

Stylistic Diversity in the *Corpus Ciceronianum* and in the *Corpus Paulinum*: A Comparison and Some Conclusions

ARMIN D. BAUM

Freie Theologische Hochschule, Giessen / Evangelische Theologische Faculteit, Leuven
baum@fthgiessen.de

ABSTRACT The *Corpus Paulinum* can roughly be divided into four letter groups, the Thessalonian letters, the *Hauptbriefe*, the Prison Letters, and the Pastoral Letters. As New Testament style criticism has revealed, each of these letter groups displays a number of lexical, syntactical, and other stylistic peculiarities. In order to interpret this stylistic diversity in the Pauline corpus on a broader basis and to explore all possible explanations for the different stylistic phenomena, it proves helpful to take into account the scholarly explanations for similar style differences in the much larger oeuvre of Cicero. Cicero's writings confirm the prevalent observation that the same ancient author could write in very different styles. In addition, they demonstrate how different communication situations, different text genres, and different addressees could influence not only Cicero's but also Paul's style.

KEYWORDS Cicero's style, New Testament style criticism, Pauline style, stylistic diversity

Stylistic Diversity in the *Corpus Paulinum*

The letters of Paul show many stylistic similarities.¹ At the same time, there are minor and major stylistic differences among the letters of the *Corpus Paulinum*. These consist not only in the fact that each of the 13 canonical Pauline Letters reveals lexical and/or syntactic peculiarities. There are also differences in style between discrete groups of letters. The *Corpus Paulinum* consists of several groups

1. See, e.g., Anthony Kenny, *A Stylometric Study of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986).

of letters whose members are stylistically particularly close to each other and differ from the style of other groups of letters. This is clearly the case for the two letters to the Thessalonians, the *Hauptbriefe*, the Prison Letters to the Ephesians, the Colossians, and Philemon, and the three Pastoral Letters. Philippians is somewhat similar to the other Prison Letters but also has some similarities with the *Hauptbriefe*.

For a correct assessment of the numbers that I will present below, it is important to keep in mind that both the lengths of each individual letter and of each letter group differ considerably. The Thessalonian letters contain only 2,296 words (tokens), the *Hauptbriefe* contain no fewer than 20,569 words, the Prison Letters contain 5,954 words, and the Pastoral Letters contain 3,484 words.² For the purpose of this article, I have presented the numbers for the *Corpus Paulinum* in a way that is comparable to the evidence that is available for the *Corpus Ciceronianum*.

The Thessalonian Letters

The two Thessalonian letters agree in their sender information (Παῦλος καὶ Σιλουανὸς καὶ Τιμόθεος) and their addressees (τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεσσαλονικέων ἐν θεῷ). In addition, their structures are parallel over long stretches.

Apart from these similarities, the Thessalonian letters have stylistic similarities that concern their vocabulary, their specific phrases, their syntax, and other stylistic devices. In all three areas, it is helpful to distinguish between positive stylistic features, which are missing in the other letters of the *Corpus Paulinum*, and negative stylistic features, which appear in the rest of the *Corpus Paulinum* and are missing in the Thessalonian letters.

LEXIS In their vocabulary, the Thessalonian letters hardly have any special features compared to the *Hauptbriefe* and the Prison Letters. However, they differ from the Pastoral Letters in several respects.³

1. Compared to the Pastoral Letters, the Thessalonian letters contain a relatively limited number of different words (types; below I discuss lexis in the Pastoral Letters).
2. Each of the two Thessalonian letters contains some Pauline *hapax legomena*, which appear only in this one letter of the *Corpus Paulinum*. Of the 336 words that appear in 1 Thessalonians, 36

2. Cf. Robert Morgenthaler, *Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes*, 3rd ed. (Zurich: Gotthelf, 1982), 164.

3. For data relevant to the following observations, the other groups of letters will be examined below.

are Pauline *hapax legomena*.⁴ Of the 250 words that appear in 2 Thessalonians, 21 are Pauline *hapax legomena*.⁵ However, the share of Pauline *hapax legomena* in vocabulary is fewer than in the Pastoral Letters (discussed below).

3. In comparison to the Prison Letters (Ephesians, Colossians) and above all to the Pastoral Letters, the Thessalonian letters contain many indeclinables, that is, adverbs, conjunctions, particles, and prepositions (discussed below).
4. Compared to the Pastoral Letters, the Thessalonian letters contain relatively few compound verbs (discussed below).
5. Compared to the Pastoral Letters, the Thessalonian letters contain relatively few adjectives (discussed below).
6. Compared to the other three groups of letters, the Thessalonian letters contain relatively few words not found in the Septuagint. At the same time, compared to the Pastoral Letters, the Thessalonian letters contain relatively few Grecisms, that is, words that are missing in the LXX and/or are typical for Hellenistic authors (discussed below).
7. In contrast to the *Hauptbriefe*, the Thessalonian letters do not contain any interjections (I discuss lexis in the *Hauptbriefe* below).
8. In their common vocabulary of 471 words,⁶ the letters to the Thessalonians contain hardly any words that they do not share with the remaining 11 Paulines. However, some preferred words occur significantly more frequently in one of the two letters than in the other 12 letters of the *Corpus Paulinum*. For example, the conjunction καθώς, measured by the length of the letters, is used considerably more frequently in 1 Thessalonians than in all other canonical letters of Paul (BW; see table 1).⁷ The noun παρουσία and the verb στηρίζειν are also relatively more frequent in the Thessalonian letters than in the other letter groups (see table 2). In contrast, the particles μέν and εἰ are used comparatively rarely in 1 Thessalonians, especially in comparison to the *Hauptbriefe*.⁸ The same applies to 2 Thessalonians (BW).

4. Jermo van Nes, *Pauline Language and the Pastoral Epistles: A Study of Linguistic Variation in the Corpus Paulinum*, Linguistic Biblical Studies 16 (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 264–65.

5. *Ibid.*, 151, 264–65.

6. Morgenthaler, *Statistik*, 173.

7. Many of the numbers that I will present in this essay (including these numbers regarding common vocabulary) were obtained using the BibleWorks software application. I will indicate this where relevant by inserting the abbreviation BW in parentheses.

8. Günther Schwab, *Beobachtungen zur Sprache des ersten Thessalonikerbriefs*, vol. 1B of *Echtheitskritische Untersuchungen zu den vier kleinen Paulusbriefen* (Norderstedt: Books on Demand, 2011), 51.

TABLE 1 Word Frequencies in the *Corpus Paulinum*

	1 Thess	2 Thess	Hauptbriefe	Prison Letters	Pastoral Letters
καθώς	13	2	54	18	1

TABLE 2 Word Frequencies in the *Corpus Paulinum*

	1 Thess	2 Thess	Hauptbriefe	Prison Letters	Pastoral Letters
παρουσία	4	3	5	2	0
στηρίζειν	2	2	2	—	—

TABLE 3 Phrase Frequencies in the *Corpus Paulinum*

	1 Thess	2 Thess	Hauptbriefe	Prison Letters	Pastoral Letters
αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἶδατε*	3	1	—	—	—
αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ θεὸς / ὁ κύριος*	2	2	—	—	—
ἐρωτῶμεν / παρακαλοῦμεν δέ	3	1	—	—	—
ὡμᾶς, ἀδελφοί*					
παρακαλοῦμεν ἐν κυρίῳ	1	1	—	—	—
Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, ἵνα*					

PHRASES The letters to the Thessalonians contain some common formulations that do not appear elsewhere in the letters of Paul. (See table 3; an asterisk indicates that the marked expression occurs only in one letter group of the *Corpus Paulinum*.)

SYNTAX The letters to the Thessalonians have some syntactic peculiarities that distinguish them from the other Pauline Letters.

1. The two letters contain only three questions; this is a very small number compared to the *Hauptbriefe* (below, I discuss syntax in the *Hauptbriefe*).
2. The first chapter of 2 Thessalonians contains a sentence (2 Thess 1:3–12) that is unparalleled in length and complexity in the *Corpus Paulinum*, though some sentences in Colossians and Ephesians come

close.⁹ The average sentence length in Ephesians and Colossians is, however, greater than in 2 Thessalonians (below, I discuss syntax in the Prison Letters).

3. 2 Thessalonians contains some genitive formulations, which occur in similar frequency only in Colossians and Ephesians.¹⁰ Overall, however, the Thessalonian letters contain fewer consecutive genitives than the Prison Letters (discussed below).
4. The two Thessalonian letters contain fewer imperatives than the Pastoral Letters (below, I discuss syntax in the Pastoral Letters).
5. The Thessalonian letters presumably contain fewer anacolutha than the Pastoral Letters (discussed below).
6. The Thessalonian letters presumably contain fewer ellipses than the Pastoral Letters (discussed below).
7. The Thessalonian letters presumably contain fewer parentheses than the Pastoral Letters (discussed below).

OTHER STYLISTIC DEVICES In addition, the letters to the Thessalonians lack some other stylistic elements that are common in other letters of Paul.

1. In contrast to the other three groups of letters, the Thessalonian letters do not contain any catalogs of virtues or vices (see table 4).¹¹
2. In contrast to the *Hauptbriefe*, the Thessalonian letters contain hardly any dialogical elements (below, I discuss other stylistic devices in the *Hauptbriefe*).
3. In contrast to the *Hauptbriefe* (and Ephesians), the Thessalonian letters do not contain any Old Testament quotations (discussed below).
4. The Thessalonian letters employ antitheses more sparingly than the *Hauptbriefe* and more frequently than Colossians (discussed below).

