

*Ancient Literary Criticism and Major Structural Relationships: A Comparative Analysis*

Matthew R. Peterson and Dain Alexander Smith

Asbury Theological Seminary

matthew.peterson@asburyseminary.edu

dain.smith@asburyseminary.edu

**Abstract:** The texts of the New Testament (NT) emerged during an era that produced robust literary and rhetorical criticism. This article draws from works produced during that period to investigate similarities and differences between the figures discussed by ancient literary theorists and the Major Structural Relationships (MSRs) identified by David R. Bauer and Robert A. Traina. Ultimately, this article reveals that the MSRs proposed in their Inductive Bible Study (IBS) handbook are not merely an invention of modern literary critical reading strategies but reflect devices incorporated into ancient literature and identified and discussed by ancient literary theorists.

**Keywords:** Inductive Bible Study (IBS), Major Structural Relationships (MSR), Ancient Literary Criticism

## **Structural Inductive Bible Study**

David R. Bauer and Robert A. Traina's approach to the Inductive Bible Study (IBS) method interprets biblical texts by emphasizing the

relationship between structure and meaning.<sup>1</sup> One important aspect of this method is the observation that various “major structural relationships” (MSRs) may be identified in biblical texts.<sup>2</sup> Bauer and Traina argue that these relationships are “found in all cultures, all genres, all time periods, and all forms of art, not simply in literature. They are pervasive and foundational for communication.”<sup>3</sup> Additionally, Fredrick J. Long has mused that these MSRs have some correlation to topos theory within the ancient rhetorical tradition as well as to “vital relations” in contemporary conceptual integration theory.<sup>4</sup> Thus, these studies provide this article’s point of entry. If this claim of their ubiquity to human discourse is accurate, then these MSRs would not only be beneficial for modern readers approaching ancient texts, but they also ought to be acknowledged, if not discussed in some measure, by ancient literary theorists. Indeed, the NT texts emerged during an era that had a precedent and concurrent tradition of robust literary criticism, and such a tradition has influenced modern literary criticism. Consequently, this article investigates the similarities and differences between Bauer and Traina’s MSRs and ancient literary and rhetorical

---

<sup>1</sup> Due to its widespread use, there exist a multitude of approaches to IBS, each with varying terminology to describe structural relationships. This article references the descriptions in David R. Bauer and Robert A. Traina, *Inductive Bible Study: A Comprehensive Guide to the Practice of Hermeneutics* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011) because this book is utilized by students of Asbury Theological Seminary. A helpful survey of different IBS models can be found in Fredrick J. Long, “Major Structural Relationships: A Survey of Origins, Development, Classifications, and Assessment,” *JIBS* 1.1 (2014): 22–58.

<sup>2</sup> These relationships being: *repetition, contrast, comparison, causation/substantiation, climax, pivot, particularization/generalization, instrumentation, preparation/realization, summarization, interrogation, inclusion, interchange, chiasm, and intercalation*; see Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 127–30.

<sup>3</sup> Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 94.

<sup>4</sup> Long posits that MSRs, Greco-Roman rhetorical topoi, and Jewish exegetical methods “provide a “heuristics” for interpreting human discourse, employing categories that are either 1) universal in nature, or, 2) historically conditioned, yet based upon universals of communication” (“Major Structural Relationships,” 26). Also see idem, “Vital Relations and Major Structural Relationships: Heuristic Approaches to Observe and Explore Biblical and Other Discourse,” *JIBS* 4.2 (2017): 92–128.

figures in order to demonstrate that these MSRs correspond to observed and theorized phenomena within ancient literary criticism.<sup>5</sup>

In order to accomplish this goal, we first briefly explain how modern literary criticism depends and expands upon ancient literary criticism.<sup>6</sup> Second, we present some similarities and differences between Bauer and Traina's MSRs and corresponding literary and rhetorical figures found in ancient literary criticism. Ultimately, this article reveals that the MSRs proposed by Bauer and Traina are not merely an invention of modern literary critical reading strategies but reflect devices incorporated into ancient literature and identified by ancient theorists.

## References to Classical Literature by Literary Critics

Reference to ancient discussions about the structure and organization of literature is not unprecedented within the field of literary analysis. Erich Auerbach opens his influential work *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature* with discussions on the literary technique of Homer and Petronius alongside biblical narratives.<sup>7</sup> In his *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*, Gérard Genette often alludes to literary critical discussions amongst the philosophical schools regarding

---

<sup>5</sup> The genesis of this research project emerged during an Independent Study course taken by the authors under the guidance of Dr. David R. Bauer. Conversations with Dr. Bauer prompted an analysis of IBS methods in light of the works surveyed in the course. The authors wish to thank Dr. Bauer and Dr. Fredrick J. Long for additional insights into IBS methodology.

<sup>6</sup> Although ancient literary critics are diverse and are not monolithic, this study adopts the term “ancient literary criticism” to broadly explain the literary analysis done by ancient critics. We have chosen this specific terminology because it is used by classical scholars. J. W. H. Atkins, *Literary Criticism in Antiquity: A Sketch of its Development*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1934); G. M. A. Grube, *The Greek and Roman Critics* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965); G. A. Kennedy, ed., *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, vol. 1, *Classical Criticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

<sup>7</sup> Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*, trans. Willard R. Trask (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), 3–49.

*mimesis* (imitation) and *diēgesis* (narrative).<sup>8</sup> Paul Ricoeur's works *The Rule of Metaphor* and *Time and Narrative* both appeal to Aristotle's work on rhetoric and poetics.<sup>9</sup> Literary critical works influenced by these authors frequently incorporate similar discussions of Homer, Plato, Aristotle, and other ancient literature.<sup>10</sup> Such references generally occur in order to illustrate the origins of specific literary structures or to engage the philosophical question of a relation between the text and its referent. Within biblical studies, many have been influenced by modern literary criticism, but it is rare for a sustained analysis of biblical texts to be directly influenced by ancient literary criticism. Although rhetorical criticism has grown in prominence, the ancient discussions on literary style and figures are often unutilized.<sup>11</sup>

#### *Ancient Discussions on Plot Construction and Mimesis*

It is not surprising that ancient literary criticism has influenced modern literary criticism since critiquing literature's plot, rhetoric, and style is well documented in antiquity. One of the earliest extant discussions of

---

<sup>8</sup> Gérard Genette, *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*, trans. Jane E. Lewin (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1980), 30, 46, 163–69.

