

2001

"Through Many Tears" (2 Cor. 2:4): Paul's Grieving Letter and the Occasion of 2 Corinthians 1-7

David E. Fredrickson
Luther Seminary, dfredric@luthersem.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.luthersem.edu/faculty_articles



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), and the [Christianity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Fredrickson, David E., "'Through Many Tears' (2 Cor. 2:4): Paul's Grieving Letter and the Occasion of 2 Corinthians 1-7" (2001). *Faculty Publications*. 210.

http://digitalcommons.luthersem.edu/faculty_articles/210

Published Citation

Fredrickson, David E. "'Through Many Tears' (2 Cor 2:4): Paul's Grieving Letter and the Occasion of 2 Corinthians 1-7." In *Paul and Pathos*, edited by Thomas H. Olbricht and Jerry L. Sumney, 161–79. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001.

“Through Many Tears” (2 Cor 2:4): Paul’s Grieving Letter and the Occasion of 2 Corinthians 1–7

David E. Fredrickson

In 2 Cor 2:4 Paul refers to a letter that has been appropriately named “the letter of tears”: “For out of much affliction and contraction of heart I wrote to you through many tears.” Although scholars have recognized the importance of this tearful letter in Paul’s relationship with the church at Corinth, no attention has been given to the function of his grieving self-presentation against the background of ancient epistolary conventions.¹ As a result, the letter’s role in determining the occasion of 2 Corinthians has not been determined with the degree of precision possible. Thus, two related questions will be addressed in this essay. What can we know about the rhetorical character of the letter? How does this knowledge help us reconstruct the occasion and argumentative aims of 2 Cor 1–7?

The letter of tears was a critical moment in the series of events between the writing of 1 and 2 Corinthians. This history can be summarized as follows.² Paul’s travel plans in 1 Cor 16:5–9 ruled out an immediate visit to the congregation at Corinth. Instead, Paul recommended Timothy to the church, presumably with the expectation that Timothy, as his representative, would deal effectively with the factionalism and immorality addressed in 1 Corinthians. Yet Timothy’s visit was a failure, and Paul made an emergency visit to Corinth to deal with the troubles in the church.³ During this intermediate visit, an individual injured or insulted Paul.⁴

¹ Hans Windisch notes the parallel with Pseudo-Libanius, *Charact. Ep.* 43 but does not pursue its relevance (*Der zweite Korintherbrief* [9th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1924], 84). Stanley K. Stowers comments on the severe rebuke conveyed by the letter but does not classify it in terms of the grieving style (*Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity* [LEC 5; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986], 134).

² For this history, see Charles Kingsley Barrett, “‘Ο ἈΔΙΚΗΣΑΣ’ (2. COR 7,12),” in *Verborum Veritas: Festschrift für Gustav Stählin* (ed. O. Böcher and K. Haacker; Wuppertal: Rolf Brockhaus, 1970), 149–57.

³ Victor P. Furnish, *II Corinthians* (AB 32A; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1984), 54–55, 143.

⁴ Barrett, “‘Ο ἈΔΙΚΗΣΑΣ,” 149–53. Yet Barrett’s argument that the offender was an intruder and the community itself did not share in the guilt is not persuasive (pp.

After Paul left Corinth, he wrote a letter that no longer exists, the letter of tears. Allusions to this letter occur in 2 Cor 2:3–4; 5:13; 7:8–12; and 10:9–10. Its style and purpose can be discerned by examining 2:4: “For out of much affliction and contraction of heart I wrote to you through many tears” (ἐκ γὰρ πολλῆς θλίψεως καὶ συνοχῆς καρδίας ἔγραψα ὑμῖν διὰ πολλῶν δακρύων). Evidently, Paul portrayed himself grieving and made his grief the stated motivation for writing. Tears are an obvious indication of grief. Less obvious to modern readers but quite clear to the ancient audiences is the reference to contraction of the heart. Shrinking soul or heart was a commonplace in Stoic psychology, in which expressions similar to Paul’s “affliction and contraction of the heart” signified grief (λύπη).⁵ The language Paul uses to describe the letter of tears in 2:4 suggests that grieving self-presentation was the key to the rhetoric of the letter.⁶ What can we know about grieving self-presentation in ancient letter writing?

153–57). First, Barrett’s claim that ἀγνός in 7:11 depicts the church’s lack of involvement with ὁ ἀδικήσας is forced. Second, he views ἐκδίκησις as self-vindication; clearly, the reference here is to the rebuke (ἐπιτιμία, 2:6) carried out by the church. Finally, he is hard pressed to explain why Paul used the term μετάνοια (7:9) for the church’s decision to discipline the individual.

⁵ Diogenes Laertius, *Vit.* 7.118: διὰ τὸ τὴν λύπην ἄλογον εἶναι συστολήν τῆς ψυχῆς; Cicero, *Tusc.* 4.6.14: “*Est ergo aegritudo opinio recens mali praesentis, in quo demitti contrabique animo rectum esse videatur.*” See also *SVF* 3:94.14–15; 3:95.17–18, 24–25, 41–43; Diogenes Laertius, *Vit.* 7.111; Cicero, *Tusc.* 1.37.90; 3.34.83; 4.31.66–67; Cicero, *Quint. fratr.* 1.1.4; Seneca, *Ep.* 99.15; Epictetus, frg. 9. See Max Pohlenz, *Die Stoa* (2 vols.; 2d ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959), 1:149; 2:77. In Paul, note ὀλιγόψυχος in 1 Thess 5:14. Note esp. 2 Cor 6:12: στενοχωρεῖσθε δὲ ἐν τοῖς σπλάγχνοις ὑμῶν.

⁶ For arguments against identifying the letter with either 1 Cor or 2 Cor 10–13, see Furnish (*II Corinthians*, 163–68). Other attempts reveal the pitfalls of either identification. Udo Borse fails to consider grieving self-presentation as an epistolary convention (“Tränenbrief’ und 1. Korintherbrief,” *SNTSU* 9 [1984]: 175–202). Francis Watson summarizes the objections to the arguments for identifying the letter with 2 Cor 10–13 (“2 Cor. x–xiii and Paul’s Painful Letter to the Corinthians,” *JTS* 35 [1984]: 339–40): “1. The painful letter was concerned with an individual of the congregation, whereas 2 Cor. x–xiii is concerned with teachers outside Corinth. 2. The offense committed against Paul, which occasioned the painful letter, is not mentioned in 2 Cor. x–xiii.” He neither overcomes these objections nor deals with Paul’s tearful description of the letter in 2:4 and the fact that Paul does not present himself as grieving in 2 Cor 10–13. The most sophisticated presentation of the identification thesis is offered by Laurence L. Welborn, whose use of epistolary theory is a welcome methodological addition to the debate (“The Identification of 2 Corinthians 10–13 with the ‘Letter of Tears,’” *NovT* 37 [1995]: 138–53). Yet he directs epistolary theory to 2 Cor 1–7 in general (as a letter of reconciliation) and not to 2:4 in particular. This lack of attention to

Letters of Grief in Ancient Epistolography

Pseudo-Libanius gives the following definition of the grieving style: λυπητικὴ δι' ἧς ἐμφαίνομεν ἑαυτοὺς λυπουμένους.⁷ More instructive is the sample letter that he provides, since it indicates the rebuking function of the grieving style:

The letter of grief. You caused me extremely much grief [αὐλύπηκας] when you did this thing. For that reason I am very much vexed with you, and bear a grief [λυποῦμαι λύπην] that is difficult to assuage. For the grief [λύπαι] men cause their friends is exceedingly difficult to heal, and holds in greater insults than those they receive from their enemies.⁸

The grieving style has overtones of rebuke.⁹ Friendship language calls attention to the unexpected pain the writer has suffered at the hands of his friend and thereby increases the force of the rebuke.¹⁰

the specific rhetorical character of the letter mentioned in 2:4 allows it to become the mirror image of the interpreter's understanding of Paul's demeanor and emotions portrayed in 10–13. As Jerry L. Sumney has pointed out, "Interestingly, the interpreters who identify 10–13 as the letter of 2:4 usually call it the 'severe letter' rather than the 'letter of tears' as Paul refers to it" (*Identifying Paul's Opponents: The Question of Method in 2 Corinthians* [JSNTSup 40; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990], 217 n. 38). One outcome of the present study will be to foreclose the possibility of identifying 10–13 with the letter mentioned in 2:4 by showing the necessity of taking seriously the rhetoric of Paul's grief, an emotion certainly not communicated in 10–13. For the same conclusion reached on general rhetorical principles, see J. D. H. Amador, "Revisiting 2 Corinthians: Rhetoric and the Case for Unity," *NIS* 46 (2000): 95–97.

⁷ Pseudo-Libanius, *Charact. Ep.* 43 (Abraham Malherbe, *Ancient Epistolary Theorists* [SBLBS 19; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988]: 72).

⁸ Pseudo-Libanius, *Charact. Ep.* 90 (Malherbe, *Ancient Epistolary Theorists*, 80–81).

⁹ For rebuke conveyed by the grieving style, see Gregory of Nazianzus, *Ep.* 40.1–4 (Paul Gallay, *Gregor von Nazianz: Briefe* [GCS 53; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1969], 35); Basil, *Ep.* 44.1. For grieving self-presentation and rebuke in the accusing style, see Pseudo-Demetrius, *Eloc.* 17. For expressions of grief as moral condemnation in the philosophic tradition, see the Cynic appropriation of Heraclitus and the philosophers who imitated his gloominess: Pseudo-Heraclitus, *Ep.* 5.3; 7.2, 10; Lucian, *Demon.* 6; Lucian, *Vit. auct.* 7; Lucian, *Fug.* 18. For the philosopher as σκυθρωπός, see K. Funk, "Untersuchungen über die Lucianische *Vita Demonactis*," *Phil* 10 (1905): 596–98. This tradition may stand behind Phil 3:18: νῦν δὲ καὶ κλαίων λέγω. It may also explain what "mourning" (πενθεῖν) is doing in contexts (1 Cor 5:2; 2 Cor 12:21) that are obviously about moral rebuke.

¹⁰ E.g., Cicero, *Fam.* 2.16.1: "I should have been deeply grieved at your letter [*magno dolore me affecissent tuae litterae*] had not my own reflection by this time

I turn from Pseudo-Libanius's theoretical treatment to instances of the grieving style in actual correspondence. Two of Demosthenes' letters exhibit the grieving style.¹¹ In *Ep.* 2, Demosthenes complains to the council and assembly of the unfair treatment he has received. The letter is full of indignation and reproach.¹² Demosthenes portrays himself grieving in a number of instances over the wrongs he has received from his readers. He even contemplates suicide.¹³ Near the conclusion of the letter, Demosthenes expresses his grief a last time:

Let not one of you think, men of Athens, that through lack of manhood or from any other base motive I give way to my grief [ὀδύρεσθαι] from the beginning to the end of this letter. Not so, but every man is ungrudgingly indulgent to the feeling of the moment, and those that now beset me—if only this had never come to pass!—are sorrows and tears [λύπαι καὶ δάκρυα], longing both for my country and for you, and pondering over the wrongs I have suffered, all of which cause me to grieve [ὀδύρεσθαι].¹⁴

Similar is the ending of *Ep.* 3:

And do not assume from these words that it is anger that moves me, because I could not feel that way toward you. To those who are wronged [τοῖς ἀδικουμένοις], however, it brings a certain relief to tell their sorrows, just as it relieves those in pain to moan [τοῖς ἀλγοῦσι τὸ στένειν], because toward you I feel as much goodwill as I would pray you might have toward me.¹⁵

stifled all sense of irritation [*molestias*], and had not I so long despaired of affairs that my mind had grown callous to any fresh grief [*dolorem novum*]. . . . My experience of your acute intellect is not such that I could ever suppose you do not see all that I see myself. What surprises me is that you, who ought to know my inmost heart, could ever have been induced to regard me as either so short-sighted . . . or inconsistent."

¹¹ Although the authenticity of these letters is questionable, they are still valuable for this study. Jonathan A. Goldstein argues for Demosthenes' authorship (*The Letters of Demosthenes* [New York: Columbia University Press, 1968]: 97–102). He briefly touches on epistolary theory but does not consider the types discussed by Pseudo-Libanius. Instead, he views the letters as deliberative speeches.

¹² Demosthenes, *Ep.* 2.1, 3, 8, 12. Goldstein calls attention (*Letters of Demosthenes*, 158 n. 133, 166) to Hermogenes' use of these passages to illustrate the indignant style (βαρύτης). For this reason alone, Wellborn's use of *Ep.* 2 as an illustration of the conciliatory epistle needs to be questioned ("Identification of 2 Corinthians 10–13," 146–48).

¹³ Demosthenes, *Ep.* 2.13, 21–22.

¹⁴ Demosthenes, *Ep.* 2.25.

¹⁵ Demosthenes, *Ep.* 3.44.

These expressions of grief are similar to Paul's description of the letter in 2 Cor 2:3–4 and conform to Pseudo-Libanius's description of the grieving style. Note especially the writer's tears.

Nearly seven centuries after Demosthenes rebuked his readers through many tears, Julian demonstrates the conservative nature of epistolary forms as he sternly reprimands an otherwise unknown Dositheus for laziness in *Ep.* 68. Julian opens the letter as follows: "I am almost in tears [μικροῦ μοι ἐπήλθε δακροῦσι]—and yet the very utterance of your name ought to have been an auspicious sound." He concludes the letter by driving home the point that Dositheus's misbehavior will cause him grief: "But if you are indolent you will grieve [λυπήσεις] me, and you will blame yourself when blaming will not avail."¹⁶

Gregory of Nazianzus provides a good example of the grieving style. In *Ep.* 16, he writes to Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, to criticize his treatment of Basil:

I write what presents itself to my mind; and I beg you to excuse my plain speaking [παρρησίαν], or you will wrong the truth by depriving me of my liberty [ἐλευθερίας], and forcing me to restrain within myself the pain of my grief [ὄδινα τῆς λύπης], like some secret and malignant disease.¹⁷

Gregory's parting words also portray his grief: "For my pain shall not obscure the truth [οὐ γὰρ ἐπισκοπήσει τὸ λυπεῖσθαι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ]."¹⁸ The letter stresses his bold speech (παρρησία) and freedom (ἐλευθερία), thus indicating that grieving self-presentation has the force of strong rebuke.¹⁹

Some letters of Basil exhibit the *grieving style*.²⁰ Their reproving character is shown in one instance by Basil's plea to endure his παρρησία when he speaks plainly of the pain his readers had caused him.²¹ In *Ep.*

¹⁶ Julian, *Ep.* 68.