9. Daryl D. Schmidt, "The Syntactical Style of 2 Thessalonians: How Pauline Is It?" in *The Thessalonian Correspondence*, ed. R. F. Collins, BETL 87 (Leuven: University Press, 1990), 283–93, esp. pp. 384–85; cf. George K. Barr, *Scalometry and the Pauline Epistles*, JSNTSup 261 (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 86.

10. Schmidt, "Syntactical Style," 386.

11. Cf. David E. Aune, *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2003), 90.

TABLE 4 Catalogs of Virtues and Vices in the *Corpus Paulinum*

	1–2 Thess	Hauptbriefe	Prison Letters	Pastoral Letters
Catalogs of virtues	—	2	4	10
Catalogs of vices	—	6	3	5

The Hauptbriefe

The four so-called *Hauptbriefe* of the *Corpus Paulinum* (Romans, 1–2 Corinthians, Galatians) also show some similarities in vocabulary, sentence structure, and style.

LEXIS First, these letters also have some lexical peculiarities.

1. Compared to the Pastoral Letters, the *Hauptbriefe* have a limited vocabulary (below, I discuss lexis in the Pastoral Letters).
2. Each of these four letters shows some Pauline *hapax legomena*, which are documented in the *Corpus Paulinum* only in this letter: 281 (Romans), 255 (1 Corinthians), 177 (2 Corinthians), or 86 (Galatians) words.¹² However, the proportion of Pauline *hapaxes* in vocabulary is fewer than in the Pastoral Letters (discussed below).
3. The *Hauptbriefe* contain as many indeclinables as 1–2 Thessalonians and more than the Prison Letters (Ephesians, Colossians) and especially the Pastoral Letters (discussed below).
4. Compared to the Pastoral Letters, the *Hauptbriefe* contain few adjectives (discussed below).
5. Compared to the Pastoral Letters, the *Hauptbriefe* have few compound verbs (discussed below).
6. Compared with the Pastoral Letters, the *Hauptbriefe* have fewer Grecisms. At the same time, the *Hauptbriefe* use more words that are missing in the Septuagint than the Thessalonian letters and fewer of these words than the Pastoral Letters (discussed below).
7. In contrast to the other letter groups, the *Hauptbriefe* contain a series of interjections, including frozen imperatives and adjectives used as interjections (BW; see table 5).¹³

12. Van Nes, *Pauline Language*, 143; cf. Morgenthaler, *Statistik*, 173.

13. Friedrich Blass, Albert Debrunner, and Friedrich Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, 16th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), §107.2.

TABLE 5 Word Frequencies in the *Corpus Paulinum*

	1–2 Thess	Rom	1 Cor	2 Cor	Gal	Prison Letters	Pastoral Letters
ἰδε*	—	1	—	—	1	—	—
ἰδοῦ*	—	1	1	6	1	—	—
καλῶς*	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
ὦ	—	4	—	—	1	—	2 (1 Tim)

8. Each of the *Hauptbriefe* contains some preferred vocabulary. These include conjunctions or particles that are also present in other letters but that are particularly frequent in a letter in terms of its size. In Romans, οὖν is particularly frequent (BW); in 1 Corinthians, ἐάν (BW); in 2 Corinthians it is ναί (BW); and in Galatians it is ἄρα (BW) and ὅτε (BW).

In addition, the four *Hauptbriefe* taken together have lexical peculiarities: the indeclinables ἄν and τε occur almost exclusively in the four *Hauptbriefe* (BW). Further, the conjunction γάρ is in relation to their length significantly more frequent in the *Hauptbriefe* than in the other Pauline Letters, with the exception of 1 Thessalonians (BW). Μήτι appears only in 2 Corinthians (BW; see table 6). In relation to its length, καί is particularly rare in Galatians (BW). In addition, a number of nouns and verbs occur exclusively in the *Hauptbriefe* or, measured by the size of the letter, much more frequently than in the other letters and groups of letters (see table 7).

PHRASES

1. The *Hauptbriefe* contain some phrases that are missing in the other letter groups (see table 8).
2. In addition, the four *Hauptbriefe* contain a number of (theological) expressions missing in the other nine letters of the *Corpus Paulinum*. The phrases listed in table 9 appear in two to four letters of this group.

SYNTAX

1. From a syntactical point of view, the four *Hauptbriefe* stand out with their numerous questions. 1 Corinthians 9 contains 32 sentences with 17 questions. In Rom 1–14, about 25% of all sentences are questions. The questions are concentrated mainly in Rom 2:3–4:10 and

TABLE 6 Word Frequencies in the *Corpus Paulinum*

	1-2 Thess	Rom	1 Cor	2 Cor	Gal	Prison Letters	Pastoral Letters
ἄν	—	6	7	3	2	1	—
γάρ	27	144	105	77	36	33	33
ἐπεί*	—	3	5	2	—	—	—
μήτι*	—	—	2	3	—	—	—
τε	—	14	3	2	—	2	—

TABLE 7 Word Frequencies in the *Corpus Paulinum*

	1-2 Thess	Rom	1 Cor	2 Cor	Gal	Prison Letters	Pastoral Letters
Ἀβραάμ*	—	9	—	1	9	—	—
ἀσθένεια κτλ	1	8	15	14	2	2	2
δικαιόω	—	15	2	—	8	—	2
δοξάζω	1	5	2	3	1	—	—
ἐλευθερία*	—	1	1	1	4	—	—
εὐλογία*	—	2	1	4	1	—	—
ζῆλος κτλ	—	2	6	7	5	1	1
καταλλαγή κτλ*	—	4	1	5	—	—	—
νόμος	—	74	9	—	32	1 (Eph)	2 (1 Tim)
σπείρω*	—	—	8	3	3	—	—
σπέρμα	—	9	1	1	5	—	1

TABLE 8 Phrase Frequencies in the *Corpus Paulinum*

	1-2 Thess	Rom	1 Cor	2 Cor	Gal	Prison Letters	Pastoral Letters
οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν*	—	2	2	—	—	—	—
οὐκ οἶδατε*	—	2	10	—	—	—	—
ἢ οὐκ οἶδατε;*	—	1	4	—	—	—	—
μὴ γένοιτο*	—	10	1	—	2	—	—
τί οὖν;*	—	11	4	—	1	—	—

TABLE 9 Phrase Frequencies in the *Corpus Paulinum* (C)

	1-2 Thess	Rom	1 Cor	2 Cor	Gal	Prison Letters	Pastoral Letters
δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ*	—	5	—	1	—	—	—
ἔργα νόμου*	—	2	—	—	6	—	—
κατὰ ἄνθρωπον*	—	1	3	—	2	—	—
καθ' ὑπερβολήν*	—	1	1	3	1	—	—
σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ*	—	2	—	1	1	—	—
ὕπὸ νόμον*	—	2	4	—	5	—	—

TABLE 10 Questions in the *Corpus Paulinum*

	1-2 Thess	Rom	1 Cor	2 Cor	Gal	Prison Letters	Pastoral Letters
Questions (total 233 in CP)	3	81	101	26	18	3	1

8:24–11:11.¹⁴ In the other three letter groups, questions are virtually absent (BW; see table 10).¹⁵

2. In the *Hauptbriefe*, the average sentence length is, as in the Thessalonian letters, smaller than in Ephesians and Colossians (below, I discuss syntax in the Prison Letters).
3. The *Hauptbriefe* contain fewer consecutive genitives than the Prison Letters (discussed below).
4. The *Hauptbriefe* contain fewer imperatives than the Pastoral Letters (below, I discuss syntax in the Pastoral Letters).
5. The *Hauptbriefe* presumably contain fewer anacolutha than the Pastoral Letters (discussed below).
6. The *Hauptbriefe* presumably contain fewer ellipses than the Pastoral Letters (discussed below).
7. The *Hauptbriefe* presumably contain fewer parentheses than the Pastoral Letters (discussed below).

OTHER STYLISTIC DEVICES

1. In the *Hauptbriefe*, there are more catalogs than in 1–2 Thessalonians but fewer than in the Prison Letters and in the Pastoral Letters.
2. Dialogical sections, in which the author speaks to a fictitious interlocutor,¹⁶ are a familiar feature of the *Hauptbriefe*. They appear, for example, in Rom 2, 1 Cor 6, and Gal 3, but there are hardly any real dialogues with a longer sequence of questions and answers. Often in the dialogical sections of Paul's *Hauptbriefe*, certain formulations appear in response to statements of his interlocutors.¹⁷ Many of these formulations appear only in the *Hauptbriefe*, with a clear emphasis in Romans and 1 Corinthians.

14. Barr, *Scalometry*, 33–35, 51–53.

15. Ibid., 73.

16. Cf. Alfred Hermann and Gustave Bardy, "Dialog," *RAC* 3:990–1009.

17. Cf. Rudolf Bultmann, *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe*, *FRLANT* 13 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 64–74.

