative judgment. An example is 1 Corinthians 1:31. The verse reads: Therefore, as it is written, “Let him who boasts, boast in the Lord.” This verse is an abbreviation of:
“But in this let him who boasts boast, understanding and knowing that I am the Lord who does mercy and justice and righteousness on the earth; for in these things are my will,” says the Lord (Jeremiah 9:24).

Gail O’Day’s interesting article on this passage lacks any mention of a “rhetorical” use of this wording from Jeremiah 9. This usage supports Dewey’s case that a “literary culture” is not governing the use of words in Pauline discourse. There is explicit reference to the presence of these words in a written text, yet the recitation selects and/or rearranges the words to give them the force of an authoritative judgment. Systematic analysis of this in Pauline discourse could be especially beneficial to test Dewey’s assertions. This common usage in rhetorical culture, and New Testament texts attribute this kind of discourse both to Jesus and Paul.

(c) A third way is to speak or write a recitation in words that are different from an “authoritative” version. Theon describes this as reciting “in the same words or in others as well” (Hock and O’ Neil: 95). An excellent instance of this exists in Paul’s recitation in 1 Cor 9:14 of the command of the Lord “that those who proclaim the gospel (τοῦ τοῦ ἐκαγγέλου καταγγέλλων) should get their living (τὰ ποιμενικά) from the gospel (ἐκ τοῦ ἐκαγγελοῦ). This exists in written text in the following form:

For the laborer is worthy of his food/reward (Matt 10:10/Luke 10:7).

This is an instance of Pauline recitation “in different words” from the tradition. The words, in fact, are characteristic Pauline words. The verb καταγγέλλων (to proclaim) is not customary in early Christian discourse outside of Paul’s writings, and the noun ἐκαγγέλλον (gospel) does not occur in the earliest strata of sayings attributed to Jesus (Kloppenburg: 220; Mack 1993). Pauline discourse uses “its own words” freely in quotations of the Lord Jesus, but it appears that it does not use “its own words” so freely with written biblical text. Systematic analysis of this, also, would be important to test Dewey’s assertions. It appears that 1 Corinthians, at least, seriously challenges some of Dewey’s conclusions about the relation of Pauline discourse to written biblical text. Pauline discourse includes many exact words from written biblical text, and this is a phenomenon she does not address in her statements about the “primary” or “secondary” nature of Paul’s use of Scripture.

(d) A fourth way is to recite an episode using some of the narrative words in biblical text plus a saying from the text. Acts 7:30-32 reads as follows:

Now when forty years had passed, an angel appeared to him in the wilderness of Mount Sinai, in the flame of a burning bush. When Moses saw it, he was amazed at the sight; and as he approached to look, there came the voice of the Lord: “I am the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.” Moses began to tremble and did not dare to look.

This recitation contains words (underlined) that appear in Exodus 3:2-6. This is an excellent example of recitation in an abbreviated form, which Theon discusses as a characteristic rhetorical activity (Hock and O’ Neil: 100-101). The recitation not only abbreviates the narrative wording. In Exodus 3:6 the saying of the Lord reads:

I myself am the God of your father, the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.

The recitation in Acts replicates only the underlined words in the saying. This abbreviated recitation suggests the presence of the expanded written version somewhere in the vicinity of this composition. The abbreviated account does not vary “factually” from the written version. There is no special concern to replicate extended word strings in verbatim form, but neither is there any embarrassment about replicating words exactly. There is freedom to use one’s own words to recite the account in a manner that fits the rhetorical context and that gives the recitation an appropriate function in its context (Robbins 1991b). This kind of recitation is frequent in Luke and Acts. It would be helpful to test the genuine and deutero-Pauline letters for the presence of this phenomenon.

(e) A fifth way is to recite a narrative in substantially one’s own words. Mark 2:25-26 is an example:

And he said to them, “Have you never read what David did when he and the ones with him were hungry and in need of food? He entered the house of God, when Abiathar was high priest, and ate the bread of the Presence, which it is not lawful for any but the priests to eat, and he gave some to his companions.”

Words that occur in 1 Samuel 21:1-6 are underlined. The remaining words are different from the biblical text. A remarkable feature of this recitation is that it does not get the story quite right (Mack and Robbins: 114-17; Dean-Otting and Robbins: 99-105). This is an abbreviated recitation in rhetorical culture that reveals no close relation to the written version. This recitation replicates only words that are easily transmitted in oral transmission apart from any “authoritative” version of the text, and it contains a significant number of variations from the written text that a “literary” culture would consider to be “errors.” Despite these “oral” characteristics, interpreters regularly attribute the composition of this to an early Christian scribe rather than Jesus (Funk and Hoover: 49). Boomershine says nothing about a text like this. Are there any recitations of episodes in Pauline discourse that exhibit this kind of “factual” variation?

(f) A sixth way is to summarize a span of text that includes various episodes. The full text of Luke 17:26-27 reads:
Just as it was in the days of Noah, so it will be in the days of the Son of Man. They were eating and drinking, and marrying and being given in marriage, until the day Noah entered the ark, and the flood came and destroyed them all.

