

Cambridge University Press

0521472237 - Wrestling with Rationality in Paul: Romans 1-8 in a New Perspective

John D. Moores

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## INTRODUCTION

**THE LAYOUT OF THIS STUDY AND THE  
APPROACH BEHIND IT**

For Paul the truth of the gospel of Christ was not to be understood by dodging the logical riddles with which it confronts us. He does not speak as if the illumination guaranteed by the Holy Spirit dispenses with the need for reflection. Rather he speaks as if, sharpened and directed by the Holy Spirit, the human capacity for exercising critical judgement plays a formative role in our grasp of the gospel. In addressing those who, in different ways according to their differing backgrounds, had to face the difficulties such a perspective entails, Paul, impelled by the urgency of his message, was unaccommodating.

‘The attempt to understand the logic and argumentation of Paul must give a Greek a headache,’ V. Grönbech once observed (in *Paulus Jesu Christi Apostel*). And certainly to the mind shaped by the Socratic tradition, his manner of reasoning could scarcely fail to occasion perplexity of reader response. It was not his aim to stimulate detached intellectual enquiry in anything like the Socratic spirit. He assumes in his readers a core of conviction in which an answer to every question lies latent. And yet, if his approach is thus out of line with the Greek tradition, it is no less out of line with the OT tradition. In his concern with explanation, verification, substantiation, though it may be questionable how much there is of the Greek philosopher, there is certainly much of the Greek rhetorician with his philosophical background. Paul’s propensity for applying to the data of divine revelation a technique of syllogistic appraisal is clearly part of his Greek inheritance, and if his use of it is such as to give a Greek a headache, his Jewishness can hardly have failed to ensure it meant headaches for him too. But if it did he seems to have thrived on them.

This study focusses on Romans 1–8, an area pervaded by argument which is nothing if not intricate and tangled. Commentators have given much attention to cultural influences and situational

Cambridge University Press

0521472237 - Wrestling with Rationality in Paul: Romans 1-8 in a New Perspective

John D. Moores

Excerpt

[More information](#)2 *Wrestling with rationality in Paul*

motivation in the attempt to account for its awkwardnesses. Necessary and valuable as such researches eminently are, I believe that they involve a risk of falsifying the tune Paul is playing; for he introduces his arguments as representing a source of blessed encouragement. At any rate, that is how I would propose we should construe Paul's attitude. It is a construal which colours all my considerations, and is the goal towards which they all tend – as its role in drawing my discussion to a conclusion in Chapter 5, sections 4–5, displays. Towards this proposal, which gives my study its direction, the build-up is essentially a vindication of the intellectual substance of Paul's argumentation. It is a vindication founded on a somewhat innovatory approach to Pauline rationality.

I have been led to it by viewing Paul against the background of semiology, the science of signs – perhaps, better, of *signification* or *sign-production*. Though I see this as giving to my study a new and distinctive slant, let me say at once that the final outcome I have to report is more a matter of envisaging a promising line of investigation than of being able to offer results. The promise is that afforded, as I believe, by the new analytical tools of 'fuzzy logic': promise of a more conceptually penetrating dissection than has hitherto been feasible of some of the issues that figure most prominently in Paul's argumentation, in particular those surrounding his use of the terms δίκαιος, νόμος and θάνατος. As to what this might involve, I give as much elucidation as my level of competence permits in Chapter 5, section 3. That section thus provides the immediate foundation on which I base my proposal regarding the 'encouraging' tenor of Paul's 'tune'.

I do not settle upon 'fuzzy logic' as the best source of promise without having first reviewed other approaches to Pauline argumentation that developments in the science and philosophy of language in the twentieth century might seem to commend. And Chapter 5, section 2, reflects my concern to take account of the scope such approaches may offer, notably those emanating from the ambit of aesthetics, existentialism and deconstructionism. Into a related category Chapter 1, sections 2–4, may also be seen to fall, where I deal with the 'rhetorical' and 'sacred' dimensions as they impinge on Pauline discourse.