¹⁷ Gregory of Nazianzus, *Ep.* 16.1–2 (Gallay, *Briefe*, 17–18; trans. Charles G. Browne and James E. Swallow, *NPNI*² 7:448–49).

¹⁸ Gregory of Nazianzus, *Ep.* 16.8 (Gallay, *Briefe*, 18; trans. Browne and Swallow, *NPNI*² 7:449). In *Ep.* 7.1–2, Gregory rebukes his brother, Caesarius, for his decision to remain in the emperor Julian's service: "I have had enough to blush for in you; that I was grieved [ἐλυπήθημεν], it is hardly necessary to say to him who of all men knows me best. But, not to speak of my own feelings, or of the distress [ἀθυμία] with which the rumor about you filled me" (Gallay, *Briefe*, 8; trans. Browne and Swallow, *NPNI*² 7:457).

¹⁹ For the apologetic function of claiming to use παρρησία in letters of rebuke, see Gregory of Nazianzus, *Ep.* 11.2; 206.1; Basil, *Ep.* 204.2

²⁰ Basil, *Ep.* 45.1; 156.3; 204.2; 207.1; 212.2; 223.1; 224.3; 270.

²¹ Basil, *Ep.* 204.2.

270 one finds an interesting example of the grieving letter that, though not dependent on 2 Cor 2:3–4, criticizes the failure to carry out discipline that is analogous to Paul's rebuke of the church's indifference to the wrong done to him. Basil rebukes those who tolerate the abduction of young women from households for unlawful marriage:

I am greatly grieved [πάνυ λυπούμαι] that I do not find you either indignant [ἀγανακτοῦντας] over deeds which are forbidden or able to understand that this rape which is going on is an unlawful outrage and a tyranny against life itself and the existence of man, and an insult to free men. . . . Therefore assume in the present instance the zeal of a Christian and be moved in a manner worthy of the injustice. And as for the girl, whenever you find her, take her by force and restore her to her parents; and as for the man, debar him from the prayers and declare him excommunicated.²²

Basil rebukes the lack of moral seriousness that tolerates such injustice. The purpose of his grieving self-presentation is to move the readers to indignation and punitive action.

This investigation of epistolary theory and practice shows that grieving self-presentation conveyed strong moral rebuke. This insight helps us understand the character, aim, and effect of the letter Paul describes in 2 Cor 2:3–4. In this letter, Paul rebuked the church for its failure to discipline ὁ ἀδικήσας. He sought to arouse the indignation of the church against the offender. To accomplish this he presented himself stricken with grief because of the church's indifference to the offense committed against him. Corroborating evidence for the forcefulness of the grieving letter is found not only in the church's subsequent discipline of ὁ ἀδικήσας but also in the pain (λύπη) Paul admits that the letter inflicted on the church (2:4; 7:8).

Paul in the Estimation of His Critics

Citing parallels from the ancient epistolary tradition, we have made a case for the rebuking character of Paul's letter of tears. The question now arises how this knowledge about the letter helps us reconstruct the occasion and argumentative aims of 2 Cor 1–7. One possible area of exploration is the conciliatory themes Paul employs in 2 Cor 1:3–2:11 and 5:11–7:16. These might be interpreted as Paul's attempt to ameliorate the grief he caused the church by the forcefulness of his rebuke.²³ Limitations

²² Basil, *Ep.* 270.

²³ See David E. Fredrickson, "Paul's Sentence of Death (2 Corinthians 1:9)," in *God, Evil, and Suffering: Essays in Honor of Paul R. Sponheim* (ed. T. Fretheim and C. Thompson; Word & World Supplement Series 4; St. Paul:

of space, however, prohibit development of this proposal. Instead, I will examine another problem generated by the forcefulness of the letter of tears, the issue of Paul's consistency and his possession of bold speech (παρρησία). The apostle's critics in Corinth were quick to comment on the disparity they perceived between his forcefulness and boldness of speech in letters and his gentleness while in the presence of the church. Paul's bold speech is the topic of his defense in 2:14-4:6.²⁴ The crisis to which this defense responds was generated, at least in part, by the forcefulness of the rebuking letter of tears.

In 2 Cor 10:9-10, Paul refers to his critics' evaluation of his letters, physical presence, and speech: ἵνα μὴ δόξω ὡς ἂν ἐκφοβεῖν ὑμᾶς διὰ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν· ὅτι αἱ ἐπιστολαὶ μὲν, φησὶν, βαρεῖαι καὶ ἰσχυραί, ἡ δὲ παρουσία τοῦ σώματος ἀσθενής καὶ ὁ λόγος ἐξουθενημένος. In 10:8-9, he boasts of his authority (ἐξουσία) lest he seem to terrify (ἐκφοβεῖν) his readers through letters. The sarcasm implies that the opinion his letters were terrifying was not his own.²⁵ The next verse discloses in whose judgment his letters possess this power. Paul's critics observed that his letters had the ability to terrify because of their weightiness and strength.

The notion of weightiness in epistolary theory sheds light on the critics' evaluation of Paul's letters. Of the different types of letters, Cicero calls

Word & World, 2000), 99-107. In 2:3-4 and 7:8-12 Paul calls upon the notion of appropriate grief, which he derives from the Greco-Roman tradition of soul care. For the intellectual sources of Paul's positive construal of the grief he caused through the letter of tears, see Clarence E. Glad, *Paul and Philodemus: Adaptability in Epicurean and Early Christian Psychagogy* (NovTSup 81; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 53-98.

²⁴ The defense of Paul's speech in 2:14-4:6 is anticipated in 2 Cor 1:12-24. In response to his critics' charge of hiding his thoughts in the presence of the church, Paul makes several claims in 1:12-13 concerning his open manner of life and straightforward speech. Both ἀπλότης and εἰλικρίνεια describe straightforward speech. See Antisthenes, frg. 51; *SVF* 3:161.3-6. Cf. Aristotle, *Eth. eud.* 3.7.6; Dio Chrysostom, *Philoct. arc.* 16. See Leif Bergson, "Eiron und Eironeia," *Hermes* 99 (1971): 416; R. Vischer, *Das einfache Leben: Wort- und motiugeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu einem Wertbegriff der antiken Literatur* (Studienhefte zur Altertumswissenschaft 11; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965), 10-22. From the standpoint of rhetorical theory, speaking ἀπλῶς was the opposite of concealing one's thoughts under figures (σχηματίζειν). See Dionysius of Halicarnassus, [*Rhet.*] 8.3, 5. See also Benjamin Fiore, "'Covert Allusion' in 1 Corinthians 1-4," *CBQ* 47 (1985): 85-102. Similarly, pure (καθαρός) speech, to which Paul refers in the phrase ἐν ... εἰλικρινείᾳ, was the quality of unambiguous communication of the speaker's thought. See C. Smiley, "Latinitas and ΕΛΛΗΝΙΣΜΟΣ," *Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin Philology and Literature Series* 3 (1906): 219-24.