This recitation presents a summary of the biblical text in Genesis 6:1-24. There is no reference to “eating and drinking” in the biblical account. This appears to be a result of the characterization of the Son of man’s “eating and drinking” (Matt 11:19/Luke 7:33). The reference to “marrying and being given in marriage” summarizes Gen 6:2-4, which emphasizes the marrying between “sons of God” and “daughters of men.” In addition, the biblical text features Noah and all of his household entering the ark (Gen 7:1, 7), while the recitation focuses on Noah alone. There is no evidence of direct interaction between the wording in this saying attributed to Jesus and wording in the biblical text of the account. The wording of the saying is characteristic of oral expansion in a rhetorical culture, without concern for wording in the actual written text of the account. Is this phenomenon characteristic of Pauline discourse as well as discourse in the Gospels?

Recontextualization, in contrast to recitation, presents wording from biblical texts without explicit statement or implication that the words “stand written” anywhere else. An excellent example is Mark 15:24:

And they crucify him
and they divide his garments
casting lots for them, who would take what.

The biblical text it recontextualizes contains the following wording:

They divided my garments among themselves
and for my outer garment they cast lots (Ps 22:19 [LXX: 21:19]).

The Markan recitation recontextualizes wording from the psalm, revising the tense and syntax to create a three-step statement out of parallelismus membrorum (Robbins 1992b:176-77). The Markan text gives no indication that these words exist anywhere else in a written text. This form of writing, which significantly replicates word-stems in a new syntactical construction, is characteristic of both oral and written composition in a rhetorical culture (Robbins 1991b). Again, what is the nature of “recontextualization” in the authentic and deuto-Pauline letters?

Reconfiguration refers to the restructuring of an antecedent tradition. Reference, recitation, and recontextualization may or may not be present in the context of reconfiguration. An excellent example exists in the reconfiguration of Psalm 22 in the broader context of Mark 15. Significant reinscription of wording from Psalm 22 occurs in Mark 15:24, 29-32, 34. The recontextualization of Ps 22:19 in Mark 15:24 has been discussed above. Mark 15:29-32 recontextualizes language from Ps 22:7-9 in the form of “expansion composition” that produces a three-step scene featuring the mocking of three groups: (a) people passing by (15:29); (b) chief priests with scribes (15:32); and (c) the two thieves crucified alongside Jesus (15:32) (Robbins 1992b:177-78). Mark 15:33-39 contains recontextualization of the opening verse of Ps 22. In this instance, the Markan text attributes the words in Aramaic to Jesus, forming a chreia statement, and to this the text adds a parenthetical comment that translates the statement into Greek (Robbins 1992b:178). The net result of this recontextualization is a “reversal of the order” of the scenes in Ps 22. Given the nature of the scenes and the content of Ps 22:2, the reversal of the order produces a reversal of the rhetoric. Mark 15 reconfigures an account of a suffering person who expresses hope that he will be saved into an account of a crucified person who expresses despair just before he dies (Robbins 1992b:178-81).

It would be unlikely that such a reversed use of Ps 22 would occur in oral composition. In other words, here we have, it seems to me, excellent evidence of scribal rather than oral progymnastic composition as the process by which this version of the text was produced. What is the nature of this phenomenon in Pauline and deuto-Pauline discourse?

Echo occurs when a word or phrase evokes, or potentially evokes, another text. Richard Hays’s recent study uses this term, but the analysis addresses many different phenomena without distinguishing rhetorically among them. The nature of echo assures that scholars regularly will debate the presence or absence of the phenomenon in the text under consideration. One of the most interesting instances of echo in recent New Testament scholarship has been Burton L. Mack’s discovery of the echo of paideia in the planting of the seeds in Mark 4:1-34. He presents the following Greco-Roman texts to support his case:

The views of our teachers are as it were the seeds. Learning from childhood is analogous to the seeds falling betimes upon the prepared ground (Hippocrates, III).

As is the seed that is ploughed into the ground, so must one expect the harvest to be, and similarly when good education is ploughed into young persons, its effect lives and burgeons throughout their lives, and neither rain nor drought can destroy it (Antiphon, fr. 60).

Words should be scattered like seed; no matter how small the seed may be, if it once has found favorable ground, it unfolds its strength and from an insignificant thing spreads to its greatest growth (Seneca, Epistles 38:2).

If you wish to argue that the mind requires cultivation, you would use a comparison drawn from the soil, which if neglected produces thorns and thickets, but if cultivated will bear fruit (Quintillian, V.xi.24) (Mack and Robbins: 155-56; Mack 1988:159-60).
The echo of paideia in Mark 4 undoubtedly represents the kind of "cultural" intertexture Abraham J. Malherbe has so well outlined with the relation of Pauline discourse to both Hellenistic-Jewish and Greco-Roman moral philosophical discourse (Malherbe 1987; 1989).

In the context of this rhetorical spectrum of oral-scribal intertexture in New Testament texts, we have an opportunity to pursue systematically the questions Boomershine and Dewey raise about Jesus and Paul. The issues, however, concern many more people than Jesus and Paul. Both orality and literacy were “group” activities. Who, then, was speaking and who was writing? Whose speech was imitating writing and speech, and whose writing was imitating writing and speech? These are intriguing questions that can shed new light on our understanding of first-century Judaism and Christianity.
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