It is, however, the way that general semiotics has led me to where I stand that I am principally concerned to expound as fully as possible in this study. And it is to this exercise that I apply myself right at the very beginning of Chapter 1, section 1. Attention there

Cambridge University Press

0521472237 - Wrestling with Rationality in Paul: Romans 1-8 in a New Perspective

John D. Moores

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Introduction*

3

centres at once on a nucleus of semiological theory which is to dominate all my references to the subject: that constituted by the typology of semiosis elaborated by Umberto Eco. I see in his findings a striking relevance to the Pauline propensity for logical argumentation. The method by which I move towards vindicating the latter springs from this relevance, for in the principle of signification which – among the various modes into which he classifies sign-productivity – Eco identifies by the term ‘Recognition’ we can, I believe, see both the reason why argumentation is indispensable to Paul and why it gets him into difficulties. Section 1.1 illustrates the applicability of Eco’s semiological typology to Paul’s apprehension of the significance of the Crucifixion. The persistence with which intractable logical issues are pursued by him can then be linked to specific tendencies inherent in the particular semiological mechanism (Recognition) which is involved. Later in the chapter (1.5) I show how these tendencies and the impasse to which they bring the deductive process (on which Recognition nevertheless depends) are manifested in Paul’s argumentative persistence.

The central body of my study then deals with the technical phenomenon which is the most conspicuous outcome of this persistence, syllogistic reasoning formulated enthymematically – that is to say, elliptically, without a full display of the syllogistic components. That Paul’s argumentation may often not be clear, that it may involve insidious shifts of meaning, that its motivation may be difficult to perceive (and that the influence of cultural and situational factors complicates and confuses the issues as much as it sheds light on them) are all features which become amply apparent as Chapters 2–4 of my study work their way through the argumentation of Romans 1–8 highlighting the incidence of the enthymematic element, and bringing out the perplexingly wide varieties of effect with which it becomes associated (Chapter 2), the differing ways in which it arises (Chapter 3), and the changing levels of importance which it assumes (Chapter 4).

I do not pretend that the semiological background against which I would view these complexities disposes of the problems to which they give rise. I do, however, contend that it does much to set them in a fundamentally positive light, not only because it shows them as inevitable rather than self-induced (of an essentially healthy, not idle, irrelevant or incidental origin), but because they emerge as tangles in which illuminatory potential is as much to be cherished as obscurity regretted or excused. They emerge in a light compatible

Cambridge University Press

0521472237 - Wrestling with Rationality in Paul: Romans 1-8 in a New  
Perspective

John D. Moores

Excerpt

[More information](#)4 *Wrestling with rationality in Paul*

with their having inspired in Paul an optimism and a confidence to be shared with others as blessings. It is indeed a function of semiology to show that communicativity does not depend on ‘clarity’ of one kind only; it shows, for example, that rational inconsistency or inexactitude is not incompatible with expressive immediacy. These are issues I pursue in 5.1 – but only, in the end, to affirm that the promise which I can see in recourse to ‘fuzzy’ logic deflects me from tackling Pauline reasoning on any such basis. In fact, it convinces me that the most fruitful approach to the rational element in Paul, particularly – but not only – in Romans 1–8, is to expect the communicative energy inherent in objective argumentative substance to be the *main* source of illuminatory potential in the tight corners where Paul’s logic lands him.

Cambridge University Press

0521472237 - Wrestling with Rationality in Paul: Romans 1-8 in a New Perspective

John D. Moores

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## 1

## ENTHYMEMATIC SEMIOSIS IN PAUL

**1.1 A semiotic perspective for the study of Pauline argument.  
Umberto Eco's 'typology of modes of sign-production'.**

'It is very difficult to imagine an imprint that mentions a referent without the mediation of a content.' This is a comment which the semiologist Umberto Eco is prompted to make in relation to the significance which Robinson Crusoe reads into the human footprint which he comes upon on the island where he is shipwrecked.<sup>1</sup> The message may be spelt out thus: 'There is at least one other human being on this island in addition to me.' The referent which the imprint, by virtue of its form, 'mentions' is 'human being', but the 'mention' does not come about for Crusoe on this occasion without the mediation of a content which the words 'human being' alone do not adequately represent. He does not think 'human being' except as 'a particular human being who must be my fellow inhabitant on this island'.