²⁵ The ὡς ἂν in 10:9 also puts Paul at a distance from this opinion.

special attention to those that do not merely give information but are "intimate and humorous" (*familiare et iocusum*) or are "austere and serious" (*severum et grave*).²⁶ In the weighty (*gravis*) letter, the writer expresses his thoughts boldly.²⁷ This association between bold speech and weightiness is not surprising in light of its frequency in philosophic texts where βαρύς is used of the philosopher who freely speaks his mind.²⁸ The term "weighty" applied to the reproving letter is consistent with its authority and intent to alter the behavior of the recipient.²⁹

Rhetorical theory further clarifies the critics' evaluation of Paul's letters. The critics used three terms borrowed from rhetorical and literary criticism: ἐκφοβῆεν, βαρύς, and ἰσχυρός. Terror, weight, and strength were frequently discussed under the rubric of "forcefulness" (δεινότης). Rhetoricians defined δεινότης in two ways: "rhetorical skill generally" and "passionate force or intensity."³⁰ The judgment that

²⁶ Cicero, *Fam.* 2.4.1. See Heikki Koskenniemi, "Cicero über die Briefarten (*genera epistularum*)," in *Commentationes in Honorem Edwin Linkomies* (Arctos: Acta Philologica Fennica NS 1; Helsinki: Otava, 1954), 97–102. For a similar distinction, see Julius Victor, *Ars rhetorica* 27 (Karl Halm, *Rhetores Latini Minores* [Leipzig: Teubner, 1863], 447.37–38).

²⁷ Cicero, *Fam.* 2.4.1.

²⁸ Philo, *Prob.* 28–31. See Abraham Malherbe, "'Gentle As a Nurse': The Cynic Background to I Thess ii," *NovT* 12 (1970): 212–14.

²⁹ See Cicero, *Ep. Brut.* 19.1–2; Pseudo-Demetrius, *Eloc.* 3. See Otto Hiltbrunner, "Vir gravis," in *Sprachgeschichte und Wortbedeutung: Festschrift Albert Debrunner* (Bern: Francke, 1954), 198–200; Hans D. Betz, *Der Apostel Paulus und die sokratische Tradition* (BHT 45; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1972), 45 n. 6. See also Johann C. G. Ernesti, *Lexicon technologiae Graecorum rhetoricae* (Leipzig: Fritsch, 1795), 55. The connection between the weighty (*gravis*) letter and moral rebuke is well illustrated in Cicero, *Quint. frat.* 1.2.12–13: "I had written you a letter not quite in a brotherly spirit, upset [*commotus*] as I was. . . . I had written it in a fit of temper [*iracundius*], and was anxious to recall it. Such a letter, though written in an unbrotherly way, you ought as a brother to forgive. . . . The rest of that same letter was in stronger terms [*graviora*] than I could have wished. . . . Those expressions, as you will find, are needlessly vehement; my reproaches teemed with affection [*mea obiurgationes fuerunt amoris plenissima*]. . . . I should never have thought you deserved the smallest reproof [*reprehensione*] in any respect, so absolutely blameless was your conduct, were it not that we had a multitude of enemies. Whatever I have written to you in a tone of admonition and reproof [*admonitione aut obiurgatione*], that I have written on account of my anxious watchfulness."

³⁰ W. Kendrick Pritchett, *Dionysius of Halicarnassus: On Thucydides* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1975), 108 n. 4. He is dependent on Ludwig Voit, *ΔΕΙΝΟΤΗΣ: Ein antiker Stilbegriff* (Leipzig: Dieterich'sche, 1934).

stands behind 10:9–10 corresponds to the latter definition, since the practical consequences of Paul's letters stand out, namely, striking terror in his readers.

According to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, δεινότης was the pinnacle of rhetorical accomplishment and best exemplified by Demosthenes.³¹ Because of its strength (ἰσχύς), Demosthenes' speech struck fear into his listeners.³² His forcefulness was associated with παρρησία.³³ Lysias's style is another matter. Dionysius's criticism of Lysias presumes the superiority of δεινότης and illustrates its qualities:

But there is nothing sublime or imposing about the style of Lysias. It certainly does not excite us or move us to wonder, nor does it portray pungency, intensity [τὸ δεινόν] or fear [τὸ φοβερόν]; nor again does it have the power to grip the listener's attention, and to keep it in rapt suspense [ἐν τοῖς πάθεσιν ἰσχυρά]; nor is it full of energy and feeling, or able to match its moral persuasiveness with an equal power to portray emotion [ἐν τοῖς πάθεσιν ἰσχυρά], and its capacity to entertain, persuade and charm with an ability to force and compel his audience.³⁴

³¹ For the arousal of emotions as the highest accomplishment in oratory, see Quintilian, *Inst.* 6.2.2–7.

³² Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Dem.* 22. For the production of fear in the hearers as the main criterion of δεινότης, see Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Thuc.* 24; Longinus, [*Styl.*] 10.2–6; 12.5; Pseudo-Demetrius, *Eloc.* 283. See F. Qaudlbauer, "Die genera dicendi bis Plinius d. J.," *Wiener Studien* 71 (1958): 55–111, esp. 59–60, 74, 93. For δεινότης and the arousal of emotion, see Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Thuc.* 53; Dio Chrysostom, *Nest.* 7–8. Gorgias's view of rhetoric's power to instill emotion stands behind the association of δεινότης and φόβος. For the renewed importance of emotions in rhetoric after the rationalizing tendencies of Plato, Aristotle, and Isocrates, see Jacqueline de Romilly, *Magic and Rhetoric in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975), 75–85.

³³ See Caecilius Calactinus, frg. 141 (Ernest Ofenloch, *Caecilli Calactini fragmenta* [Leipzig: Teubner, 1907; repr. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1967], 124). See also Lucian, [*Incom. Demosth.*] 40. For the debate over Demosthenes' rhetorical accomplishments that stands behind this work, see B. Baldwin, "The Authorship and Purpose of Lucian's *Demosthenis encomium*," *Antichthon* 3 (1969): 58–62. Note also that the criteria for Demosthenes' δεινότης are used to delineate παρρησία in Plutarch, *Adul. amic.* 68C: ἄν δ' ὑπὲρ μειζόνων ἦ, καὶ πάθει καὶ σχήματι καὶ τόμφ φωνῆς ὁ λόγος ἀξιόπιστος ἔστω καὶ κλητικὸς.

³⁴ Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Lys.* 13. For these contrasts in the history of rhetorical criticism, see Qaudlbauer, "Die genera dicendi," 93–94. For the connection between vehement emotion and δεινότης, see Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Thuc.* 48.

Dionysius also associates weightiness with the portrayal of the speaker's emotion and notes its ability to arouse emotions in the hearers.³⁵ Thus, the critics' estimation of Paul's letters conforms to the rhetorical style named δεινότης and agrees with our earlier examination of the grieving self-presentation of the letter of tears in the light of epistolary theory. In the letter of tears, Paul, with rhetorical power and effectiveness, portrayed his grief in order to move the church to repentance, moral indignation, and a serious view of the injury he had received from ὁ ἀδικήσας.³⁶

The reference in 10:10 to Paul's physical presence (ἡ δὲ παρουσία τοῦ σώματος ἀσθενῆς) should also be understood as part of the critics' evaluation of Paul's manner of speech. Again, terms drawn from the field of rhetoric are applied to Paul.³⁷ Superior physical qualities were expected in the orator,³⁸ since the power of his speech was conveyed through delivery, which consisted of the modulation of the voice and the gestures of the body.³⁹ Since the face is the image of the soul,⁴⁰ the orator's emotions were portrayed as much through gesture and countenance as through language itself.⁴¹ In short, forceful style demanded vigorous delivery.⁴² Plutarch's account of Demosthenes' unsuccessful attempts at public speaking in his

³⁵ Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Thuc.* 23. See also Longinus, [*Subl.*] 30.1. For βάρος as a rhetorical term in Dionysius, see Larue van Hook, *The Metaphorical Terminology of Greek Rhetoric and Literary Criticism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1905), 16.

