Chapter 13. Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation
Vernon K. Robbins

Emerging in the 1970s, socio-rhetorical interpretation received its name in 1984 with an integration of rhetorical, anthropological, and social-psychological insights in a study of the Gospel of Mark. During the 1980s, ancient *progymnasmata* manuals guided the development of rhetorical strategies to interpret elaborated argumentation in Christian and Greco-Roman literature. During the 1990s, investigation of inner texture, intertexture, social and cultural texture, ideological texture and sacred texture moved the approach into an interpretive analytic. Currently, incorporation of conceptual blending, cognitive theory, and cultural geography theory are guiding interpretation of the blending in early Christian literature of six rhetorolects – prophetic, apocalyptic, wisdom, precreation, priestly, and miracle – in the context of religious mantic (divine communication), philosophical, and ritual discourse in the Mediterranean world.

Introduction

Socio-rhetorical interpretation is a multi-dimensional approach to texts (Robbins 1996a, 1996b, 2009a; Porter and Olbricht 1997: 24-52; Tate 2006) guided by a multi-dimensional hermeneutic (Robbins 1998a, 2004, 2005a; Detweiler and Robbins 1991; Porter and Stamps 2002: 48-60). Rather than being one more method for interpreting texts, socio-rhetorical interpretation is an interpretive analytic – an approach that evaluates and reorients its strategies as it engages in multi-faceted dialogue with the texts and other phenomena that come within its purview (Robbins 1996a: 11-13; Porter and Olbricht 1997: 25-33). This means that it invites methods and methodological results into the environment of its activities, but those methods and results are always under scrutiny. Using insights from sociolinguistics, semiotics, rhetoric, ethnography, literary studies, social sciences, cognitive science, and ideological studies, socio-rhetorical interpretation enacts an interactive interpretive analytic that juxtaposes and interrelates phenomena by drawing and redrawing boundaries of analysis and interpretation (Lawson and McCauley 1990: 22-31). The approach uses a transmodern philosophical position of relationism to interrelate ancient, modern

and post-modern systems of thought with one another (Robbins 2005a). Cognitive theory concerning conceptual blending (Fauconnier and Turner 2002; Oakley 1998, 1999, 2009; Coulson and Oakley 2000; Robbins 2007, 2008) and culture geography theory concerning places and spaces (Gunn and McNutt 2002) guide socio-rhetorical interpretation of pictorial scenes (rhetography) and argumentation (rhetology) that discourse evokes through the ears and eyes of hearers and readers.

Socio-rhetorical interpretation began to emerge after 1975, with a goal of integrating rhetorical and anthropological modes of interpretation (Gowler 1994; Robbins 1992a: xix-xliv). An additional, feature of socio-rhetorical interpretation is its special interest in the orality of texts.[1] Bernard Brandon Scott and Margaret E. Dean have developed this aspect of the approach into a special area of investigation with its own strategies of analysis and interpretation.[2] During the 1990s, socio-rhetorical criticism featured analysis and interpretation of multiple textures of texts (Robbins 1994c, 1996a, 1996b). Five textures have been central to the interpretive activity: inner texture, intertexture, social and cultural texture, ideological texture, and sacred texture (Robbins 1996b; Gowler 2000; Tate 2006). A wide range of socio-rhetorical studies using textural strategies emerged during the 1990s. The seven "Pepperdine" rhetoric conferences, initiated and nurtured by Thomas H. Olbricht, played an important role for advances in rhetorical biblical study from 1992 to 2002 (Robbins 2005c),[3] and socio-rhetorical interpretation has benefited and grown in the context of these conferences and the volumes that have emerged from them. The SBL section on Rhetoric and the New Testament played a special role during the 1990s in nurturing socio-rhetorical interpretation of apocalyptic (Carey and Bloomquist 1999; Watson 2002) and miracle discourse (Watson 2010) in the New Testament. L. Gregory Bloomquist, Chair of the SBL section from 2002 through 2008, published a series of essays developing various aspects of socio-rhetorical interpretation.[4] Duane F. Watson, a former Chair of the SBL Section, and H. J. Bernard Combrink have written programmatic essays on the challenges and benefits of writing socio-rhetorical commentary (Porter and Stamps 2002, 129-57; Combrink 2002). During 1999-2003, the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas provided the context for a Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation Seminar that met at annual meetings in South Africa (Pretoria), Israel (Tel Aviv), Canada (Montreal), Great Britain (Durham), and Germany (Bonn). Since 2004, David A. deSilva has Chaired the SBL Rhetoric of Religious Antiquity Seminar in the context of his own production of integrated multi-textural applications of socio-rhetorical interpretation.[5] Progress is under way currently for production of socio-rhetorical commentaries in a series entitled "Rhetoric of Religious Antiquity."[6]

Initial Socio-Rhetorical Studies

Socio-rhetorical interpretation began with analysis and interpretation of social and cultural dynamics in written works. The first sustained socio-rhetorical study was an analysis of the relation of the we-passages in Acts to ancient Mediterranean sea voyages.[7]

As Robbins observed in a later study: "This study in 1975 revealed that traveling in a boat on the sea with other people created a social environment that made it natural for some authors in antiquity to use first-person plural 'we' for literary accounts of sea voyages" (Robbins 1992a: xix). This common social environment became a well-known cultural phenomenon in Mediterranean literature. In 1999-2000, Dennis R. MacDonald emphasized that the cultural intertexture of the sea voyages in Acts goes back to Homer's *Odyssey* and Marianne Palmer Bonz expanded the epic nature of Paul's sailing to Rome to include Virgil's *Aeneid*.[8] Other interpreters have focused so intently either on the historical intertexture of the sea voyages in Acts or on literary coherence in Acts itself that they have missed the broader social and cultural intertexture of the sea voyage accounts (Robbins 2009b).[9] Robbins's 1975 study was an initial interpretation of social and cultural intertexture among the sea voyages in Acts and other Mediterranean accounts of sea voyages (Robbins 1996a: 108-18, 1996b: 58-63).

The second sustained socio-rhetorical analysis concerned the teaching-learning cycle in the Gospel of Mark. The first steps of this analysis appeared in studies of Jesus' calling of his disciples and of repetitive-progressive summoning in the Gospel of Mark (Robbins 1981, 1982). The full-scale study of these phenomena in Mark, which appeared in 1984, appealed to the works of Kenneth Burke and the ancient rhetorical treatises entitled *progymnasmata*[10] for analysis of rhetorical repetition and progression (Robbins 1984, 1992a). It also appealed to the works of Clifford Geertz, William Bascom, Roger D. Abrahams, Roger M. Keesing, Theodore R. Sarbin and Vernon L. Allen for social, cultural and social-psychological analysis. This study revealed evidence of a Mediterranean teaching-learning cycle the Gospel of Mark reconfigures as it tells the story of Jesus' life and death. Subsequent studies have built on the analysis and interpretation in this book.[11]

In the midst of various socio-rhetorical studies between 1981 and 1991,[12] specific discussions of rhetorical interpretation and specific strategies of analysis using insights from classical rhetorical treatises on the chreia and its elaboration appeared.[13] Willi Braun completed a Ph.D. dissertation that included a substantive socio-rhetorical analysis and interpretation of Luke 14, and it appeared in the SNTS monograph series in 1995 (Braun 1993, 1995). David B. Gowler, who had independently developed a socio-narratological approach to New Testament literature,[14] wrote a programmatic essay on the development of socio-rhetorical interpretation showing the manner in which it developed out of literary, rhetorical, social and cultural studies during the 1970s and 1980s (Gowler 1994). These studies were precursors to the organization of socio-rhetorical interpretation on the basis of multiple textures of signification, meanings and meaning effects in texts. David Hester Amador included a full-length critical assessment of socio-rhetorical interpretation in this earlier form (Amador 1999). Amador perceived the approach during this earlier phase to be driven by disciplinary strategies and goals, rather than being truly interdisciplinary or multi-disciplinary in its approach.

Expansion beyond Biblical Literature

A major feature of socio-rhetorical interpretation since its inception has been its reach beyond biblical literature. Usually the literature outside the Bible was included for the purpose of intertextural analysis of biblical texts.[15] These interests led to analysis and interpretation in *Jesus the Teacher* (1984, 1992a) of Dialogues of Plato, Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, sections of Flavius Josephus and Philo Judaeus, rabbinic literature, Philostratus's *Life of Apollonius*,[16] and the *Discourses* of Dio Chrysostom.[17] Half a decade later, it led to the publication of over 1500 biblical, Greco-Roman, early Christian, rabbinic, and Muslim pronouncement stories and a volume of essays on rhetorical analysis of some of them (Robbins 1989b, 1993b).

During the 1990s, socio-rhetorical interpretation moved into a wider and wider range of sacred texts. One of the reasons is that socio-rhetorical interpretation features a constellation of interests that naturally moves an interpreter into programmatic analysis and interpretation of literatures of various kinds in various cultures, both on their own terms and in their own contexts. Another reason, however, was that interpreters from various areas of specialty began to apply socio-rhetorical analysis and interpretation in their own fields of study. Jack N. Lightstone published a socio-rhetorical investigation of portions of the Babylonian Talmud (Lightstone 1994), followed by portions of the Mishnah, Tosefta, and Semahot (Lightstone 2002). Martin Oosthuizen produced a multiple texture socio-rhetorical interpretation of Deuteronomy 15:1-18 (Oosthuizen 1997). Gordon D. Newby began to use socio-rhetorical strategies of interpretation on portions of the Qur'an (Newby 1998). Thomas J. Bell produced a full-scale socio-rhetorical study of two medieval "sequences" attributed to Peter Abelard (Bell 1999). H. J. Bernard Combrink wrote socio-rhetorical essays interpreting religious traditions and biblical interpretation in South Africa (Combrink 1998, 1999, 2007), and Robbins wrote an essay on participation in African biblical interpretation (Robbins 2001). Patrick Gray analyzed the social rhetoric of sinfulness and punishment in the Apocalypse of Peter (Gray 2001). In turn, Robbins extended his socio-rhetorical studies into the Coptic Gospel of Thomas (Robbins 1987b, 1997, 1998b, 2006), portions of the Book of Mormon (Robbins 1995), the Mishnah (Lightstone 2002: 201-16), and the *Apocalypse of Paul* (Robbins 2003). During the 1990s, Robbins and Newby teamed with Laurie L. Patton in Emory College and Graduate School courses in "interactive" socio-rhetorical interpretation of Jewish, Christian, Muslim, Hindu, and Buddhist sacred texts (Patton, Robbins, Newby 2009). At the beginning of the 21st century, R. Kevin Jaques used socio-rhetorical strategies of interpretation in his Ph.D. dissertation on Islamic Law (Jaques 2001) and Stuart Young produced as a senior honors thesis a socio-rhetorical study of African-American slave songs (Young 2002). During the early 2000s, Robbins and Newby worked as a team on socio-rhetorical interpretation of the relation of the Qur'an and the Bible (Robbins and Newby 2003; Gowler, Bloomquist, and Watson 2003: 333-54), and Robbins started a special investigation of Gospel traditions in the Qur'an (Robbins 2005b). Socio-rhetorical interpretation has continually moved beyond biblical studies into other disciplines and traditions. This is a natural result of its interdisciplinary and intercultural base and focus, and one can expect an even greater extension of this approach into other fields in the coming years.