This example illustrates one mode of the operation which Eco defines as 'sign-production'. It is the mode which he refers to as 'Recognition'. It is the first of four modes into which he distinguishes 'sign-production'. The others are Ostension, Replica and Invention.<sup>2</sup> It is a feature of Eco's general theory of semiotics that the object of semiological study should be understood not as the sign itself but as the production of signs.<sup>3</sup> It is his belief that it must be a theory which embraces all the forms in which sign-production can occur.<sup>4</sup> Its products, he considers, are more properly identified by the term 'sign-function' than 'sign'.<sup>5</sup> It is a further feature of his theory that 'sign-production' embraces not only intentional but also unintentional signs.<sup>6</sup> The Crusoe example is a case in point. The 'production' of the sign in such a case – the process whereby the imprint becomes 'sign-functional' – arises with the act of recognition. Eco's definition of 'Recognition' is, in fact, as follows: 'Recog-

Cambridge University Press

0521472237 - Wrestling with Rationality in Paul: Romans 1-8 in a New Perspective

John D. Moores

Excerpt

[More information](#)6 *Wrestling with rationality in Paul*

tion occurs when a given object or event, produced by nature or human action (intentionally or unintentionally), and existing in a world of facts as a fact among facts, comes to be viewed by an addressee as the expression of a given content, either through a pre-existing and coded correlation or through the positing of a possible correlation by its addressee.<sup>7</sup>

The crucifixion of Jesus Christ is an event which was produced by human action and which exists as a fact in a world of facts. These – whatever doubts some may have or have had on the subject – were undoubtedly the terms on which it was recognised by Paul of Tarsus as the expression of the content which he read into it through the correlation which he posited between the event and that content. That the action, as understood by Paul, has a dimension which makes ‘human’ an epithet of questionable adequacy, and that the complexity which invests the intentionality of its occurrence is of a uniqueness that lies outside anything Eco was concerned to accommodate, does not prevent his definition of ‘Recognition’ from fitting the sign-receptive experience of Paul as aptly as it does that of Robinson Crusoe.

Eco’s definition of Recognition, as I have just quoted it, may not seem to account adequately for his inclusion of Recognition under the heading ‘sign-production’. The ‘coming to be viewed’ of an event or object in a certain light is not naturally or obviously to be equated with the view having been ‘produced’ by anyone. (And to call the viewer the ‘addressee’ sounds decidedly odd.) But, as Eco sees it, when an object or event is recognised as having a certain meaning – as being, that is, the expression of a certain content – it is as if (a) the one who recognises the meaning had had his attention drawn to it, or (b) as if recognising it had involved its being represented to him, or (c) had entailed an appeal being made to his creative judgement. ‘The object or event’, as he puts it, ‘must be considered as if it had been produced by ostension, replica or invention.’<sup>8</sup>

Paul first sees the Crucifixion as speaking to himself. This is Recognition. But it speaks as something he has been shown and that he can show to others. If Crusoe had had a fellow castaway with him, he could have shown him the footprint, and – without his having said anything – his companion would have understood the message to be ‘Look, we are not the only human beings on this island.’ From Recognition we pass at once to Ostension.<sup>9</sup> And there is a sense in which Paul considers that the Crucifixion is an event

Cambridge University Press

0521472237 - Wrestling with Rationality in Paul: Romans 1-8 in a New Perspective

John D. Moores

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Enthymematic semiosis in Paul*

7

which, once it is shown, speaks.<sup>10</sup> But even if the significance of the Crucifixion may be considered as essentially complete the moment the identity of the victim is grasped (i.e. that he is the Son of God), to any but those who had been with him personally or had enjoyed a unique illuminatory experience like Paul's, it would need pointing out and spelling out.<sup>11</sup> Even Paul has understood the meaning revealed to him by spelling it out, representing it to himself. And here we move into the ambit of Replica.

