1

INTRODUCTION

This investigation concerns itself with the socio-rhetorical function of an apparent allusion to a saying of Jesus in the Epistle of James. It approaches James as an instance of written rhetorical discourse, a text that seeks to modify the social thought and behavior of its addressees. It presupposes a broad scholarly consensus, according to which the text appropriates a tradition of Jesus' sayings, and it seeks to ascertain the social texture of one particular allusion to a saying of Jesus in James 2.5 by a rhetorical analysis according to Greco-Roman conventions.

The reasons for choosing James 2.5 are significant. First, practically all previous investigations that give serious attention to James' use of Jesus tradition identify James 2.5 as an important allusion to a saying of Jesus (Deppe, 1989, pp. 89–91, 237–38). Second, this verse occurs in a unified argument (James 2.1–13) which is one of the three rhetorical units that, in the opinion of the scholarly majority, have the greatest potential for disclosing the thought, piety, and style of the text (Dibelius, 1975, pp. 1, 38–45, 47–50). Third, we shall see that James 2.1–13 displays a definite pattern of argumentation that evinces Greco-Roman rhetorical strategies. Fourth, James 2.5 addresses a social issue, conflict between the rich and the poor, which is not only a principal theme in James, occupying almost a quarter of the entire text (James 1.9–11; 2.1–13; 2.15–16; and 4.13–5.6),[1] but is also a moral issue of social significance in the Jesus tradition and in much of early Christian literature.[2]

[1] Apparently James' energetic interest in the "poor and rich" became a prominent feature in NT scholarship with Kern (1835). Almost a century later, in 1921, Dibelius would say: "What is stressed most [in James] is the *piety of the Poor*, and the accompanying opposition to the rich" (1975, p. 48). See also Mußner (1987, pp. 76–84); Rustler (1952); Boggan (1982); and Maynard-Reid (1987).

[2] The literature on this is voluminous; see esp. Dibelius (1975, pp. 39–45, and the bibliography). Also, Keck (1965; 1966); Bammel (1968); Hauck (1968); Hauck and Kasch (1968); Dupont (1969); Grundmann (1972); Finley (1973); Kelly (1973);

2   *The social rhetoric of James*

The purpose of this chapter is to introduce the thesis that guides our inquiry, along with the method of analysis it employs, and to explain further its scope and goal. To do this, we shall address the issue of the relation between James' epistolary format and its rhetoric. Then, presupposing that James makes use of Jesus tradition, we shall discuss its allusions to Jesus' sayings as an aspect of its strategy of persuasion. Then, we shall give attention to the relation between rhetoric and its social function as a means of setting the stage for the investigation that follows. Finally, we shall provide an overview of the intended progression of our inquiry.

The Epistle of James and rhetoric

James presents itself as an early Christian letter (1.1).[3] As such it is, according to ancient epistolary theory, "a substitute for oral communication and could function in almost as many ways as a speech" (Aune, 1987, p. 158; Demetrius *De elocutione* 223–24; Malherbe, 1988, pp. 1–14). From a rhetorical perspective, James is also intentional discourse: it has "a message to convey" and seeks "to persuade an audience to believe it [the message] or to believe it more profoundly" (G. A. Kennedy, 1984, p. 3).[4]

Whereas distinctively literary-critical studies of James focus primarily on the question of what the text is,[5] this study is an exercise in rhetorical criticism, which is

> that mode of internal criticism which considers the interactions between the work, the author, and the audience. As

Hengel (1974b); L. T. Johnson (1979; 1981); Nickelsburg (1977); Countryman (1980); Maier (1980); Saller (1982); Osiek (1983); Borg (1984); Eisenstadt and Roniger (1984); Horsley and Hanson (1985); Garnsey and Saller (1987); Hollenbach (1987); Horsley (1987); Malina (1987); and Moxnes (1988).

[3] For the purposes of this investigation, ancient letters are considered according to three customary categories: diplomatic, documentary, and literary letters. These are viewed as general, non-rigid, often overlapping classifications, and they are readily conducive to subdivision and/or supplementation by other epistolary typologies, both ancient and modern. On this, see esp. White (1986) and Aune (1987). On ancient letter typologies, see Pseudo-Demetrius (in V. Weichert, 1910), and Pseudo-Libanius (in R. Forester, 1927). The latter are conveniently collected and translated in Malherbe (1988). See also the excellent typology of six epistolary types by Stowers (1986a).

