HOW CAN BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES BE JUSTIFIABLY USED IN CHRISTIAN MINISTRY?¹

Dr Alan Gordon

Journals, such as Leadership, that specialize in the many fields of practicum, often appear to assume that contributions from the behavioral sciences may be appropriated as required. Many leaders in the fields of practicum have formerly trained in the university faculties of psychology, sociology, anthropology, management, marketing, communication, and other related studies. Such practitioners successfully used behavioral insights in their chosen secular employment for many years before they entered Christian ministry. Therefore in parallel situations in a church setting the practitioners would scarcely hesitate to utilize the behavioral insights that had been so helpful in their former profession. However, the various behavioral theories that are employed by Christian leaders have underlying philosophical assumptions which may or may not be congruous with Biblical faith. The ministry methodologies cannot be used with integrity if the underlying behavioral theory is based on a philosophical assumption that runs counter to Biblical faith.

There is, for example, considerable debate as to whether marketing can be used as a valid discipline in church-related ministry. Strong arguments are presented by some Christian leaders against the use of marketing in Christian service (e.g., Webster, 1992; Kenneson and Street, 1997; and Wrenn, 1994). Nevertheless, many other Christian leaders argue persuasively that marketing is appropriate for use by Christian churches and parachurch groups (Barna, 1992; 1988; Considine, 1995; and Ogletree, 1995). The strength of the debate may be gleaned from Barna’s (1992, 13) response to the many church leaders who criticized his first book on church-related marketing, Marketing the Church:

Many pastors wrote me off as a heretic, a young, aggressive, worldly fellow who did not truly believe in God's omniscience and omnipotence. Some Christian book stores 'banned' the book, refusing to expose their customers to a volume filled with such scandalous thoughts.

¹ This article is a slight revision of an Appendix of my Denver Seminary Doctor of Ministry Thesis.
Barna alienated many Christian leaders with such assertions as: "The church is a business." However, Douglas D. Webster, in *Selling Jesus: What's Wrong with Marketing the Church*, considers that the problem of Barna's approach is more subtle and dangerous than the use of such assertions: "He has figured out what people want, what they need and how to give it to them" (Webster, 1992, 36). Nevertheless, the issue of the use of behavioral sciences is much broader than is indicated by Barna's unqualified statements. It is more fundamental than Barna's opponents have stated. The issue, as indicated above, is whether Christians can utilize behavioral sciences with integrity in Christian ministry.

**A proposal for resolution of the problem**

There have been attempts to provide a rationale for the use of behavioral sciences in Christian service. When church growth was at its pinnacle, Peter Wagner (1987, 36) was acutely aware of the criticism that church growth was a methodology without a theological basis: "Some have criticized the Church Growth Movement for not having a strong enough theological foundation. It has been called 'atheological' or 'thin on exegetical material.'" Church growth sought to utilize behavioral sciences to facilitate conversion and subsequent growth of the church: "Church growth, strongly influenced by missiology, leans heavily on the social sciences and the social scientific method" (Wagner, 1987, 38). Succeeding Donald McGavran as leader of the influential movement, Wagner (1987, 38) sought to provide a theological foundation for church growth studies:

The classical approach judges the validity of any experience on the basis of previous theological principles. In contrast, church growth leans toward a phenomenological approach which holds theological conclusions somewhat tentatively and is open to revise them when necessary in the light of what is learned by experience.

Wagner proposed that he could *eclectically* make use of any social scientific discipline that impacted church growth. This effectively meant that if the social science discipline 'worked,' the church growth practitioner was justified in its use. And church growth did appear to 'work' in many churches. Churches had grown numerically as a result of the use of the discipline, and the churches had often also grown spiritually. An example of this numerical and spiritual growth is seen in Churches of Christ in Australia as a result of Win Arn Church Growth Seminars in the 1970s. During the following ten years, the denomination moved from a slight decline to steady growth. Thus, Wagner would feel justified in concluding the use
of principles from the social sciences worked: phenomenology was an appropriate philosophy upon which to base the church growth movement.

Phenomenology, however, is an inadequate philosophy upon which to base a Christian ministry. Firstly, it brackets out the transcendent (Sahakian, 1968). Secondly, there can be no absolutes: all is relative. Experience is the sole arbiter of right and wrong. The resultant methodology is crass pragmatism: if something works, it is right. Crass pragmatism is inappropriate for Christian life and witness. Scripture is the sole authority for the evangelical Christian. Phenomenology, therefore, cannot be used as an appropriate basis for Church Growth. Similarly the behavioral sciences cannot use phenomenology to defend their use in Christian ministry. What then is an alternative approach to Christian ministry that is appropriate?

**Seeking an Answer in a Parallel Case in Church History: Classical Rhetoric**

**The Nature of the Issue**

The answer is found in church history. A similar debate to that of marketing and church growth occurred within the Post-apostolic and Patristic periods of church history. The issue during this early time of church history was regarding the use of rhetoric as a vehicle of Christian preaching. Greco-Roman Rhetoric dominated the educational system of the first four centuries of the Christian era (Clark, 1957, 177-212; Kinneavy, 1987). Rhetoric was ubiquitous through the Mediterranean world (Fischel, 1977, 449; Litfin, 1994, 14, 125). Because most of the early church leaders were highly skilled in classical rhetoric (as noted below), it would be considered almost axiomatic that these leaders would use this form of communication to proclaim the Christian message. However, rhetoric in ancient Greece had similar pejorative aura about it as does marketing, because both disciplines, in the hands of unscrupulous practitioners, have been used to exploit people for the purpose of considerable financial gain. Therefore many church leaders questioned the use of rhetoric in Christian ministry. A heart-searching study of Scripture by Post-apostolic and Patristic leaders provided a resolution of the

---

2 Whereas one may question Wagner's use of phenomenology in the service of church growth, one cannot fault Wagner's commitment to Scripture. To Wagner (1987, 38-39), if experience leads one to question a specific doctrine such as speaking in tongues, Scripture is the sole arbiter as to whether such a doctrine is to be accepted by a Christian.
dilemma. This resolution is helpful to contemporary Christians in their dilemma as to whether behavioral sciences can be co-opted into Christian service.