The term 'replica' is used by Eco to cover that category of sign which is distinguished by its repeatability. A sign that has the form of an object or an event existing in a world of facts is by its nature unrepeatable. Intentional communication largely operates by means of artificial signs which depend for their functioning on the reproduction of the convention.<sup>12</sup> The English word 'book' means what the body of English speakers agrees it to mean. Repetition is both the mode and the source of its sign-productivity. Words are by no means the only form that repeatable signs can take, but they are the most common, and are notable particularly for the capacity to explicate the meaning latent in other types of sign-production (*some* others, that is: not all – as Eco characteristically insists, whatever had previously been claimed);<sup>13</sup> words explicate what is recognised in Recognition and what is displayed in Ostension. Through repetition they represent the meanings which as a result of the sign-productive process come to be recognised in or imparted to objects or events.

The meaning of a footprint in the sand seems to be best construed as something that represents itself to Crusoe in words. And so it is with the meaning of the Crucifixion to Paul. In both cases the communication of the meaning by means of ostension can be seen as implying a verbal content, even if, at least in the case of Crusoe, it can do without any words actually being uttered aloud. In the case of Paul silent ostension is not feasible – with far-reaching consequences for the involvement of the mechanism without which semiosis could not occur at all: Coding.

The meaning of an object or event is something we decipher, and to decipher we need to know and apply the appropriate code. Decoding is a matter of correlating forms with meanings. Coding is the principle by virtue of which objects or events are correlated as 'expression' to 'content'. It is the principle on which words depend for their meaning.<sup>14</sup> Where expression is verbal the correlation with content is fundamentally arbitrary and is brought about by coding

Cambridge University Press

0521472237 - Wrestling with Rationality in Paul: Romans 1-8 in a New Perspective

John D. Moores

Excerpt

[More information](#)8 *Wrestling with rationality in Paul*

which operates at various different levels.<sup>15</sup> It is ultimately rooted in the manipulation of expression units composed of elements which depend for meaning entirely on the combinations in which they figure.<sup>16</sup> For example, 'book' exists as a sign-function in its own right. It can also contribute to the sign-functional value of a propositional unit such as 'That book is red'. But whereas the meaning of the proposition is the sum of a series of sign-functional contributions the nature of each of which can be separately identified and explained, the meaning of the word 'book' is not the aggregate of what the orthographic elements b, o, o, k, of which it is made up, can be separately explained as contributing.<sup>17</sup> The coding on which the combination of elements like these depends for its operation is coding at its most rigorously artificial.<sup>18</sup> Replica, then, is a semiotic mode in which a great deal of the coding involved is arbitrary. However, where Replica occurs non-verbally (as in the case of conventional signs, on the road, in public buildings, etc.) the convention may contain a 'motivation' that makes it less than entirely arbitrary and to some extent self-explanatory. For instance, the sign ♣ is chosen to indicate access to a provision intended for women because its appearance has some correlation to the circumstances of being a female. Where sign-production arises through Recognition or Ostension, the correlation, though it may enjoy the status of a convention in some cases, never involves wholly arbitrary coding. In the case of an imprint the code is established by experience, and experience provides all that is necessary to crack it.<sup>19</sup> The range of experience enjoyed by an 'addressee' may indeed determine whether or not, and according to what principle, he or she is in fact 'addressed' by the sign-productive potential of the situation. As women come to wear skirts less and less, a child of today may need to be taught a convention before being able to interpret the ♣ which experience would formerly have sufficed to decode.

Whether the code which enabled Paul to 'recognise' the meaning of the Crucifixion was a code provided by experience alone, it is effectively impossible for us to say. The Recognition certainly depended on a code which, through the experience of a moment of privileged insight, invalidated at a stroke the code that had served him hitherto. By the terms of the invalidated code to the formation of which the whole of Paul's earlier experience had contributed, he had read the crucifixion of Jesus as the fitting punishment of an impostor who had blasphemously claimed to be the Son of God whose coming the Hebrew Scriptures had foreseen.<sup>20</sup> Under the new

Cambridge University Press

0521472237 - Wrestling with Rationality in Paul: Romans 1-8 in a New Perspective

John D. Moores

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Enthymematic semiosis in Paul*

9

code formed with dramatic suddenness as an integral part of his conversion experience, he read the same event as God's sacrifice of his Son in mysterious fulfilment of all (and more than all?) that the Hebrew Scriptures could be seen to foreshadow concerning his coming. The writings of Paul abundantly display his anxiety that the meaning he thus saw in the Crucifixion should be adequately spelt out. But their volume scarcely seems to square with his resolve to know nothing among the Corinthians except Jesus Christ and him crucified, a declaration which is consequently often regarded as a mere tactical device to be seen strictly in relation to the dangers of over-reliance on intellect or of empty shows of eloquence.<sup>21</sup> I would argue that it should be taken more seriously.