<sup>9</sup> Paul Ricoeur, *The Rule of Metaphor: The Creation of Meaning in Language* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977) 8–39; *Time and Narrative*, vol. 1 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1984), 31–52.

<sup>10</sup> Seymour Chatman, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978), 85–89, 108–111; Wayne C. Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983), 92–94, 98–99; Alan R. Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 80–82; Paul Cobley, *Narrative*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2014), 52–58; Kent Puckett, *Narrative Theory: A Critical Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 24–46.

<sup>11</sup> George A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984); Vernon K. Robbins, *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, Society, and Ideology* (London: Routledge, 1996); Ben Witherington III, *New Testament Rhetoric: An Introductory Guide to the Art of Persuasion in and of the New Testament* (Eugene: Cascade, 2009); Mikeal C. Parsons and Michael Wade Martin, *Ancient Rhetoric and the New Testament: The Influence of Elementary Greek Composition* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2018).

literary criticism can be found in Aristotle’s *Poetics*, a work that primarily analyzed poetic epic and tragedy. According to Aristotle, “plot is the mimesis of the action—for I use ‘plot’ to denote the construction of events, ‘character’ to mean that in virtue of which we ascribe certain qualities to the agents, and ‘thought’ to cover the parts in which, through speech, they demonstrate something or declare their views” (*Poet.* 1449b.36–1450a.9 [Halliwell, LCL]). The construction of plot takes such a central role in Aristotle’s approach that it drives both characterization and description of events within a narrative (*Poet.* 1450a.14–28; 1451a.16–1451b.35; 1454a.16–19). Aristotle also argues that a poet is one only “by virtue of mimesis” through plot-making rather than composition of verse (*Poet.* 1451b.25). While a full discussion of mimesis exceeds the scope of this article, it should be noted that for Aristotle and indeed many ancient theorists, it served as the core aim towards which literary, stylistic, and rhetorical devices were to be employed.

Vividness and beauty repeatedly appear in ancient discussions of literary figures due to the relationship between mimesis and art. A number of ancient critics discuss literature, painting, sculpture, and other creative works as similar examples of life imitation, albeit with distinct techniques.<sup>12</sup> Mimesis through plot was prioritized because writers desired that their literature imitate or represent life (Aristotle, *Poet.* 1449b.36–1450a.9). Longinus explains that literary figures allow “imitation [mimesis] to approach the effects of nature. For art is only perfect when it looks like nature and Nature succeeds only when she conceals latent art” ([*Subl.*] 22.1 [Fyfe, LCL]). These ancient discussions about mimesis are similar to Bauer and Traina’s discussion of MSRs compounding in books and units. “Indeed, books and other units of various sizes will usually contain more than one major structural relationship, for biblical literature tends to be thick and somewhat

---

<sup>12</sup> Aristotle, *Poet.* 4.1–9; *Rhet.* 1.1371<sup>a</sup>21–1371<sup>b</sup>25; Longinus, [*Subl.*] 13.2; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Comp.* 20; Quintilian, *Inst.* 10.2.1–11; Plutarch, *Mor.* 346f–384d.

complex.”<sup>13</sup> Bauer and Traina observe similar phenomena as noted by ancient theorists, but they describe them with different terms. The authors of biblical and other ancient literature utilized numerous figures or MSRs because these produce thick, complex, and vivid imitations or representations of reality.

### *The Importance of Ancient Literary Criticism*

Ancient literary criticism and rhetorical criticism’s usefulness is often critiqued in biblical studies because scholars postulate that this literature was reserved for the literate elite.<sup>14</sup> This misconception is then used to posit a substantial divide between orality and literature. However, classical scholars note ample evidence that suggests otherwise. For example, Bernard Knox summarized some relevant data,

Though the archaic period yields no explicit evidence of books and readers, there is evidence of the essential precondition for their existence, widespread literacy. Public inscriptions ... are found all over the Greek world.... In addition to inscriptions added by the artist we have specimens of private messages scratched on broken potsherds. Three sixth-century (BCE) graffiti from the Adienian agora clearly suggest that writing was a commonplace accomplishment.<sup>15</sup>

This evidence assumes a functional widespread literacy. Additionally, it is anachronistic to assume that literature was only accessible to

---

<sup>13</sup> Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 98.

<sup>14</sup> William V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991), 106–110; cited in, Fredrick J. Long, *In Step with God’s Word: Interpreting the New Testament with God’s People* (Wilmore, KY: GlossaHouse, 2017), 326.

<sup>15</sup> Bernard Knox, “Books and Readers in the Greek World,” in *Greek Literature*, ed. P. E. Easterling, *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature 1* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 5–6.

readers and written only for the literate. In the ancient world, literature was not composed solely for private readers but public listeners. Long explains: “Orality influenced the production of texts.... In the Greek world, the oral and textual dimensions of communication co-existed and mutually informed each other both in poetry (esp. Homer) and in the rhetorical tradition....”<sup>16</sup>

Moreover, public reading and performance of texts constituted the majority of public exposure to literature.<sup>17</sup> An interplay existed between oral-aural culture and written literature in what Vernon Robbins has termed *rhetorical culture*.<sup>18</sup> This interplay can be observed in comments by Dionysius of Halicarnassus who writes of the orator Lysias that he “varies his style according to the different parts of the speech: his introductions have a firm moral tone, his narratives are persuasive and economical, his proofs terse and concentrated, his amplifications and appeals to the emotions are dignified and sincere, and his concluding summaries are relaxed and concise” and that “his charm [a literary figure] ... blossoms forth in every word he writes” (*Lys.* 9 and 10 [Usher, LCL]). Speeches were littered with stylistic “literary” figures because they were written with the art of performance in mind.

Remnants of ancient orality can be observed in works related to the process of rhetorical education. This form of education aimed to produce in the student an ability to develop oratorical skill through a gradual process of learning how to read and practice writing, as well as to recite and comment upon classic literary works. The traditional

---

<sup>16</sup> Long, *In Step with God's Word*, 327.

<sup>17</sup> Paul J. Achtemeier, “Omne Verbum Sonat: The New Testament and the Oral Environment of Late Western Antiquity,” *JBL* 109 (1990): 16. Repeated exposure to higher forms of oratory would then instill certain patterns of thought within the minds of those hearers who could utilize literary and rhetorical devices even if they could not describe them in the same way as found in the *progymnasmata*.