Discerning Multiple Textures in Sacred Texts

The paperback edition of Robbins's *Jesus the Teacher* contained an introduction that launched the organization of socio-rhetorical strategies of analysis and interpretation according to inner texture, intertexture, social and cultural texture, and ideological texture (Robbins 1992a: xix-xliv). Robbins's initial display of a multi-textural approach occurred in an essay on the Woman who Anointed Jesus, written for the purpose of inviting multiple authors into interpretation and discussion of the multiple versions of the story in the Gospels (Robbins 1992c). Robbins published his first programmatic multi-textural study in an essay on Mary, Elizabeth and the Magnificat in Luke (Robbins 1994c). Wesley H. Wachob produced the first full-length Ph.D. dissertation containing multi-textural socio-rhetorical analysis, working in detail on James 2:1-13, and this study appeared in the SNTS monograph series (Wachob 1993, 1999; also Watson 2002: 165-85; Gowler, Bloomquist, and Watson: 264-80). Subsequently, many insights in this work were incorporated into Luke Timothy Johnson's commentary on the epistle of James,[18] and Wachob and Johnson co-authored a socio-rhetorical essay on sayings of Jesus in James (Wachob and Johnson 1999). Russell B. Sisson produced the second multi-textural Ph.D. dissertation on a New Testament text, working on 1 Corinthians 9, and subsequently he has produced socio-rhetorical essays on the Sermon on the Mount and Philippians (Sisson 1994, 1997; Gowler, Bloomquist, and Watson 2003: 242-63). To display a full textural approach to New Testament texts, Robbins produced *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse*, exploring 1 Corinthians 9 from the perspective of inner texture, intertexture, social and cultural texture, and ideological texture (Robbins 1996a).[19] Then Mark 15 served as the sample text throughout *Exploring the Texture of Texts*, in which Robbins added a chapter on sacred texture (Robbins 1996b: 120-31).[20]

The entire textural mode of interpretation, as it exists at present, is available in an interactive mode on the web.[21] H. J. B. Combrink wrote essays probing the Gospel of Matthew from a rhetorical perspective that was moving toward social-rhetorical analysis and interpretation (Combrink 1992, 1993). During this period of time, Robbins produced additional socio-rhetorical studies of various kinds.[22] In addition to the Ph.D. dissertations of Braun, Wachob and Sisson, four additional socio-rhetorical dissertations were produced by 1997.[23] Then two more full-scale multi-textural dissertations were written by H. Stephen Brown on two second-century Christian martyr texts and by Thomas J. Bell on two medieval musical sequences attributed to Peter Abelard.[24] Also, Jon Ma. Asgeirsson produced a series of studies on the Gospel of Thomas that contain significant socio-rhetorical dimensions.[25] During the 1990s, other people also produced studies that contained significant use of socio-rhetorical strategies of analysis and interpretation.[26] The beginning of the 21st century exhibits an increasing rate of socio-rhetorical studies appearing on multiple continents.[27]

The Emergence of Multiple Rhetorolects in Early Christianity

By 1996, socio-rhetorical analysis and interpretation began to exhibit significantly different textures for different kinds of early Christian discourse. For example, early Christian miracle discourse has a different texture than wisdom or apocalyptic discourse. In addition, early Christian prophetic discourse is different from precreation discourse. In this context, Robbins defined and described six kinds of discourse in the New Testament as "rhetorolects" (Robbins 1996c). According to the essay, "A rhetorolect is a form of language variety or discourse identifiable on the basis of a distinctive configuration of themes, topics, reasonings, and argumentations" (Robbins 1996c: 356). Each rhetorolect blends with the other rhetorolects during the first seven decades of the emergence of early Christian discourse. This raises a challenge for interpreters to describe the texture of each rhetorolect and to explain and display the manner in which each rhetorolect blends with the other rhetorolects during the emergence of Christian discourse as an identifiable phenomenon in the Mediterranean world.

Robbins's move to analysis of rhetorolects had actually started with his papers at the 1992 Heidelberg conference and the 1993 annual *Exegetiska dagen* at the University of Uppsala, where he investigated different kinds of culture in relation to different kinds of discourse (Porter and Olbricht 1993: 443-63; Robbins 1994d). This means that attention to multiple textures in early Christian discourse began to emerge prior to the publication of the books that presented the multi-textural approach in 1996. However, Robbins actually launched the multiple discourse approach in a paper on the dialectical nature of six kinds of early Christian rhetorolects at the second annual South African Rhetorical Conference in 1996 at the University of Stellenbosch (Robbins 1996c). The names that have gradually evolved for these six rhetorolects are: prophetic, apocalyptic, wisdom, precreation, priestly, and miracle.[28] In 1996, Robbins also published an article on the game-like nature of the wisdom discourse in the Epistle of James, using insights from the anthropologist Bradd Shore (Robbins 1996d; Shore 1996). As Robbins began to analyze different modes of early Christian discourse more intensively, socio-rhetorical analysis of enthymemes became a more prominent feature of the approach (Porter and Olbricht 1997: 33-40). The result was a conclusion that enthymemes work with social, cultural, ideological and theological topics and values, using some topics and values as a context for reconfiguring others.

Beginning in 1998, Robbins's analysis and interpretation of enthymemes began to display rule, case, and result, rather than simply major premise, minor premise, and conclusion (Robbins 1998b, 1998c, 2006). The purpose was to invite a discussion concerning the relation of deductive, inductive, and abductive reasoning in early Christian argumentation. Robbins argued that the unusual sequence of argumentation in Luke 11:4 and 11:13 is abductive in a context where enthymematic networks about praying to God to be forgiven merge with a context where one forgives others, and where God's giving of the Holy Spirit appears in a context where God is being presented as a Father who gives food and other basic needs to people (Robbins 1998c: 210-14). In addition, Robbins proposed that there were a series of instances of abductive reasoning in the Gospel of Thomas (Robbins 1998b: 346-47, 356-86, 2006). L. G. Bloomquist, in a

context of careful exploration of C. S. Peirce's statements about abduction, has concluded that only in a few instances might one be able to detect abductive reasoning in New Testament texts (Porter and Stamps 2002: 61-96). Rather, he suggests, "What Peirce calls deduction, as the tracing out of necessary and probable consequences of certain original hypotheses that were held, seems widely present in the New Testament argumentation and, in fact, appears to be the primary argumentative form" (Porter and Stamps 2002: 85). D. E. Aune has objected to any discussion of abduction in relation to enthymemes in the New Testament, asserting that "Enthymemes, like syllogisms, are *always deductive*…" (Aune 2003: 315). Aune does not discuss Bloomquist's essay, nor does he cite Robbins's essay on the Gospel of Thomas nor Richard L. Lanigan's discussion of abduction and the enthymeme in his 1995 essay (Lanigan 1995), on which Robbins's analysis was initially based. Socio-rhetorical analysis and interpretation of enthymemes is still in its early stages, and it appears that it may be the center of some considerable debate. Jeffrey Walker has published an important analysis and interpretation of the "lyric enthymeme" in the writings of Pindar, Alcaeus, Sappho, and Solon (Walker 2000). This study promises to contribute substantively to the discussion, since it contains enthymematic interpretation of quite lengthy sections of text that people have not regularly considered to be rhetorically argumentative (Walker 2000: 154-273).

As the 20th century was drawing to a close, Robbins turned to apocalyptic discourse and produced an essay on Mark 13 that contains a significant amount of socio-rhetorical analysis of its enthymematic texture in a context that interprets the passage as transferring holiness from the Jerusalem temple to the bodies of Jesus' disciples (Carey and Bloomquist 1999: 95-121). Bloomquist also has produced socio-rhetorical studies of apocalyptic discourse.[29] Newby, who began socio-rhetorical analysis in the Quran in 1997, also has produced essays on apocalyptic discourse in Surahs 2, 10, and 18 of the Quran (Newby 1998; Gowler, Bloomquist, and Watson 2003: 333-54). Thus apocalyptic rhetorolect, which blends extended sequences of vivid, graphic images with emphatic assertions about God's actions, became the testing ground for rhetorical analysis and interpretation that moved beyond semi-philosophically oriented wisdom rhetorolect grounded in God's created order to a rhetorolect grounded in God's ability to act as an omnipotent emperor who can destroy all evil in the universe and transport all holy souls to an environment of well-being.

By the time of the Lund Rhetoric Conference in 2000, it was becoming evident that different ways of "elaborating" *topoi* held the key for describing each rhetorolect on its own terms and in relation to the other rhetorolects in early Christian discourse. Robbins's socio-rhetorical essay for the Lund conference worked programmatically with enthymematic argumentative elaboration in the six rhetorolects that are perceived to be central to first century Christian discourse (Eriksson, Olbricht, and Übelacker 2002: 27-65). In the context of writing a socio-rhetorical study of the intertexture of apocalyptic discourse in Mark for the 1999 SBL NT Rhetoric session, Robbins began to distinguish between narrative-descriptive and argumentative-enthymematic elaboration,[30] and to work with their relation to one another in each rhetorolect. Since 2000, Robbins considers narrative description to be "rhetography" which is picturesque or pictorial expression (Robbins 2008; Jeal 2008; deSilva 2008). In turn, Robbins considers argumentative enthymeme to be "rhetology," which is argumentative

expression. Narrative begins by creating a verbal picture or pictograph (Oakley 1999: 110-111). Elaboration of one verbal picture by means of additional pictures in a sequence (rhetography) creates a graphic story. Argumentation, in contrast, begins by asserting a thesis (logos). Elaboration of a thesis through some combination of rationale, opposite, contrary, analogy, example, citation of authoritative testimony, and/or conclusion creates an argument (rhetology). Each early Christian rhetorolect has its own way of blending rhetography (pictorial narration) and rhetology (argumentation).