TABLE 11 Old Testament Quotations in the *Corpus Paulinum*

	<i>1–2 Thess</i>	<i>Rom</i>	<i>1 Cor</i>	<i>2 Cor</i>	<i>Gal</i>	<i>Prison Letters</i>	<i>Pastoral Letters</i>
OT quotations (121 in total) ¹⁸	—	74	17	11	11	6 (Eph)	2
OT quotations (length in words) ¹⁹	—	654	122	83	99	59 (Eph)	4 (1 Tim)

TABLE 12 Word Frequencies in the *Corpus Paulinum*

	<i>1–2 Thess</i>	<i>Rom</i>	<i>1 Cor</i>	<i>2 Cor</i>	<i>Gal</i>	<i>Prison Letters</i>	<i>Pastoral Letters</i>
γέγραπται*	—	16	9	2	4	—	—

TABLE 13 Antitheses in the *Corpus Paulinum*

	<i>1 Thess</i>	<i>2 Thess</i>	<i>Rom</i>	<i>1 Cor</i>	<i>2 Cor</i>	<i>Gal</i>	<i>Phil</i>	<i>Col</i>	<i>Phlm</i>
Antitheses (per page)	26 (3.7)	10 (2.5)	181 (5.3)	208 (6.7)	125 (6.0)	63 (6.3)	32 (4.2)	13 (1.7)	7 (3.5)

3. It is striking that, with a few exceptions, only the *Hauptbriefe* contain Old Testament quotations (see table 11). Accordingly, the verb form γέγραπται is only used in the *Hauptbriefe* (see table 12).
4. The *Hauptbriefe* are richer in antitheses than the Thessalonian letters and above all Colossians (see table 13).²⁰

The Prison Letters

Among the Prison Letters (Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon; cf. Philippians), Ephesians and Colossians have numerous parallels in structure and content. Some additional parallels connect these two letters with Philemon. Among the four Prison Letters, Philippians stands rather alone.

18. B. Aland et al., eds., *The Greek New Testament*, 5th ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2014), 861–62.

19. Kenny, *Stylometric Study*, 121.

20. Cf. Walter Bujard, *Stilanalytische Untersuchungen zum Kolosserbrief als Beitrag zur Methodik von Sprachvergleichen*, SUNT 11 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973), 102–12.

TABLE 14 Word Frequencies in the *Corpus Paulinum*

	1-2 Thess	Hauptbriefe	Eph	Col	Phlm	Phil	Pastoral Letters
ἐν	81	545	122	88	10	66	94

LEXIS

1. Compared to the Pastoral Letters, the Prison Letters have a limited vocabulary (below, I discuss lexis in the Pastoral Letters).
2. The Prison Letters show fewer Pauline *hapaxes* than the Pastoral Letters (discussed below).
3. The Prison Letters (Ephesians, Colossians) contain fewer indeclinables than the Thessalonian letters and the *Hauptbriefe* but more indeclinables than the Pastoral Letters (discussed below).
4. Compared to the Pastoral Letters, the Prison Letters have few adjectives (discussed below).
5. Compared with the Pastoral Letters, the Prison Letters have few compound verbs (discussed below).
6. Compared with the Pastoral Letters, the Prison Letters have few Grecisms (discussed below).
7. In contrast to the *Hauptbriefe*, the Prison Letters, like the Thessalonian letters, do not contain any interjections.
8. The Prison Letters also contain some preferred words. The preposition ἐν occurs more frequently in Colossians and Ephesians than in the other letter groups (see table 14).²¹ The conjunction ὡς is relatively common in Philemon. Colossians is comparatively rich in relative pronouns.²² Ephesians and especially Colossians contain altogether fewer conjunctions than the Thessalonian letters and the *Hauptbriefe*.²³

PHRASES The Prison Letters, especially Ephesians and Colossians, contain some phrases that are missing in the other groups of letters (see table 15).

21. Kenny, *Stylometric Study*, 86; cf. Bujard, *Stilanalytische Untersuchungen*, 121–28.

22. Bujard, *Stilanalytische Untersuchungen*, 64–71.

23. Ibid., 24–53.

TABLE 15 Phrase Frequencies in the *Corpus Paulinum*

	1–2 Thess	Hauptbriefe	Eph	Col	Phlm	Phil	Pastoral Letters
τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*	—	—	1	3	—	—	—
ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ*	—	—	1	3	—	—	—
κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν*	—	—	2	1	—	1	—
πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα*	—	—	1	2	—	—	—
τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης*	—	—	1	1	—	—	—
τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ*	—	—	3	1	—	—	—

TABLE 16 Sentence Length in the *Corpus Paulinum*

(van Roon)	1 Thess	2 Thess	Rom	1 Cor	2 Cor	Gal	Eph	Col	Phlm	Phil	1 Tim	2 Tim	Titus
Sentence length (in lines)	4.2	4.3	2.75	2.25	3.2	2.5	5.7	5.5	4.6	4.0			

TABLE 17 Sentence Length in the *Corpus Paulinum*

(Kenny)	1 Thess	2 Thess	Rom	1 Cor	2 Cor	Gal	Eph	Col	Phlm	Phil	1 Tim	2 Tim	Titus
Sentence length (in words)	23		14	12	16	14	30	24		14	16	16	

SYNTAX

1. Compared to the *Hauptbriefe*, the Prison Letters hardly contain any questions (see above regarding syntax in the *Hauptbriefe*).²⁴
2. Each of the 13 Pauline Letters contains sections with relatively long sentences (usually in the doctrinal parts) and sections with relatively short sentences (usually in the ethical parts).²⁵ At the same time, the average sentence length in the Prison Letters (Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon) is somewhat longer than in the Thessalonian letters and considerably longer than in the *Hauptbriefe* (see tables 16–17).²⁶

24. Cf. Aart van Roon, *The Authenticity of Ephesians* (Leiden: Brill, 1974), 102–3.

25. Barr, *Scalometry*, 15–16.

26. Van Roon, *Authenticity*, 105–11; cf. Kenny, *Stylometric Study*, 106.

3. In addition, Ephesians and Colossians contain comparatively many consecutive genitives.²⁷ Colossians is particularly rich in sentence continuations with nominative participles.²⁸
4. Compared to the Pastoral Letters, the Prison Letters contain few imperatives (below, I discuss syntax in the Pastoral Letters).
5. The Prison Letters presumably contain fewer anacolutha than the Pastoral Letters (discussed below).
6. The Prison Letters presumably contain fewer ellipses than Pastoral Letters (discussed below).
7. The Prison Letters presumably contain fewer parentheses than Pastoral Letters (discussed below).

OTHER STYLISTIC DEVICES

1. Catalogs are more frequent in the Prison Letters than in the Thessalonian letters and the *Hauptbriefe*, but rarer than in the Pastoral Letters.
2. In contrast to the *Hauptbriefe*, there are hardly any dialogical elements in the Prison Letters.²⁹
3. In contrast to the *Hauptbriefe*, there are hardly any Old Testament quotations in the Prison Letters, and only in Ephesians.
4. Compared with the Thessalonian letters and especially with the *Hauptbriefe*, Colossians employs antitheses markedly less often.

The Pastoral Letters

The Pastoral Letters have many characteristics that distinguish them from the other 10 Paulines. This applies already to the greetings at the beginning of the letters. In contrast to the greeting χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη (ἀπὸ θεοῦ), which occurs in the other 10 Paulines, the greeting in the Pastoral Letters is χάρις ἔλεος εἰρήνη (ἀπὸ θεοῦ; 1 Tim 1:2b; 2 Tim 1:2b) or χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη (ἀπὸ θεοῦ; Titus 1:4b).³⁰

27. Van Roon, *Authenticity*, 121–28; cf. Bujard, *Stilanalytische Untersuchungen*, 156–57.

28. Bujard, *Stilanalytische Untersuchungen*, 59–63.

29. Cf. van Roon, *Authenticity*, 102–3.

30. See Otto Roller, *Das Formular der paulinischen Briefe: Ein Beitrag zur Lehre vom antiken Briefe*, BWANT 4/6 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933), table 4.

TABLE 18 Types and Tokens in the *Corpus Paulinum*

	<i>Length</i> (Tokens)	<i>Vocabulary</i> (Types)
Rom	7,111	1,055
1 Cor	6,830	951
2 Cor	4,477	779
Eph	2,422	527
Gal	2,230	520
Phil	1,629	440
1 Tim	1,591	535
Col	1,582	429
1 Thess	1,481	362
2 Tim	1,238	451
2 Thess	823	249
Titus	659	298
Phlm	335	140
Σ	32,408	2,621

LEXIS

1. The Pastoral Letters employ a richer vocabulary than the other ten Paulines (see table 18).³¹
2. The Pastoral Letters contain more Pauline *hapaxes* than the other 10 Paulines (see table 19).³²
3. The Pastoral Letters contain, in relation to their length, fewer indeclinables than the Prison Letters (Ephesians, Colossians) and especially the *Hauptbriefe* and the Thessalonian letters (see table 20).³³
4. The Pastoral Letters contain more adjectives than the 10 Paulines.³⁴
5. The Pastoral Letters contain more compound verbs than the other 10 Paulines.³⁵

31. Armin D. Baum, "Semantic Variation within the *Corpus Paulinum*: Linguistic Considerations Concerning the Richer Vocabulary of the Pastoral Epistles," *TynBul* 59 (2008): 271–92; cf. Morgenthauer, *Statistik*, 164.

32. Van Nes, *Pauline Language*, 143–45, 225–76.

33. *Ibid.*, 170–76, 281–89.