[4] On rhetorical discourse as the "embodiment of an intention," see Sloan (1947). About the implications of this for the NT, see Mack (1990, esp. pp. 9–48).

[5] On the differences between rhetorical and literary criticism, and the ways in which they complement each other, see Bryant (1973, pp. 3–43); Sloan (1947); G. A. Kennedy (1984, pp. 3–5); and Mack (1990, pp. 93–102).

> such it is interested in the *product*, the *process*, and the
> *effect*, of linguistic activity, whether of the imaginative
> kind or the utilitarian kind . . . it regards the work not so
> much as an object of contemplation but as an artistically
> structured instrument for communication. It is more inter-
> ested in a literary work for what it *does* than for what it is.[6]
>
> (Corbett, 1969, p. xxii)

Therefore, the function of James, what the text does or rather what
it intends to do, shall be our primary concern.

The functional approach to discourse belongs, traditionally and
preeminently, to rhetoric (Bryant, 1973, p. 27). So, when Stanley
Stowers (1986a, p. 15) says that NT letters should be thought of
more "in terms of the actions that people performed by means of
them," than as "the communication of information," he expresses a
view that is characteristic of rhetoric (as do Meeks, 1983, p. 7; and
Malherbe, 1977, p. 50). And this perspective clearly coheres with
ancient epistolary theory; for example, the letter handbooks of
Pseudo-Demetrius and Pseudo-Libanius list, respectively, twenty-
one and forty-one "functional" styles for letters. These are *not
actual letter types*, as Koskenniemi (1956, p. 62) correctly observes,
but rather the *appropriate styles and tones* that could be chosen
depending upon both the circumstances involved in writing a letter
and the "function" the writer intended to perform through the letter
(see White, 1986, p. 190; Aune, 1987, pp. 158–225; and Malherbe,
1992). Moreover, because rhetorical discourse is "an instrument of
communication and influence on others" (Perelman and Olbrechts-
Tyteca, 1969, p. 513), its inherent social aspect lends itself to an
instrumental purpose: the exploration of the intended social func-
tion of the discourse.[7] Rhetorical analysis can help us to discover
the latent intent in James' rhetoric and to understand how that
intent is transmitted to its audience (G. A. Kennedy, 1984, p. 12).

An awareness of the relation that exists between James' episto-
lary format or genre and its rhetoric is, according to George
Kennedy, "not a crucial factor in understanding how rhetoric
actually works" in James' argumentative units (1984, p. 32). On the
other hand, it may "contribute to an understanding of [James']

---

[6] Also see Corbett (1971); Bryant (1973, pp. 27–42); Hudson (1923); Wichelns (in
Bryant, 1958, pp. 5–42); and Ericson (in Murphy, 1983, pp. 127–36).
[7] On the social function and/or effect of rhetorical discourse, see Corbett (1971,
pp. 3–4, 14–15, 31–44); Halliday (1978, pp. 36–58); Wuellner (1987); and esp.
Mack and Robbins (1989).

rhetorical situation'' (pp. 30–36), especially the audience the text evokes and the presence of various features in the text (p. 31). Consequently, we shall return to this issue when we focus on the rhetorical situation. At this point, however, it is advantageous to spotlight the difficulties involved in classifying James as an ancient letter, to state our position regarding this matter, and to clarify why a rhetorical approach to James is appropriate for our inquiry.

Modern scholarship remains divided over the possibility of assessing James as a letter. On the one hand, seminal literary and form-critical analyses (e.g., Deissmann, 1901, pp. 52–55; and Dibelius, 1975, pp. 1–11) have rightly pointed out that James does not appear to be a ''real'' letter, that is, a confidential communication in response to a specific epistolary situation.

The classification of letters into two fundamental types: (1) ''true''/''real'' letters, that are private and conversational (such as the authentic letters of Paul, and 2–3 John), and (2) ''literary'' letters or ''epistles,'' that are public and artistic (such as 1–2 Timothy, Titus, Hebrews, James, 1–2 Peter, and Jude) harks back to the pioneering epistolary investigations of Deissmann (1927, pp. 233–45). He argued (1901, p. 4) that the ''essential character'' of a letter is not to be found in its form, external appearance, or contents, but in ''the purpose which it serves: confidential personal conversation between persons separated by distance.''