<sup>18</sup> Vernon K. Robbins, “Oral, Rhetorical, and Literary Cultures: A Response,” *Semeia* 65 (1994): 80–81; Harry Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 28–32; David F. Smith, “Can We Hear What They Heard?: The Effect of Orality Upon a Markan Reading-Event” (PhD diss., University of Durham, 2002), 54.

model, which some eager orators may have attempted to skirt, involved significant effort to imitate the prose, diction, and style of famed orators and poets of the past.<sup>19</sup> The innate connection between preferences in speech and the process of writing can be found in introductory comments in rhetorical treatises and the progymnasmata.<sup>20</sup> Students who reached a sufficient stage in their education to engage in composition of texts and speeches would have had prior exposure to poetry and other literary works as well as the stylistic devices used to achieve effective mimesis of life. Therefore, rhetorical argumentation rested not only upon persuasion but also an assumed familiarity with stylistic literary preferences for vivid representation.

### *Scope of Study*

This survey provides only a brief glimpse into how ancient discussions of literary and rhetorical figures cohere with the MSRs provided by Bauer and Traina. Our primary source sample set includes the following works: Aristotle's *Poetics* (4th century BCE), Longinus's *On the Sublime* (1st century CE), Demetrius's *On Style* (2nd century CE), the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (1st century BCE), various critical essays by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1st century BCE), Quintilian's *Institutes of Oration*

---

<sup>19</sup> In a satire directed at contemporaries who skirted past the elementary phases of composition, Lucian alludes to the centrality of imitation to training in rhetoric, "he [the teacher] will tell you to imitate those ancient worthies, and will set you fusty models for your speeches, far from easy to copy, resembling sculptures in the early manner such as those of Hegesias and of Critius and Nesiotes —wasp-waisted, sinewy, hard, meticulously definite in their contours. And he will say that hard work, scant sleep, abstention from wine, and untidiness are necessary and indispensable; it is impossible, says he, to get over the road without them" (*Rhet. praec.* 9 [Harmon, LCL]).

<sup>20</sup> According to Aelius Theon's *Progymnasmata*, it is through reading the works of another author that the student assembles a style repertoire; but this can only be actualized through frequent written composition which engages literary works (Theon, *Prog.*1). This is affirmed in similar compositional handbooks: Nicolaus the Sophist, *Preliminary Exercises* 1; John of Sardis, *Commentary on Prog. Aphthonius*, Preface.

(1st century CE), and several *progymnasmata* from Kennedy's volumes (1st–4th centuries CE).<sup>21</sup>

These sources come from a variety of geographic and temporal settings within the ancient Hellenistic and Roman worlds so that we are able to note recurring trends and approximations of wider cultural views. It should not be assumed that ancient literary criticism was monolithic or uniform. In the following study, we do *not* argue that Bauer and Traina's precise nuancing of MSRs is found in ancient literary criticism. Rather, this study demonstrates that ancient critics were aware of concepts and techniques that are similar to the MSRs used in IBS to interpret biblical discourse.

## Comparative Analysis of Major Structural Relationships and Ancient Literary Criticism

### *Repetition and Recurrence*

Working from William Freedman's understanding of a literary motif, Bauer and Traina explain their first MSR, Repetition or Recurrence as "the repetition of the same or similar terms, phrases, or other elements, which may involve motifs, concepts, persons, literary forms, or other structural relationships."<sup>22</sup> They then identify three functions of repetition: emphasis, thematic development, and "depth and richness of presentation" that "invites readers to interpret individual occurrences in light of the other occurrences and in light of the recurring pattern

---

<sup>21</sup> Citations from the progymnasmata of Aelius Theon, Aphthonius, John of Sardis, Hermogenes, Libanius, Nicolaus the Sophist, and Pseudo-Hermogenes reflect the numbering in Kennedy's translations in the following volumes: *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*. WGRW 10 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003); *Invention and Method: Two Rhetorical Treatises from the Hermogenic Corpus* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005).

<sup>22</sup> Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 95.

as a whole.”<sup>23</sup> Essentially, Bauer and Traina argue that authors use repetition/recurrence to emphasize and develop rich concepts in texts.

In ancient literary criticism, repetition is discussed in a variety of forms. Demetrius explained the figure *epanalepsis* as “resumptive repetition of the same particle in the course of a long sentence.... Clarity often demands repetition” (*Eloc.* 196–97 [Innes, LCL]). The author of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* explained, “This figure has not only much charm, but also impressiveness and vigour in highest degree; I therefore believe that it ought to be used for both the embellishment and the amplification of style” (*Rhet. Her.* 4.19 [Caplan, LCL]). Elsewhere, the author mentioned four varieties of repetition: *repetitio* (the same word for the start of successive clauses), *conversio* (the same word for the end of successive clauses), *complexio* (a combination of *epanaphora* and *antistrophe*), and *traductio* (multiple repetitions of a key term in close context). “In the four kinds of figures ..., the frequent recourse to the same word is not dictated by verbal poverty; rather there inheres in the repetition an elegance which the ear can distinguish more easily than words can explain” (*Rhet. Her.* 4.21).

Ancient authors thought that repetition had multiple functions.<sup>24</sup> Demetrius explained that repetition makes a passage “clear”; the author of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* stated that repetition makes it easier for the listener. Therefore, repetition is an aid to listeners and readers that brings clarity to a passage. It is a figure that embellishes and amplifies the Plain or Elegant style of a writer. Plain or Elegant “style” is not colloquial dialect, but a style of writing (*Eloc.* 127–235.). Repetition also makes a passage “vivid.” Demetrius explained a repeated insult, “The repetition ... gives the insult a more vivid impact” (*Eloc.* 211). This appeal to “vivid impact” was a goal of ancient writers and speakers because vivid discourse was considered a virtue in composition (Dion.

---

<sup>23</sup> Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 96.

<sup>24</sup> Other notable mentions of repetition: Demetrius, *Eloc.* 59, 66, and 140; Longinus, [*Subl.*] 20.1–3; *Rhet. Her.* 4.38; Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.29–31.

Hal., *Lys.* 13). The more vivid a text was, the better it represented real life (Quintilian, *Inst.* 4.2.64–65).