Rhetoric, although criticized by many church leaders of the time, played an important role in Christian ministry from the second to the fourth centuries. Many Christian leaders had formerly been professors of rhetoric (for example, Tertullian, Lactantius, Ambrose, Augustine). Many other leaders had been highly trained in the theory and practice of rhetoric (for example, Cyprian, Basil the Great, Eusebius of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus, and John Chrysostom). Greco-Roman rhetoric is readily identified in its external form (i.e. style, arrangement, etc.) in the preaching and writing of Christian leaders. A study of the relationship between rhetoric and the Christian scriptures must often include a third element, philosophy, as will be evidenced in the following discussion.

A potential problem in approaching the relationship between rhetoric and the church is simplism. In the Post-apostolic and Patristic approaches to oratory, there are many factors influencing the nature of preaching, and thus it is easy to come to misinformed conclusions. There are several examples:

(i) It may appear logical that a former teacher of rhetoric would utilize rhetoric as a vehicle for preaching. Similarly, it would seem automatic that a rhetorician who denounced his former occupation would refrain from utilizing its services.

(ii) The ornate rhetorical school, Asianism, would appear to be the emphasis for the Eastern Church, especially in light of the Asian origin of the Second Sophistic. In a similar way, the simple style of Atticism would be the expected emphasis in the Latin West.

(iii) A rejection of Athens for Jerusalem gives an appearance of rejecting Greco-Roman rhetoric in the second and third century church.

Enigmas are prevalent in the rhetoric of Late Antiquity. In consequence, it is best to begin where the Post-apostolic and Patristic writings began, in the relationship between rhetoric, philosophy and Christianity.
Second and Third Centuries: Struggling with the Issue

Tertullian is one of the first recorded church leaders in the post-Apostolic age to use rhetorical arrangement. In the *Apologeticum*, the structure was based upon a traditional forensic speech: *exordium* (1-3); *partitio* and *propositio* (4.1-2); *refutatio* (4-45); and *peroratio* (46 - 50) (See Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 3.13-19). The former lawyer, while remaining true to the normal rhetorical pattern, constantly varied his arrangement. For example, in *De carne Christi*, the pattern of the treatise was: *exordium* (chapter 1), *narratio, partitio* and *reprehensio* (chapters 2-16), *amplificatio* (chapters 17-23) and *peroratio* (chapters 24-25). Therefore, Tertullian employed rhetorical arrangement, but not rigidly, adapting it for the purposes of each speech.

Tertullian was primarily concerned about the Christian Scriptures, and he recognized that classical rhetoric was an excellent vehicle of communication. About this aspect, Sider (1971, 21) wrote:

> In the theological treatises, Tertullian's proof is to a very great extent Biblical exposition, and in his exposition he conforms in a general way to the sequence of the canonical books. This offered the possibility of merging two 'canonical' books. This offered the possibility of merging two 'canonical' sequences, the Biblical and the rhetorical, and just how skilfully he was able to fuse the two traditions may be seen first in *De resurrectione mortuorum*.

In *De resurrectione mortuorum*, the proof is contained in chapters 29-51. Chapters 29-39 consist of a Biblical exposition of the Prophets and the Gospels, and is treated as *confirmatio*. The New Testament Epistles are expounded in chapters 40-51, which becomes the *refutatio* of his treatise. In this way, Tertullian united the Biblical and the rhetorical.

Generally speaking, the early Greek apologists were philosophically oriented, while the Latin apologists disdained, at least publicly, the use of philosophy. There was, however, considerable confusion about this matter. There was a trilogy of fields: philosophy, rhetoric and Biblical Christianity. During the first and second centuries, secular Romans largely rejected Greek philosophy while maintaining classical rhetoric. Thus, Tertullian (c.160/70-c.215/20) (*De Praescriptione* 7.9) declaimed: "What has Athens to do with Jerusalem? Or what has the Academy in common with the church?" Part of Tertullian's antipathy for Greek philosophy came from his Latinity. He was not, as is often assumed, using rhetoric to destroy rhetoric. He was using rhetoric to destroy philosophy as an enemy of Christianity. The remarks of Tertullian (*De Praescriptione* 7.9) were taken from the context of an attack upon Gnosticism, in which he displays considerable rhetorical skill:
Who are you, when and whence do you come?
What are you doing on my property belonging to me?
Who gives you the right, Marcion, to cut my timber?
Who gives you permission to divert my springs, Valentinus?
Whence your claim, Apelles, to remove any landmarks?...
The property belongs to me;
I have always posses it,
I have possessed it prior to you
and have reliable title-deeds from the actual owners to whom the estate belonged.
I am heir of the apostles.

Such rhetoric constituted Asianism, which bears strong resemblance to the ornate style of Gorgias. Therefore, Tertullian openly used rhetoric and distinguished it from philosophy. He elsewhere confirmed that his opposition is to philosophy: "[There is no common ground] between a philosopher and a Christian, between a disciple of Hellas and a disciple of Heaven" (Tertullian, Apology 46.18). However, he was often contradictory. In De Pallio, Tertullian (De Pallio 6.4) said that the humble pallium (philosopher's cloak) of the pagan philosopher is enobled once it donned by a Christian.

The pallium was donned by many of the Patristic fathers, either literally or metaphorically. Justin Martyr, an Apostolic Father, was one who continued to wear the pallium, as did Aristides of Athens and Heracles, even after the latter had become Bishop of Alexandria (Martyr 12). Other Patristic leaders, although not wearing the pallium, displayed a similar commitment both to philosophy and the Christian faith. Theophilus, a bishop of Antioch in the late second century, sought to balance each of the disciplines in the trilogy. His philosophy closely paralleled that of Aelius Aristides. Of his usage of rhetoric, Grant (1959, 37) wrote:

As in the writings of other early Christians, rhetoric and theology cannot so easily be separated. It is not that there is a theology underneath the rhetoric; it is instead that through and in the rhetoric the theology comes to expression.