The essay on the intertexture of apocalyptic discourse in Mark, mentioned above, focused primarily on enthymematic argumentation. Virtually every instance identified as a "Case" features pictorial narration. In addition, it is characteristic of apocalyptic discourse to create both "Rules" and "Results" through pictorial narration. This means that the enthymematic argumentation (rhetology) of apocalyptic discourse unfolds through pictorial narration (rhetography). The essay states many of these things only implicitly, however, as it attempts to exhibit the sequential rhetology (enthymematic argumentation) of Markan apocalyptic discourse through different sequences of Rule, Case, and Result, and through different manifestations of Rule, Case, and Result.[31] Both the 1999 SBL essay and the 2000 Lund essay explicitly attempt to negotiate multiple early Christian rhetorolects in a context of analysis and interpretation of enthymematic argumentation. H. J. B. Combrink contributed to this subsequently in an investigation of the enthymematic nature of prophetic rhetorolect in Matthew 23 (Gowler, Bloomquist, and Watson 2003: 1-35).

Cultural Geography and Conceptual Blending in Rhetorolects

In the context of analysis and interpretation of the different modes of argumentation in the six major early Christian rhetorolects, reasoning associated with particular social, cultural, and religious locations began to emerge as highly significant. This has led more and more to analysis of social, cultural, and ideological places in socio-rhetorical interpretation. It became obvious, first of all, that a major characteristic of early Christian discourse emerges from the patterns with which it creates enthymematic argumentation out of pictorial narration and reasoning related to people's bodies, households, villages, synagogues, cities, temples, kingdoms, empires, geophysical world, and cosmos. In other words, the cognitions and reasonings were emerging from "lived experiences" in specific places in the first century Mediterranean world. This has led to the use of "critical spatiality theory" in socio-rhetorical interpretation (Berquist 2002, 2007). This area of study, located in the field of cultural geography studies, builds in particular on writings by Henri Lefebvre,[32] Robert D. Sack,[33] Pierre Bourdieu,[34] Edward W. Soja,[35] and Stephen Toulmin.[36] James W. Flanagan was especially instrumental in bringing critical spatiality theory into biblical study (Flanagan 1999; Gunn and McNutt 2002). In 1991, Robbins used Robert D. Sack's *Human Territoriality* for socio-rhetorical analysis of "images of empire" in Acts (Robbins 1991b) and T. F. Carney's *The Shape of the Past*[37] for the social location of the implied author of Luke-Acts (Robbins 1991a). Jerome H. Neyrey has applied strategies for interpreting the social location of the implied

author to Jude and 2 Peter,[38] Luke's social location of Paul,[39] the Gospel of John,[40] and to Paul's writings.[41] Since 2000, Roland Boer has written an important study on "the production of space" in 1 Samuel 1-2,[42] Claudia V. Camp an important essay on "storied space" in Sirach (Gunn and McNutt 2002: 64-80), Victor H. Matthews an important discussion of physical, imagined, and "lived" space in ancient Israel,[43] Thomas B. Dozeman an essay on Ezra-Nehemiah,[44] and Bart B. Bruehler a study of social-spatial functions in Luke 18:35—19:48 (Bruehler 2007).

Socio-rhetorical interpretation is using critical spatiality theory together with cognitive theory about conceptual blending to analyze and interpret the nature of early Christian discourse (Robbins 2007). Here the foundational work is Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner's *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*.[45] Robert von Thaden has produced the first full socio-rhetorical study of a New Testament text using conceptual blending theory (von Thaden 2007). The merger of conceptual blending theory with critical spatiality theory is clarifying the relation of social places to cultural, ideological and religious spaces in the six major early Christian rhetorolects. According to Fauconnier and Turner: "Conceptual integration always involves a blended space and at least two inputs and a generic space" (Fauconnier and Turner 2002: xv, 279). Socio-rhetorical analysis and interpretation of rhetorolects begins, therefore, with a perception that places and spaces are related to conceptual blending in multiple ways. Sensory-aesthetic experiences of the body in various places create the contexts in which people interpret the places they experience as cultural, ideological and religious spaces. In New Testament discourse, the most prominent places for "remembered" and "imagined" experiences of the body are: household, village, city, synagogue, kingdom, temple, geophysical world, and cosmos. Desert, road, sea, and mountain are four of the most prominent geophysical places in early Christian memory. People's interpretations in the ongoing context of their sensory-aesthetic experiences are the "spaces of blending" in which they lead their daily lives. In this context, socio-rhetorical analysis is revealing that different blends of "cultural geography" distinguish early Christian rhetorolects from one another.

In the context of the three major streams of mythical, philosophical, and ritual Mediterranean religious discourse described by the Roman writer Varro ca. 45 BCE (Rives 2007: 21-23), first century Christianity produced localized versions of mantic (divine communication); philosophical; and ritual religious discourse. First century emerging Christian rhetorolects were "localizations" within these three major streams of Mediterranean religious discourse. Emerging Christian prophetic and apocalyptic rhetorolects were localizations of Mediterranean mantic (divine communication) discourse (Beech 2007), with an emphasis on the oracular in prophetic and the visual in apocalyptic rhetorolect. Emerging Christian wisdom and precreation rhetorolects were localizations of Mediterranean philosophical discourse, with an emphasis on moral philosophy based on the visible world in wisdom and speculative philosophy based on the invisible in precreation rhetorolect. Emerging Christian priestly and miracle

rhetorolects were localizations of Mediterranean ritual discourse, with an emphasis on sacrifice and mystery in priestly and on healing in miracle rhetorolect.

Early Christian prophetic rhetorolect was a localization of Mediterranean oracular mantic discourse that blends the speech and action of a prophet's body with the concept of a "kingdom of God" that has political boundaries on the earth. The reasoning in the rhetorolect presupposes that the prophet has received a divine message about God's will. The prophet speaks and acts on the basis of this message in a context of significant resistance, and often explicit rejection and persecution. In the space of blending, God functions as heavenly King over his righteous kingdom on earth. The goal of prophetic rhetorolect is to confront religious and political leaders who act on the basis of human greed, pride, and power rather than God's justice, righteousness, and mercy for all people in God's kingdom on the earth.

Early Christian apocalyptic rhetorolect was a localization of Mediterranean visual mantic discourse that blends human experiences of the emperor and his imperial army with God's heavenly temple city, which can only be occupied by holy, undefiled people. In the space of blending, God functions as a heavenly emperor who gives commands to emissaries to destroy all the evil in the universe and to create a cosmic environment where holy bodies experience perfect well-being in the presence of God. Apocalyptic rhetorolect, then, features destruction of evil and construction of a cosmic environment of perfect well-being. The goal of this blending is to call people into action and thought guided by perfect holiness. The presupposition of the rhetorolect is that only perfect holiness and righteousness can bring a person into the presence of God, who destroys all evil and gathers all holiness together in His presence. Apocalyptic redemption, therefore, means the presence of all of God's holy beings in a realm where God's holiness and righteousness are completely and eternally present.

Early Christian wisdom rhetorolect was a localization of Mediterranean moral philosophical discourse based on the visible world that blends human experiences of the household, one's interpersonal body, and the geophysical world with God's cosmos. In this conceptual blending, God functions as heavenly Father over God's children in the world, whose bodies are to produce goodness and righteousness through the medium of God's wisdom, which is understood as God's light in the world. In this context, wisdom rhetorolect emphasizes "fruitfulness" (productivity and reproductivity). The goal of wisdom rhetorolect is to create people who produce good, righteous action, thought, will, and speech with the aid of God's wisdom.

Early Christian precreation rhetorolect was a localization of Mediterranean speculative philosophical discourse based on the invisible that blends human experiences of an emperor (like the Roman emperor) and his household with the cosmos, with the presupposition that God has an eternal status as a loving heavenly emperor with a household populated by loving people. The result of this blending is the presence of the loving Emperor Father God in God's heavenly household before all time and continually throughout God's "non-time." God's Son existed with God during "non-time" before time began with the creation of the world. This "eternal" Son does what His Father asks him to do, and heirs and friends of the eternal emperor and his eternal son receive eternal benefits from their relation to this eternal household. In the space of blending, God functions as heavenly Emperor Father who possesses eternal blessings He will give

to people as a result of his love for the world and the people in it. People may enter into this love by believing, honoring and worshipping not only God but also his eternal Son and members and friends whom God sends out with a message of eternal blessings. Precreation rhetorolect, then, features love that is the source of all things in the world and the means by which people may enter into God's eternal love. In this rhetorolect, God's light is love that provides the possibility for entering into eternal love, rather than being limited to light that is the basis for the production and reproduction of goodness and righteousness. The goal of the blending in precreation rhetorolect is to guide people towards community that is formed through God's love, which reflects the eternal intimacy present in God's precreation household.

Early Christian priestly rhetorolect was a localization of Mediterranean sacrificial and mystery ritual discourse that blends human experiences in a temple with a concept of temple city and God's cosmos. Reasoning in priestly rhetorolect presupposes that ritual actions benefit God in a manner that activates divine benefits for humans on earth. In the space of blending, people make sacrifices by giving up things that give them well being in the form of giving them to God. Things like food, possessions and money but also things like comfort and honor may be given up to God. Some of these things may be given to God by giving them to other people on earth, or by allowing other people to take things like honor or fame away without protest. The greatest sacrifice people can offer to God, of course, is their entire life. Usually, in contrast, a person gives up only certain highly valued things in life. Much, though not all, early Christian priestly rhetorolect somehow relates to Jesus' death on the cross and mystery that accompanies its benefits to humans and the world. Priestly rhetorolect features beneficial exchange between God and humans in a context of human sacrificial action that regularly is ritualized. The goal of the conceptual blending is to create people who are willing to give up things they highly value in exchange for special divine benefits that come to them, because these sacrifices are perceived to benefit God as well as humans. In other words, sacrificial actions by humans create an environment in which God acts redemptively among humans in the world.

Early Christian miracle rhetorolect was a localization of Mediterranean healing ritual discourse with a primary focus on human bodies afflicted with paralysis, malfunction, or disease. In this context, a malfunctioning body becomes a site of social geography. Miracle rhetorolect features a bodily agent of God's power who renews and restores life, producing forms of new creation that oppose powers of affliction, disruption, and death. The location of importance for early Christian miracle rhetorolect, therefore, is a ritualized space of relation between an afflicted body and a bodily agent of God's power. In this rhetorolect, there is no focus on any particular social, cultural, political, or religious "places" on earth. A bodily agent of God's power, wherever it may be, is a "location" where God can function as a miraculous renewer of life. A major goal of miracle rhetorolect is to effect renewal within people that moves them toward speech and action that produces communities that care for the well-being of one another.