Multiple similarities and differences exist between Bauer and Traina’s use and understanding of repetition and examples found in ancient literary criticism. Both view repetition as a literary device used to communicate meaning in a text; both argue that repetition adds emphasis, embellishment, or something similar; and both explain that repetition draws the reader into vivid or rich presentation. However, Bauer and Traina expand repetition to encompass larger patterns working throughout whole books, and thus repetition in the IBS model is a more broadly applied concept than is found in ancient discussions. Additionally, Bauer and Traina argue that repetitions contribute to themes and motifs. In contrast, repetition in ancient literary criticism was focused on repeating words, letters, and ideas primarily in closer context for stylistic effect. Repetition brought clarity and vividness, but the larger application of repetition across a whole text would likely have been considered a form of plot construction, not a distinct literary device.

### *Contrast and Comparison*

After their discussion of repetition, Bauer and Traina delineate “semantic structures” that indicate “movement from something to something.”<sup>25</sup> The first structure they explain is contrast—“the association of opposites or of things whose differences the writer wishes to stress.”<sup>26</sup> After contrast, they discuss comparison—“the association of like things, or of things whose similarities are emphasized by the writer.”<sup>27</sup> Essentially, Bauer and Traina argue that contrast emphasizes difference, while comparison emphasizes similarity. Although contrast

---

<sup>25</sup> Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 97.

<sup>26</sup> Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 97.

<sup>27</sup> Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 98.

and comparison are presented as separate MSRs in Bauer and Traina's work, ancient theorists often presented these together. For example,

Comparison is a manner of speech that carries over an element of likeness from one thing to a different thing. This is used to embellish or prove or clarify or vivify. Furthermore, corresponding to these four aims, it has four forms of presentation: Contrast, Negation, Detailed Parallel, Abridged Comparison. To each single aim in the use of Comparison we shall adapt the corresponding form of presentation. (*Rhet. Her.* 4.59)

The common Greek term for comparison was *syncrisis*, a device used in legal/deliberative oratory and literature (Theon, *Prog.* 1). The device frequently received extended discussion within ancient handbooks.<sup>28</sup> Regarding comparison within literature, Aelius Theon commented:

Syncrisis (*synkrisis*) is language setting the better or the worse side by side. There are syncrises both of persons and of things. An example involving persons is a comparison of Ajax and Odysseus, of things a comparison of wisdom and bravery. Since, however, we give preference to one of the persons by looking at their actions, and at anything else about them that is good, the method would be the same in both cases. (*Prog.* 10)

Several components of ancient approaches to comparison are of note. First, there was an emphasis that proper *syncrisis* engaged similar figures for the purpose of either distinguishing one over the other or demonstrating their equality (Theon, *Prog.* 10; Hermogenes, *Prog.* 8). Second, when a comparison was made with a highly regarded individual (such as a hero or deity) or an extreme event, this had an amplifying effect which highlighted the quality of the initial individual (Hermogenes,

---

<sup>28</sup> Theon, *Prog.* 10; Hermogenes, *Prog.* 8; Athonius, *Prog.* 10; Nicolaus, *Prog.* 9.

*Prog.* 8; Nicolaus, *Prog.* 9).<sup>29</sup> Third, it lent vividness, clarification, and stylistic variety to a text or speech (*Rhet. Her.* 4.45–49).<sup>30</sup> It is worth noting as well that within ancient literary criticism, points of comparison were reflective of social values of the time and thus tended to revolve around parentage, physical traits, and great deeds (Theon, *Prog.* 10). These points of comparison were contextually bound and often found in laudatory speeches.

Working from this understanding, Quintilian explained, “Comparisons . . . are a pair of specially effective features” (*Inst.* 9.1.31–32 [Russell, LCL]). Therefore, contrast and comparison are different expressions of the same figure that placed people and objects in parallel with one another. Although these figures emphasized sameness or difference, similarly to Bauer and Traina’s explanation, there is one important specification in ancient literary criticism. Comparison added vividness, detail, and beauty to a description. Demetrius explained, “comparison owes its vividness to the fact that all accompanying details are included and nothing is omitted” (*Eloc.* 209). He also stated that detailed comparison adds “an element of beauty and precise detail” (*Eloc.* 274). Ultimately, comparison and contrast are figures that transform description from banal to vivacious, or “thick and somewhat complex,” to use Bauer and Traina’s wording.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> To illustrate with a NT example: When Jesus indicates that his disciples will perform “greater” works than those which he was engaged in (John 14:12), this establishes a mental comparison which draws upon the reader’s knowledge of Jesus. By comparing the work(s) of the disciples to those of Jesus, the author amplifies the quality of their work without elaborating on the precise content thereof.

<sup>30</sup> Quintilian lists comparison as one of several ornamental devices of addition which can render one’s speeches more pleasing to the ear through diversity in sound and structure (*Inst.* 9.3.28–54). Demetrius recommends comparison as a way of developing *charm* for one’s work (*Eloc.* 146–147).

<sup>31</sup> Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 98.

*Causation and Substantiation*

Bauer and Traina organize their discussion of causation (a shift from cause to effect) and substantiation (a shift from effect to cause) around three varieties: historical, logical, and hortatory.<sup>32</sup> Within ancient literary criticism, concern for causal relationships between events and thoughts was valued in both writing and public speaking. Causation was listed by Aelius Theon as one of the six principal elements of narrative description with its constituent parts corresponding specifically to motives for action (*Prog.* 5).<sup>33</sup> Description of causal relationships between events and character motivations was also an important component of establishing narrative credibility (John of Sardis, *Commentary of Prog. Aphthonius*, 2).

While cause and substantiation were important elements in judicial rhetoric,<sup>34</sup> one also finds discussion of these in reference to historiographical literature. Aelius Theon framed his section on narrative credibility around an analysis of historical narratives by Thucydides and Herodotus (*Prog.* 5). There he commented that the standard order was to progress from cause to effect, but acknowledged that authors could occasionally dislocate their comments on historical causes/motivations from this sequence in pursuit of a more stylistic narrative. One of Dionysius of Halicarnassus's critiques of Thucydides was an improper narrative ordering of causes for the Peloponnesian War (*Thuc.* 10–11). Dionysius argued that historical/chronological order should dictate narrative order and that by providing a retroactive claim by one of the parties at the start of his work, Thucydides's arrangement suffered. These concerns over the shaping of larger historical narrative

---

<sup>32</sup> Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 105–8.

<sup>33</sup> The same narrative elements are provided in other handbooks (Nicolaus, *Prog.* 3; Aphthonius, *Prog.* 2).