34. Kenny, *Stylometric Study*, 92, 94.

35. Van Nes, *Pauline Language*, 42–44.

TABLE 19 *Hapax Legomena in the Corpus Paulinum*

	<i>Length (Tokens)</i>	<i>Pl. Hapaxes (Types)</i>
Rom	7,111	281
1 Cor	6,830	255
2 Cor	4,477	177
Eph	2,422	86
Gal	2,230	91
Phil	1,629	75
1 Tim	1,591	131
Col	1,582	63
1 Thess	1,481	36
2 Tim	1,238	102
2 Thess	823	21
Titus	659	51
Phlm	335	10

TABLE 20 *Indeclinables in the Corpus Paulinum*

	<i>Length (Tokens)</i>	<i>Indeclinables (Types)</i>
Rom	7,111	120
1 Cor	6,830	114
2 Cor	4,477	130
Eph	2,422	202
Gal	2,230	171
Phil	1,629	182
1 Tim	1,591	212
Col	1,582	213
1 Thess	1,481	193
2 Tim	1,238	223
2 Thess	823	219
Titus	659	238
Phlm	335	239

6. In the Pastoral Letters are a number of words that can be described as Grecisms.³⁶ Table 21 lists only a selection of them. At the same time, there are “fewer Septuagint words and more Hellenistic

36. Ibid., 54–58.

TABLE 21 Word Frequencies in the *Corpus Paulinum*

	<i>1–2 Thess</i>	<i>Hauptbriefe</i>	<i>Prison Letters</i>	<i>1 Tim</i>	<i>2 Tim</i>	<i>Titus</i>
δεσπότης*	—	—	—	2	1	1
διάβολος	—	—	2 (Eph)	3	2	1
ἐπιφάνεια κτλ	1 (2 Thess)	—	—	1	3	3
εὐσέβεια κτλ*	—	—	—	9	2	2
σεμνότης κτλ	—	—	1 (Phil)	4	—	2
σωφρονέω κτλ	—	2	—	3	1	6
σωτήρ	—	—	2	3	1	6
ὕγιαίνω*	—	—	—	2	2	4

TABLE 22 Non-Septuagint Words in the *Corpus Paulinum*

	<i>Length</i> (Tokens)	<i>Not in LXX</i> (Tokens)		<i>Vocabulary</i> (Types)	<i>Not in LXX</i> (Types)
Rom	7,111	76 (1.1%)	Rom	1,055	32 (3.0%)
1 Cor	6,830	51 (0.7%)	1 Cor	951	22 (2.3%)
2 Cor	4,477	51 (1.1%)	2 Cor	779	27 (3.4%)
Eph	2,422	31 (1.3%)	1 Tim	535	33 (6.2%)
Gal	2,230	28 (1.3%)	Eph	527	16 (3.0%)
Phil	1,629	31 (1.9%)	Gal	520	12 (2.3%)
1 Tim	1,591	57 (3.6%)	2 Tim	451	18 (4.0%)
Col	1,582	23 (1.5%)	Phil	440	15 (3.4%)
1 Thess	1,481	16 (1.1%)	Col	429	10 (2.3%)
2 Tim	1,238	31 (2.5%)	1 Thess	362	6 (1.7%)
2 Thess	823	7 (0.9%)	Titus	298	7 (2.3%)
Titus	659	25 (3.8%)	2 Thess	249	4 (1.6%)
Phlm	335	6 (1.8%)	Phlm	140	1 (0.7%)

expressions in the Pastoral Letters than in the *Hauptbriefe*.³⁷ This applies both in relation to the length of Paul's letters and in relation to their vocabulary (see table 22).³⁸

7. In contrast to the *Hauptbriefe*, the Pastoral Letters contain virtually no interjections (see above regarding lexis in the *Hauptbriefe*).
8. Each of the three Pastoral Letters contains some preferred words. These include ἴνα and μή in Titus (BW). In addition, the Pastoral

37. Morgenthaler, *Statistik*, 47.

38. Cf. *ibid.*, 175–76.

TABLE 23 Word Frequencies in the *Corpus Paulinum*

	<i>1-2 Thess</i>	<i>Hauptbriefe</i>	<i>Prison Letters</i>	<i>1 Tim</i>	<i>2 Tim</i>	<i>Titus</i>
ἀρνεῖσθαι*	—	—	—	1	4	2
βέβηλος*	—	—	—	3	1	—
δεσπότης*	—	—	—	2	1	1
διάβολος	—	—	2 (Eph)	3	2	1
ἐπιφάνεια	1 (2 Thess)	—	—	1	3	1
εὐσέβεια*	—	—	—	8	1	1
ζήτησις*	—	—	—	1	1	1
παραθήκη*	—	—	—	1	2	—
παρατεῖσθαι*	—	—	—	2	1	1
σωτήρ	—	—	2	3	1	6
ὕγιαίνω*	—	—	—	2	2	4

TABLE 24 Phrase Frequencies in the *Corpus Paulinum*

	<i>1-2 Thess</i>	<i>Hauptbriefe</i>	<i>Prison Letters</i>	<i>1 Tim</i>	<i>2 Tim</i>	<i>Titus</i>
δι' ἣν αἰτίαν*	—	—	—	—	3	1
πιστὸς ὁ λόγος*	—	—	—	3	1	1

TABLE 25 Theological Phrases in the *Corpus Paulinum*

	<i>1-2 Thess</i>	<i>Hauptbriefe</i>	<i>Prison Letters</i>	<i>1 Tim</i>	<i>2 Tim</i>	<i>Titus</i>
διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ*	—	—	—	1	2	—
ἐπίγνωσις ἀληθείας*	—	—	—	1	2	1
ἡ ὑγιαίνουσα διδασκαλία*	—	—	—	1	1	2
ὁ νῦν αἰὼν*	—	—	—	1	1	1
πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν*	—	—	—	1	1	1
τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ*	—	—	—	1	—	3

Letters as a group contain a number of words that are unique or almost unique to them (see table 23).

PHRASES

1. The Pastoral Letters contain some typical formulations, which are lacking in the other groups of letters (see table 24).
2. The Pastoral Letters contain numerous theological expressions, which do not appear in the other Pauline letters (see table 25).

SYNTAX

1. Compared to the *Hauptbriefe*, the Pastoral Letters contain few questions.
2. Compared to the Prison Letters, the Pastoral Letters contain few consecutive genitives.
3. Compared to the other 10 Paulines, the Pastoral Letters contain many imperatives (BW).
4. Compared to the other 10 Paulines, the Pastoral Letters presumably contain fewer anacolutha. However, this information has recently been called into question.³⁹
5. Compared to the other 10 Paulines, the Pastoral Letters presumably contain fewer ellipses. This information has also recently been called into question.⁴⁰
6. Compared with the other 10 Paulines, the Pastoral Letters presumably contain few parentheses. This statement has recently been called into question as well.⁴¹

OTHER STYLISTIC DEVICES

1. Compared to the other 10 Paulines, the Pastoral Letters, in relation to their length, contain the most catalogs.
2. In contrast to the *Hauptbriefe*, the Pastoral Letters hardly contain dialogical elements.
3. In contrast to the *Hauptbriefe*, the Pastoral Letters contain hardly any Old Testament quotations.

Conclusion

Each letter group contains a number of phrases (and words) that are missing outside the letters of this group. The phrases, which only occur in one letter group, are listed in table 26.

In addition, each letter group has its own features. The two relatively short Thessalonian letters have the fewest special features. Even relative to their size, the *Hauptbriefe* employ more interjections, more questions, more dialogical sections, more Old Testament quotations, and more antithetical formulations than the other three letter groups. The Prison Letters (especially Ephesians and Colossians) contain few indeclinables (compared to the Thessalonian letters and the *Hauptbriefe*) and many consecutive genitives (compared to all three other letter groups). Moreover, the average sentence length in the Prison Letters

39. Cf. Van Nes, *Pauline Language*, 206–8.

40. Cf. *ibid.*, 208–10.

41. Cf. *ibid.*, 205–6.

TABLE 26 Phrase Frequencies in the *Corpus Paulinum*

	1-2 Thess	Hauptbriefe	Prison Letters	Pastoral Letters
αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἶδατε*	4	—	—	—
αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ θεὸς / ὁ κύριος*	4	—	—	—
ἐρωτῶμεν / παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί*	4	—	—	—
παρακαλοῦμεν ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, ἵνα*	3	—	—	—
δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ*	—	6	—	—
ἔργα νόμου*	—	8	—	—
ἢ οὐκ οἶδατε;*	—	5	—	—
κατὰ ἄνθρωπον*	—	6	—	—
καθ' ὑπερβολήν*	—	6	—	—
μὴ γένοιτο*	—	13	—	—
οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν*	—	4	—	—
οὐκ οἶδατε*	—	12	—	—
σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ*	—	4	—	—
τί οὖν;*	—	16	—	—
ὑπὸ νόμον*	—	11	—	—
τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*	—	—	4	—
ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ*	—	—	4	—
κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν*	—	—	4	—
πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα*	—	—	3	—
τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης*	—	—	4	—
τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ*	—	—	2	—
δι' ἣν αἰτίαν*	—	—	—	4
διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ*	—	—	—	3
ἐπίγνωσις ἀληθείας*	—	—	—	4
ἡ ὑγιαινούσα διδασκαλία*	—	—	—	4
ὁ νῦν αἰὼν*	—	—	—	3
πιστὸς ὁ λόγος*	—	—	—	5
πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν*	—	—	—	3
τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ*	—	—	—	4

is particularly large. The Pastoral Letters contain the most special features. Compared to the other three letter groups, they contain a particularly rich vocabulary, more Pauline *hapax legomena*, more adjectives, more compound verbs, more Grecisms, and more imperatives. (Whether they also contain fewer anacolutha, fewer ellipses, and fewer parentheses is controversial.) See table 27.

A couple of these stylistic phenomena show a continuous development. The relative number of indeclinables decreases at the transition from the two earlier to the two later letter groups. Also, the relative frequency of virtue and vice catalogs gradually increases from one letter group to the next.