The inclusion of conceptual blending theory and cultural geography theory in socio-rhetorical interpretation allows an interpreter to construct a topology of spaces in early Christian rhetorolects and to interpret the rhetorical power of the blending of spaces in these rhetorolects. Since each of the rhetorolects presents social, cultural and

ideological language, story-telling and argumentation that evoke specific pictures, emotions, cognitions and reasonings, each rhetorolect made vital contributions to an emerging culture of Christian discourse during the first century. Since many of the social places present in early Christian discourse (like household, village, places of sacred ritual, city, etc.) continue to exist to the present day in some kind of reconfigured form, early Christian discourse continually functions anew in places believers perceive to be similar in social, cultural and religious function. Some believers locate their thinking primarily in one rhetorolect at a time, blending aspects of other rhetorolects into this one rhetorolect for very specific purposes. Other believers locate their thinking in a particular blend of multiple rhetorolects, inviting specific aspects of other rhetorolects in implicit, subtle and nuanced ways. These variations produce a dynamic conceptual, cognitive and verbal system of Christian discourse that is highly adaptive to multiple contexts and cultures.

Dynamic blending of the six early Christian rhetorolects created a richly variegated culture of early Christian discourse by the end of the first century. Believers blended each rhetorolect dynamically with the other rhetorolects either by blending multiple rhetorolects into one dominant rhetorolect or by blending particular rhetorolects together in a particularly forceful manner. The dynamics of these blendings throughout the verbal culture of early Christianity produced a continually increasing combination of cognitions, reasonings, picturings, and argumentations. This interactive process continued in Christian discourse throughout the centuries, and it continues in our present day.

Socio-Rhetorical Commentary in Six Steps

At present, interpreters have developed six steps for writing socio-rhetorical commentary that incorporates insights concerning rhetography and rhetology, textures of discourse, modes of elaboration, and multiple rhetorolects in biblical discourse.

Step 1: Describe the rhetography (visual imagery, scene construction) in the discourse

Interpreters begin socio-rhetorical commentary with a description of the blending of rhetorolects that occurs through the sequence of pictures the discourse evokes. This beginning point is motivated by insights both from conceptual blending theory and from rhetorical interpretation of early Christian discourse. Todd Oakley, a conceptual blending theorist working with rhetorical interpretation asserts that: "At the most basic levels of intelligent behavior, scene construction is fundamental" (Oakley 1999: 110). For this reason, spoken or written discourse begins its persuasive work by creating a sequence of pictures in the mind. Averil Cameron, after discussing the multiple rhetorics in early Christian discourse in a chapter entitled "How Many Rhetorics?", discussed the pictorial nature of early Christian discourse in two succeeding chapters entitled "Showing and Telling" and "Stories People Want" (Cameron 1991: 15-119). Currently, socio-rhetorical interpreters focus especially on the rhetography in prophetic, apocalyptic, wisdom, precreation, priestly, and miracle rhetorolects to present an initial interpretation

of the blending of rhetorolects in biblical tradition during the first Christian century. As an aid to this first step in socio-rhetorical commentary, interpreters produce an initial "blending outline," like this outline for 2 Peter 1:1-11:

Introductory Blending of Prophetic, Priestly, Wisdom, Miracle, and Apocalyptic Christian Rhetorolects

Step 1: Prophetic
Peter adopts a Prophetic Role with his Hearers

1:1 Simeon Peter, a servant and apostle of Jesus Christ, To those who have obtained a faith of equal standing with ours in the righteousness of our God and Savior Jesus Christ:

Step 2:	**Wisdom**
Blended Priestly	A Priestly Blessing based on Wisdom from
Rhetorolect	God

1:2 May grace and peace be multiplied to you in the knowledge of God and of Jesus our Lord.

Step 3:	**Wisdom**	**Prophetic**
Blended	God's Miraculous Power through God's Wisdom calls the Speaker	
Miracle	and Hearers to Prophetic Responsiblity	
Rhetorolect		

1:3 His divine power has granted to us all things that pertain to life and godliness, through the knowledge of him who called us to his own glory and excellence,

Step 4:	**Apocalyptic**
Blended Prophetic	Prophetic Speech guides the Hearers to
Rhetorolect	Escape from Corruption at the End of Time

1:4 by which he has granted to us his precious and very great promises, that through these you may escape from the corruption that is in the world because of passion, and become partakers of the divine nature.

II. Blending Wisdom with Priestly, Prophetic, and Apocalyptic

Step 1: Wisdom
Wisdom Paraenesis

1:5 For this very reason make every effort to supplement your faith with virtue, and virtue with knowledge, 6 and knowledge with self-control, and self-control with steadfastness, and steadfastness with godliness, 7 and godliness with brotherly affection,

and brotherly affection with love. 8 For if these things are yours and abound, they keep you from being ineffective or unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Step 2:	**Priestly**
Blended Wisdom	Wisdom Rationale grounded in Priestly Reasoning
Rhetorolect	

1:9 For whoever lacks these things is blind and shortsighted and has forgotten that he was cleansed from his old sins.

Step 3:	**Prophetic**	**Apocalyptic**
Blended	Paraenetic Wisdom Conclusion directed toward Prophetic Life that leads
Wisdom	to Entrance into God's Eternal Kingdom
Rhetorolect	

1:10 Therefore, brethren, be the more zealous to confirm your call and election, for if you do this you will never fall; 11 so there will be richly provided for you an entrance into the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

This blending outline reveals a sequence of pictures in which Peter functions as prophet, priest, sage, agent of God's power, and apocalyptic seer. In turn, his hearers are members of God's kingdom on earth, recipients of priestly holiness, possessors of wisdom from God, benefactors of God's miraculous powers, and visionaries of God's eternal kingdom.

After Step 1, socio-rhetorical commentators exercise the freedom to present Steps 2-5 in whatever order they wish and blended in whatever manner they wish. The essential feature is explicit analysis and interpretation of all four textures of the text.

Step 2: Analyze and Interpret the Inner Texture of the Rhetography and Rhetology in the Discourse

Using guidelines from Robbins 1996a: 44-95 and Robbins 1996b: 7-39 as an initial frame of reference, socio-rhetorical commentators analyze and interpret the relation of rhetography and rhetology in the elaboration of the discourse. The initial frame of reference calls attention to repetitive, progressive, narrational, opening-middle-closing, argumentative, and sensory-aesthetic rhetorical strategies in discourse (Gowler, Bloomquist, and Watson 2003: 1-28, 97-102, 246-48, 282-96). These strategies activate and correlate two traditions of inquiry that often are separated: the "image tradition of inquiry" and the "logic tradition of inquiry" (2000: 193, based on Galison 1997: 19-31). The goal of this "double-mode" of "inner texture" inquiry is to locate patterns that integrate and correlate rhetography and rhetology in the discourse. This is a double mode of inquiry, since patterns are likely to call attention both to images and to logical assertions in the discourse. Underlying the strategies of analysis and interpretation is a presupposition that humans "elaborate blends by treating them as simulations and running them imaginatively according to the principles that have been established for the blend… Part of the power of blending is that there

are always many different possible lines of elaboration, and elaboration can go on indefinitely" (Fauconnier and Turner 2002: 48-49).

Step 3: Analyze and Interpret the Intertexture of the Rhetography and Rhetology in the Discourse

Using guidelines from Robbins 1996a: 96-143 and 1996b: 40-70 as an initial frame or reference, socio-rhetorical commentators analyze and interpret various aspects of oral-scribal, cultural, social, and historical intertexture from the perspective of both rhetography and rhetology (Gowler, Bloomquist, and Watson 2003: 28-30, 103-05, 248-51, 264-80, 296-302, 333-54). These procedures of analysis and interpretation presuppose that humans blend images and reasonings by recruiting great ranges of "background meaning" to create richer patterns through processes of "pattern completion" (Fauconnier and Turner 2002: 48). In this context, memory functions as "a complex and dynamic process of constructing a complex scene and marshaling our learned capacity to order successive changes" (Oakley 1999: 109).

Step 4: Analyze and Interpret the Social and Cultural Texture of the Rhetography and Rhetology in the Discourse

Using guidelines from Robbins 1996a: 144-91 and Robbins 1996b: 71-94 as an initial frame of reference, socio-rhetorical commentators analyze and interpret various aspects of social and cultural texture (specific topics, common social and cultural topics, and final cultural categories) from the perspective of both rhetography and rhetology (Gowler, Bloomquist, and Watson 2003: 30-34, 36-63, 126-64, 252-61, 277-78). Using insights from cultural geography studies that have been refined through critical spatiality theory, socio-rhetorical commentators identify and interpret the relation of socially experienced places (firstspace) to socially and culturally imagined spaces (secondspace) and spaces of daily living and blending (Gunn and McNutt 2002: 14-50, 64-80; Dozeman 2003: 455). At present, this analysis and interpretation keeps prophetic, apocalyptic, wisdom, precreation, priestly, and miracle rhetorolect in Mediterranean discourse in the forefront as an overall frame of reference.

Step 5: Analyze and Interpret the Ideological Texture of the Rhetography and Rhetology in the Discourse

Using guidelines from Robbins 1996a: 192-236 and Robbins 1996b: 95-119, socio-rhetorical commentators analyze and interpret various aspects of ideology (individual locations, relation to groups, modes of intellectual discourse, and spheres of ideology) from the perspective of both rhetography and rhetology (Gowler, Bloomquist, and Watson 2003: 34-35, 64-125, 165-241, 252-63, 279-80, 317-32). In this context, places and spaces are understood to be politically charged as places of domination, marginalization, and/or resistance (Gunn and McNutt 2002: 30-80).

Step 6: Analyze and Interpret the Rhetorical Force of the Rhetography and Rhetology as Emergent Christian Discourse

After presenting analysis and interpretation on the basis of Steps 2-5, socio-rhetorical commentators explain the rhetorical force of the emerging Christian discourse in the Mediterranean world. Using insights into the reconfiguration of concepts of deity, holy person, spirit being, human redemption, human commitment, religious community, and ethics (Robbins 1996b: 120-131), socio-rhetorical commentators analyze and interpret how rhetorolects blend rhetography and rhetology into newly configured Mediterranean discourse. This step in socio-rhetorical commentary emerges from the observation that "if ever there was a case of the construction of reality through text, such a case is provided by early Christianity. Out of the framework of Judaism, and living as they did in the Roman Empire and in the context of Greek philosophy, pagan practice, and contemporary social ideas, Christians built themselves a new world" (Cameron 1991: 21). Socio-rhetorical commentary further presupposes that "the very multiplicity of Christian discourse, what one might call its elasticity, while of course from the Church's point of view needing to be restrained and delimited, in fact constituted an enormous advantage in practical terms, especially in the early stages. No account of Christian development can work if it fails to take this sufficiently into account" (Cameron 1991: 9).