³⁶ For the ability of emotional speech to arouse indignation, see Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Dem.* 55; Cicero, *De or.* 1.53; Quintilian, *Inst.* 6.2.23–24.

³⁷ Peter Marshall stresses instead a sociological aspect of ἀσθένεια, although this is an unexplained departure from his rhetorical analysis (*Enmity in Corinth: Social Conventions in Paul's Relations with the Corinthians* [WUNT 2/23; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987], 388–89).

³⁸ Cicero, *De or.* 1.114; 2.88; 3.220–227; Quintilian, *Inst.* 11.3.14, 19, 54–55. For superior physical attributes and the awe that they inspired, see the description of the Stoic philosopher Euphrates in Pliny the Younger, *Ep.* 1.10.

³⁹ Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Dem.* 53: τὰ πάθη τὰ τῆς φωνῆς καὶ τὰ σχήματα τοῦ σώματος. See also *Rhet. Her.* 3.11.19–20; Plutarch, *Dem.* 7.1–3.

⁴⁰ Cicero, *Or. Brut.* 60.

⁴¹ Cicero, *De or.* 3.216. See also *De or.* 1.18; 3.223; Cicero, *Or. Brut.* 55–60; Quintilian, *Inst.* 11.3.14; 11.3.65–68; Pliny the Younger, *Ep.* 2.3; 2.19. For delivery as a means of conveying vehement emotion, see R. P. Sonkowsky, "An Aspect of Delivery in Ancient Rhetorical Theory," *TAPA* 90 (1959): 265–74.

⁴² Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Isocr.* 13 and *Dem.* 22; Quintilian, *Inst.* 11.3.1–9. For Quintilian's teaching on delivery, see Elaine Fantham, "Quintilian on Performance: Traditional and Personal Elements in the *Institutio* 11.3," *Phoenix* 36 (1982): 243–62.

early career illustrates the necessity for matching powerful words with a strong body:

Although he had a style of speaking [τὸν λόγον ἔχων] which was most like that of Pericles, he was throwing himself away out of weakness [μαλακίας] and lack of courage [ἀτολμίας], neither facing the multitude with boldness [εὐθαρσῶς], nor preparing his body [τὸ σῶμα] for these forensic contests, but suffering it to wither away in slothful neglect.⁴³

The pitch of the voice and the movements of the body communicate emotions as surely as the arrangement of words and figures of thought.⁴⁴ Weak presentation of the body was altogether inappropriate for the speaker capable of the forceful style,⁴⁵ unless, of course, he aimed at irony.

Paul refers to his weakness in 2 Cor 11:21 as he draws a comparison between himself and his critics, whom he characterizes in 11:13, 20 in terms reminiscent of the popular criticism of harsh Cynics.⁴⁶ Paul's weakness

⁴³ Plutarch, *Dem.* 6.4.

⁴⁴ Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Dem.* 22, 54.

⁴⁵ Plutarch, *Dem.* 4.3; 6.3–4; 11.1–2; Plutarch, *Cic.* 3.5; 4.3; Quintilian, *Inst.* 11.3.12–13.

⁴⁶ For μετασηματίζεσθαι, see Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.19.28; 4.8.6–20; Lucian, *Fug.* 13: σχηματίζουσιν καὶ μετακοσμοῦσιν αὐτοὺς εὐ μάλα εἰκότως καὶ πρὸς ἔμε; Lucian, *Pisc.* 31–33, 35–37; Julian, *Or.* 6.201A; Aristides Rhetor, *Or.* 3.676, 682–683. For ψευδαπόστολος, see Epictetus, *Diatr.* 3.22.23–25, 45–49; 3.24.110–114; 4.8.30–34. For ἐργάτης δόλιος, see Lucian, *Pisc.* 34; Lucian, *Fug.* 15, 18–19; Aristides Rhetor, *Or.* 3.663–667. For καταδουλοῦν, see Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.12.24; Lucian, *Fug.* 12: τούτα πάντα τυραννίδα οὐ μικρὰν ἡγοῦντο εἶναι; 17: αἰτοῦντας μὲν τυραννικῶς. For κατεσθίειν, see Epictetus, *Diatr.* 3.22.50; for the Cynic reputation of having γνάθοι μεγάλοι, see Margarethe Billerbeck, *Epiklet: Von Kynismus* (Philosophia Antiqua 34; Leiden: Brill, 1978), 113. For λαμβάνειν, see Lucian, *Fug.* 14, 17: λαμβάνοντας δὲ προχείρωσ; 20; Aristides Rhetor, *Or.* 3.666: λαμβάνουσιν ὁ το ἄν δυνηθῶσιν (Friedrich W. Lenz and Charles A. Behr, *P. Aelii Aristidi opera quae exstant omnia* [2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1976–1981], 1:513); *Or.* 3.668: τὸ δὲ λαμβάνειν φιλανθρωπεύεσθαι (Lenz and Behr, *P. Aelii Aristidi opera*, 1:513); *Or.* 3.671: λαμβάνοντες δὲ λοιδορεῖν (Lenz and Behr, *P. Aelii Aristidi opera*, 1:514). See also Gustav A. Gerhard, *Phoenix von Kolophon* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1909), 76. For ἐπαίρομαι, see Lucian, *Pisc.* 31; Aristides Rhetor, *Or.* 3.671. Comparable to these charges of tyranny, arrogance, and brutality are commonplace invectives against political opponents in Roman oratory. See J. Roger Dunkle, "The Greek Tyrant and the Roman Political Invective of the Late Republic," *TAPA* 98 (1967): 151–71. Scott B. Andrews argues for a political background to the terminology in 2 Cor 11 ("Enslaving, Devouring, Exploiting, Self-Exalting: 2 Cor 11:19–20 and the Tyranny of Paul's Opponents," *SBLSP* 36 [1997]: 472–77). The Cynic comparison, however, accounts

should be understood in contrast to the practice of these Cynics, who were notorious for their refusal to mix encouragement and forgiveness with rebuke. Paul wants his weakness to be understood as gentleness opposed to Cynic harshness, which in 11:20 is evoked by εἶ τις εἰς πρόσωπον ὑμᾶς δέρει.⁴⁷ Furthermore, in 11:21 Paul ironically attenuates his physical presence (ἡσθενήκαμεν), portraying himself as incapable of abusing the church and thereby making his opponents appear harsh and himself kind and conciliatory.⁴⁸

Paul's weak physical presence was not in itself grounds for criticism.⁴⁹ The fact that he did not employ the full range of vocal modulation and physical gestures associated with δεινότης only meant that his delivery was not appropriate for the portrayal and communication of strong emotions. What disturbed Paul's critics was his inconsistency.⁵⁰ This criticism emerged when they compared the forcefulness of his letters, especially the weighty letter of grief, with his weak physical presence. This letter proved to the critics that Paul was indeed capable of forceful, bold speaking. His unemphatic physical presence, therefore, could only be interpreted as irony in his face-to-face dealings with the church.