Supporting the view that James is not a ''real'' letter is the observation that apart from the prescript (1.1) James either suppresses or lacks the epistolary framework and conventions that are customary in the common letter tradition, which includes ancient diplomatic and documentary letters. Diplomatic (royal, negotial, or official) letters are generally defined as those written from a government or military representative to others in an official capacity (Exler, 1923, p. 23), and include royal benefactions and concessions (Welles, 1934; Aune, 1987, pp. 164–65; see Demetr. *Eloc*. 234; Ps.-Lib. 76; and Jul. Vict. *Ars Rhetorica* 27).[8] Documentary (nonliterary or private) letters, to which belong most of the extant nonliterary papyri from Egypt, comprise the largest class of ancient letters and represent the common letter tradition. This

---

[8] Apparently letter writing began with official injunctions; in time, however, due to the popularity of personal letters, official letters began to reflect the common letter tradition in both form and style. On this see White (1986, pp. 191–93, 218; 1988, pp. 86–87), who draws on Stirewalt (''A Survey of Uses of Letter-Writing in Hellenistic and Jewish Communities through the New Testament Period'').

category comprises letters of recommendation, petitions/requests,
invitations, instructions/orders, legal contracts, memoranda, and
family or friendly letters (Stowers, 1986a, pp. 17–26; Aune, 1987,
pp. 162–64; and esp. White, 1986; 1981b).[9]

Noting James' aphoristic character, the hortatory tone of much
of its content, and its diverse, conventional subject matter which
seems to lack a dominant theme and to evince no specific historical
location, the scholarly trend has been to view James as a loosely
arranged collection of sayings and brief essays or treatises that is
merely framed by an epistolary prescript.[10]

Recent studies in ancient epistolography, on the other hand,
support the long-held possibility of assessing James as a letter.[11]
First, they stress the fact that in antiquity the letter was not only
the most popular genre; it was also, due to its incredible elasticity,
the most variously used of any literary form (White, 1988; Stowers,
1986a, pp. 15–47). Literary variation was one of the hallmarks of
the Greco-Roman world, and motifs, themes, and constituent
elements of other genres were frequently subsumed within an
epistolary frame and function (Norden, 1983, vol. II, p. 492; Kroll,
1924, pp. 202–24). In other words, practically any text could be
addressed, *and could function*, as a letter (Aune, 1987, p. 158;
Bauckham, 1988). Further, based on the unequivocal variety in
both the form and function of ancient letters, scholars now con-
sistently assert that the customary manner of classifying such letters
is deficient in both its terminological distinctions and perspectives.[12]
In this light, James' perceived incongruities with the common letter

[9] Documentary letters share a number of conventions, themes, and motifs with
early Christian letters, especially Paul's; and, since Deissmann, they have dominated
the comparative study of NT letters and have largely determined scholarly assess-
ments of early Christian literature (see Schubert, 1939a; 1939b; and Doty, 1973; cf.
Koskenniemi, 1956, pp. 18–53). Klaus Berger (1984c, pp. 1327–40), however,
rightly criticizes this approach as too narrow, and proposes that ancient philoso-
phical letters of instruction are more appropriate for comparisons with NT letters.

[10] This is Dibelius' view (1975, pp. 1–11). On epistolary conventions as framing
devices, see Aune (1987, pp. 167–70).

[11] For earlier assessments of James as a literary letter, see Deissmann (1901, p. 4)
and Ropes (1916, pp. 6–18).

[12] Deissmann's terminology: "real" and "non-real," "private" and "public," and
"specific" and "general" is ultimately misleading. For example, some "epistles" are
also "real" letters, and some "real" letters imply a "general," rather than a
"specific," epistolary setting. On this see Aune (1987, pp. 160–61); Bauckham (1988,
pp. 471–73); and K. Berger (1984c, pp. 1327–63). Cf. also Hackforth and Rees
(1970); Levens (1970); Dahl (1976); Doty (1969; 1973, pp. 4–19, 23–27); Thraede
(1970, pp. 1–4).

tradition are hardly sufficient to preclude its classification as a letter
(K. Berger, 1984c; Baasland, 1988). Therefore, while emphasizing
that James is not a common, private letter, many hold that it is a
type of "literary" letter.

The working definition of the "literary" letter employed in this
research is provided by David Aune (1987, p. 165): "Literary letters
are those that were preserved and transmitted through literary
channels and were valued either as epistolary models, as examples
of literary artistry, or as vignettes into earlier lives and manners";
he lists the following varieties: letters of recommendation; letter-
essays; philosophical letters; novelistic letters; imaginative letters;
embedded letters; letters as framing devices; and letter collections
(pp. 165–70; see also White, 1981a, pp. 5–6; Thraede, 1970,
pp. 17–77; and Traub, 1955).