<sup>34</sup> For instances of judicial and deliberative rhetoric that correspond with BT's *logical causation/substantiation*, see Quintilian, *Inst.* 5.10.80–81 and Pseudo-Hermodorus, *On Invention* 2.2, 2.7. The author of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* warns against appeals to evidence for which a causal connection cannot be firmly established (2.25).

units adhere closer to judicial uses than the historical, logical, and hortatory categories that Bauer and Traina also propose. As elaborated in our discussion of other devices, ancient theorists tended to place greater weight on stylistic flourishes and rhetorical impact than on the ability to communicate meaning, although these concerns are not absent from IBS.

### *Climax*

The next MSR delineated by Bauer and Traina is climax. “Climax is the movement from the lesser to the greater, toward a high point of culmination. The term climax derives from the Greek word for ladder or staircase and suggests the element of climbing.”<sup>35</sup> This description is similar to explanations of a literary figure sharing the same name found in ancient literary criticism.

The figure called climax should also be used, as in this sentence from Demosthenes, “I did not express this opinion, and then fail to move the resolution; I did not move the resolution and then fail to serve as envoy; I did not serve as envoy and then fail to convince the Thebans.” This sentence seems almost to be climbing higher and higher at each step. (Demetrius, *Eloc.* 270)

Both Bauer and Traina and various ancient literary theorists recognize that a climax progresses upward in a step by step fashion (Longinus, [*Subl.*] 23.1–4; *Rhet. Her.* 4.34; Dion. Hal., *Pomp.* 3; Quintilian, *Inst.* 8.4.7–9.). However, similar to the discussion on repetition, ancient literary criticism focused more on the clause or sentence level. The author of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* described climax (*gradatio*) as repetition of preceding words within subsequent cola in a hierarchical arrangement (*Rhet. Her.* 4.25). A similar description was offered by Quintilian,

---

<sup>35</sup> Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 99.

who stressed the emphatic impact of climactic arrangement (*Inst.* 9.3.54–57). Conversely, while Bauer and Traina acknowledge climaxes at the sentence or clause level, they also expand their discussion of climax into the larger macrostructure. Bauer and Traina offer examples of climax that cover the whole book of Acts and Exodus.<sup>36</sup> In contrast to this, Demetrius explained a climax as something that happens within a sentence (*Eloc.* 270).

### *Cruciality/Pivot*

Bauer and Traina define cruciality as a process through which a core narrative pivot brings about “a radical reversal” in narrative trajectory, which leads to “an accurate understanding of the message of the book-as-a-whole and for the interpretation of individual passages within the book.”<sup>37</sup> Aristotle’s discussion of “complex” tragedies (*Poet.* 1452a.10–1452b.13) is similar to that argued by Bauer and Traina. “[M]ost integral to the plot and action is the one described: such a joint recognition and reversal will yield either pity or fear, just the type of actions of which tragedy is taken to be a mimesis; besides, both adversity and prosperity will hinge upon such circumstances” (*Poet.*, 1452a.35–1452b.5). Aristotle referred to shifts from prosperity to adversity, which were marked by scenes of *reversal* and *recognition*. Such were generally unanticipated by the reader yet were integrally related to the wider plot narrative.

Furthermore, this figure was not unique to tragedies, “epic should encompass the same types as tragedy, namely simple, complex, character-based, rich in suffering; it has the same components, except for lyric poetry and spectacle, for it *requires reversals, recognitions, and scenes of suffering, as well as effective thought and diction*” (*Poet.* 1459b.10–15; emphasis added). Recognition and reversal were distinguished primarily through their orientation—reversal referred to the shift in

---

<sup>36</sup> Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 99–100.

<sup>37</sup> Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 108.

fortunes of the key character, and recognition alluded to a plot upheaval marked through a revelation to the character. Ultimately, Bauer and Traina’s “cruciality” or “pivot” and Aristotle’s “reversal and recognition” are incredibly similar, if not describing the same literary phenomena. Both stress a reorientation to the components of the wider work through the impact of occurrences interior to the narrative.

### *Particularization and Generalization*

The MSR particularization and generalization are respectively described by Bauer and Traina as movements in material from general to particular and particular to general. These are broken down into identificational, ideological, historical, and geographical varieties depending on their content.<sup>38</sup> Such specific designations do not find analogous expression within ancient literary criticism, although the practice of text organization along general or particular lines can be observed as latent in ancient texts. One reason for this distinction is that in IBS, the MSR are understood according to their content as well as their form.<sup>39</sup> Ancient literary criticism tended towards descriptions of form and style. There existed a widely held belief that these elements must correspond closely with the nature of the content to provide a satisfying imitation.<sup>40</sup> Such differences in orientation explain why perfectly analogous devices cannot always be located.

Long has proposed a connection between these MSR and the argumentative *topos* “from parts to whole,” first described by Aristotle (*Rhet.* 2.23.13).<sup>41</sup> Aristotle described this as ἐκ τῶν μερῶν, “enumerating the parts” [Freese, LCL] and provided an example of the general

---

<sup>38</sup> Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 100–105.

<sup>39</sup> Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 4.

<sup>40</sup> For select comments on this, see Demetrius, *Eloc.* 6–7; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Comp.* 16.

<sup>41</sup> Fredrick J. Long, *Ancient Rhetoric and Paul’s Apology: The Compositional Unity of 2 Corinthians*, SNTSMS 131 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 66.

question “what kind of movement is the soul” to which a full response required an examination of the varying ways in which the soul moves. Long also observes this *topos* in the writings of Cicero and Quintilian. Cicero listed “enumeration of the parts” under “internal arguments” (*Part. Or.* 2.7 [Rackham, LCL]; *Top.* 8). As an example, Cicero provided an argument in which a woman was bequeathed all the silver in her home. This general bequeathment would cover particulars such as an individual coin that falls under the category of silver (*Top.* 13). In addition to these authors, Long references Quintilian, who placed this *topos* under the category of arguments by definition (*Inst.* 5.10.54-55). This usage would provide a more specified definition of a term, object, or individual by listing its constituent parts.

Long’s analysis suggests that particularizing and generalizing forms of organizing discourse existed within ancient rhetoric and that these were common enough to be included in rhetorical handbooks. However, this specifically rhetorical usage tends towards shorter, more immediate contextual uses in the middle of an argument. Particularization and generalization in Bauer and Traina’s model can expand across significant portions of text and even entire books. For this reason, comparisons between these MSRs and Greco-Roman argumentative *topoi* should be reserved for instances in which biblical texts appear to enumerate “parts” in an immediate literary context. For example, Bauer and Traina observe that Psalm 78:2–4 offers a general overview of Israel’s history as “things that we have heard and known, that our ancestors have told us,” with events in this history enumerated over the remainder of the psalm.<sup>42</sup> Although this text was not composed within a Greco-Roman rhetorical framework, its enumeration of particularized expressions in close connection with a general claim operates out of a similar organizational framework as espoused by Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian.