In 10:10, the accusation of ironic self-depreciation is explicit. In the presence of the church, Paul's speech, they said, was attenuated (ὁ λόγος ἐξουθενημένος). This too is a judgment couched in rhetorical terminology⁵¹ closely related to the critics' view that in person Paul was "debased" (ταπεινός, 10:1) and a "person untrained in speech" (ιδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ, 11:6). The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* equated attenuated speech with the simple style, which employed everyday language and could, if handled skillfully, achieve elegance.⁵² If mishandled, however, attenuated speech

for more of the terms and corresponds with Paul's practice in other passages. See Malherbe, "Gentle As a Nurse," 35–48; David E. Fredrickson, "No Noose Is Good News: Leadership As a Theological Problem in the Corinthian Correspondence," *WW* 16 (1996): 420–26.

⁴⁷ See Lucian, *Fug.* 14–15.

⁴⁸ For this rhetorical strategy, see Quintilian, *Inst.* 6.2.15–16.

⁴⁹ Against Betz, *Der Apostel Paulus*, 53–55.

⁵⁰ Emphasized on other grounds by Abraham Malherbe, "Antisthenes and Odysseus, and Paul at War," *HTR* 76 (1983): 167–68.

⁵¹ For ἐξουθενησμός as a figure of thought, see Julius Rufianus, *De figuris sententiarum et elocutionis* 6: "Figura haec sit, cum rem aliquam extenuamus et contemtam facimus" (Halm, *Rhetores Latini Minores*, 39–40). See also Ernesti, *Lexicon technologiae Graecorum rhetoricae*, 114.

⁵² *Rhet. Her.* 4.11.16. For the simple style, see Cicero, *Or. Brut.* 75–90. For its similarity with everyday speech, see Cicero, *Or. Brut.* 76; Longinus, [*Subl.*] 40.1–4.

was "meager," "bloodless," debased, and merely ordinary.⁵³ More to the point of this investigation, provision was made in rhetoric for the intentional attenuation of speech.⁵⁴ Cicero categorizes those who "intentionally resembled untrained and unskillful speakers" as a subgroup of those who employed the simple style. They were thus furthest removed from Demosthenes and the forceful style he exemplified.⁵⁵

Cicero's observation that attenuated speech is the furthest removed from forcefulness helps us understand the inconsistency the critics saw in Paul. He was bold at a distance yet servile when face to face (10:1). This criticism comes into sharper focus when it is noted that attenuation of speech was sometimes employed to achieve irony.⁵⁶ The critics charged that Paul's mildness was, in fact, ironic self-depreciation.

In sum, the grieving style of the letter of tears gave proof to all in the church at Corinth of Paul's forcefulness. Yet because of this letter, the critics drew the conclusion that Paul's mildness in the company of the church was an ironic attenuation of his speech.⁵⁷ From their point of view, his attenuated speech was a convenient means by which he concealed his thoughts and was evidence of his lack of constancy and bold speech.⁵⁸ That the critics drew this conclusion is given further support by

⁵³ Longinus, [*Subl.*] 31.1–2; 40.2; 43.5–6.

⁵⁴ *Rhet. Her.* 4.11.16. See also Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Dem.* 28, 56; Cicero, *Brut.* 283–285; Cicero, *Or. Brut.* 76; Plutarch, [*Lib. ed.*] 7B; Longinus, [*Subl.*] 31.1–2; 43.6.

⁵⁵ Cicero, *Or. Brut.* 20. Cicero's analysis is informed by the classification of speech into three types (*genus humile*, *genus medium*, *genus vehemens*); see Anton D. Leeman, *Orationis ratio: The Stylistic Theories and Practice of the Roman Orators, Historians, and Philosophers* (2 vols.; Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1963), 1:145–49. George Kennedy reconstructs the history of the threefold distinction ("Theophrastus and Stylistic Distinctions," *HSCP* 47 [1957]: 93–104). According to Quintilian (*Inst.* 9.2.3), the forceful style effectively portrays strong emotion, reproach, and execration; attenuated speech is suited for commendation, conciliation, and humor.

⁵⁶ Horace, *Sat.* 1.10.11–15; Cicero, *De or.* 3.202; Cicero, *Brut.* 292; Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 1.17. For ironic self-depreciation in which the claim to be an ἰδιώτης in speech is made, see Dio Chrysostom, *Dial.* 1–3 and *Cont.* 1.8.

⁵⁷ John Chrysostom (*Hom.* 2 Cor: 11:13 [PG 51:304]) understands that the critics charged that Paul employed εἰρωνεία.

⁵⁸ Edwin A. Judge finds Paul's claim to be ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ (2 Cor 11:6) an instance of irony ("Paul's Boasting in Relation to Contemporary Professional Practice," *ABR* 16 [1968]: 37–38). For the Epicurean demand that philosophers use παρρησία and shun ironic self-depreciation, which amounted to dissembling and hypocrisy, see Mark T. Riley, "The Epicurean Criticism of Socrates," *Phoenix* 34 (1980): 60–68.

the rhetoric of Paul's defense in 10:11: "what sort of people we are in word through letters while absent we are also in deed while present." By asserting conformity of word and deed in his mission, Paul refutes the charge that he is inconsistent.⁵⁹

Paul's inconsistency is also the issue in 2 Cor 5:13, where two terms concerning emotion and its control are contrasted: "If we were beside ourselves, it was to God; if we are restrained, it is for you" (εἴτε γὰρ ἐξέστημεν, θεῷ· εἴτε σωφρονούμεν, ὑμῖν).⁶⁰ The vacillation between emotional outburst, or madness (ἐξέστημεν),⁶¹ and restraint (σωφρονούμεν) reflects the difference, on the one hand, between the forcefulness of Paul's letters and, on the other, the weakness of his physical presence and his attenuated speech.⁶² If understood as a portrayal of strong emotion, Paul's ecstasy fits

⁵⁹ For the *topos* of conformity of word and deed and the consistency of the philosopher, see Lucian, *Demon.* 3; Lucian, *Icar.* 29–31; Lucian, *Pisc.* 34; Lucian, *Fug.* 19; Plutarch, [*Lib. ed.*] 14A–B; Seneca, *Vit. beat.* 27.4–6; Seneca, *Ep.* 52.8–10; Philo, *Spec.* 1.321–322; Juvenal, *Sat.* 2.1–35; Julian, *Or.* 7.214B–C. For additional references, see André Jean Festugière, "Lieux communs littéraires et thèmes de folklore dans l'Hagiographie primitive," *Wiener Studien* 73 (1960): 140–42.

⁶⁰ Exegetes have labored over ἐξέστημεν. Explanations based on revelations given to Paul in 1 Cor 12 or speaking in tongues in 1 Cor 14 intrude upon the context. For such explanations, see Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 179–80; Charles Kingsley Barrett, *A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (HNTC; New York: Harper & Row, 1973), 166–67; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 324–25.