In comparing James' prescript and contents – which suggest a
general "circular," that is, a letter for several communities – with
other ancient letters, numerous scholars underscore its similarities
with the Jewish encyclical (see Baasland, 1988; Dahl, 1976; Meeks,
1986, p. 121; and Ropes, 1916, pp. 127–28).[13] The latter was a type
of letter used for many different administrative and religious
purposes. See, for example, the three Aramaic Gamaliel letters
(from the Tannaitic period) that are addressed to three regional
groups of Diaspora Jews (*y. Sanh.* 18d; *b. Sanh.* 18d; *t. Sanh.* 2.5);
the two festal encyclicals in 2 Maccabees (ca. 180–161 BCE): 2
Maccabees 1.1–9 (with a Hebrew prescript), and 2 Maccabees
1.10–2.18 (with a Greek prescript); a prophetic encyclical (ca. 125
CE) in the *Paraleipomena of Jeremiah* 6.19–25. Moreover,
embedded in *2 Baruch* is the Letter of Baruch (originally in
Hebrew; ca. 100 CE): an unrecorded copy (cf. 77.17–19), described
as "a letter of doctrine and a roll of hope" (77.12), was apparently
addressed to "our brothers in Babylon" (i.e., "the two-and-one-
half tribes in Babylon"); another copy (cf. 78.1–86.3) is addressed
to "the nine-and-a-half tribes across the river Euphrates" (texts and
discussions of the latter are conveniently found in Pardee, 1982).
And this type of letter definitely influenced early Christian letter
writing: 1–2 Peter, Jude, and the embedded letter in Acts 15.23–29
evince characteristics of the Jewish encyclical (see also the refer-
ences to apparent encyclicals in Acts 9.1 and 28.21).

---

[13] On the "circular" letter, see Koester (1982, vol. II, p. 157); Aune (1987, p. 159);
Ropes (1916, pp. 6–7, 40–43); and White (1988, p. 101).

In addition, James' distinctive character as a direct address or summons and its use of "sententious maxims" (γνωμολογία) and "exhortations" (προτροπαί) move the discourse away from the conversational tone, style, and content of the common private letter toward that of an address or speech.[14] For, "a letter is designed to be the heart's good wishes in brief; it is the exposition of a simple subject in simple terms. Its beauty consists in the expression of friendship and the many proverbs (παροιμίαι) which it contains . . . But the man who utters sententious maxims (γνωμολογῶν) and exhortations (προτρεπόμενος) seems to be no longer talking familiarly in a letter but to be speaking *ex cathedra*" (Demetr. *Eloc*. 231b–232). Thus, Baasland (1988, p. 3653) correctly says, "Der Jak. ist aber . . . kein Freundschaftsbrief, auch kein Empfehlungs- oder informativer Privatbrief. Eher haben wir es mit einem Bittbrief oder mit '*Orders and Instructions*' in Briefform zu tun" ("The letter of James is however . . . neither a letter of friendship, nor even a letter of recommendation nor an informative private letter. Rather we have to place it with a letter of supplication or with 'Orders and Instructions' in the form of a letter" (cf. K. Berger, 1984c, pp. 1328–29; White and Kensinger, 1976, pp. 79–91).

While this kind of language appears to indicate a measurable distinction for determining the type of letter that James is (Stowers, 1984), it is also extremely important in gauging the social meaning and function that it intends (Mack, 1990, p. 24). For example, speaking from the sociolinguistic perspective, and stressing "the social meaning of language," M. A. K. Halliday (1978, p. 50) reminds us that: "the whole of the mood system in grammar, the distinction between indicative and imperative, and within indicative, between declarative and interrogative . . . is not referential at all; it is purely interpersonal, concerned with the social-interactional function of language. It is the speaker taking on a certain role in the speech situation." This also befits the official disposition of the encyclical. Further, James' concern with moral advice and social issues corresponds significantly with ancient letter-essays[15]

---

[14] Baasland (1988, p. 3650) correctly argues that James distinguishes itself among NT letters as a direct summons to its hearers.

[15] Ropes (1916, pp. 127–28); Doty (1973, pp. 7–8, 15); Kümmel (1975, p. 408). On letter-essays see Aune (1987, pp. 165–67); Stirewalt (1991); Malherbe (1986); Arrighetti (1973); Cicero, *The Letters to His Friends*; Canik (1967); Coleman (1974); Betz (1978); Fiore (1986).

and philosophical letters,[16] both of which, incidentally, could also display a remarkably limited use of epistolary convention (Aune, 1987, pp. 167–70).