---

<sup>42</sup> Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 102.

### *Preparation and Realization*

Bauer and Traina refer to preparation as “the inclusion of background or setting for events or ideas,” which are then realized in the subsequent narrative.<sup>43</sup> Bauer and Traina use Job’s heavenly court scene as an example. “[T]he book begins in chapters 1–2 by providing background or setting according to which the reader is to understand the dialogues that follow.”<sup>44</sup> This literary phenomenon was also discussed by Aristotle. For Aristotle and others who followed after him, literature was imitative of life, and plot events must be plausible within the confines of the universe established in the text. Background involving supernatural agents were placed in narrative frames *external* to the main narrative setting, such as heavenly councils.

The *deus ex machina* should be employed for events outside the drama—preceding events beyond human knowledge, or subsequent events requiring prediction and announcement; for we ascribe to the gods the capacity to see all things. There should be nothing irrational in the events; if there is, it should lie outside the play, as with Sophocles’ Oedipus. Since tragedy is mimesis of those superior to us, poets should emulate good portrait painters, who render personal appearance and produce likenesses, yet enhance people’s beauty. (Aristotle, *Poet.* 1454b.1–10)

Aristotle recognized that sometimes a narrative’s plot required information from outside of the central events, and he recognized this as a literary device similar to Bauer and Traina. The heavenly court scene is not the only way preparation and realization can be used. Bauer and Traina also explain that characters prefigure and help readers interpret other characters. “John’s ministry provides background for ... the

---

<sup>43</sup> Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 114.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*

ministry of Jesus. The reader of this Gospel, then, is to interpret Mark's narrative of Jesus's ministry according to the background or setting of Mark's account of John's ministry."<sup>45</sup> Classical scholars have observed the same phenomena in Plutarch's *Parallel Lives*. Alexi V. Zadorojnyi writes, "The erudite writings of Plutarch, in particular the *Parallel Lives*, explore the past specifically with an eye to examples to learn from and (discriminately) imitate.... Mimesis is thus both an ingredient of the exemplary past and the purpose of studying it under Plutarch's tutelage."<sup>46</sup> For example, Plutarch depicted Diogenes frankly saying, "I imitate (μιμοῦμαι) Heracles, and emulate (ζῆλω) Perseus, and follow in the footsteps of Dionysus, the divine author and progenitor of my family" (*Alex. fort.* 332B [Babbitt, LCL]). Similarly to Jesus and John, Plutarch placed the narrative about Diogenes in relation to people and gods who came before him. Although ancient literary theorists may not have used a specific term to describe this practice, concepts analogous to Bauer and Traina's preparation and realization were observed by them and utilized by ancient authors in literature.

### *Summarization*

Summarization, according to Bauer and Traina, is "an abridgment or compendium (summing up) either preceding or following a unit of material," which identifies the "main elements" of the narrative or discourse.<sup>47</sup> This semantic structure is constrained to interactions with material within the text rather than a summary of events in the world external to the narrative. Bauer and Traina identify three areas of significance in summarization. "First, the selectivity of the summary statement indicates to the reader what is of prime importance in the

---

<sup>45</sup> Ibid.

<sup>46</sup> Alexi V. Zadorojnyi, "Mimesis and the (plu)past in Plutarch's *Lives*," in *Time and Narrative in Ancient Historiography*, ed. Jonas Grethlein and Christopher B. Krebs (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 176

<sup>47</sup> Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 110.

material being summarized.” Second, the summary identifies “the main elements in the material.” Third, the context of the summary may indicate the passage’s “interpretive function” in its surrounding context.<sup>48</sup> Essentially, summarization statements help readers reinforce the central ideas and concepts presented in a text.

Summarization is also addressed in ancient literary criticism. Towards the beginning of a speech, one could include a discrete section called a “partition” (*partitio*) that outlined the argument heads of the speech (Quintilian, *Inst.* 4.5.1–3).<sup>49</sup> Additionally, Quintilian suggested that one could include *partitio* anywhere needed in the discourse (*Inst.* 3.9.2–3).<sup>50</sup> Then, too, discrete argument units ended in a conclusion that could provide a summary (*complexio*) of the propositions (*Rhet. Her.* 2.28). Also, summarization as recapitulation occurred as one important function of the speech’s conclusion in the epilogue or *peroratio* (*Rhet. Her.* 2.47; Quintilian, *Inst.* 6.1.1–2; cf. Cicero, *Part. Orat.* 17.59). The author of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* explains, “The conclusion is the end of the discourse, formed in accordance with the principles of the art” (*Rhet. Her.* 1.4). The “art” being discussed here is the *Résumé* or *complexio* that is said to be defective “if it does not include every point in the exact order in which it has been presented; if it does not come to a conclusion briefly; and if the summary does not leave something precise and stable” (*Rhet. Her.* 2.46; cf. 2.28 and 3.15).

Although some may think that speeches are not “literature,” it is important to note that ancient rhetoric was the last step in Greco-Roman education; the development of the oration involved the application of written composition practices. Therefore, if summary and conclusion were used in oral speech, they were also used in writing. This connection explains why Demetrius wrote about the written style of letters, “*In summary*, in terms of style the letter should combine two of the styles, the elegant and the plain, and *this concludes* my account of the

---

<sup>48</sup> Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 111.

<sup>49</sup> Long, *Ancient Rhetoric and Paul’s Apology*, 85–89.