TABLE 27 Stylistic Features in the *Corpus Paulinum*

		1-2 Thess	Hauptbriefe	Prison Letters	Pastoral Letters
Lexis	(1) Lexical wealth	+	+	+	++
	(2) Pauline <i>hapax legomena</i>	+	+	+	++
	(3) Indeclinables	++	++	+	+
	(4) Adjectives	+	+	+	++
	(5) Compound verbs	+	+	+	++
	(6) Grecisms	+	+	+	++
	(7) Interjections	0	+	0	(+)
Syntax	(1) Questions	+	++	+	+
	(2) Sentence length	++	+	+++	+
	(3) Consecutive genitives	+	+	++	+
	(4) Imperatives	+	+	+	++
	(5) Anacolutha	++	++	++	+(?)
	(6) Ellipses	++	++	++	+(?)
	(7) Parentheses	++	++	++	+(?)
Style	(1) Catalogs	0	+	++	+++
	(2) Dialogical sections	+	++	+	+
	(3) Old Testament quotations	0	++	+	+
	(4) Antitheses	+	++	+	

In the Pastoral Letters, an abrupt increase or decrease can be observed for several phenomena. The lexical richness increases sharply at the transition from the third to the fourth letter group. The same holds true for the number of Pauline *hapax legomena*, adjectives, compound verbs, Grecisms, and imperatives.

For some other phenomena, an initial increase with subsequent decrease can be observed. The relative number of interjections, dialogical elements, Old Testament quotations, and antithetical formulations increases in the *Hauptbriefe* and decreases afterward. The number of consecutive genitives grows in the Prison Letters and declines afterward. In one case, a double decrease can be observed. The average sentence length decreases in the second letter group, increases in the third letter group, and decreases again in the fourth letter group.

In order to interpret these style-critical observations, one can take different paths. Jermo van Nes has recently used the most up-to-date research results from modern linguistics to interpret a number of lexical and syntactical peculiarities of the Pastoral Letters.⁴² In what follows, I will examine what contribution the philological style analysis of Cicero's work can make to the interpretation of stylistic differences in the *Corpus Paulinum*.

42. Van Nes, *Pauline Language*.

Stylistic Diversity in the *Corpus Ciceronianum*

From no pagan Latin author of antiquity have more texts been preserved than from Cicero.⁴³ Since the *Corpus Ciceronianum* is much larger than the relatively small *Corpus Paulinum*, it allows more reliable stylistic observations and interpretations. On the other hand, stylistic studies of Cicero's work are very elaborate but not quite as detailed as the studies of the *Corpus Paulinum*, which are facilitated by computer programs such as BibleWorks.

In this second section of my article, my main source was Michael von Albrecht's extensive meta-analysis of Cicero's language and style for a supplement volume of *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, in which he offered a comprehensive summary of all the relevant earlier scholarly studies on this topic.⁴⁴ Von Albrecht's meta-analysis is also available in a somewhat revised English edition.⁴⁵ Below I will, for convenience's sake, refer to and quote from the English edition.

The writings of Cicero show a number of stylistic similarities among themselves⁴⁶ but also a number of remarkable stylistic differences. In Cicero research, these stylistic differences are primarily attributed to the influence of genre, diachronic style development, and the influence of the addressees. Based on the scholarly literature on the subject, I will summarize below how these three factors affected the style of Cicero's writings.

The Influence of Genre

The complete work of Cicero consists of orations, philosophical and rhetorical treatises, and letters. Certain stylistic characteristics have been identified for each of these three genera. Cicero himself has mentioned the stylistic differences:

I don't always adopt the same style. What similarity is there between a letter, and a speech in court or at a public meeting? Why, even in law-cases I am not in the habit of dealing with all of them in the same style. Private cases, and those petty ones too, I conduct in a more plain-spoken fashion, those involving a man's civil status or his reputation, of course, in a more ornate style; but my letters I generally compose in the language of everyday life.⁴⁷

43. Jürgen Leonhardt, "Cicero als Redner und Schriftsteller," *DNP* 2:1196.

44. Michael von Albrecht, "Cicero, Sprache und Stil," *PWSup* 13:1237–1347.

45. Michael von Albrecht, *Cicero's Style: A Synopsis* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

46. *Ibid.*, 125.

47. Cicero, *Epistulae ad familiares* 9.21.1 to Paetus (Williams, LCL).

CICERO'S ORATIONS Cicero's orations have a number of stylistic features that distinguish them from his treatises and letters.

LEXIS That Cicero's choice of words was particularly strict in his orations was already observed by ancient readers. The Roman rhetorician Fronto (ca. 100–170 CE) wrote:

In all his orations you will find very few words indeed that are unexpected and unlooked for, such as are not to be hunted out save with study and care and with watchfulness and the treasuring up of old poems in memory.⁴⁸

Modern Cicero research has confirmed this observation in much detail.

1. "In his orations, Cicero eschews poetic and colloquial expressions,"⁴⁹ since "a first negative guideline for any orator who wants to influence his audience is to avoid all that could strike them as odd; and therefore he conforms his language and style to the common usage."⁵⁰
2. The orations contain few comparatives and superlatives.
3. The orations contain few diminutives.
4. "Technical terms used in the philosophical and rhetorical treatises are absent from the orations."⁵¹
5. Greek words are "more frequent in Cicero's philosophical writings than in his orations."⁵² "In order to be understood by all of his listeners, in his popular orations Cicero shuns Greek terms. . . . Furthermore, Cicero avoids in his orations certain words used in his other writings (*grammaticus*, *hilarus*, *philosophari*, *philosophia*, *rhetor*)."⁵³ The data for table 28 come from the list of Greek loan words in Cicero developed by Oksala.⁵⁴ It contains some technical terms that Cicero has taken over from the Greek.

48. Fronto, *Epistulae ad M. Caesarem* 4.3.3 (Haines, LCL).

49. Von Albrecht, *Cicero's Style*, 12.

50. Ibid., 11; cf. the overview in Louis Laurand, *Études sur le style des discours de Cicéron, avec une esquisse de l'histoire du 'cursus'*, 4th ed. (Amsterdam: Hakert, 1965), 362–402.

51. Von Albrecht, *Cicero's Style*, 13.

52. Ibid., 12; cf. Laurand, *Études*, 99.

53. Von Albrecht, *Cicero's Style*, 13; cf. Paivo Oksala, *Die griechischen Lehnwörter in den Prosaschriften Ciceros*, Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemia toimituksia B 80/1 (Helsinki: Finnish Academy, 1953), 84.

54. Oksala, *Die griechischen Lehnwörter*, 156–61.

TABLE 28 Word Frequencies in the *Corpus Ciceronianum*

	Orations (1,549 pages)	Treatises (1,627 pages)
<i>historia</i>	1	73
<i>historicus, a</i>	1	2
<i>historicus</i>	—	6
<i>philosophus</i>	12	321
<i>philosophia</i>	3	252
<i>philosophari</i>	2	18
<i>rhetor</i>	5	49
<i>rhetoricus</i>	—	18
<i>rhetorica</i>	—	12

SYNTAX

1. "Cicero's syntax is more careful in his orations than it is in his letters." The finite verb stands mostly at the end of the sentence.⁵⁵
2. In the orations, the use of participles is frequent.⁵⁶ In the orations, "agglomerations of participles alternate with long passages without any participles."⁵⁷
3. The orations prefer period building.⁵⁸
4. The orations contain few anacolutha.
5. The orations contain few ellipses.
6. The orations contain few parentheses.
7. The orations contain few interjections.

OTHER STYLISTIC DEVICES

1. In contrast to the treatises, Cicero does not use dialogue in his orations, apart from a few sections in which he uses natural dialogue.⁵⁹
2. The orations contain fewer quotations from the poets than the treatises.
3. The orations contain fewer historical examples than the letters.

55. Von Albrecht, *Cicero's Style*, 15.56. *Ibid.*, 16.57. *Ibid.*, 43.58. *Ibid.*, 16.59. Laurand, *Études*, 256–60.

In general, it was typical for Cicero's style in his orations to conceal his superior education "in order not to offend his audience."⁶⁰

STYLISTIC DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ORATIONS In addition to the similarities that distinguish orations from treatises and letters, there are also differences within Cicero's orations that distinguish different groups of orations from each other.

Cicero himself was convinced that he had written his court orations partly in a simple style, partly in a medium style, and partly in a high style:

In the *Mamilian Law* the task was to glorify Pompeius; in the tempered and moderate style we drew on the full resources of rhetorical ornament. The whole principle of the maintaining the dignity of the republic was at stake in the speech *In the Defence of Rabirius*, therefore in this we blazed forth with every kind of rhetorical amplification. But these styles need to be modified at times and varied. Every style is used in the seven speeches of *Accusation*, in the speeches *In Defence of Habitus*, *In Defence of Cornelius*, and for many of our clients.⁶¹

In addition, research has shown that the written book orations differ in style from the orations that Cicero actually presented: "In orations written for publication only, parentheses and words of Greek origin are more frequent than in other orations."⁶²

CICERO'S TREATISES Cicero's philosophical writings date from the 50s and 40s (54–44 BCE). With the exception of *De inventione*, his rhetorical writings also date from the 50s and 40s (55–44 BCE).

LEXIS "More than 5000 words form the basic vocabulary of both the orations and the treatises. In addition, each group has no more than 2000 words of its own."⁶³

1. "The vocabulary of the philosophical writings is, despite their smaller bulk, not only larger than that of the orations but also more colourful and diversified."⁶⁴
2. The treatises contain few comparatives and superlatives.
3. The treatises contain few diminutives.