Grant was effectively saying that the Patristic writers used rhetoric to help shape the external form and internal content of their theology. He wrote again of Theophilus: "His method is ... to use scripture in a rhetorical manner in order to construct a theology" (1959, 37).
Irenaeus (fl. c.175-c.195) was more subtle in the balance which he held between the three elements of the triangulation. Regarding philosophy, his attitude to it appeared to be ambiguous. He seems to be highly critical of it (Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* ii 14. 2; ii 33 2-4), while at the same time he could find Plato "More religious than Marcion" (*Adversus Haereses* iii 25.5; cf. Schoedel, 1959, 22). However, on closer examination, the two passages quoted against philosophy were, in reality, criticism of specific doctrines associated with individual philosophies. He did not hesitate to use philosophy for apologetic purposes. Regarding rhetoric, he appears to begin *Adversus Haereses* with a disclaimer as to his ability with its use (Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* i Praef. 3). Such a disclaimer, far from revealing lack of use of rhetoric, demonstrates his ability in its deployment. Many of the leading rhetorical teachers commended such a beginning (for example, Lysias xix 1.2; Isaeus x1; Hermogenes, *Peri Ideon* ii 6, 370; Schoedel, 1959 27). After his disclaimer, Irenaeus proceeded to employ classical arrangement, style, argumentation, *topoi* and Hermagorean *stasis* (*Adversus Haereses* 27-31, Grant, 1949, 47-51). In summary, Irenaeus displayed a slight leaning toward philosophy when used for apologetic purposes, adequate skill with rhetoric and an unwavering commitment to the Christian Scriptures.

A similar approach to Irenaeus is to be found in Cyprian (c.200/10-258), Bishop of Carthage. Cyprian, a Roman-oriented apologist, showed great dependence upon Tertullian. "His[Cyprian's] secretary reported later that no day went by when Cyprian did not ask for the reading of his Tertullian; he called him simply 'the teacher'” (von Camponhausen, 1964, 36). Cyprian, like Tertullian, began his career as a professor of rhetoric (von Camponhausen, 1964, 37, Hinchliff, 1974, 22). Nevertheless, Cyprian does not rise to the heights of oratory which were to be found in his teacher. It is noteworthy that in the age which immediately followed Cyprian that a strong Biblicism developed. This is evidenced when Cyprian's biographer was dismissive of the bishop's secular education: "although study and the literal arts had imbued his devout heart, I omit these, for as yet they brought him no advantage except in the world" (Pontius, *Life of Cyprian* 2). Thus, both philosophy and rhetoric were rejected in the Latin Church in North Africa in the age immediately following Cyprian. Notwithstanding, the Greek Church in Alexandria, which is also in North Africa, went to the opposite extreme and openly espoused both philosophy and rhetoric.

Origen (c.185-c.254) and his Alexandrian school sought to unite Greek philosophy and Christian thought. Rhetoric was utilized as a vehicle of persuasion, but it was not of primary interest to the Alexandrian theologians. The school was begun by
Pantaenus (c. 190) who was educated in Greek philosophy. His allegorical approach to hermeneutics was typically Alexandrian, being inherited from Philo and the Stoics. Pantaenus was succeeded by Clement (c.155-c.220) whom Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444) described as "a man admirably learned and skilful, and one that searched the depths of all learning of the Greeks, with an exactness rarely attained before" (The Ante-Nicene Fathers II.166). Clement used philosophy apologetically but also incorporated philosophical categories into his theology. He explained the significance which he saw in philosophy:

Philosophy was given to the Greeks directly till the Lord should call the Greeks also. For this was a schoolmaster to bring the Hellenic mind to Christ, as was the law to bring the Hebrews (Clement of Alexandria, Stromata I.5).

Clement's emphasis was developed and popularised by his successor, Origen.

Origen, as well as achieving distinction in philosophy, became the founder of expository preaching, that is, preaching that starts from and expounds a Biblical text (Brilioth, 1965, 23-25). He began his working career as a teacher of rhetoric and grammar (Broadus, 1889, 56). Later, he was to use this training in his daily homilies, the rhetoric providing the skill for his preaching and the grammar giving him techniques for his exegesis of the text. Notwithstanding, Origen’s best-known characteristic of preaching is his allegorization. He taught that God had placed three levels of meaning in the Christian Scriptures, which corresponded to the body, soul and spirit of a person (Origen, On First Principles 4.1.11). On the corporeal level, there is the literal meaning of the text; on the level of the soul, the moral truths of the text were obtained by a metaphorical approach; on the spiritual level, the theological principles could be discovered. Origen’s allegorical hermeneutic is forced and often fanciful. With his allegorical method possessing a philosophical basis, Origen in his homilies blended Scripture, philosophy and a little rhetoric.

Homilies of this period generally were of poorer quality and lacked the techniques of the Sophists. Smith (1974, 89) wrote of the level of the homilies, even of Athanasius who had received excellent rhetorical training:

The invertebrate products of preachers, like some of those of Athanasius, lacked real substance on occasion and appear today as sweet and insipid .... That Alexandrians could and would listen to them testifies to their superficial character and low taste.

The standard homily of the period, as is described of Origen, was totally lacking in arrangement: "He just takes clause after clause as they come, and remarks upon
them in succession” (Broadus, 1889, 56). The question arises as to why Origen ignored his rhetorical training. Origen, who held the Bible as the God-given book with supreme authority, preached his homilies in the same manner in which he wrote his commentaries, clause by clause. The authoritative text, because of Neo-Platonic ideology, was shaping the sermon. Nevertheless, not all sermons of this period rejected the rhetorical model.

Melito (second century), Bishop of Sardis, in the mid-second century, wrote The Homily on the Passion using the Grand Style of the First Sophistic. Grandiose Georgian figures abound. There are figures of language: anaphora, antithesis, paronomasia, homoioteleuton and simple parallelism, all of which were freely used throughout the homily. Tropes are also frequently employed: metaphor, simile and oxymoron (Bonner, 1940, 20-24). Melito displayed a similar usage of allegorization which was later to be found in the homilies of Origen. The Grand Style of Melito did not become normative, as the simple, unarranged style of Origen became the popular form of preaching until the rise of the notable preachers of the fourth century.