⁶¹ ἐξίστημι in Stoic psychology signifies extreme emotion, usually anger. See *SVP* 3:125.12–25; 3:129.6–24; 3:131.22–25; Cicero, *Tusc.* 4.38.82. See also Plutarch, *Cobib. ira* 455F. For ἐξίστημι as an angry reaction to insult and injury, see Musonius Rufus frg. 10 (ed. and trans. C. Lutz; *Musonius Rufus "The Roman Socrates"* [New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1947], 76.28).

⁶² Marshall acknowledges the rhetorical background of 5:13 but does not explore the connection between δεινότης and the portrayal of emotions (*Enmity in Corinth*, 331–33). He applies the conclusions of Helen North, who understands σωφροσύνη in rhetoric as a combination of passion and mastery over it ("The Concept of *Sophrosyne* in Greek Literary Criticism," *CP* 43 [1948]: 16). North's conclusions lead Marshall to assume that for the rhetoricians the passionate style had always to be tempered. He then draws precisely the opposite conclusion than the one argued here. He writes concerning the critics' evaluation of Paul's letters: "the contrast of ἐκστήναι and σωφροσύνη as a device of invective may suggest that Paul ignored the required restraints, disregarded the proprieties and was carried along by his own impetus" (*Enmity in Corinth*, 333). This ignores the fact that the opponents based their criticism not on the defects of his letters but on the contrast between the style of the letters and Paul's speech when present. It would appear that Paul's critics actually approved of his "ecstatic" style in the letters, his δεινότης. Moyer Hubbard ("Was Paul out of His Mind? Re-reading 2 Corinthians

the style of the grieving self-presentation in the intermediate letter and is consistent with the critics' view that Paul employed δεινότης in his letters.⁶³

In order to understand the charge of inconsistency that lies behind 5:13, the portrayal of the speaker's strong emotions as the main feature of δεινότης must be examined. The speaker's ability to portray his own emotion is an important criterion of δεινότης.⁶⁴ The cardinal rule is that speakers must feel the very emotions they seek to arouse.⁶⁵ It is in this respect that ecstasy is associated with forceful speech.⁶⁶ Dionysius asserts that δεινότης is full of "passion and spirit" (θυμοῦ καὶ πνεύματος).⁶⁷ When Cicero discusses the part of oratory that pertains to the arousal of emotions (τὸ παθητικόν),⁶⁸ he claims that it is not an inborn ability that provides the power to excite others "but 'a vigorous spirit [*magna vis animi*] which inflames me to such an extent that I am beside myself [*ut me ipse non teneam*]; and I am sure that the audience would never be set on fire unless the words that reached him were fiery."⁶⁹ Similarly, Longinus asserts that

5.13," *JSNVT* 70 [1998]: 39–64) follows Marshall's dependence on North with the same result, namely, 2 Cor 5:13 is Paul's acknowledgement that his oratory is not polished.

⁶³ Identification of Paul's outburst with the grieving letter accounts for the tense of ἐξέστημεν. The aorist has vexed those who read into 5:13 the issue of ecstatic experience. See Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 308.

⁶⁴ Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Thuc.* 23–24, 48. Hieronymus in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Isocr.* 13, criticized Isocrates for neglecting "the orator's most important instrument for arousing the emotions of a crowd—animation and intensity of feeling" (τὸ παθητικὸν καὶ ἔμψυχον). See also Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Dem.* 55. For Hieronymus and his reiteration of the Aristotelian connection between τὸ παθητικὸν and δεινότης, see Voit, ΔΕΙΝΟΤΗΣ, 102–3. According to Dionysius (*Lys.* 13), Lysias was capable of character description and moral persuasion but unable to "portray emotion" in order to "force and compel his audience." See also Longinus, [*Subl.*] 12.3; 34.4.

⁶⁵ Quintilian, *Inst.* 6.2.25–28.

⁶⁶ For the identification of the orator's πάθος with inspiration and madness, see Qaudlbauer, "Die *genera dicendi*," 55–60, 63, 71–74, 88–91, 96, 100–4. From the perspective of the philosophic tradition, the association of madness with bold speech explains how ἐξέστημεν could refer to the forcefulness of the letter of tears. Cynics, for example, were often called mad because of their bold speech. See Abraham Malherbe, "Not in a Corner": Early Christian Apologetic in Acts 26:26," *SecCent* 5 (1985–1986): 206–8. Cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 11.1.37. Frequent are the warnings not to cross the line separating bold speech and madness. See, for example, Isocrates, *Demon.* 15; Philo, *Ios.* 73.

⁶⁷ Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Lys.* 13. See also *Dem.* 22, 54; Plutarch, *Dem.* 9.3–4.

⁶⁸ Cicero, *Or. Brut.* 128–133.

⁶⁹ Cicero, *Or. Brut.* 132. See also *De or.* 2.194; Seneca, *Ep.* 40.8. For passion and divine inspiration in extemporaneous speech, see Plutarch, *Dem.* 9.4; Quintilian,

one of the causes of the sublime (ὑψος)⁷⁰ in literature is "the inspiration of vehement emotion" (τὸ σφοδρὸν καὶ ἐνθουσιαστικὸν πάθος).⁷¹ His criticism of speakers who employ untimely emotional outbursts links ἐξίστημι with the portrayal of emotions:

For writers often behave as if they were drunk and give way to outbursts of emotion which the subject no longer warrants. Such emotion is purely subjective and consequently tedious, so that to an audience which feels none of it their behaviour looks unseemly. And naturally so, for while they are in ecstasy [ἐξεστηκότες], the audience are not.⁷²

These examples drawn from Dionysius, Cicero, and Longinus show that an important aspect of the forceful style was the heightening of the speaker's emotions. This heightening was sometimes called ecstasy.⁷³

In 5:13, Paul contrasts vehement emotion with restraint (σωφρονούμεν). The familiar distinction in rhetorical theory between πάθος and ἦθος illuminates the contrast in 5:13 between madness and restraint.⁷⁴ This distinction

Inst. 10.7.13–14. For imagination, divine possession, and the heightening of emotions, see Quintilian, *Inst.* 6.2.24–36; Longinus, [*Subl.*] 12.5; 15.1–11.

⁷⁰ For the relationship between δεινότης and ὑψος see Voit, ΔΕΙΝΟΤΗΣ, 47–53.

⁷¹ Longinus, [*Subl.*] 8.1. See also [*Subl.*] 8.4: "I would confidently lay it down that nothing makes so much for grandeur as genuine emotion [τὸ γενναῖον πάθος] in the right place. It inspires the words as it were with a fine frenzy and fills them with divine afflatus [ὑπο μανίας τιλὸς καὶ πνεύματος ἐνθουσιαστικῶς ἐκνέον καὶ οἶονεὶ φοιβάζον τούς λόγους]." For the frenzied element of Demosthenes' δεινότης, see Lucian, [*Eucom. Demosth.*] 5: τὴν σφοδρότητα καὶ πικρίαν καὶ ἐνθουσιασμόν. For the traditional connection between passion, inspiration, and forceful speech to which Longinus alludes, see Donald A. Russell, "Longinus": *On the Sublime* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1964), 62, 89, 113–15. Plato's treatment of the notions of madness and divine possession in poetical inspiration is examined in E. N. Tigerstedt, "Plato's Idea of Poetical Inspiration," *Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum* 44.2 (1969): 1–77. For a wider literary perspective, see W. J. Verdenius, "The Principles of Greek Literary Criticism," *Mnemosyne* 36 (1983): 37–46.