60. Von Albrecht, *Cicero's Style*, 17.

61. Cicero, *Orator* 29.102–3 (Hubbell, LCL).

62. Von Albrecht, *Cicero's Style*, 18; cf. Oksala, *Die griechischen Lehnwörter*, 77–78.

63. Von Albrecht, *Cicero's Style*, 28.

64. Ibid.

4. In the rhetorical treatises, Cicero avoids the rhetorical technical terminology less strictly than in the orations: "When alluding to rhetorical rules in the orations, Cicero is even more careful than in his rhetorical works to avoid technical terms and choose verbal expressions."⁶⁵
5. "Purely Greek words are not very frequent even in Cicero's treatises. Still, they occur fifty times as often as in his orations."⁶⁶ Greek loan words are more frequent in the treatises than in the orations but rarer than in the letters.⁶⁷ Also, in the treatises Greek words are used for reasons different from in the letters; in the treatises, Cicero uses Greek technical terms.⁶⁸
6. The treatises contain certain preferred words: "Typical of the philosophical writings is the relative frequency of the negative *haud* linked with an adjective or adverb."⁶⁹ Also, "verbal nouns ending in *-io* are three times as frequent, derivatives ending in *-us* and *-tas* four times as frequent as in the orations. . . . Derivatives in *-mentum* occur more than twice as often in the treatises as in the orations. . . . We also find twice as many adjectives ending in *-osus* as in the orations, and three times as many ending in *-alis*."⁷⁰

Some vocabulary differences between the treatises and the orations are related to the particular topics: "*hiberno* and *hiemo* ('pass the winter') are found only in orations dealing with campaigns, and it would be fruitless to look for these words in the philosophical writings. For the same reasons, agricultural terms and some legal terms . . . are missing in his philosophical writings. Obviously, many names of animals turning up in the *De Natura Deorum* are not found in the orations."⁷¹

SYNTAX

1. In the philosophical writings, the syntax is generally less careful than in the orations but less colloquial than in the letters.⁷²

65. Ibid., 48.

66. Ibid., 33; see Oksala, *Die griechischen Lehnwörter*, 126.

67. Oksala, *Die griechischen Lehnwörter*, 146.

68. Laurand, *Études*, 81, 85.

69. Von Albrecht, *Cicero's Style*, 31.

70. Ibid., 29.

71. Ibid., 28.

72. Ibid., 15.

2. "Participles are distributed more regularly in Cicero's rhetorical (and philosophical) works than in his orations."⁷³
3. Period construction is not as common in the treatises as in the orations.
4. "Anacoluthon occurs more often in the philosophical writings than in the orations."⁷⁴
5. "Ellipses occur more often in the philosophical writings than in the orations."⁷⁵
6. "Parentheses . . . are originally a hallmark of natural speech . . . (and) they are especially frequent in those of Cicero's rhetorical works which are elaborated with the greatest care."⁷⁶
7. Interjections are rare in the treatises.

OTHER STYLISTIC CHARACTERISTICS

1. In contrast to the orations and letters, the treatises use the dialogue form.⁷⁷
2. "Quotations from poets are longer and more numerous in the philosophical writings than in the orations."⁷⁸ Here, Cicero is not afraid to show his education.
3. In the treatises, the historical examples seem to be less frequent than in the letters.⁷⁹

CICERO'S LETTERS More than 900 letters from Cicero have survived. They originated in a period from 68 to 43 BC. "The style of letters, as a rule, mimics the tone of everyday conversation."⁸⁰ The orations maintain the greatest distance from the colloquial language, and the letters are closest to it. Cicero himself underlined this:

How do I strike you in my letters? Don't I seem to talk to you in the language of common folk? . . . My letters I generally compose in the language of everyday life.⁸¹

73. Ibid., 50.

74. Ibid., 39.

75. Ibid., 38.

76. Ibid., 49.

77. Ibid., 36.

78. Ibid., 90; cf. p. 40.

79. Cf. *ibid.*, 34, 46, 67.

80. Ibid., 67.

81. Cicero, *Epistulae ad familiares* 9.21.1 to Paetus.

At the same time, "it is precisely in the letters that Cicero's style is especially rich and varied, which makes it difficult to trace a continuous line of development."⁸² Therefore, it is not always possible to distinguish their style clearly from that of the two other genres.⁸³

LEXIS

1. In the letters (as in the treatises), the vocabulary is richer than in the orations.
2. "Superlatives of participles and also comparatives and superlatives of adverbs are more frequent here than elsewhere."⁸⁴
3. "Diminutive forms are more frequent here than in all other genres."⁸⁵
4. In some letters, there are more technical terms than in the orations.
5. "Greek loanwords are more frequent in Cicero's letters than in his orations. . . . More than 800 Greek words can be counted in Cicero's letters."⁸⁶
6. The letters also contain certain preferred words: "Many adjectives, verbs, and adverbs with *per-* and *sub-* and substantives with *-tor*, *-sor*, *-io* are typical of the letters."⁸⁷

SYNTAX

1. In the letters, the syntax is generally more colloquial or freer than in the orations.⁸⁸
2. "The closer a letter is to colloquial Latin, the fewer the participles."⁸⁹
In addition, "elaborate letters can be expected to contain many participles."⁹⁰
3. The letters use periodic and paratactic syntax.
4. The relative number of anacolutha in Cicero's letters as compared to his orations and treatises seems not yet to have been studied in detail.
5. The letters contain many ellipses.
6. "In his letters, Cicero feels free to use interjections like *st!*, *hui!*, *sodes*."⁹¹

82. Von Albrecht, *Cicero's Style*, 118; cf. 119.

83. Cf. Laurand, *Études*, 67–68.

84. Von Albrecht, *Cicero's Style*, 53.

85. *Ibid.*, 52.

86. *Ibid.*, 53; cf. Oksala, *Die griechischen Lehnwörter*, 103; Laurand, *Études*, 70–71.

87. Von Albrecht, *Cicero's Style*, 53.

88. *Ibid.*, 15; cf. Laurand, *Études*, 113.

89. Von Albrecht, *Cicero's Style*, 69.

90. *Ibid.*, 70.

91. *Ibid.*, 53.

TABLE 29 Stylistic Features in the *Corpus Ciceronianum*

		<i>Orations</i>	<i>Treatises</i>	<i>Letters</i>
Lexis	(1) Lexical wealth	+	++	++
	(2) Comparatives/superlatives	+	+	++
	(3) Diminutives	+	+	++
	(4) Technical terms	+	++	+ / ++
	(5) Grecisms	+	++	+++
Syntax	(1) Strict syntax	+++	++	++ / +
	(2) Participles	++		++ / +
	(3) Period construction	++		++ / +
	(4) Anacolutha	+	++	
	(5) Ellipses	+	+	++
	(6) Parentheses	+	++	
	(7) Interjections	+	+	++
Style	(1) Dialogue form	(o)	+	o
	(2) Quotations from poets	+	+++	++
	(3) Historical examples	+	+	++

OTHER STYLISTIC DEVICES

1. In the letters, Cicero does not use the dialogue form characteristic of his treatises.
2. "Quotations from poets are rarer than in the philosophical treatises."⁹²
3. "Historical exempla abound in the letters."⁹³

CONCLUSION From the many individual observations on the influence of the text genres on the style of Cicero, the following overall picture emerges (see table 29).

The Influence of Time

Cicero himself was aware that the style of his orations had changed in the course of his biographical development. For his early days, he has expressed this clearly:

Afterwards I travelled through all of Asia Minor and was with the most distinguished orators of the region. . . . However, not content with them, I went to Rhodes and attached myself to Molo, whom I had already heard at Rome. He . . . was particularly skilful in

92. Ibid., 64.

93. Ibid., 67.

criticizing and correcting faults, and wise in his whole system of teaching. He made it his task to repress if possible the redundance and excess of my style, which was marked by a youthful impetuosity and lack of restraint, and to check it so to speak from overflowing its banks. Thus I came back after two years' absence not only better trained, but almost transformed."⁹⁴

Of Cicero's orations, 58 have survived completely or partially. They cover a period of several decades (81–43 BCE). Some stylistic differences between Cicero's orations are due to the phases of life in which Cicero (106–43 BCE) wrote them. Cicero's literary activity can be divided into four phases: prior to his becoming a praetor (before 66 BCE), his exile (66–58 BCE), his stay in Cilicia (58–51 BCE), and his death (51–44 BCE), respectively. The first two phases can also be combined into one phase. "It is an established fact . . . that Cicero's early orations have in common some stylistic features which tend to disappear in his later works. Nor is there any doubt that certain elements of style are typical of his mature orations."⁹⁵

CICERO'S EARLY ORATIONS (UNTIL 58 BCE)

LEXIS

1. Typical of the early orations is "the use of verbal compounds as synonyms for their simple forms (which Cicero would prefer later)."⁹⁶
2. The same applies to the "synonyms, of which one is abandoned later."⁹⁷
3. In addition, the early orations contain some preferred words in comparison to the later ones: "Cicero uses adverbs like *perperam*, *ocius*, *porro* only or prevalently in his early orations. . . . Certain words—some of them redolent of legal or bureaucratic usage—are prominent in the earlier orations, but would gradually give way to briefer and more elegant expressions. This is true of coordinating conjunctions such as: *eo quod*, *quemadmodum*, *idcirco*, *verumtamen*, *verum*. . . . The same applies to double expressions of concessive or causal relation such as *tametsi-tamen* or *propterea quod*."⁹⁸

94. Cicero, *Brutus* 91.316 (Hendrickson, LCL); cf. Cicero, *Orator* 30.108.

95. Von Albrecht, *Cicero's Style*, 89.

96. *Ibid.*, 99.