Fourth and Fifth Centuries: The Eastern Church Proposed an Answer

Before considering the great pulpit orators of the fourth century, attention must be drawn to the historian, Eusebius of Caesarea (c.265-c.339), 'The Father of Church History', who was trained in Origen's Caesarean school by Pamphilius (c.250-310). His Ecclesiastical History, his two apologies and his sermons, especially his two orations on Constantine, contributed considerably in the evolution of the relationship between philosophy, rhetoric and Christian theology.

Eusebius, after the 'Great Persecution' and the accession of Constantine (c.274/280-337), recognized in the battles of Constantine a new freedom and opportunity. He accepted the Hellenistic divine kingship ideology, with a new philosophy of history. This new philosophy of history incorporated a greater level of Greek philosophy, as seen in Eusebius' two apologies: Preparation of the Gospel and Proof of the Gospel.

In the Preparation of the Gospel, Eusebius sought to prove the harmony between Christianity and all that was best in Greco-Roman culture. Eusebius used rhetorical arrangement in his treatise, beginning with a confirmatio and then proceeding to a refutatio. The Preparation of the Gospel argues that Christianity, far from being
apostate from Greek and Jewish religion, is identified with the Hebrew patriarchs. Moving from religion to philosophy, Eusebius argued that Plato derived his philosophy from the Hebrews. This accounts for the essential unity between Platonic philosophy and the Christian faith.

Whereas the *Preparation of the Gospel* considered the relationship between Christianity and Greco-Roman religion and culture, the *Proof of the Gospel* concentrates on the relationship between Christianity and Jewish religion and culture. In the *Proof of the Gospel*, Eusebius answered Porphyry’s charge that Christianity is an apostate Jewish religion. He argued that the New Testament is the fulfillment of the prophecies of the Old Testament, and thereby supersedes the old revelation.

Eusebius' presuppositions were that reason and revelation are compatible. The Greek philosophic tradition ‘originated’ in the Biblical revelation of the Old Testament. The Christian faith is superior to Greek philosophy and Jewish law. As the fulfillment of both, it can draw upon their resources. Such an approach assisted in the integration of philosophy, rhetoric and Christian theology. An expression of that integration may be observed in Eusebius' two quinquennalia orations.

Eusebius' oration, the *Panegyric to Constantine* (*Oratio de laudibus Constantini*), is of an epideictic form, celebrating the quinquennalia of the Caesars. Eusebius (*Penegyric to Constantine*. Prologue 1) began the oration stating that he was not approaching the panegyric as would a Sophist: "I have not come before you with idle stories, with verbal nets spun from silken words that I may beguile your ears with Siren song." The church historian proceeded to praise the God-like character and deeds of the Christian emperor. The panegyric utilizes the terminology of Green philosophy to justify a Christian empire and the suppression of paganism. (Barnes, 1981, 254). Eusebius (*Penegyric to Constantine* II, XI) compared Constantine with none other than Christ himself. The concept of the monarchy reflecting the divine order is distinctly Platonic. A similar approach is taken in the second of Eusebius’ quinquennalia orations, although the content takes a different format.

*The Life of Constantine* (*De vita constantini*) is an encomium celebrating the victory of Constantine over the pagan forces. Unlike the usual encomia which catalogued
the military triumphs, Eusebius praised the piety of the Emperor. The Emperor was lauded for his opposition to paganism, his church-building program, and his support of responsible Christian doctrine. Following encomiastic practice, Constantine was recognized as excelling all earlier Roman rulers, comparing only with Cyrus and Alexander. He was the new Moses: the destroyer of God's enemies, and the law-giver of God's people. Eusebius constantly moved between the heavenly and earthly Sovereigns, creating the impression that the earthly kingdom is a Platonic 'form' of the heavenly. The Christian Empire under Constantine was an earthly reflection of God's heavenly kingdom. The Platonic system of forms had been united with the Christian system, and describes in an openly rhetorical presentation. Therefore, in Eusebius of Caesarea the relationship between philosophy, rhetoric and Christian faith attained a zenith.

In the fourth and fifth centuries, there was a revival of preaching. Six pulpit orators lifted preaching to the highest level it was to achieve in the Patristic Age: Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, John Chrysostom, Ambrose and Augustine. All six enjoyed the highest level of rhetorical training which the secular world could provide (Dargin, 1922, 50). Consequently, the nature of the homily changed to add the rhetorical dimension. From this perspective, it is instructive to look at Cicero's comments about 'conversation' (sermo). The Latin, sermo is equivalent to the Greek ἡμιλαία. The Christian homily had taken on conversational style up to the fourth century. Of conversation, Cicero (De Officiis 1.132) had earlier written:

> There are rules for oratory laid down for rhetoricians; there are none for sermo; and yet I do not know why there should not be .... The same rules that we have for words and sentences in rhetoric will apply also to sermo.

The homily (sermo) was lifted by the pulpit orators of the fourth and fifth centuries from its simple and unstructured form and shaped by classical rhetoric into a much more effective form of Christian communication. Paradoxically, the change took place through Christian leaders who were prepared for their task by the uncompromising pagan rhetorician, Libanius (314-c.394).

---

3 If Eunapius of Sardis is correct, Constantine was guilty of immorality, brutality, prevarication and profligacy (Zosimus 2.7.2; 8.2; 29.2-3; 18.1; 28.2; 30.1, 32-34, 38.). However, Zosimus, the source of Eunapius' words, has proved to be so inaccurate historically, that little credibility can be placed on his and "Eunapius"' charges. This does not mean, nevertheless, that Eusebius was not utilising rhetorical coloures.
Libanius was the rhetorical teacher of such Christian leaders as Theodore of Mopseustia (c.350-428) (Florovsky, 1987, V.194), Maximus (c.380-c.468) Kennedy, 1983, 241), John Chrysostom (c.349-407) (Ulback, 1938, 329), Basil the Great (c.329-379) and Gregory of Nazianzus (330-c.395) (Socrates, 4.26; Sozomen, 16.16). Gregory of Nazianzus and Basil the Great influenced Gregory of Nyssa (330-c.395) (Basil's brother, who later became a teacher of rhetoric), Jerome (c.345-c.419) (Barnes, 1981, 251) and Ambrose (c.339-397) (Kennedy, 1980, 147). Ambrose became a model for Augustine (354-430). Gregory of Nyssa, who studied Libanius' works, considered him to be the supreme living representative of classical Greek culture (Von Camperhausen, 1963, 117). It was Libanius' love of ancient Greece which caused him to adopt a strong Atticist position in his rhetoric. Through Libanius, Atticism became the stylistic method of the three Cappadocians and Chrysostom, even though the flamboyant Asianism had been the characteristic style of the Second Sophistic in Asia. Therefore, the three Cappadocians played a significant role in fourth century oratory, with Gregory of Nazianzus being the most influential.