Conclusion

Socio-rhetorical interpretation began in the 1970s with an attempt to explain special characteristics of language in the accounts of voyaging on the sea in Acts and Jesus' calling, gathering, teaching and sending out of disciples in the Gospels. In both instances, the goal was to understand the language of New Testament literature in the context of Mediterranean literature, both religious and non-religious. Also, the goal was to understand the use of language in relation to social, cultural, ideological and religious environments and relationships in the Mediterranean world. During the 1980s, the rhetorical treatises entitled *Progymnasmata* (Preliminary Exercises) played a major role in the interpretation of abbreviation, expansion, addition, rebuttal, commendation and elaboration in biblical and Mediterranean literature before and during the time of the emergence of early Christianity. During the 1990s, socio-rhetorical interpretation identified multiple textures of texts for the purpose of reading and re-reading them in ways that activated a wide range of literary, rhetorical, historical, social, cultural, ideological and religions "webs of signification" in texts. This led to a display of strategies of interpretation for five textures of texts: inner texture, intertexture, social and cultural texture, ideological texture and sacred texture. During the last half of the 1990s, socio-rhetorical interpretation gradually moved toward analysis of different rhetorolects in early Christian discourse. Gradually, six early Christian rhetorolects have appeared: prophetic, apocalyptic, wisdom, precreation, priestly, and miracle. Having initially gravitated toward wisdom rhetorolect during the 1980s and early 1990s, socio-rhetorical interpreters focused specifically on apocalyptic and

miracle rhetorolect during the last half of the 1990s. A Festschrift appeared in 2003 that reviewed many of the developments in socio-rhetorical interpretation and featured contributions to the approach from various angles (Gowler, Bloomquist, and Watson 2003). Socio-rhetorical interpreters still face major challenges of analyzing and interpreting precreation, priestly and prophetic rhetorolect in early Christian writings. In addition, they face the challenge of writing programmatic commentary that displays the manifold ways in which early Christian writings blend early Christian rhetorolects together. Work is under way to display this kind of socio-rhetorical commentary in a forthcoming series entitled Rhetoric of Religious Antiquity.[46]

NB: The pagination from 208 to the end is different from the published version.

Bibliography

Adams, E. 1994: Constructing the World: An Exegetical and Socio-Rhetorical Analysis of Paul's Uses of *kosmos* and *ktisis*. Ph.D. diss., University of Glasgow.

Amador, J. D. H. 1999: Academic Constraints in Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament: An Introduction to a Rhetoric of Power. JSNTSup 174, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Arnal, W. E. 1997: Gendered Couplets in Q and Legal Formulations: From Rhetoric to Social History, *JBL* 116, 75-94.

Ascough, R. S. 1997: Voluntary Associations and Community Formation: Paul's Macedonian Communities in Context. Ph.D. diss., University of St. Michael's College.

Ascough, R. S. 2003: Paul's Macedonian Associations: The Social Context of Philippians & 1 Thessalonians. WUNT II/161, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Aune, D. E. 2003: Use and Abuse of the Enthymeme in New Testament Scholarship, *NTS* 49, 299-320

Batten, A. J. 1998: Patience Breeds Wisdom: Q 6:40 in Context, *CBQ* 60, 641-56.

Beech, T. 2007: A Socio-Rhetorical Analysis of the Development and Function of the Noah-Flood Narrative in *Sybilline Oracles* 1-2. Ph.D. diss., Saint Paul University, Ottawa, Canada.

Bell, T. J. 1999: The Paraclete Abbey Bridal Tapestry: A Socio-Rhetorical Analysis of Peter Abelard's Sequences *Virgines castae* and *Epithalamica*. Ph.D. diss., Emory University = 2007: *Peter Abelard after Marriage: The Spiritual Direction of Heloise and*

Her Nuns Through Liturgical Song. Cistercian Studies 211, Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications.

Berquist, J. L. 2002: Critical Spatiality and the Construction of the Ancient World. In Gunn and McNutt 2002: 14-29.

Berquist, J. L. 2007: Introduction: Critical Spatiality and the Uses of Theory. In J. L. Berquist and C. V. Camp (eds.), *Constructions of Space I: Theory, Geography, and Narrative*. NewYork/London: T. & T. Clark, 1-12.

Bloomquist, L. G. 1999: Patristic Reception of a Lukan Healing Account: A Contribution to a Socio-Rhetorical Response to Willi Braun's *Feasting and Social Rhetoric in Luke 14*, (SNTSMS, 85, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995). In S. Muir and J. K. Coyle (eds.) 1999: *Healing in Religion and Society, From Hippocrates to the Puritans.* Studies in Religion and Society 43, Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 105-34.

Bloomquist, L. G. 2002: First Century Models of Bodily Healing and their Socio-Rhetorical Transformation in some New Testament Synoptic Gospel traditions. *Queen: a journal of rhetoric and power,* Special Issue, http://www.ars-rhetorica.net/Queen/VolumeSpecialIssue/Articles/Bloomquist.html, 1-28.

Blount, B. K. 1993: A Socio-Rhetorical Analysis of Simon of Cyrene: Mark 15:21 and Its Parallels, *Semeia* 64, 171-98.

Braun, W. 1993: The Use of Mediterranean Banquet Traditions in Luke 14:1-14. Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto.

Braun, W. 1995: *Feasting and Social Rhetoric in Luke 14*. SNTSMS 85, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Braun, W. 1997: Social-rhetorical Interests: Context. In W. E. Arnal (ed.), *Whose Historical Jesus*? Studies in Christianity and Judaism 7, Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier Press, 93-95.

Bruehler, B. B. 2007: The Public, the Political, and the Private: The Literary and Social-Spatial Functions of Luke 18:35—19:48. Ph.D. diss., Emory University.

Brown, H. S. 1999: The Martyrs on Trial: A Socio-Rhetorical Analysis of Second Century Christian Court Narrative. Ph.D. diss., Temple University.

Cameron, Averil 1991: *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse*. Berkley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press.

Carey, G. and Bloomquist, L. G. (eds.) 1999: *Vision and Persuasion: Rhetorical Dimensions of Apocalyptic Discourse.* St. Louis, Mo.: Chalice Press.

Combrink, H. J. B. 1992: Reference and Rhetoric in the Gospel of Matthew, *Scriptura* 40, 1-17.

Combrink, H. J. B. 1993: 'n Retoriese benadering tot die Nuwe Testament, *Skrif en Kerk* 14,2, 146-62.

Combrink, H. J. B. 1998: The Rhetoric of the Church in the Transition from the Old to the New South Africa: Socio-Rhetorical Criticism and Ecclesiastical Rhetoric, *Neot* 32, 289-307.

Combrink, H. J. B. 1999: The Challenge of Making and Redrawing Boundaries: A Perspective on Socio-Rhetorical Criticism, *Nederduitse Gereformeerde Teologiese Tydskrif* 40, 18-30.

Combrink, H. J. B. 2002: The Challenges and Opportunities of a Socio-Rhetorical Commentary, *Scriptura* 79, 106-21.

Combrink, H. J. B. 2007: The Contribution of Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation to the Reformed Interpretation of Scripture. In W. M. J. Alston and M. Welker (eds.), *Reformed Theology: Identity and Ecumenicity II: Biblical Interpretation in the Reformed Tradition.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 91-106.

Cottrill, J. M. 1999: A Christological Contradistinction in the Gospel of Matthew. Master's thesis, Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary.

Coulson, Seana and Oakley, Todd V. 2000: Blending Basics, *Cognitive Linguistics* 11.3/4, 175-96.

Czachesz, I. 1995: Socio-Rhetorical Exegesis of Acts 9:1-30, *Communio Viatorum* (Praha) 37, 5-32.

Detweiler, R. and Robbins, V. K. 1991: From New Criticism and the New Hermeneutic to Poststructuralism: Twentieth Century Hermeneutics. In S. Prickett (ed.), *Reading The Text: Biblical Criticism and Literary Theory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 225-80.

deSilva, D. A. 1995a: *Despising Shame: The Social Function of the Rhetoric of Honor and Dishonor in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. SBLDS 152, Atlanta: Scholars Press. Rev. ed. 2008: *Despising Shame: Honor Discourse and Community Maintenance in the Epistle to the Hebrews.* Studia Biblica 21, Atlanta: SBL.

deSilva, D. A. 1995b: The Noble Contest: Honor, Shame, and the Rhetorical Strategy of 4 Maccabees, *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 13, 31-57.

deSilva, D. A. 1996: The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Honor, Shame, and the Maintenance of the Values of a Minority Culture, *CBQ* 58, 433-55.

deSilva, D. A. 1997: Investigating Honor Discourse: Guidelines from Classical Rhetoricians, *SBLSP* 36, 491-525.

deSilva, D. A. 1998a: Honor Discourse and the Rhetorical Strategy of the Apocalypse of John, *JSNT* 71, 79-110.

deSilva, D. A. 1998b: The Persuasive Strategy of the Apocalypse: A Socio-Rhetorical Investigation of Revelation 14:6-13, *SBLSP* 37, 785-806.

deSilva, D. A. 1999a: *The Hope of Glory: Honor Discourse and the New Testament*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press.

deSilva, D. A. 1999b: Hebrews 6:4-8: A Socio-Rhetorical Investigation. Part I/Part II, *Tyndale Bulletin* 50/1, 33-57; 50/2, 225-35.

deSilva, D. A. 1999c: A Socio-Rhetorical Investigation of Revelation 14:6-13: A Call to Act Justly toward the Just and Judging God, *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 9, 65-117.

deSilva, D. A. 2000: *Perseverance in Gratitude: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on the Epistle "to the Hebrews."* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.

deSilva, D. A. 2004: *An Introduction to the New Testament: Contexts, Methods & Ministry Formation.* Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press and Leicester, UK: Apollos.

deSilva, D. A. 2006: The Invention and Argumentative Function of Priestly Discourse in the Epistle to the Hebrews, *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 16, 295-323.

deSilva, D. A. 2008: Seeing Things John's Way: Rhetography and Conceptual Blending in Revelation 14:6-13, *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 18, 271-98.

Dozeman, T. B. 2003: Geography and History in Herodotus and in Ezra-Nehemiah, *JBL* 122, 449-66.

Eriksson, A., Olbricht, T. H., and Übelacker (eds.) 2002: *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts: Essays from the Lund 2000 Conference*. Emory Studies in Early Christianity 8, Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International.

Fauconnier, Gilles and Turner, Mark 2002: *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*. New York: Basic Books.

Flanagan J. W. 1999: Ancient Perceptions of Space/Perceptions of Ancient Space, *Semeia* 87, 15-43.