97. *Ibid.*

98. *Ibid.*, 100.

SYNTAX

1. The early orations have fewer participles than the later orations.
2. The early orations have fewer complex periods than the later orations.
3. The early orations contain fewer questions than the later orations.
4. The early orations contain fewer ellipses than the later orations.
5. The early orations contain fewer parentheses than the later orations.

OTHER STYLISTIC DEVICES

1. "Alliterations and, above all, duplications . . . abound in the early orations; the expression *commendare et concredere* ('to recommend and entrust'), for example, is found only there."⁹⁹
2. The early orations contain fewer antitheses.
3. They contain fewer quotations from the poets.
4. And they contain fewer historical examples.

CICERO'S ORATIONS OF THE 50S (58–51 BCE)

LEXIS

1. The orations of the 50s contain fewer compound verbs.
2. They also contain fewer synonyms.
3. In addition, these orations contain some preferred words: "*haud* appears in the orations almost exclusively in the fifties. In the rhetorical and philosophical writings, it comes into fashion about the same time and even enjoys a certain popularity."¹⁰⁰ Also, "the negative *haud* ('not') is attested for the most part in the middle and late periods of Cicero's style. In the orations, 13 of 17 examples date from the fifties."¹⁰¹

SYNTAX

1. The orations of the 50s contain more participles.
2. The periods become more frequent in these orations.
3. "Certain types of indirect interrogative sentences, too, are most numerous in the orations of that period."¹⁰²
4. The relative frequency of ellipses in the orations of the 50s seems yet to have been studied.

99. Ibid.

100. Ibid., 31.

101. Ibid., 103–4.

102. Ibid., 104.

5. The orations of the 50s contain more parentheses than the early orations.

OTHER STYLISTIC DEVICES

1. The orations of the 50s contain less alliteration.
2. These orations contain more antitheses than the early orations. "In the orations of that epoch a type of antithesis, in which a word is prepared asyndetically by its negated opposite (e.g. *non semel, sed bis* 'not once, but twice') is a particular favourite."¹⁰³
3. "In this period quotations from poets become more frequent in his orations."¹⁰⁴ "In the orations delivered between 56 and 52 quotations from poets are more prominent than in other orations. This is especially true of the *In Pisonem* and the *Pro Sestio*."¹⁰⁵
4. "In the same years [the 50s], abundant use of recent historical examples."¹⁰⁶

CICERO'S LATE ORATIONS (51–43 BCE)

LEXIS

1. The late orations contain fewer compound verbs.
2. They also contain fewer synonyms.
3. The late orations of the 40s also contain certain preferred words: typical is "the striking frequency of *quidem, sed* (instead of *verum*) and *etsi* ('however')."¹⁰⁷

SYNTAX

1. The orations of the 40s contain many participles.
2. The period construction is frequent.
3. The number of questions increases.
4. "The appearance of ellipses with *nihil* and *quid* in orations of his last two working periods is a further mark of the achievement in conciseness in the late phase of Cicero's style."¹⁰⁸
5. The late orations contain many parentheses.

¹⁰³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 103.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 105.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 112.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 112–13.

OTHER STYLISTIC DEVICES

1. The late orations contain less alliteration than the early orations.
2. The late orations contain fewer antitheses than those from the 50s.
3. The late orations contain fewer quotations from the poets than those from the 50s.
4. The late orations contain fewer historical examples than those from the 50s.

CONCLUSION Roughly speaking, in the course of his stylistic development Cicero stripped off colloquial language, refined his syntax and style, and developed a different style in his old age. This applies lexically in that "*propterea quod* becomes less frequent in the course of Cicero's development. However, this applies only to the orations (and perhaps to the rhetorical writings)."¹⁰⁹

It also applies to Cicero's syntax: "In the orations the use of participles gains in frequency and freedom"¹¹⁰ and "in the course of Cicero's life the use of predicative present participles increases considerably."¹¹¹ Also, "interrogative sentences occur more often in the later writings than in the earlier ones, another fact indicative of the ever increasing liveliness of Cicero's sentence construction."¹¹²

Another syntactical feature are the parentheses:

In the orations of the first period there are few of them, in those of the middle period they appear with some regularity. . . . The largest number of parentheses is found in the orations of Cicero's last years. The same is true of the rhetorical and philosophical writings.¹¹³

In Cicero's career as a speaker of almost 40 years, one can observe a very slight, steady increase in the use of Greek loans despite his obvious purist tendency. This growth of the Greek loanwords was apparently due to the invasion of Hellenistic life in Rome.¹¹⁴

As far as the other stylistic features are concerned, while the number of alliterations decreases over time, the antitheses, quotations, and historical examples are particularly frequent in orations of the 50s (see table 30).

109. Ibid., 32.

110. Ibid., 16.

111. Ibid., 108.

112. Ibid., 109.

113. Ibid., 110.

114 Oksala, *Die griechischen Lehnwörter*, 82.

TABLE 30 Stylistic Features in Cicero's Orations

		<i>Early Orations</i> (until 58 BCE)	<i>Middle Orations</i> (until 51 BCE)	<i>Late Orations</i> (until 43 BCE)
Lexis	(1) Compound verbs	++	+	+
	(2) Synonyms	++	+	+
Syntax	(1) Participles	+	++	+++
	(2) Period construction	+	++	+++
	(3) Questions	+	++	+++
	(4) Ellipses	+		++
	(5) Parentheses	+	++	+++
Style	(1) Alliterations	++	+	+
	(2) Antitheses	+	++	+
	(3) Quotations from poets	+	++	+
	(4) Historical examples	+	++	+

The Influence of the Addressees

Cicero's style was influenced not only by the literary genre he chose and by his personal development but also by the addressees to whom he wrote. This last point is most immediately apparent in those letters where Cicero followed the letters to which he replied in structure and vocabulary: "When answering letters, Cicero often adhered to the structure of the letters he had received. What is more, he adopted words used by his correspondents and not attested elsewhere in Cicero."¹¹⁵ However, Cicero also adjusted his style depending on how familiar the addressees were to him and depending on what level of education he could expect from them.

THE FAMILIARITY OF CICERO'S ADDRESSEES Cicero paid less attention to careful disposition in his private letters. In contrast to his official letters, "many private letters are not carefully structured, they proceed by leaps and bounds and contain postscripts and enclosures."¹¹⁶

In addition, Cicero used ellipses often in letters addressed to people who were close to him: "In the Letters to Atticus, ellipses are frequent and bold. . . . the greater the familiarity between correspondents, the smaller the risk of misunderstanding; among close friends there is no need of detailed explanations."¹¹⁷

115. Von Albrecht, *Cicero's Style*, 55.

116. *Ibid.*, 68.

117. *Ibid.*, 56; cf. pp. 61–62.

THE LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF CICERO'S ADDRESSEES Cicero also used a different style for educated addressees than for less-educated addressees. This applies to his choice of words:

Some addressees seem to invite ample use of Greek vocabulary, so Atticus (proud as he is of his Greek erudition), Cicero's brother Quintus (a follower of Greek poets), Varro (the greatest scholar of his age), and intellectuals such as Trebatius, Papirius Paetus, and, of course, Caesar.¹¹⁸

Greek words are conspicuous by their absence from letters of consolation, formal letters, and letters to persons of mediocre education. The same is true for letters of recommendation.¹¹⁹

In his orations too, Cicero paid attention to whether he was addressing the people or the Senate:

Among the political orations, there are differences between those delivered before the Senate and those delivered before the people. Language, style, and content vary according to the educational level of the audience. Before the people, Cicero avoids Greek words even more carefully than he does before the Senate.¹²⁰

This also applies to other stylistic devices:

The prevalent use of a rhetorical figure in elaborate letters may be indicative of their artificial character and of a high degree of artistic awareness. An example is the scarcity of anaphora in the Letters to Atticus (Books 12–16), to his wife, and in letters of recommendation and the greater frequency of anaphora in letters of higher literary claims, such as those to Pompey, Crassus, Appius, and Curio; the letters of consolation; the letter to Quintus on the administration of province [see table 31].¹²¹

Conclusion

Research into the style of Cicero confirms a thesis that the classical philologist Eduard Norden put forward more than 100 years ago:

118. Ibid., 54.

119. Ibid., 55; cf. Oksala, *Die griechischen Lehnwörter*, 102, 105.

120. Von Albrecht, *Cicero's Style*, 25; cf. Oksala, *Die griechischen Lehnwörter*, 78.

121. Von Albrecht, *Cicero's Style*, 66.

TABLE 31 The Education of the Addressees in Cicero's Letters

		<i>Less-Educated Addressees</i>	<i>Better-Educated Addressees</i>
Lexis	Grecisms	+	++
Style	Anaphora	+	++

One and the same writer could write in very different styles, using different ideas at different times, depending on the purpose of the work at hand. We moderns have often erred by misjudging this fact, but the time is past when, on the basis of this argument, Plato could be deprived of his *Menexenos*, Xenophon of his *Agésilaios*, Tacitus of his *Dialogus*, Appuleius of his *De mundo*, and so many authors of so many books, or when people were surprised to find that the Aristotle of the pragmatic books could write in such a daemonic way in his dialogues.¹²²

This is also true for the philological research on Cicero. *Most scholars have not interpreted the many stylistic differences in Cicero's oeuvre as indications that certain orations, treatises, or letters cannot originate from Cicero.* Rather, they attribute the differences in style to the influence of different text genres, different times of origin, and different addressees. The broad scholarly consensus is that Cicero's style varies depending upon whether he is writing orations, treatises, or letters, that his orations vary in style over time, and that he wrote differently to familiar addressees from how he wrote to less-familiar ones and to educated addressees differently from less educated ones.