Gregory of Nazianzus, in his struggles between the life as a priest and as a hermit, helped the church to proceed further in its relationship with rhetoric and philosophy. Kennedy (1983, 215) stated:

The most important figure in the synthesis of classical rhetoric and Christianity is Gregory of Nazianzus, whose speeches became the preeminent model for Christian eloquence throughout the Byzantine period.

Kennedy's statement is probably a little strong because Augustine's contribution was comparable. Gregory had studied, together with his friend Basil, in Palestinian Caesarea, Alexandria and Athens. At Caesarea, he was strongly influenced by Christian Neo-Platonism and rhetoric. There he also learned theology and Biblical exegesis, which were deeply influenced by monasticism, which had Neo-platonic and Cynic underpinnings. Athens provided ten years of training under such notable Sophists as Himerius and the Christian Prohaeresius,4 followed by Libanius in Antioch (Socrates, 4.26, Sozomen, 16.16). Gregory's objective in his studies was to use rhetoric in Christian service (Gregory of Nazianzus, Carmen de vita sua II. 113-14). However, after rejecting the requests to remain as a teacher in Athens, he left, briefly became a teacher of rhetoric in Cappadocia and then renounced rhetoric for

---

4 Prohaeresius is known in Christian literature as a Christian. However, Philostratus considered that Prohaeresius' rhetorical excesses revealed an arrogant, pompous man (Philostratus, Lives of the Sophists).
the life of a hermit (\textit{Carmen de vita sua} II. 270-03). Gregory's subsequent life saw him torn constantly between monasticism (to him, 'philosophy') and rhetoric.

In Gregory of Nazianzus, the tension between monasticism and the priesthood, was metaphoric of the larger struggle of the church between being influenced by the world and influencing the world. Such a dialectic was at the heart of the dilemma which Christians had with both rhetoric and philosophy. This explanation has been raised Rosemary Radford Ruether to account for the contradictions in Gregory and other Christians of the Patristic Age. Ruether identified Gregory's strong commitment to both rhetoric and philosophy. In rhetoric, for example, Gregory's use of figures of language and tropes were comparable to the writings of Gorgias, and were continued throughout a literary output scarcely rivaled in the ancient world. His figures of thought compare with those of Demosthenes. But nevertheless, Gregory (\textit{Oration} II; 21.12; 27.8) is generally critical of rhetoric and philosophy. To explain such inconsistencies, Ruether (1969, 147 ff) reverted to the second century when the church moved from a Jewish to a Hellenistic milieu. Then Christians taught that the Hellenistic world, which was hostile to God, would be eschatologically swept away and the Kingdom of God established on earth. Nevertheless, from another perspective, the Christian church wished to convert the Hellenistic world, and that could only be achieved with Hellenistic culture and eloquence. As Christian's rejection of culture made them appear boorish, the Hellenistic world could not be changed without recourse to philosophy and rhetoric. Moving then to the fourth century, Ruether (1969 158) wrote: "The tension between these two polarities is nowhere better illustrated than in the writings of Gregory of Nazianzus." His anticultural criticism of rhetoric stands, consequently, in contrast to the rhetoric, classical literature and philosophy which filled his writings. His ultimate conclusion regarding the use of rhetoric in preaching was significant: "Rhetoric must be plucked from its native value system and transferred into the Christian value system" (Ruether, 1969, 166). He similarly utilized the profitable insights of philosophy: "Gregory manages to claim for Christianity the whole substance of Greek philosophy" (Ruether, 1969, 172). Accordingly, both rhetoric and philosophy became subsumed into the Christian system. Because of this, both rhetoric and philosophy were incorporated into the Christian thought-forms. This process of internalization has been observed in Gregory by others. Ruether (1969, 55) referred to Marcel Guignet's study of Gregory: "His conclusion [is] that not only Gregory's language but also his habits of thought are much under the influence of sophistic education." Ruether's (1969, 156) own judgment is: "In his use of stylistic devices, the structure of his language, the motifs which govern much of his thought, ... Gregory was thoroughly imbued with contemporary sophistic culture." Therefore, as the writings of Gregory of Nazianzus formed much of the canon of Byzantine rhetoric
which entered the medieval age, classical rhetoric can be seen to have helped to shape both the form and the content of the Christian message. This was also true of the other leading preacher of the Greek church of the fourth century, Chrysostom.

John, the 'golden-mouthed' orator from Antioch, was one of the most far-reaching influences in the Eastern Church's acceptance of rhetoric. Chrysostom had been taught classical Attic rhetoric by Libanius and Neo-platonic philosophy by Andragathius. He became the master of Attic oratory. John would have learned the Greek oratorical masters from Libanius, as this was the teacher's main emphasis. Libanius was the greatest rhetorician of his age and had taught in Athens and Constantinople before returning to his home city of Antioch. When the pagan rhetorical teacher was dying, he was asked who could be worthy to succeed him as teacher of his school. He replied, 'John, if the Christians had not stolen him from us'.

After graduating, John became a lawyer. The influence of his close friend, Basil (to be distinguished from Basil the Great) attracted him to the ascetic life. After baptism, he was prevented from entering life in a monastery by the pleas of his Christian mother, Anthusa, who had sacrificed much for his education. John remained in Antioch where he studied, along with Theodore of Mopsuestia, under Diodorus (d. before 394), the founder of the Antiochian school of theology. From Diodorus, Chrysostom learned the literal interpretation of the Bible, which later was to play such an important part in his common sense approach in preaching, which increased his popularity among the general populace. After his theological training, with little experience, Chrysostom wrote De Sacerdotio ('On the Priesthood'), when he was only about twenty-eight years old.