<sup>50</sup> Long, *Ancient Rhetoric and Paul’s Apology*, 79.

letter, and also of the plain style” (*Eloc.* 235; emphasis added).<sup>51</sup> Dionysius of Halicarnassus also utilized summary in his writings on rhetoric, style, and history. He wrote in this manner about Thucydides, “I may *summarise* the instruments, so to speak, of Thucydides’s style as follows: there are four—artificiality of vocabulary, variety of figures, harshness of word-order, rapidity of signification. The special features of his style include compactness and solidity, pungency and severity, vehemence, the ability to disturb and terrify and above all emotional power.”<sup>52</sup>

Thus, summarization was an important tool in ancient rhetoric as well as in ancient literary theory. Similar to Bauer and Traina, ancient literary theorists utilized summary by selectively highlighting important points that were previously covered in a text. Although summarization as a distinct literary figure was not expounded upon like some of the other figures, the application of summary in rhetorical theory (as *partitio* and *complexio*) and its application by literary theorists (Demetrius and Dionysius of Halicarnassus) demonstrates its importance and usefulness. Furthermore, the three areas of significance identified by Bauer and Traina are also identifiable in the examples above. Dionysius’s summary identified key material, differentiated that material from other ideas previously discussed, and it even offered an important comment about “special features” of Thucydides style that highlighted the significance of the material and could be analogous to Bauer and Traina’s “interpretive function.” Ultimately, summarization was a useful tool in rhetoric, written discourse, and ancient literary theory.

### *Interrogation*

Bauer and Traina suggest that interrogation may be found in immediate contexts (such as rhetorical questions followed by a response) and

---

<sup>51</sup> See also *Eloc.* 270–71.

<sup>52</sup> Dion. Hal., *Thuc.* 24 [Stephen Usher, LCL]. Also see, *Lys.* 9 and 13; *Dem.* 46.

across wider structural units (narrative presentation of a problem and its intended solution).<sup>53</sup> “The implied author ... has employed this problem-solution structure to give readers guidance in understanding the movement of the book, to indicate to readers a major emphasis within the book, and to encourage readers to understand individual passages in light of their role in this problem-solution framework.”<sup>54</sup> This MSR, then, aids readers in their interpretation of passages and books.

In ancient literary criticism, interrogation was described as a rhetorical strategy in public oration rather than in written literature, but, as stated earlier, written and spoken discourse in the ancient world were not harshly divided. Longinus wrote about interrogation:

Now what are we to say of our next subject, *the figures of inquiry and interrogation*? ... the inspiration and quick play of the *question and answer*, and his way of confronting his own words as if they were someone else’s, make the passage, through his use of the figure, not only loftier but also more convincing. ... [T]he figure of question and answer actually *misleads the audience*, by encouraging it to suppose that each carefully premeditated argument has been aroused in the mind and put into words on the spur of the moment. (Longinus, [*Subl.*] 18.1–2; emphasis added)

Similar to Bauer and Traina, Longinus understood this figure in a question and answer format. Interestingly, the figure was also supposed to influence the audience/reader. In Bauer and Traina, interrogation guides the reader through an argument; but in Longinus, the figure “misleads” the listener. This misleading was not a negative idea but acknowledged that the questions were “carefully premeditated” to guide the listener. In other words, like Bauer and Traina’s assertions about interrogation, Longinus recognized that interrogation guided readers through a

---

<sup>53</sup> Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 113.

<sup>54</sup> Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 113–114.

hypothetical argument. Additionally, this figure was said to hold the attention of listeners. “This figure is exceedingly well adapted to a conversational style, and both by its stylistic grace and the anticipation of the reasons, holds the hearer’s attention” (*Rhet. Her.* 4.23).<sup>55</sup> Ultimately, interrogation is a figure with ancient roots that guides readers through an argument by representing a hypothetical dialogue.

### *Rhetorical Structures*

Bauer and Traina describe rhetorical structures as relationships which do not possess intrinsic meaning but instead are employed alongside semantic relationships to highlight the author’s intended point.<sup>56</sup> Such devices are often discussed within rhetorical critical approaches to the Bible. In order to avoid duplication of points that have been addressed elsewhere, our analysis of these devices is brief. However, a few comments are warranted due to the links between orality/rhetoric and literature within the ancient world.

### *Inclusio*

Bauer and Traina explain *inclusio* as “the repetition of words or phrases at the beginning and end of a unit, thus creating a bracket effect.”<sup>57</sup> In their perspective, *inclusio* is used to frame a central thought, whether in a short context or across a work as a whole. Within a shorter context of discourse, *inclusio* is paralleled by an ancient literary device known as *kyklos* in which “a sentence, clause or phrase” begins and ends with the same word in the same form (*On Invention* 4.8). In a wider context of discourse, it can be used to enclose a sustained narrative:

---

<sup>55</sup> It should also be noted that “conversational style” is a style represented in written discourse; see Demetrius, *Eloc.* 223–24. For more on interrogation, see *Rhet. Her.* 4.22–23; Hermogenes, *Prog.* 2; *On Forceful Speaking* 10.

<sup>56</sup> Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 116.

<sup>57</sup> Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 117.

As Demosthenes does in *Against Leptines* (20.73): “It is said (legetai), then, that after telling them to build the wall, he went off as an ambassador to Lacedaimon.” After going through an account of Themistocles’ doings, he ended in the same way: “And you all know in what way he deceived them it is said (legetai).” It is not the rhythm that is evidence of the *kyklos* but the beginning and the ending. (*On Invention* 4.8)

Kennedy has also pointed out that in the realm of rhetoric, repetition of words at the beginning and end of a sentence or clause constituted one variety of addition known as *epiphora* (Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.31) or *complexio* (*Rhet. Her.* 4.20). In these references, the focus was on a much smaller scale than that which Bauer and Traina allow for since the intent behind such usage was to lend *charm* to one’s speech patterns and impress an audience (Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.28).

### *Chiasm*

Bauer and Traina rightly note that chiasm is identified in ancient texts more frequently than is preferred and is best confined to discrete literary sub-units rather than books-as-wholes.<sup>58</sup> Robert M. Fowler suggested that the “spatial, visual pattern” through which scholars identify chiastic structuring is reliant upon modern approaches to texts rather than the oral-aural approach of ancient societies.<sup>59</sup> However, other scholars working with oral and visual modes of exegesis have proposed that hearers could have identified chiastic structure due to their exposure to public rhetoric.<sup>60</sup> In *Pseudo-Hermogenes*, a chiasm occurs

---

<sup>58</sup> Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 118–20.

<sup>59</sup> Robert M. Fowler, *Let the Reader Understand: Reader-Response Criticism and the Gospel of Mark* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2001), 152.