Based on these insights, in my final section I will compare the stylistic diversity in the *Corpus Paulinum* with the stylistic diversity in the *Corpus Ciceronianum* and ask what conclusions can be drawn from philological Cicero research for stylistic criticism of the New Testament letters of Paul.

Comparison and Conclusions for the *Corpus Paulinum*

No Gradual Improvement of Style in the Pauline Letters

In his statistics of New Testament vocabulary, Robert Morgenthaler attributed a number of stylistic differences in the *Corpus Paulinum* to a stylistic development of the apostle Paul: "If the Pastoral Letters are genuine, a biographical development emerges. The more Paul distanced himself theologically from

122. Eduard Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*, 2 vols. (Darmstadt: WBG, 1958), 11–12 (my translation).

TABLE 32 Stylistic Differences in Cicero's Orations

		<i>Early Orations</i> (until 58 BCE)	<i>Middle Orations</i> (until 51 BCE)	<i>Late Orations</i> (until 43 BCE)
Syntax	Participles	+	++	+++
	Period construction	+	++	+++
	Questions	+	++	+++
	Parentheses	+	++	+++

Judaism, the more he linguistically approached the Gentiles.”¹²³ The comparison between the style differences in the *Corpus Ciceronianum* and in the *Corpus Paulinum* does not confirm this explanation.

As Cicero research has shown, a stylistic development can be observed from Cicero's early to his middle and late orations. In the course of his career as a speaker, Cicero stripped away colloquialisms and especially refined his syntax. At the syntactic level, participles and complex sentence periods as well as questions and parentheses became more frequent (see table 32).

No comparable continuous increase or decrease in lexical or syntactic means can be observed in the *Corpus Paulinum*. If the Pastoral Letters come from Paul, the statistical findings show at most a unique stylistic leap in quality toward the end of his life. The vocabulary and the number of Pauline *hapax legomena*, adjectives, compound verbs, and Grecisms in the Pastoral Letters increased substantially. The same applies to the number of imperatives. If the frequently made statements about the small numbers of anacolutha, ellipses, and parentheses in the Pastorals are correct (but see the objections by van Nes¹²⁴), sentence construction suddenly becomes more regular in the Pastoral Letters. *A gradual stylistic improvement cannot be found in the Corpus Paulinum* (see table 33).

Alternating Stylistic Phases in the Pauline Letters

Stylistic developments that cannot be interpreted as an expression of a biographical improvement in style can also be found in the *Corpus Ciceronianum*. In his earlier, in his middle, and in his late orations, Cicero made use of a number of stylistic means, which he used less frequently in the other phases. This applies to the antitheses, the quotations from poetry, and the historical examples. However, their frequency did not increase or decrease continuously

123. Morgenthaler, *Statistik*, 47 (my translation).

124. Van Nes, *Pauline Language*, 203–10.

TABLE 33 Stylistic Differences in the *Corpus Paulinum*

		<i>1-2 Thess</i> (around 50 CE)	<i>Hauptbriefe</i> (mid-50s CE)	<i>Prison Letters</i> (around 60 CE)	<i>Pastorals</i> (mid-60s[?] CE)
Lexis	Lexical wealth	+	+	+	++
	Pauline <i>hapax legomena</i>	+	+	+	++
	Adjectives	+	+	+	++
	Compound verbs	+	+	+	++
	Grecisms	+	+	+	++
Syntax	Imperatives	+	+	+	++
	Anacolutha	++	++	++	+ (?)
	Ellipses	++	++	++	+ (?)
	Parentheses	++	++	++	+ (?)

TABLE 34 Alternating Stylistic Phases in Cicero's Orations

		<i>Early Orations</i> (until 58 BCE)	<i>Middle Orations</i> (until 51 BCE)	<i>Late Orations</i> (until 43 BCE)
Style	Antitheses	+	++	+
	Quotations from poets	+	++	+
	Historical examples	+	++	+

in the course of his biography; rather, it increased in the middle orations and decreased afterward (see table 34).

A temporary preference for certain stylistic devices can also be observed in the letter groups of the *Corpus Paulinum*. The relative number of questions, dialogical elements, Old Testament quotations, and antitheses increased in the *Hauptbriefe* and decreased again in the later letters. The number of consecutive genitives increased in the Prison Letters and decreased again afterward. It is plausible that *Paul made more use of certain stylistic devices in some phases of his work because the communicative situation required it* (see table 35).¹²⁵

Different Stylistic Devices in Different Kinds of Pauline Letters

Cicero research has established that Cicero used different styles in different text genres. His vocabulary, syntax, and use of other stylistic devices varied according to whether he was giving a speech, writing a treatise, or writing a letter.

125. Cf. Barr, *Scalometry*, 73.

TABLE 35 Alternating Stylistic Phases in the *Corpus Paulinum*

		<i>1–2 Thess</i> (ca. 50 CE)	<i>Hauptbriefe</i> (mid-50s CE)	<i>Prison Letters</i> (ca. 60 CE)	<i>Pastorals</i> (mid-60s[?] CE)
Syntax	Questions	+	++	+	+
	Consecutive genitives	+	+	++	+
Style	Dialogical sections	+	++	+	+
	Old Testament quotations	0	++	+	+
	Antitheses	+	++	+	

Comparatives, superlatives, diminutives, and Grecisms are all more frequent in the letters than in the treatises and orations. Anacolutha and parentheses are particularly common in the treatises, ellipses and interjections in the letters. Cicero used the dialogue form only in the treatises. Quotations from poets are also particularly frequent in the treatises. Historical examples can be found particularly frequently in the letters (see table 36).

All Pauline texts in the New Testament are letters. In this respect, no direct comparison can be made with the genre-related style differences in Cicero's oeuvre. At the same time, *there are some differences in style between different letter groups in the Corpus Paulinum, which could result from the fact that Paul used different stylistic devices in different types of letters* (see table 37).

Different Stylistic Devices for Different Pauline Addressees

Finally, Cicero research has shown that Cicero used different stylistic devices for less-educated and for better-educated addressees (discussed above, with the relevant data repeated in table 38). Similarly, some mostly lexical style differences between the three earlier Pauline letter groups and the Pastoral Letters can be attributed to the different addressees of the letters to churches and the Pastoral Letters. In the Pastoral Letters, the vocabulary is richer and the number of Pauline *hapax legomena* and Grecisms is greater than in the 10 letters of the three other groups. *Paul, too, may have expressed himself in a more sophisticated way to his more-educated coworkers Timothy and Titus than to churches, to which many comparatively uneducated persons likely belonged* (see table 39).

Final Conclusion

Overall, my comparison of the differences in style in the *Corpus Paulinum* with that in the *Corpus Ciceronianum* has shown that the stylistic diversity in

TABLE 36 Stylistic Features in the *Corpus Ciceronianum*

		<i>Orations</i>	<i>Treatises</i>	<i>Letters</i>
Lexis	Comparatives/superlatives	+	+	++
	Diminutives	+	+	++
	Grecisms	+	++	+++
Syntax	Anacolutha	+	++	
	Ellipses	+	+	++
	Parentheses	+	++	
	Interjections	+	+	++
Style	Dialogue form	(o)	+	o
	Quotations from poets	+	+++	++
	Historical examples	+		++

TABLE 37 Stylistic Features in the *Corpus Paulinum*

		<i>1-2 Thess</i>	<i>Hauptbriefe</i>	<i>Prison Letters</i>	<i>Pastorals</i>
Lexis	Lexical wealth	+	+	+	++
	Pauline <i>hapax legomena</i>	+	+	+	++
	Adjectives	+	+	+	++
	Compound verbs	+	+	+	++
	Grecisms	+	+	+	++
Syntax	Questions	+	++	+	+
	Consecutive genitives	+	+	++	+
	Imperatives	+	+	+	++
Style	Dialogical sections	+	++	+	+
	Old Testament quotations	o	++	+	+
	Antitheses	+	++	+	

TABLE 38 The Education of the Addressees in Cicero's Letters

		<i>Less-Educated Addressees</i>	<i>Better-Educated Addressees</i>
Lexis	Grecisms	+	++
Style	Anaphora	+	++

TABLE 39 The Education of the Addressees in the *Corpus Paulinum*

		<i>Church Letters</i>			<i>Pastoral Letters</i>
		<i>1-2 Thess</i>	<i>Hauptbriefe</i>	<i>Prison Letters</i>	
Lexis	Lexical wealth	+	+	+	++
	Pauline <i>hapax legomena</i>	+	+	+	++
	Grecisms	+	+	+	++

the *Corpus Paulinum* is not greater than that in Cicero's oeuvre. In contrast to the *Corpus Ciceronianum*, however, the style differences in the *Corpus Paulinum* are less-easily explained by a gradual stylistic improvement of the apostle Paul. The other scholarly explanations for the style differences in the *Corpus Ciceronianum* are better applicable to the style differences in the *Corpus Paulinum*. *The different communication situations, the different types of texts, and the different addressees can plausibly explain many stylistic differences among the four Pauline letter groups.* As scholarly explanations for the style differences in Cicero's work imply, the different styles in the *Corpus Paulinum* need not be attributed to multiple authors. (Otherwise, Pauline scholars would have to argue against the scholarly consensus and claim that a substantial part of Cicero's oeuvre is in fact pseudepigraphical.)