_De Sacerdotio_ was composed in the form of a Platonic dialogue between Chrysostom and his friend, Basil. It represents the first known attempt to write a book on pastoral theology. As it was probably written before John's ordination, _De Sacerdotio_ suffers in comparison with a companion volume, _De Doctrina Christiana_ which represented the mature thinking of Augustine, written not long before his death. The first half of Book 5 is the section of the book which most relates to Christian preaching. The modern public has been conditioned to be entertained through their constant exposure to sport, the theatre and music. The Christian preacher, to compete for the populace's attention, must work hard to ensure that he preaches well (_De Sacerdotio_ V.1). The whole treatise appears to presume that it was legitimate to use classical rhetoric for Christian preaching, but the subject is not
broached. The preacher was given no practical advice as to how to preach, as the priest was offered no suggestions as to how to provide pastoral care. *De Sacerdotio* is the idealistic product of an inexperienced young priest-to-be who presumed to have answers to the problems of the priesthood.

While Chrysostom regarded rhetoric as a necessary discipline in the training of a preacher, he was critical of the Sophists' pride and their desire to be admired (Chrysostom, *Homily* 3.3). He himself mastered rhetorical technique to such an extent that he has been compared with Demosthenes. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (cited in Goodall, 1971, 1) wrote of him:

In the homilies... pure Attic Greek dominates everywhere. In the great orations ... the musical periods roll out, the embellishment grows even richer, but never is there any clatter of rhyme or cadence.

Chrysostomus Baur (1986, I.2.223) wrote of his namesake's preaching style:

His eloquence is striking above all, because of the wonderful symmetry and harmony of language, splendid riches of colour, and intuitive art of building up images and comparisons, dazzling efficiency in the balancing of arguments and magnificent climaxes; but above all an often overpowering and involved fullness of thought, of images and tones, rich, keen and bold fantasies, an outstanding memory and brilliant facility of expression.

Unlike Gregory of Nazianzus, whose style was Gorgianian with its impressive figures of language and tropes, Chrysostom's style was closer to that of Lysias and Demosthenes and displayed a full measure of tropes and figures of thought (Baur, 1986, I.2.223-24). Even so, to modern ears, Chrysostom's style appears to tend to excess on occasions (Kennedy, 1983, 249), with florid diction and over-ornamentation. But such occasions were rare, as his style was generally 'lucid, strong and natural' (Ulback, 1938, 339). He sought constantly to appeal to the common person.

John's approach differed from the Cappadocian bishops of orthodoxy, in his open acceptance of rhetoric as a vehicle for the Christian message (Chrysostom, *De Sacerdotio* 5.2,3,5). In consequence, his emphasis was on the amalgamation of literal Antiochene exegesis with simple Attic rhetoric. In contrast, philosophy was virtually ignored. John saw Plato as being removed "not by means of another philosopher of more skill, but by an unlearned fisherman" (Chrysostom, *I Corinthians* 4.4). Thus, Hubbell (1924, 261), in his summary of Chrysostom's contribution noted:
It has almost become a truism of modern scholarship that Christianity ... had derived fully as much from the pagan thought and culture which surrounded the early church as from the Jewish religion out of which it ostensibly sprang.

Hubbell, like Ruether, recognized that the open espousal of the rhetorical method was necessitated by the desire to communicate to educated Hellenistic world in a culturally-appropriate manner. He added: "We may therefore wonder, not that Christian preaching finally fell prey to the Greek passion for oratorical display, but that it held out so long against it" (Hubbell, 1924, 262). Similar factors, which had lead to the East's capitulation to the rhetorical method as a vehicle of the Biblical kerygma, were also operative in the West.

**Fourth and Fifth Centuries: The Western Church Proposed an Answer**

In the West, four notable contributions were made, in late antiquity, to the continuing debate between Christianity, rhetoric and philosophy. A synthesis between these three disciplines was developed by the North African, Lactantius. As a former tutor of rhetoric of Constantine's son, Crispus, Lactantius was concerned that the educated and aristocratic of the Empire be converted to Christianity. He wrote a seven volume apology for the Christian faith which, following the baptism of Constantine, achieved much of its goal (Kennedy, 1980, 148-49). The volumes, *Divinae Institutiones*, were a rhetorical expression of the Christian faith with a philosophical, rather than Biblical, orientation. As such, it was a contrast to the reluctant fusion of Christianity, rhetoric and philosophy found in the Cappadocians, which was focused on Biblical language and concepts. The Biblical content remained pivotal in the three other Latin fathers: Ambrose, Jerome and Augustine.

Ambrose, Jerome and Augustine were strongly committed to the Biblical aspect of Christianity, but Jerome and Augustine rose above their earlier criticism of rhetoric to achieve syntheses of rhetoric and Biblical teaching. Similarly in their attitude to philosophy, Jerome and Augustine differed from Ambrose. Ambrose, in about 386, became Neoplatonic in philosophy. Jerome and Augustine, however, were very cautious of philosophy. Augustine's objection to philosophy, as Ernest L. Fortin (1974, 94) points out, was not fundamentally that he could not recognize points of agreement or that he purposed to criticize matters of disagreement. Augustine's concern was that a philosopher can never be content that absolute truth is attainable. Fortin (1974, 94) therefore wrote: "It is precisely this radical character of philosophy ... that constitutes the ultimate challenge to the Christian faith."
Nevertheless, it was in the area of rhetoric's relationship to Christian preaching where all three Latin leaders made their main contributions to the debate.

Ambrose and his convert Augustine had both been teachers of rhetoric, and Jerome had been a student of the famous grammarian, Donatus. All were Asianist. Ambrose had been so famed for his oratory that his biographer, Paulinus, included elements of aretalogy into his *Life of St. Ambrose*. When Ambrose was a baby, a swarm of bees entered his mouth, and his father recognized it as a sign of the baby's future greatness (Paulinus 2.3). Indeed, he became a great orator in the pulpit. Through Ambrose's life, notwithstanding, he remained ambivalent to rhetoric. Although he used it masterfully, he was critical of its use. Both Jerome and Augustine went through a stage of being opposed to rhetoric, and both developed similar syntheses of rhetoric and Christianity.