Letter-essays and philosophical letters (συγγράμματα) are literary letters (see the epistolary theorist Ps.-Lib. 50). While family or friendly letters, "especially when expressed in a cultivated manner," were deemed by the Greek and Latin rhetoricians "as the most authentic form of correspondence" (White, 1986, p. 218), G. A. Kennedy points out that most writers (including Quintilian, Cicero, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus) apparently regarded letters "as either subliterary or perhaps more accurately as attaining what literary qualities they have by imitation of one of the three literary genres [oratory, historiography, and the philosophical dialogue]" (1984, pp. 30–31; see Dion. Hal. *Comp.* in W. R. Roberts, 1910, pp. 137–51).

The evidence, then, does seem to suggest that within the vast field of ancient epistolography James may have a place as a type of "literary" letter.[17] For now, therefore, we may tentatively approach James as something of a moral address in the form of an encyclical.

The overlap between letters and rhetoric

Contemporary scholarship increasingly emphasizes the often overlooked fact that, while epistolary theory and rhetoric were not integrated in antiquity, letter writing, at least by the first century BCE, was nonetheless significantly influenced by classical rhetoric, "the theory of persuasion or argumentation."[18] Rhetoric was in a real sense the dominant culture of the Greco-Roman world: "[it] defined the technology of discourse customary for all who participated [therein]" (Mack, 1990, p. 30; G. A. Kennedy, 1984, p. 5; and Kinneavy, 1987, pp. 56–101).

As the core subject in formal education, rhetoric was evidently

[16] On philosophical letters, see Aune (1987, pp. 167–68); and Malherbe (1986; 1987; 1989a; 1992); also *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*; Attridge (1976); K. Berger (1984c, pp. 1328–29); Betz (1961; 1972; 1975a; 1978; 1979); Lutz (1947); Mussies (1972); and O'Neil (1977).

[17] Thus, Laws (1980, p. 6); Davids (1982, p. 24; 1988, p. 3627); Baasland (1988, pp. 3649–55). Also see Francis (1970, p. 126) who argues that "in form" James is a "secondary" letter, i.e., it lacks situational immediacy, but "in treatment of [its] subject matter" it is a "literary" letter.

[18] Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969); Mack (1990, pp. 19–21); G. A. Kennedy (1984, pp. 3, 12); Betz (1972; 1975b; 1986); Wuellner (1976; 1978a; 1979; 1986; 1987).

introduced at the secondary level of the Hellenistic school, when students, in their "first exercises" (*progymnasmata*), were taught to read and analyze literature for its rhetorical principles and practice.[19] "One of the results of this merger of literature and rhetoric" was that besides oral discourse, literary composition, including letters, "began to reflect studied attention to rhetorical principles."[20]

While it is possible that letter writing may also have been introduced at the secondary level in Hellenistic education, A. J. Malherbe (1988, p. 7) rightly concludes that the evidence is insufficient to make this claim.[21] On the one hand, Theon's *Progymnasmata*, the earliest extant textbook of "preliminary exercises" (ca. mid- or late first century CE),[22] mentions letters in the exercise on προσωποποιΐα ("speech-in-character"; Butts, 1987, pp. 444–64). On the other hand, as Malherbe (1988, p. 7) emphasizes, letters are mentioned here not for learning how to write letters, "but to develop facility in adopting various kinds of style." In other words, προσωποποιΐα involves "writing or giving a speech whch reflects the character of another person" (Butts, 1987, p. 460). Moreover, letter writing receives no attention in the earliest surviving rhetorical handbooks (G. A. Kennedy, 1963, pp. 52–79; Malherbe,

[19] Marrou (1956); M. L. Clarke (1971); see D. L. Clark (1957, pp. 61–66, 177–212, 266–76); Bonner (1977, pp. 250–76, 380–92); G. A. Kennedy (1963, pp. 268–73; 1972, pp. 316, 614–16, 619–20; and 1980, pp. 34–35, 41–160); Hock and O'Neil (1986, esp. pp. 9–22, and 51–56 notes 46–138); Butts (1987); Mack (1990, pp. 25–31); Mack and Robbins (1989).