⁷² Longinus, [*Subl.*] 3.5. Speech full of passion forces the hearers to share the speaker's ecstasy and is thus the opposite of persuasion. See Elder Olson, "The Argument of Longinus' 'On the Sublime,'" *Modern Philology* 39 (1942): 232–38.

⁷³ In addition to ἐξίστημι, note the following terms employed in rhetorical theory for inspiration: βακχεία, παράβακχος, μανία, and ἐνθουσιάζειν. See van Hook, *Metaphorical Terminology*, 30.

⁷⁴ For the historical development of this distinction (especially the shift from locating πάθος only in the hearer to the speaker as well), see Voit, ΔΕΙΝΟΤΗΣ,

informs Dionysius's comparison of Lysias's style with the δεινότης he finds in Demosthenes. Lysias demonstrates the ability to invest "every person with life and character" and thus has "the ability to win over and persuade."⁷⁵ The contrast between the styles of Thucydides and Lysias is that of ἦθος and πάθος:

The latter has the power to startle the mind, the former to soothe it; the one can induce tension and strain, the other relaxation and relief; the one can express violent emotion [πάθος], the other can conduce to moral character [ἦθος].

Ethical portrayal conciliates and is associated with mild speech. Cicero contrasts the ethical with the passionate:

There are, for instance, two topics which if well handled by the orator arouse admiration for his eloquence. One, which the Greeks call ἠθικόν or "expressive of character," is related to men's nature and character, their habits and all the intercourse of life; the other, which they call παθητικόν or "relating to the emotions," arouses and excites the emotions: in this part alone oratory reigns supreme. The former is courteous and agreeable, adapted to win goodwill [*ad benevolentiam conciliandam paratum*]; the latter is violent [*vehemens*], hot [*incensum*] and impassioned [*incitatum*], and by this cases are wrested from our opponents; when it rushes along in full career it is quite irresistible.⁷⁶

That ethical portrayal should be marked by calm, sober, and mild speech is the opinion of both Cicero and Quintilian.⁷⁷ That this sort of speech is aimed at conciliation is also affirmed,⁷⁸ whereas impassioned speech

122–52; Christopher Gill, "The Ethos/Pathos Distinction in Rhetorical and Literary Criticism," *CQ* 34 (1984): 149–66. For σωφρονίζειν as a rhetorical term, see van Hook, *Metaphorical Terminology*, 32. For σώφρων speech as both possessing and inculcating emotional restraint, see H. North, "Concept of *Sophrosyne*," 5–8. For σωφρονεῖν as control of the passions in Stoic psychology after Chrysippus, see Helen North, *Sophrosyne: Self-Knowledge and Self-Restraint in Greek Literature* (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology; Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1966), 219–31.

⁷⁵ Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Lys.* 13.

⁷⁶ Cicero, *Or. Brut.* 128.

⁷⁷ Cicero, *De or.* 2.182, 212; Quintilian, *Inst.* 6.2.9.

⁷⁸ Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Lys.* 13; Cicero, *Or. Brut.* 128; Quintilian, *Inst.* 6.2.9, 14. See Elaine Fantham, "Ciceronian *Conciliare* and Aristotelian Ethos," *Phoenix* 27 (1973): 262–75.

moves the hearers to anger and indignation.⁷⁹ The circumstances dictate the type of speech to be employed.⁸⁰

This investigation of δεινότης and the distinction between ἥθος and πάθος help explain the critics' view of Paul. In their estimation, Paul's letters, most significantly the letter of tears, exhibited δεινότης. In the letter of tears, he attained this style by vividly portraying himself mad with grief. He terrified (ἐκφοβεῖν) his readers and moved them to moral indignation toward ὁ ἀδικήσας. Thus, like the forceful speech of Demosthenes, Paul's letters were weighty (βαρεῖαι) and strong (ἰσχυραί) in both the portrayal of his emotion and the arousal of emotion in the readers. Judged by his letters, Paul was bold. Nevertheless, since a letter was a substitute for the writer's physical presence, an expression of what he would have said in person, and even a reflection of his personality,⁸¹ Paul's critics found in the letter of tears proof of the apostle's inconsistency. The Paul who revealed himself in the boldness of his letters hid himself under the cover of mildness when present. Although Paul's letters portrayed his strong emotions and evoked them in others, his presence, they asserted, was characterized by calm speech and a restrained manner, an unemphatic use of his body, and an intentional attenuation of his speech.

Conclusion

I have reconstructed the occasion of 2 Cor 1–7 by examining the character, purpose, and effect of Paul's letter of tears to the church at Corinth.

⁷⁹ Cicero, *De or.* 2.189–194 and *Or. Brut.* 131–133.

⁸⁰ Cicero, *De or.* 2.183: "For vigorous language [*fortis oratio*] is not always wanted, but often such as is calm, gentle, mild: this is the kind that most commends the parties." See also Quintilian, *Inst.* 6.2.14.

⁸¹ For these *topoi* on letter writing, see Cicero, *Fam.* 12.30.1; 16.16.2; Seneca, *Ep.* 27.1; 40.1; 75.1–3; 76.1; Basil, *Ep.* 163; Pseudo-Libanius, *Charact. Ep.* 2.58; Pseudo-Demetrius, *Eloc.* 223–227, 231. Note particularly the demand for forthrightness in Pseudo-Demetrius, *Eloc.* 229. A letter is essentially conversation and thus expresses the writer's moral character. See Heikki Koskenniemi, *Studien zur Idee and Phrasen-logie des griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chr.* (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Series B, vol. 102.2; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1956), 42–47; Klaus Thraede, *Grundzüge griechisch-römischer Brieftopik* (Zetemata: Monographien zur klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 48; Munich: Beck, 1970), 22–61, 68–74, 77–81, 83–88. For the remarkable endurance of these *topoi* in the history of letter writing, see M. Wagner, "A Chapter in Byzantine Epistolography: The Letters of Theodoret of Cyrus," *DOP* 4 (1948): 129–34; Thraede, *Grundzüge*, 146–65, 180–87; W. G. Müller, "Der Brief als Spiegel der Seele: Zur Geschichte eines Topos der Epistolartheorie von der Antike bis Samuel Richardson," *Antike and Abendland* 26 (1980): 138–57.

According to ancient epistolary theory and practice, Paul's grieving self-presentation conveyed strong moral rebuke and sought to instill grief in order to bring the readers to repentance. The letter had precisely this effect (2:4; 7:8–12). In addition to the grief it caused the church, the letter's forcefulness also left no doubt that Paul was capable of bold speech, at least from a safe distance through written communication. Based on his forceful self-presentation in the letter of tears, Paul's critics in Corinth detected a major flaw in the apostle's character. In terms drawn from the field of rhetoric, they construed his mild and conciliatory style while in the presence of the church as intentional attenuation of his speech, a rhetorical cover under which he hid his true thoughts. They charged that while present he was a flatterer, an ironic dissembler, and lacked bold speech. For this reason, the topic of Paul's *παρησία* was to become a central issue as he portrays himself and his ministry in 2 Cor 1–7.⁸²

⁸² David E. Fredrickson, "Παρησία in the Pauline Epistles," in *Friendship, Flattery, and Frankness of Speech: Studies on Friendship in the New Testament World* (ed. J. Fitzgerald; NovTSup 82; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 172–82.