Jerome’s reluctance to use rhetoric came from a vivid experience. On one occasion, he was so torn between his sense of calling by God and his love of the classics that his health deteriorated. Virtually on his deathbed, he dreamed (Jerome considered it to be a vision in real life) that he was before God in judgment. When God asked of his calling, Jerome replied, "I am a Christian". God answered, "You lie. You are a Ciceronian, not a Christian" (Jerome, *Epistle* 22). When Jerome recovered, he considered that any return to his books would be a denial of his calling.

Jerome, in later life, came to realize how rhetoric could be used in preaching. For twelve years he had remained true to his vow (Oberhelman, 1991, 65). Jerome’s change of mind came through his perception that Biblical leaders, from Moses to Paul, exploited the secular learning of their age. He argued that beautiful non-Jewish women captured in war could be received into Israel when all ‘heathen’ elements (such as long hair and uncut fingernails) had been removed (Deuteronomy 21:10-13). Jerome (*Epistle* 70) interpreted the passage allegorically to mean that rhetoric could be used for Christian communication when its non-Christian presuppositions have been discarded. A very similar perspective was developed by Augustine.

Augustine conceived of classical rhetoric as "gold from Egypt." When the Israelites left Egypt under Moses, they asked the Egyptians for gold. Later, this gold was to be used in the most sacred place of all for the service of God. Gold is gold, whether it is Egyptian gold or not (Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana* II.28; cf. Hesselgrave,
1976). Similarly, as Augustine explained his allegory, truth is truth, whether or not it comes from the 'pagan' world. It may be used to serve God, even in the very sacred responsibility of carrying the Christian kerygma. What Augustine was effectively doing was treating rhetoric as a methodology alone, as did Jerome. It was Aristotle's approach that rhetoric, like mathematics, possessed of itself no philosophical or ethical content. This is the presupposition of De Doctrina Christiana.

De Doctrina Christiana was written to provide the essential link between secular rhetoric and Christian preaching. De Doctrina Christiana was not planned, however, to be a textbook of Christian rhetoric, as Augustine strongly affirms at the beginning of the Book 4 (De Doctrina Christiana IV.1.2):

In the first place, then, I wish.... to put a stop to the expectations of readers who may think that I am about to lay down the rules of rhetoric such as I have learnt, and taught too, in the secular schools ... Not that I think such rules of no use, but that whatever use they have is to be learnt elsewhere.

His treatise was written to describe how secular rhetoric could be used within a Christian Weltanschauung and philosophy of ministry.

De Doctrina Christiana consists of two parts: "the mode of ascertaining the proper meaning and the mode of making known the meaning when it is ascertained" (De Doctrina Christiana I.1.1). The modus inveniendi (way of discovering) is contained in books 1-3, while the modus proferendi (way of expressing) forms the content of book 4. Accordingly, Augustine was adhering to the overall outline of Aristotle's Rhetoric which prioritized invention (and hence content over arrangement, style and delivery).

Books 1-3 are rarely considered to relate to Christian preaching, but, as has already been recognized, Augustine follows Aristotle in emphasizing the need for adequate content for an oration/sermon. Rhetoric is not an art for art's sake, but is a means of moving listeners to the truth. In this respect, Augustine was close to Plato. The North African theologian considered that Aristotle, Hermogenes and Hermogoras can provide the technical apparatus which will enable the preacher to 'invent' his arguments. In the first three books, he provided a theological context and a hermeneutical methodology to enable invention to proceed within a Christian Weltanschauung.
In Book 1, Augustine explored the theological presuppositions upon which Christian preaching was based. The ground upon which all other theological presuppositions is built in the person of God. He is the τέλος upon which our goodness and happiness depend. However, our sins prevent our enjoyment of him, and these need to be remitted through the death, resurrection and ascension of Christ. For Christians, love is the fulfillment of all Scripture, and, for Augustine, the Scripture replaces Virgin, Livy, Tacitus and Ovid as the basis of the topoi used in invention (Hill, 1960, 591).

Books 2 and 3 consider the importance of signs in Christian preaching. Augustine's understanding of a sign is not to be confused with Aristotle's, namely as a method of proof. The functional definition which Augustine (De Doctrina Christiana II.1.1) gives to a sign was: "A sign is a thing which causes us to think of something beyond the impression the thing itself makes upon the senses." Such a definition is close to that of Ferdinand de Saussure. He conceived signification to be the relationship between the mental image of a signifier (a word, spoken or read) and the mental image of a signified (an object or concept). The main difference between the two approaches is that the signifier to Augustine is concrete while, to Saussure (1959, 27), it is a mental image. Effectively, the difference means that Saussure opens the door to non-referentiality, which is a distinctive of reader-response theology. Augustine remained within the tradition of orthodoxy. Secondly, Saussure was basically concerned, as a linguist, with the spoken or written word, but Augustine perceived a wider dynamic within the communication event. Communication occurs with flags, trumpets, body language and symbolic actions (De Doctrina Christiana II.3.4).

There are two different types of signs, in Augustine's system: signs naturalia (natural signs) and signa data (intentional signs). Signa naturalia are 'those which, apart from any intention or desire of using them as signs, do yet lead to the knowledge of something else, as, for example, smoke when it indicates fire' (De Doctrina Christiana II.1.2). Signa data, the only signs which Augustine studies in the book, are those signs where a human being, for example, desires intentionally to communicate with another (De Doctrina Christiana II.1.2). In Book 2, he provided hermeneutical principles by which to discover the meaning of 'unknown' signs, with a specific reference to studying the Scriptures for sermon preparation. Augustine (De Doctrina Christiana II.11.16) commended, for example, a study of Hebrew and Greek in order to understand the meaning of a text. In Book 3, ambiguous signs are considered. Augustine gave special attention to discerning when to use literal interpretation and when figurative (i.e. allegorization). This distinction became linked
with an Augustinian hermeneutical principle that no interpretation can be true which
does not promote the love of God and the love of humanity. Hence, the destruction
of the Canaanites by the Israelites needs to be interpreted allegorically. It may be
noted that such moral dilemmas in the Bible were the last hurdle for Augustine to
cross before his conversion, when Ambrose commended this principle of
allegorization. Having provided, therefore, the theological assumptions and relevant
hermeneutical principles behind the theory of preaching, Augustine proceeded to
consider style and delivery in Book 4.