Galison, P. 1997: *Image and Logic: A Material Culture of Microphysics.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gowler, D. B. 1989: Characterization in Luke: A Socio-Narratological Approach, *BTB* 19:2, 54-62.

Gowler, D. B. 1991: *Host, Guest, Enemy and Friend: Portraits of the Pharisees in Luke and Acts*. Emory Studies in Early Christianity 1, New York: Peter Lang.

Gowler, D. G. 1993: Hospitality and Characterization in Luke 11:37-54: A Socio-Narratological Approach, *Semeia* 64, 213-51.

Gowler, D. B. 1994: The Development of Socio-Rhetorical Criticism. In Robbins 1994a: 1-35; http://userwww.service.emory.edu/%7Edgowler/chapter.htm.

Gowler, D. B. 2000: Heteroglossic Trends in Biblical Studies: Polyphonic Dialogues or Clanging Cymbals?, *Review & Expositor* 97, 443-66.

Gowler, D. B., Bloomquist, L. G., and D. F. Watson (eds.) 2003: *Fabrics of Discourse: Essays in Honor of Vernon K. Robbins*. Harrisburg/London/New York: Trinity Press International.

Gunn, David M. and McNutt, Paula M. 2002: *'Imagining' Biblical Worlds: Studies in Spatial, Social and Historical Constructs in Honor of James W. Flanagan*. JSOTSS 359, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Gray, P. 2001: Abortion, Infanticide, and the Social Rhetoric of the *Apocalypse of Peter*, *JECS* 9, 313-37.

Hendricks, Jr., O. M. 1995: A Discourse of Domination: A Socio-Rhetorical Study of the Meaning of "*Ioudaios*" in the Fourth Gospel. Ph.D. diss., Princeton University.

Hester, J. D. 1992: Socio-Rhetorical Criticism and the Parable of the Tenants, *JSNT* 45, 27-57.

Huie-Jolly, M. R. 1994: The Son Enthroned in Conflict: A Socio-Rhetorical Analysis of John 5.17-23. Ph.D. diss., University of Otago, New Zealand.

Huie-Jolly, M. R. 1997: Like Father, Like Son, Absolute Case, Mythic Authority: Constructing Ideology in John 5:17-23, *SBLSP* 36, 567-95.

Jaques, R. K. 2001: A Muslim history of Islamic Law: Ibn Qadi Shuhbah's Tabaqat al-fuqaha' al-Shafi'iyah (The generations of the Shafi'i Jurists). Ph.D. diss., Emory University.

Jeal, R. R. 2005a: Melody, Imagery and Memory in the Moral Persuasion of Paul. In Olbricht and Eriksson 2005:160-78.

Jeal, R. R. 2005b: Clothes Make the (Wo)Man, *Scriptura* 90, 685-99.

Jeal, R. R. 2008: Blending Two Arts: Rhetorical Words, Rhetorical Pictures and Social Formation in the Letter to Philemon, Sino-Christian Studies 5, 9-38.

Jensen, J. S. 1992: Retorisk kritik: Om en ny vej I evangelieforskningen, *Dansk teologisk tidsskrift* 55, 262-79; ET: Rhetorical Criticism: On a New Way in Gospel Research.

Kloppenborg, J. S. 1999: Patronage Avoidance in James, *HervTeoStud* 55, no. 4, 755-94.

Kloppenborg, J. S. 2000: "The Q Document and the Q People" and "Social Characterizations in Theological Perspective." In J. S. Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 166-213, 409-44.

Lanigan, R. L. 1995: From Enthymeme to Abduction: The Classical Law of Logic and the Postmodern Rule of Rhetoric. In L. Langsdorf and A. R. Smith (eds.), *Recovering Pragmatism's Voice: The Classical Tradition, Rorty, and the Philosophy of Communication*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 49-70.

Lawson, E. T. and McCauley, R. N. 1990: *Rethinking Religion: Connecting Cognition & Culture.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, C. W. 2001: The Pauline Concept of the Law in Romans 7: A Socio-Rhetorical Approach. D.Th. diss., University of Stellenbosch.

Lightstone, J. N. 1994: *The Rhetoric of the Babylonian Talmud, Its Social Meaning and Context*. Studies in Christianity and Judaism/Études sur le christianisme et le judaïsme 6, Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press for the Canadian

Corporation for Studies in Religion/Corporation Canadienne des Sciences Religieuses.

Lightstone, J. N. 2002: *Mishnah and the Social Formation of the Early Rabbinic Guild: A Socio-Rhetorical Approach*. Studies in Christianity and Judaism/Études sur le christianisme et le judaïsme 11, Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press for the Canadian Corporation for Studies in Religion/Corporation Canadienne des Sciences Religieuses.

Long, F. J. 2005: From Epicheiremes to Exhortation: A Pauline Method for Moral Persuasion in 1 Thessalonians. In Olbricht and Eriksson 2005:179-95.

Mack, B. L. and Robbins, V. K. 1989: *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels*. Sonoma: Polebridge. Repr. 2008: Eugene, Ore.: Wipf & Stock.

Megbelayin, O. J. 2002: A Socio-Rhetorical Analysis of the Lukan Narrative of the Last Supper. Ph.D. diss., St. Paul University, Ottawa, Canada.

Nel, M. J. 2002: Vergifnis en versoening in Matteus (Forgiveness and Reconciliation in Matthew). D.Th. diss., University of Stellenbosch.

Newby, G. D. 1998: Quranic Texture: A Review of Vernon Robbins's *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse* and *Exploring the Texture of Texts*, *JSNT* 70, 93-100.

Oakley, Todd V. 1998: Conceptual Blending, Narrative Discourse, and Rhetoric, *Cognitive Linguistics* 9.4, 321-60.

Oakley, Todd V. 1999: The Human Rhetorical Potential, *Written Communication* 16.1, 93-128.

Oakley, Todd V. 2009: *From Attention to Meaning: Explorations in Semiotics, Linguistics, and Rhetoric*. European Semiotics: Language Cognition and Cultures Series 8; Bern: Peter Lang.

Olbricht, T. H. and Eriksson, A. (eds.) 2005: *Rhetoric, Ethic, and Moral Persuasion in Biblical Discourse: Essays from the 2002 Heidelberg Conference*. Emory Studies in Early Christianity 11, New York/London: T. & T. Clark International.

Oosthuizen, M. J. 1997: Deuteronomy 15:1-18 in Socio-Rhetorical Perspective. *Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 3, herausgegeben von Eckart Otto unter Mitarbeit von Klaus Baltzer, et al., Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1997) 64-91;
http://www.religion.emory.edu/faculty/robbins/studies/OosthuizenDeut.pdf.

Park, J-S. 1999: The Shepherd Discourse in John 10: A Rhetorical Interpretation. D.Th.
        diss., University of Stellenbosch.

Patton, L. L., Robbins, V. K. and Newby, G. D. 2009: Comparative Sacred Texts and
        Interactive Reading: Another Alternative to the "World Religions" Class,
        Teaching Theology and Religion 12.1, 37-49.

Penner, T. C. 1996: Narrative as Persuasion: Epideictic Rhetoric and Scribal
        Amplification in the Stephen Episode in Acts, *SBLSP* 35, 352-67.

Penner, T. C. 1999: James in Contemporary Research, *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies*
        7, 257-308.

Penner, T. C. 2004: *In Praise of Christian Origins: Stephen and the Hellenists in Lukan
        Apologetic Historiography*. Emory Studies in Early Christianity 10, New
        York/London: T. & T. Clark International.

Porter, S. E. and Olbricht, T. H. 1993: *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992
        Heidelberg Conference*. JSNTSup 90, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Porter, S. E. and Olbricht, T. H. 1996: *Rhetoric, Scripture & Theology: Essays from the 1994
        Pretoria Conference*. JSNTSup 131, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Porter, S. E. and Olbricht, T. H. (eds.) 1997: *The Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture: Essays from
        the 1995 London Conference.* JSNTSup 146, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Porter, S. E. and Stamps, D. L. (eds.) 1999: *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays
        from the 1996 Malibu Conference*. JSNTSup 180, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic
        Press.

Porter, S. E. and Stamps, D. L. (eds.) 2002: *Rhetorical Criticism and the Bible.* JSNTSup 195,
        Sheffield: Academic Press.

Rives, J. B. 2007: Religion in the Roman Empire. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Robbins, V. K. 1975: The We-Passages in Acts and Ancient Sea Voyages, *BR* 20, 5-18.

Robbins, V. K. 1976: By Land and By Sea: A Study in Acts 13-28, *SBLSP* 15, 381-96.

Robbins, V. K. 1978: By Land and By Sea: The We-Passages and Ancient Sea Voyages. In
        C. H. Talbert (ed.), *Perspectives on Luke-Acts.* Perspectives in Religious Studies,

Special Studies Series, No. 5, Macon, Ga: Mercer University Press and Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 215-42.

Robbins, V. K. 1981: Summons and Outline in Mark: The Three-Step Progression, *Novum Testamentum* 23, 97-114 = Robbins 1994a: 119-35 = D. E. Orton (ed.) 1999: *The Composition of Mark's Gospel: Selected Studies from Novum Testamentum*. Brill's Readers in Biblical Studies 3, Leiden: Brill, 103-20.

Robbins, V. K. 1982: Mark I.14-20: An Interpretation at the Intersection of Jewish and Graeco-Roman Traditions, *NTS* 28, 220-36 = Robbins 1994a: 137-54.

Robbins, V. K. 1984: *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Robbins, V. K. 1985a: Pragmatic Relations as a Criterion for Authentic Sayings, *Forum* 1.3, 35-63.

Robbins, V. K. 1985b: Picking Up the Fragments: From Crossan`s Analysis to Rhetorical Analysis, *Forum* 1.2, 31-64.

Robbins, V. K. 1987a: The Woman who Touched Jesus' Garment: Socio-Rhetorical Analysis of the Synoptic Accounts, *New Testament Studies* 33, 502-15 = Robbins 1994a: 185-200.

Robbins, V. K. 1987b: Rhetorical argument about lamps and light in early Christian gospels. In P. W. Böckman and R. E. Kristiansen (eds.) 1987: *Context, Festskrift til Peder Johan Borgen*. Relieff 24, Universitetet i Trondheim: Tapir, 177-95 = Robbins 1994a: 201-17.

Robbins, V. K. 1988a: The Chreia. In D. E. Aune (ed.), *Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament*. Atlanta: Scholars, 1-23.

Robbins, V. K. 1988b: The Crucifixion and the Speech of Jesus, *Forum* 4.1, 33-46.