<sup>60</sup> For information on oral and visual exegesis, see Fredrick J. Long, “The Oral, the Textual, and the Visual (or, The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly) in Jesus’s and Paul’s Chiastic Performance of Scripture in 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, and Mark” in

“[w]hen both apodoses harmonize with both protases, but crosswise” (*On Invention* 4.3). This sense of chiasm referred to the narrow set of instances in which two statements existed whose antecedent clauses could be applied to each other’s consequents. Kennedy relates this to the device *commutatio* (translated “reciprocal change” in Caplan’s translation), as may be found in *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4.39.<sup>61</sup> According to Kennedy, this type of arrangement was not inclusive of all that modern scholars refer to as chiasm, although he is quick to note that a pattern analogous to that found in modern surveys was present within works by Homer and other authors. Notably, *commutatio* and the related figure *ἀντιμεταβολή* serve a contrastive purpose, with juxtaposed terms and word order heightening the contrast’s effect (*Rhet. Her.* 4.39; Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.85). What we find, then, is a rhetorical device that likely was latent in the compositional tendencies of authors, stemming from the sphere of public oration. In light of this, the aforementioned cautions ought to be kept in mind when proposing that a text was written with a chiasmic structure as a key to its meaning.

### *Structural Relationships with Limited Parallels*

Several structural relationships provided by Bauer and Traina lack clear extant parallels in the literature surveyed. The discrepancy in parallels does not mean that such relationships did not exist within ancient texts, but rather that they were not directly commented upon in the portions of ancient literary criticism surveyed.

*Intercalation* is described as “the insertion of one literary unit in the midst of another,” which prompts the reader to draw conclusions about how these materials connect.<sup>62</sup> In the analysis by Bauer and Traina, this structure includes the book-as-whole or macro level. Such

---

*Orality and Theological Training in the 21st Century*, ed. Jay W. Moon and Joshua Moon (Wilmore, KY: Digit-oral, 2017), 48–63.

<sup>61</sup> Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 28–29.

<sup>62</sup> Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 121.

a level was less frequently the scope of analysis in ancient literary criticism. One handbook, *On Forceful Speaking*, referred to the use of *hyperbaton* in a similar fashion, albeit within a strictly narrow context when performing an analysis on a section of the tenth book of the *Odyssey* in which Odysseus explained to his crew the reason why they were heading towards the underworld (229).<sup>63</sup> This use of *hyperbaton* was done in a much briefer fashion than the sort of analysis found in Bauer and Traina. Nevertheless, this analysis involved the insertion of remarks in order to clarify the wider narrative.

*Interchange* is “the exchanging or alternation of certain elements in an a-b-a-b arrangement.”<sup>64</sup> It is likewise not mentioned in ancient literary criticism. Similar to chiasm, this structuring can be more easily detected through analysis of written texts as opposed to hearing them performed.

*Instrumentation* concerns purpose statements and means-to-ends constructions;<sup>65</sup> such do not receive clear discussion in ancient literary criticism. However, Bauer and Traina indicate that these structures are often marked by the use of certain conjunctions or prepositions (“in order that,” “through”). As a result, they are supported at the syntactical level of texts and do not require justification via ancient literary criticism.

---

<sup>63</sup> It should be noted, as Kennedy does, that this use of hyperbaton is peculiar. Generally the device refers to insertion of words or thoughts in order to create the impression of spontaneity in one’s speech or to preserve meter (Longinus, [*Subl.*] 22.1–4; *Rhet. Her.* 4.32; Quintilian, *Inst.* 8.6.62–67). Aelius Theon comments that such usage might be appropriate in literature for variety’s sake, but should be avoided for its potential to confuse the audience (*Prog.* 5). It is possible that the author cited above is not using hyperbaton in a technical sense to suggest that intercalation is the full spectrum of uses of the device, but rather that these follow the usual use in a similar fashion.

<sup>64</sup> Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 116.

<sup>65</sup> Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 115–16.

## Conclusions

In this article, we have explored how Bauer and Traina's MSRs are often analogous to literary and rhetorical figures found in ancient literary criticism. Bauer and Traina's all-encompassing claim that MSRs are "found in all cultures, all genres, all time periods, and all forms of art, not simply in literature. They are pervasive and foundational for communication" is impossible to fully validate.<sup>66</sup> However, this study has demonstrated that ancient Greco-Roman literary theorists, since the time of Aristotle, had been observing phenomena similar to the MSRs that Bauer and Traina propose. Moreover, because ancient critics saw these figures and techniques connected to a vivid representation of life, they too thought these figures were foundational for communication. Ancient literary and rhetorical analysis was concerned with mimesis through vividness and aural impact. In the Aristotelian system, written texts, alongside the other arts, participated in the imitation (mimesis) of life. Therefore, the success of a work depended on its ability to vividly represent human action. Ancient literary criticism differs from but is not in complete contradiction with, the IBS model. For IBS focuses on "the form of the text, giving serious attention to the ways students can identify for themselves literary structure and can show how such structure informs the meaning of the text."<sup>67</sup> Although there may be subtle differences between these approaches, the result is similar: patterns, structures, literary figures, and literary style guide readers in the communicative process.

The content of this article is but a starting point for additional work. Further analysis of how literature achieves *vividness* and collation of comments from an even wider array of sources is needed. While NT scholarship has made ample use of ancient rhetoric, discussions of literary figures and literary style have largely been overlooked with some

---

<sup>66</sup> Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 94.

<sup>67</sup> Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 4.

notable exceptions.<sup>68</sup> Nonetheless, when Bauer and Traina's MSR's are understood alongside ancient literary criticism, it is clear that literary and rhetorical figures are not just tools for constructing meaning. They are tools for representing life. The life that was presented in ancient texts was a unique description of the world, and MSR's and ancient literary and rhetorical figures aid readers in the hermeneutical reconstruction of a text's world. "Hermeneutics does not place accent on the dialogic relation between the author and the reader, nor even on the decision taken by the listener to the word, but rather—and essentially—on the world of the text."<sup>69</sup> By paying attention to MSR's and literary and rhetorical figures, modern readers encounter tools that authors used in the ancient world to imitate life. The tools once meant for vivid and imitative representation are now the readers' tools for creative hermeneutical reconstruction.

---

<sup>68</sup> Aída Besançon Spencer, *Paul's Literary Style: A Stylistic and Historical Comparison of II Corinthians 11:16–12:13, Romans 8:9–39, and Philippians 3:2–4:13* (Lanham: University Press of America, 2007). However, Spencer's analysis is based on a modern linguistic analysis known as "stylistics," not ancient literary criticism's understanding of style.

<sup>69</sup> Paul Ricoeur, *Figuring the Sacred*, ed. Mark I. Wallace (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 235.