Book 4 of *De Doctrina Christiana* related the rhetorical theories of Cicero to the
Christian preacher. Firstly, Augustine distinguished between *sapientia* (divine
wisdom) and *eloquentia* (human wisdom in its best expression). Ker (1888, 106;
cf. Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana* IV.5.7-7.21) summarized the Bishop of
Hippo's viewpoint: "*Sapientia* without *eloquentia* will do good; *eloquentia* without
*sapientia* will do no good, but will often do harm; but the union of *sapien\n\textit{tia* with *eloquentia* must be our ideal." Books 1-3 have considered *sapientia*. However, Book
4 is not merely about *eloquentia*, but how to unite *sapientia* and *eloquentia*. Thus
Patton (1977, 100) recognized the two stages of exegesis in Augustine: the
explicative stage and the communicative stage.

Augustine, in the communicative stage, considered the Scripture as help, not only
in supplying content for the sermon, but also in providing models of communicative
style. Such a conviction reveals the complete change of opinion of one who, in his
pre-conversion days, felt only contempt for the plain style of the Bible and its lack of
harmonies. He now promoted preachers such as Paul and Amos as models for
Christian oratory (Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana* IV.7.11-21). Immediately after
this advice, the influence of Cicero is evident.

Professor Harald Hagendahl (cited in Fortin, 1974, 86) argued:

[Augustine] follows.... Cicero’s views so closely often even to the minutest particulars, that it
cannot make a substantial claim to novelty and originality ....[except] at most ... a slight
modification on this or that point (cited in Fortin, 1974, 86).

Fortin (1974, 100) is of a different opinion, recognizing in *De Doctrina Christiana*, "a
profound albeit silent transformation of Cicero’s basic teaching." But, Fortin does not
describe Augustine’s subtle reorientation of Cicero to make his communication
subservient to Scripture.
The 'great orator', as Augustine calls Cicero, taught that an eloquent person should speak 'to teach, to delight and to persuade' (Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana* IV.12.27). Augustine then innovatively combined the three ends of oratory with the three styles:

He is therefore eloquent who, in order to teach can speak of small things in a subdued manner; and in order to please, can speak of moderate things in a temperate manner; and in order to persuade, can speak of great things in a grand manner (*De Doctrina Christiana* IV.17.34).

The three styles are to be used for different occasions and audiences as is required, the colloqual subdued style, the splendid middle style, and the vehement grand style (*De Doctrina Christiana* IV.19.38; 28.61). Augustine recommended using all three styles in the same messages, thereby providing variety. It was Augustine's goal to teach in a pleasing manner that the audience would actively respond. The basis of such an approach to rhetoric was the use of the Scripture both for content and for rhetorical model. As Murphy (1960, 409) concluded: "Augustine ... used *De Doctrina* to urge the union of both matter and form in Christian preaching."

Oberhelman (1991, 115) observed: "Augustine revolutionizes rhetoric in the final book [of *De Doctrina Christiana*], for while he seems to restore the classical ideal of "res et verba", he does so in a functionalist and Christian theoretical framework." Nonetheless, rhetoric was not utilized for Christian service for the purposes of *utilitas*: "Such learning must serve as a means to an end, to turn the mind to God" (Roberts, cited in Oberhelman, 1991, 115). With this approach, Augustine moved closer to Plato than Aristotle. Plato had insisted that rhetoric was to be used only for the purpose of achieving the good. Consequently, if rhetoric may be used with impunity, to be a vehicle of the kerygma, as argued by Jerome, Augustine and, as has been seen in the Eastern Church, Chrysostom, then the scruples of the earlier Patristic Fathers had been overcome. Rhetoric now could become an integral part of Christian preaching.

**Contemporary Behavioral Science Proposed an Answer: Technical Eclecticism**

In more recent years, a parallel problem to that faced by Christian practitioners has been also experienced by secular psychotherapists. There are over 240 psychotherapies listed by Corsini (1981). These psychotherapies often have conflicting theories upon which their practice is based (Corey, 1991). However,
their practices are being employed by the same therapist, depending upon the client and her/his problem. Norcross (1986, ix) observed: "The psychotherapy Zeitgeist of the 1980s is rapprochement, convergence, and integration." For many, there is a "haphazard picking of techniques without any overall theoretical rationale. In this brand of ‘sloppy’ eclecticism the practitioner grabs anything that seems to work" (Corey, 1991, 426). Most psychotherapists used a sheaf of psychotherapies with considerable success, although the psychotherapists had disagreed with many of the conflicting philosophical theories upon which the counseling techniques were based.

An answer to this problem is found in the multimodal therapy of Arnold Lazarus. Lazarus proposes that useful techniques may be divorced from their philosophical origins by utilizing a model termed 'technical eclecticism' (Lazarus, 1987). In this model, the practitioner may employ such techniques that have been considered effective in dealing with specific problems, without necessarily agreeing with their philosophy of origin. The philosophy of the introduced discipline, however, must be amenable with the practitioner's philosophy. Thus, this model differs from the eclecticism of Wagner in that Wagner was willing to use all methodologies that worked, ignoring their philosophical foundations.

For the Christian, the model of technical eclecticism provides a foundation for using social scientific methodologies in Christian ministry. The techniques may readily be used, provided they are severed from the philosophies of their origins and conditional to their use being appropriate within a Christian worldview. Using a gardening image, the grafted branch had to be appropriate to the stock for the grafted branch to 'take.' Consequently, disciplines such as Christian education can appropriate methodologies such as those based on behaviorism, if those methodologies are consistent with Christian faith and ethics. If a methodology would create a doctrinal or ethical difficulty, it cannot be used with integrity in Christian ministry.

The use of technical eclecticism as an approach for testing ministry methodologies would probably have little effect upon present Christian practitioners. Most leaders in the ministry fields are fully cognizant of the methodologies they have appropriated. These leaders are often trained theologically to understand the issues involved in the use of their preferred methodologies. Such Christian practitioners would generally not compromise their Christian convictions to serve the Lord Jesus Christ.
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