Robbins, V. K. 1989a: Foxes, Birds, Burials & Furrows. In Mack and Robbins 1989: 70-74.

Robbins, V. K. (ed.) 1989b: *Ancient Quotes & Anecdotes: From Crib to Crypt*. Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge.

Robbins, V. K. 1990a: Interpreting the Gospel of Mark as a Jewish Document in a Graeco-Roman World. P. V. M. Flesher (ed.), *New Perspectives on Ancient Judaism*. Lanham, New York/ London: University Press of America, 47-72 = Robbins 1994a: 219-42.

Robbins, V. K. 1990b: A Socio-Rhetorical Response: Contexts of Interaction and Forms of Exhortation, *Semeia* 50, 261-71.

Robbins, V. K. 1991a: The Social Location of the Implied Author of Luke-Acts. J. H. Neyrey (ed.) 1991: *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 305-32.

Robbins, V. K. 1991b: Luke-Acts: A Mixed Population Seeks a Home in the Roman Empire. In L. Alexander (ed.) 1991: *Images of Empire*. Sheffield: JSOT Press 202-21.

Robbins, V. K. 1991c: Beelzebul Controversy in Mark and Luke: Rhetorical and Social Analysis, *Forum* 7.3-4 (1991) 261-77.

Robbins, V. K. 1991d: Writing as a Rhetorical Act in Plutarch and the Gospels. D. F. Watson (ed.), *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 157-86.

Robbins, V. K. 1992a: *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark,* pbk. ed., Minneapolis: Fortress Press. Repr. 2009: Fortress Press ex libris.

Robbins, V. K. 1992b: The Reversed Contextualization of Psalm 22 in the Markan Crucifixion: A Socio-Rhetorical Analysis. In F. van Segbroeck, C.M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle, J. Verheyden (eds.), *The Four Gospels 1992. Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Volume 2, BETL 100, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1161-83.

Robbins, V. K. 1992c: Using a Socio-Rhetorical Poetics to Develop a Unified Method: The Woman who Anointed Jesus as a Test Case, *SBLSP* 31, 302-19.

Robbins, V. K. 1993a: Progymnastic Rhetorical Composition and Pre-Gospel Traditions: A New Approach. In C. Focant (ed.), *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*, BETL 110, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 116-31.

Robbins, V. K. (ed.) 1993b: *The Rhetoric of Pronouncement*. *Semeia* 64, Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Robbins, V. K. 1994a: *New Boundaries in Old Territory: Forms and Social Rhetoric in Mark,* ed. D. B. Gowler, Emory Studies in Early Christianity 3, New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Robbins, V. K. 1994b: Oral, Rhetorical, and Literary Cultures: A Response, *Semeia* 65, 75-91.

Robbins, V. K. 1994c: Socio-Rhetorical Criticism: Mary, Elizabeth, and the Magnificat as a Test Case. In E. S. Malbon and E. V. McKnight (eds.), *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 164-209.

Robbins, V. K. 1994d: Interpreting Miracle Culture and Parable Culture in Mark 4-11, *SEÅ* 59, 59-81.

Robbins, V. K. 1995: Divine Dialogue and the Lord's Prayer: Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Sacred Texts, *Dialogue* 28, 117-46.

Robbins, V. K. 1996a: *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, Society and Ideology*. London: Routledge.

Robbins, V. K. 1996b: *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation.* Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International.

Robbins, V. K. 1996c: The Dialectical Nature of Early Christian Discourse, *Scriptura* 59, 353-362. Online: http://www.religion.emory.edu/faculty/robbins/dialect/dialect353.html.

Robbins, V. K. 1996d: Making Christian Culture in the Epistle of James, *Scriptura* 59, 341-51; http://www.religion.emory.edu/faculty/robbins/James/James341.html.

Robbins, V. K. 1997: Rhetorical Composition and Sources in the Gospel of Thomas. *SBLSP*, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 86-114.

Robbins, V. K. 1998a: Socio-Rhetorical Hermeneutics and Commentary. In J. Mrazek, S. Brodsky, and R. Dvorakova (eds.), *ΕΠΙ ΤΟ ΑΥΤΟ. Essays in honour of Petr Pokorny on his sixty-fifth birthday*, Praha-Trebenice: Mlyn Publishers, 284-97; http://www.religion.emory.edu/faculty/robbins/commentary/commentary284.html

Robbins, V. K. 1998b: Enthymemic Texture in the Gospel of Thomas. *SBLSP,* Atlanta: Scholars Press, 343-66.

Robbins, V. K. 1998c: From Enthymeme to Theology in Luke 11:1-13. In R. P. Thompson and T. E. Phillips (ed.), *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: A Collection of Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 191-214.

Robbins, V. K. 2001: Why Participate in African Biblical Interpretation? In M. N. Getui, T. S. Maluleke, and J. Ukpong (eds.), *Interpreting the New Testament in Africa*.

Nairobi, Kenya: Acton Publishers, 275-91;
http://www.religion.emory.edu/faculty/robbins/Africa/africa10.htm

Robbins, V. K. 2003: The Legacy of 2 Corinthians 12:2-4 in the *Apocalypse of Paul*. In T. J. Burke and J. K. Elliott (eds.), *Paul and the Corinthians: Studies on a Community in Conflict*. SupNovT 109, Leiden/Boston: Brill, 25-339.

Robbins, V. K. 2004: Where is Wuellner's Anti-Hermeneutical Hermeneutic Taking Us?: From Scheiermacher to Thistleton and Beyond. In J. D. Hester and D. Hester (eds.), *Rhetorics and Hermeneutics: Wilhelm Wuellner and His Influence*. Emory Studies in Early Christianity 9, New York/London: T. & T. Clark International, 105-25.

Robbins, V. K. 2005a: "The Rhetorical Full-Turn in Biblical Interpretation and Its Relevance for Feminist Hermeneutics." In C. Vander Stichele and T. Penner (eds.), *Her Master's* Tools? Feminist and Postcolonial Engagements of Historical-Critical Discourse, Global Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship 9, Atlanta: SBL, 109-27.

Robbins, V. K. 2005b: Lukan and Johannine Tradition in the Qur'an: A Story of (and Program for) *Auslegungsgeschichte* and *Wirkungsgeschichte.* In T. Penner and C. Vander Stichele (eds.), *Moving Beyond New Testament Theology? Essays in Conversation with Heikki Räisänen*. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society and Göttingen:Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 336-68.

Robbins, V. K. 2005c: From Heidelberg to Heidelberg: Rhetorical Interpretation of the Bible at the Seven "Pepperdine" Conferences from 1992-2002. In Olbricht and Eriksson: 335-77.

Robbins, V. K. 2006: Enthymeme and Picture in the Gospel of Thomas. In J. Ma. Asgeirson, A. DeConick, and R. Uro (eds.), *Thomasine Traditions in Antiquity: The Social and Cultural World of the Gospel of Thomas*. Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 59; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 175-207.

Robbins, V. K. 2007: Conceptual Blending and Early Christian Imagination. In P. Luomanen, I. Pyysiäinen and R. Uro (eds.), *Explaining Christian Origins and Early Judaism: Contributions from Cognitive and Social Science*. Biblical Interpretation Series 89, Leiden/Boston: Brill, 161-95.

Robbins, V. K. 2008: Rhetography: A New Way of Seeing the Familiar Text. In C. C. Black and D. F. Watson (eds.), *Words Well Spoken: George Kennedy's Rhetoric of the New Testament*. Studies in Rhetoric and Religion 8; Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 81-106.

Robbins, V. K. 2009a: *The Invention of Christian Discourse*. Volume 1. Rhetoric of Religious Antiquity 1, Blandford Forum, UK: Deo Publishing.

Robbins, V. K. 2009b: *Sea Voyages and Beyond*. Emory Studies in Early Christianity 14, Blandford Forum, UK: Deo Publishing.

Robbins V. K. and Newby, G. D. 2003: A Prolegomenon to the Relation of the Qur'an and the Bible. In J. Reeves (ed.), *Bible and Qur'an: Essays in Scriptural Intertextuality*. Symposium Series, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 23-42.

Robbins, V. K. and Patton J. H. 1980: Rhetoric and Biblical Criticism, *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 66, 327-37.

Shore, B. 1996: Culture in Mind: Cognition, Culture, and the Problem of Meaning. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sisson, R. B. 1994: The Apostle as Athlete: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of 1 Corinthians 9. Ph.D. diss., Emory University.

Sisson, R. B. 1997: Voices of Authority in the Sermon on the Mount, *SBLSP 36*, 551-66.

Tate, W. R. 2006: Socio-Rhetorical Criticism. In W. R. Tate, *Interpreting the Bible: A Handbook of Terms and Methods.* Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 342-46.

Theissen, G. 2001: *Gospel Writing and Church Politics: A Socio-rhetorical Approach*. Chuen King Lecture Series 3, Hong Kong: Theology Division, Chung Chi College, Chinese University of Hong Kong.

van den Heever, G. A. 1998: Finding Data in Unexpected Places (Or: From Text Linguistics to Socio-Rhetoric). A Socio-Rhetorical Reading of John's Gospel, *SBLSP* 37, 2:649-76.

von Thaden, R. 2007: Fleeing *Porneia*: 1 Corinthians 6:12—7:7 and the Reconfiguration of Traditions. Ph.D. diss., Emory University.

Wachob, W. H. 1993: "The Rich in Faith" and "The Poor in Spirit": The Socio-Rhetorical Function of a Saying of Jesus in the Epistle of James. Ph.D. diss., Emory University.

Wachob, W. H. 1999: *The Voice of Jesus and the Social Rhetoric of James*. SNTSMS 106, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wachob, W. H. and Johnson, L. T. 1999: The Sayings of Jesus in the Epistle of James. In B. Chilton and C. A. Evans (eds.), *Authenticating the Words of Jesus*. NTTS 28, Leiden: Brill, 430-50.

Walker, J. 2000: *Rhetoric and Poetics in Antiquity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Watson, D. F. (ed.) 2002: *The Intertexture of Apocalyptic Discourse in the New Testament.* Symposium Series 14, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Watson, D. F. 2010: *The Role of Miracle Discourse in the Argumentation of the New Testament*. Symposium Series, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Wuellner, W. H. 1978: Toposforschung und Torahinterpretation bei Paulus und Jesus, *NTS* 24, 463-83.

Young, S. 2002: "My Lord's Coming Again": Biblical Interpretation through Slave Songs. B.A. Senior Honors Thesis, Emory University; http://www.religion.emory.edu/faculty/robbins/Pdfs/YoungThesis.pdf.

---

[1] Robbins 1989a, 1993a, 1996a: 106-08, 121-24, 1996b: 40-62, 1994b, 2009a: 9-14, 60-61, 283-86.