The key factor in the disclosure experience of Paul's conversion is identified by Paul himself as his having seen the risen Jesus. The new code is determined by the evidence that he who was crucified had indeed risen from the tomb and was alive for ever. Paul's identification of the victim of the Crucifixion as the Son of God, and the particular connotative dynamic which the title 'Son of God' carries for Paul (as well as all the soteriological implications that he draws from it) arise from the code having its origin in the evidence of Paul's own eyes (albeit those spiritually opened for him by miraculous means). I see myself here as following assertions in Paul's own letters (Gal 1:12–16; 1Cor 9:1; 15:8).<sup>22</sup> If it is thought that I make insufficient allowance for the teaching he received from other Christians, I would still say that whatever part such teaching may have played in his act of recognition, a unique focus on the risen victim of the Crucifixion remains characteristic of, and central to, his experience.<sup>23</sup> However, Eco affirms that 'all sign-functions depending on replica, ostension and recognition articulate given units in order to produce more complex texts'.<sup>24</sup> Paul cannot grasp what he has 'recognised' without the mediation of a verbal text. And he cannot communicate what he has grasped without relaying the verbal text as it has articulated itself for him.

The experiential background to the sign-productive event of Paul's recognition of the significance of the Crucifixion is one in which the experience of a revelatory confrontation with the resurrected victim impinges on a network of attitudes and of beliefs drastically reshaping and expanding it. And therefore, whilst the code governing the Recognition is provided by a single sudden experience, at least six distinct core statements seem to inhere in the content of the Recognition as Paul must, even initially, have spelt it

Cambridge University Press

0521472237 - Wrestling with Rationality in Paul: Romans 1-8 in a New Perspective

John D. Moores

Excerpt

[More information](#)10 *Wrestling with rationality in Paul*

out to himself for it ultimately to produce the flood of more complex texts that it does.

- 1 A man is crucified.
- 2 That man is the son of God.<sup>25</sup>
- 3 God gave him up to be crucified.
- 4 It was for us that God gave him up to be crucified.
- 5 This is the extent of God's gift to us.
- 6 The measure of the gift is the measure of God's love.

For the meaning of what Paul points to in the Crucifixion to be communicable to others certainly no fewer than these six propositions are necessary. Its decoding cannot begin to come about in terms of less textual elaboration than this. But perhaps no more elaboration than this is necessary for enough text-productive energy to have been sparked off to generate, without further boosting, the total result with which the teaching of Paul confronts us. Already, however, the minimum textual elaboration needed to give effect to the initial decoding dynamic of Paul's encounter with the Risen One depends necessarily on the special codificatory mechanisms by which verbal communication operates. These quickly multiply and diversify (as we shall see in 1.4) as more and more explicatory texts, flooding Paul's channels of outgoing transmission, amplify the basic textual nucleus. Nevertheless the acts of sign-production that make up Paul's teaching are all ultimately instances of Replica effecting Ostension by explicating Recognition; the myriad sign-productive tokens of which his discourse is composed serve always, directly or indirectly, in diverse ways, to articulate the single sign-productive event which the Resurrection led him to decode as the Crucifixion of the Son of God. Once this is taken duly into account, many problems to which the idiosyncrasies of his discourse give rise are alleviated, not the least those surrounding his propensity for introducing arguments to support his statements. The present study attempts to demonstrate this.

### 1.2 Pauline argument and the rhetorical dimension of his discourse. Two lines of approach: the classical and the 'new'.

Paul's use of argument can roughly be said to take two forms: they are (1) appeals to Scripture; (2) appeals to reason. Only (2) comes within the scope of what I have just been saying and what I am proposing to say.

There seems to be a fairly wide consensus of opinion today that it