[20] Mack (1990, p. 30; also 1984); and esp. Mack and Robbins (1989). Among the many scholars who detect the influence of rhetoric in early Christian literature are Church (1978); Jewett (1982); Fiore (1986); and Conley (1987).

[21] See Malherbe's theory that a handbook such as *Bologna Pyprus* 5 (a third- or fourth- century CE collection of eleven samples of letters without any introductory descriptions as to their letter-type and evincing no interest in epistolographical theory) may have been used at this elementary level (1988, pp. 4–6, 10; 44–57). Cf. also Rabe (1909); O'Neil's "Discussion of Preliminary Exercises of *Marcus Fabius Quintilianus*" (in Hock and O'Neil, 1986, pp. 113–49); Colson and Whitaker (1919 and 1921).

[22] Apparently, *progymnasmata* were in use already in the first century BCE (Bonner, 1977, p. 250; Hock and O'Neil, 1986, p. 10; Mack and Robbins, 1989, p. 33). Apart from Theon's (Walz, vol. I, pp. 137–262; Spengel, vol. II, pp. 57–130; and Butts, 1987, which is the most recent critical edition), the three most important *progymnasmata* are: (1) Hermogenes' *Progymnasmata* (second century CE; Rabe, vol. VI, pp. 1–27); an English translation is provided by Baldwin (1928 [1959], pp. 23–38). (2) Aphthonius' *Progymnasmata* (fourth century CE; Rabe, vol. X); English trans. Nadeau (1952). (3) The *Progymnasmata* of Nicolaus of Myra (fifth century CE; in Felten, 1913). There is no English translation of the latter.

10   *The social rhetoric of James*

1988, pp. 2, 8 note 11); in fact, its earliest mention in a rhetorical treatise (mid-third to first century BCE) belongs to Demetrius *De elocutione* (223–25).[23]

Incidentally, epistolary handbooks, such as Pseudo-Demetrius' Τύποι Ἐπιστολικοί (first century BCE to 200 CE) and Pseudo-Libanius' Ἐπιστολιμαῖοι Χαρακτῆρες (fourth–sixth centuries CE) do not appear to have belonged to this stage in the curriculum. Their narrow concern with epistolography, their rigor in classification, and the rhetorical theory they presuppose combine to suggest that these handbooks were most probably used in the training of professional letter writers.[24] Therefore, despite the difficulty of assessing the relation of these two handbooks both to formal education and to the discussion of epistolary theory in general, the frequent violations of letter theory in the actual practice of letter writing leads J. L. White (1988, p. 190) to conclude: "One thing is certain. There was never a full integration of the practice and the theory."[25]

In sum, the judgment of G. A. Kennedy (1983, pp. 70–73) reflects the evidence well: on the one hand, letter writing in antiquity remained on the fringes of formal education;[26] on the other, the influence of rhetoric on both oral (conversations and speeches) and written discourse is undeniable (1984, pp. 8–12, 86–87; 1980, p. 111). One of the dominant cultural contexts for early Christian letters was Greco-Roman rhetoric.

Thus, in this investigation the fundamental approach to James proceeds according to Greco-Roman rhetorical conventions: the statements in this "literary" letter will be interpreted by their

[23] G. A. Kennedy (1984, p. 86; see also 1963, pp. 284–90). Cf. Grube (1965, pp. 110–21); and Roberts' introduction to Demetr. *De eloc.* (1953, pp. 257–93). This disquisition is most probably incorrectly ascribed to Demetrius of Phaleron (Kennedy, 1963, p. 286). Julius Victor, a minor Latin rhetorician (fourth century CE), provides the earliest mention of letter writing "as part of the *ars rhetorica*" (Malherbe, 1988, p. 3; Halm, 1863). Yet it was not until the Middle Ages that "the rhetorical art of letter writing" (i.e., the *dictamen*), became "a major development within the discipline of rhetoric" (Kennedy, 1980, pp. 185, 186–87).
[24] Malherbe (1988, p. 7). Whether the instructors of professional letter writers were also teachers of rhetoric (as Malherbe supposes) or civil servants who were experienced letter writers (as G. A. Kennedy suggests, 1983, pp. 70–73), the epistolary handbooks clearly evince the influence of rhetorical theory.
[25] Cf. Hack (1916); Allen (1972–73). On epistolary theory, in addition to Malherbe (1988), see Koskenniemi (1956, pp. 18–53) and Thraede (1970, pp. 17–77).
[26] This is noted in Malherbe (1988, p. 11 note 62).