[2] B. B. Scott and M. E. Dean 1993: A Sound Map of the Sermon on the Mount, *SBLSP* 32, 672-725 = *idem* 1995: In D. Bauer and M. A. Powell (eds.), *Treasures Old and New: Recent Contributions to Matthean Studies*, Atlanta: Scholars Press; *idem* 1994: A Sound Map of Mark 7:1-23, unpublished paper presented for the Rhetoric and New Testament Section, SBL Annual meeting; M. E. Dean 1996: The Grammar of Sound in Greek Texts: Toward a Method for Mapping the Echoes of Speech in Writing, *Australian Biblical Review* 44, 53-70; *idem* 1996: Elements of a Sound Map, unpublished paper presented to the Bible in Ancient and Modern Media Group, SBL, November 1996; *idem* 1998: Textured Criticism, *JSNT* 70, 95-115.

[3] Porter and Olbricht 1993, 1996, 1997; Porter and Stamps 1999, 2002; Eriksson, Übelacker, and Olbricht 2002; Olbricht and Eriksson 2005.

[4] Porter and Olbricht 1997: 200-31; Carey and Bloomquist 1999: 181-203; Porter and Stamps 1999: 173-209; Porter and Stamps 2002: 61-96; Eriksson and Olbricht 2002: 157-73; Bloomquist 1999, 2002; Watson 2002: 45-68; Gowler, Bloomquist, and Watson 2003: 165-93.

[5] deSilva 1995a, 1995b, 1996, 1997, 1998a, 1998b, 1999a, 1999b, 1999c, 2000, 2004, 2006; Carey and Bloomquist 1999: 123-39; Watson 2002: 215-41; Gowler, Bloomquist, and Watson 2003: 303-16.

[6] See online: http://www.deopublishing.com/rhetoricofreligiousantiquity.htm.

---

7 Robbins 1975, 1976, 1978.

8 D. R. MacDonald (1999): The Shipwrecks of Odysseus and Paul, *NTS* 45, 88-107; M. P. Bonz 2000: *The Past as Legacy: Luke-Acts as Ancient Epic,* Minneapolis: Fortress Press. Cf. C. H. Talbert and J. H. Hayes (1995): A Theology of Sea Storms in Luke-Acts, *SBLSP* 34, 321-36; L. C. Alexander (1995): "In Journeyings Often": Voyaging in the Acts of the Apostles and in Greek Romance, in C. M. Tuckett (ed.), *Luke's Literary Achievement: Collected Essays,* JSNTSup 116; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 17-49.

9 E.g., H. J. Cadbury 1956: We and I Passages in Luke-Acts, *NTS* 3, 128-32; J. A. Fitzmyer 1985: *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV,* AB 28A, New York: Doubleday, 35-53; *idem* 1989: *Luke the Theologian: Aspects of His Teaching*, New York: Paulist, 16-22; M. Hengel 1980: *Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity*, Philadelphia: Fortress, 66-67; C. J. Hemer 1985: First Person Narrative in Acts 27-28, *TB* 36, 79-109; S. E. Porter 1994: The "We" Passages, in D. W. J. Gill and C. Gempf (eds.), *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*, vol. 2, *The Book of Acts in Its Graeco-Roman Setting*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 545-74; J. M. Gilchrist 1996: The Historicity of Paul's Shipwreck, *JSNT* 61, 29-51; and C. K. Barrett 1998: *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, vol. 2, ICCONT, Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

10 G. A. Kennedy 2003: *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, Atlanta: SBL; R. F. Hock and E. N. O'Neil 1986: *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric: Volume I. The Progymnasmata*, Atlanta: Scholars Press; R. F. Hock and E. N. O'Neil 2002: *The Chreia and Ancient Rhetoric: Classroom Exercises*, Atlanta: SBL.

11 M. Sawicki 1988: *The Gospel in History: Portrait of a Teaching Church*, Mahwah, NJ: Paulist; *idem* 1994: *Seeing the Lord: Resurrection and Early Christian Practices*, Minneapolis: Fortress, 51-76; B. L. Melbourne 1988: *Slow to Understand: The Disciples in Synoptic Perspective*, Lanham/New York/London: University Press of America; M. N. Beavis 1989: *Mark's Audience: The Literary and Social Setting of Mark 4.11-12*, JSNTSup 33, Sheffield: JSOT Press; Robbins 1990a = Robbins 1994a: 219-42; J. T. Dillon 1995: *Jesus As a Teacher: A Multidisciplinary Case Study*, Lanham, MD: International Scholars Publications.

12 Robbins 1981, 1982, 1985a, 1987a, 1987b, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c.

13 Robbins and Patton 1980; Robbins 1985b, 1988a, 1990b, 1991b, 1993b: vii-xvii, 3-31, 95-115; Mack and Robbins 1989.

14 Gowler 1989, 1991, 1993; Gowler, Bloomquist, and Watson 2003: 89-125.

[15] Robbins 1975, 1978, 1982, 1991d.

[16] Robbins 1984 and 1992a: Plato, 87-94, 136-47; Xenophon, 54, 60-68, 86, 126-28, 172-73, 206-09; Josephus and Philo, 94-101, 134-35; Rabbinic literature, 101-05; Philostratus, 105-08, 147-55, 208-09.

[17] Robbins 1984 and 1992a: 189-91, 1992b.

[18] L. T. Johnson 1995: *The Letter of James*, AB 37A, New York: Doubleday.

[19] Sisson 1994 was an important resource for the socio-rhetorical interpretation of 1 Corinthians 9 in Robbins 1996a.

[20] Raymond E. Brown 1994: *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave*, New York: Doubleday, 1:873-77, 1461-62, in which Brown used and expanded earlier work by Robbins (Robbins 1988b, 1992b), contributed to the socio-rhetorical interpretation of Mark 15 throughout Robbins 1996b.

[21] Online: http://www.religion.emory.edu/faculty/robbins/SRI/defns/index.

[22] Porter and Olbricht 1993: 443-63; Robbins 1994a, 1995.

[23] Huie-Jolly 1994; Adams 1994; Hendricks 1995: Ascough 1997.

[24] Brown 1999; Bell 1999.

[25] J. M. Asgeirsson 1997: Arguments and Audience(s) in the Gospel of Thomas (Part I), *SBLSP* 36, 47-85; *idem* 1998: Arguments and Audience(s) in the Gospel of Thomas (Part II), *SBLSP* 37, 325-42; *idem* 1998: Doublets and Strata: Towards a Rhetorical Approach to the Gospel of Thomas. Ph.D. diss., Claremont Graduate University; *idem* 2002: The *Chria* as Principle and Source for Learning Literary Composition, in J. M. Asgeirsson and N. van Deusen (eds.), *Alexander's Revenge: Hellenistic Culture through the Centuries*, Rekjavik: University of Iceland Press.

[26] Blount 1993; Czachesz 1995; Hester 1992; Huie-Jolly 1997; Jensen 1992; Penner 1996, 1999; 2004; Arnal 1997; Braun 1997; Batten 1998; van den Heever 1998; Porter and Stamps 2002: 297-334; Cottril 1999; Kloppenborg 1999, 2000: 166-213, 409-44; Gowler, Bloomquist, and Watson 2003: 64-88; Park 1999.

[27] Theissen 2001; Lee 2001; Nel 2002; Megbelayin 2002; Gowler, Bloomquist, and Watson 2003; Jeal 2005a, 2005b, 2008; Long 2005.

[28] The names "oppositional, suffering-death-resurrection and cosmic" in the 1996 essay gradually have changed to "prophetic, priestly and precreation respectively."

[29] Carey and Bloomquist 1999: 181-203; Porter and Stamps 1999: 173-209. Also see deSilva 1998b, 1999c; Watson 2002: 215-41; Gowler, Bloomquist, and Watson 2003: 303-16.

[30] Watson 2002: 11-44. The origin of Robbins's awareness of this distinction lies in Wuellner 1978: 467.

[31] In Watson 2002: 11-44: contrary Rule (25), contrary Case (29, 32, 33, 39), contrary Result (29), exhortative Result (20. 31), petitionary Result (39).

[32] H. Lefebvre 1991 [1974]: *The Production of Space*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

[33] R. D. Sack 1986: *Human Territoriality: Its Theory and History*, Cambridge: Cambridge University; *idem* 1997: *Homo Geographicus: A Framework for Action, Awareness, and Moral Concern*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.

[34] P. Bourdieu 1989: Social Space and Symbolic Power, *Sociological Theory* 7, 14-25.

[35] E. W. Soja 1989: *Postmodern Geography: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*, New York: Verso; *idem* 1993: Postmodern Geographies and the Critique of Historicism, in J. P. Jones III, W. Natter, and T. R. Schatzki (eds.), *Postmodern Contentions: Epochs, Politics, Space*, New York: Guildford, 113-36; *idem* 1996: *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*, Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell.

[36] S. Toulmin 1990: *Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[37] T. F. Carney 1975: *The Shape of the Past: Models and Antiquity*, Lawrence, Kans.: Coronado Press.

[38] J. H. Neyrey 1993: *2 Peter, Jude*, AB 37C, New York: Doubleday, 32-42, 128-42.

[39] J. H. Neyrey 1996: Luke's Social Location of Paul: Cultural Anthropology and the Status of Paul in Acts, in B. Witherington III (ed.), *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 251-79.

[40] J. H. Neyrey 2002: Spaces and Places, Whence and Whither, Homes and Rooms: "Territoriality" in the Fourth Gospel, *BTB* 32, 60-74; *idem* 2002: Spaced Out in John: Territoriality in the Fourth Gospel, *HervTeoStud* 58, 633-63.

[41] Gowler, Bloomquist, and Watson 2003: 126-64.

[42] R. Boer 2009: Henri Lefebvre: the Production of Space in 1 Samuel, in C. V. Camp and J. L. Berquist (eds.), *Constructions of Space II: The Biblical City and Other Imagined Spaces,* London: T. & T. Clark, 1-24.

[43] V. H. Matthews 2003: Physical Space, Imagined Space, and "Lived Space" in Ancient Israel, *BTB* 33, 12-20.

[44] Dozeman 2003.

[45] The use of Fauconnier and Turner 2002 for socio-rhetorical commentary is the result of an e-mail by L. G. Bloomquist on Dec. 4, 2002, which called attention to the relation of conceptual blending theory to early Christian blending of rhetorolects, which was a topic of discussion at the Rhetoric of Religious Antiquity meetings prior to the AAR/SBL sessions at Toronto in November, 2002.

[46] Online: http://www.deopublishing.com/rhetoricofreligiousantiquity.htm.