of a writer into a new direction. According to Doble, "... Luke's retelling of Jesus' passion was pulled into a variant orbit by Wisdom's model" (p. 193). This influence is detectable obliquely through the presence of fundamental patterns and certain words. Doble employs a carefully considered set of criteria, outlined on pp. 194-5, to assess such references; and he identifies Wisdom allusions in the testing of Jesus (22:28-29), Jesus' demeanor in the face of death, the Sanhedrin's decision (22:66-71), the motif of entrapment, Jesus' ἔξοδος in Jerusalem (9:31), and the Lukan theme of ignorance and guilt.

Doble concludes by discussing the issue of a Lukan theologia crucis. He finds that Luke used the distinctive concept from Wisdom of the persecuted δίκαιος to deal with the problematic issue of Jesus' death. With this model in mind, Luke demonstrates to his audience that Jesus' passion and death was not meaningless but was according to scriptures and a key event in God's history of salvation for his people. Although Judaism had little discussion of a suffering messiah, the idea of a suffering righteous person was known through Wisdom literature. According to Doble, Luke sees the death of Jesus as the final fulfillment of this δίκαιος-model. Although Luke's concept differs from the idea of Christ's atonement found in Paul, Jesus' death is presented in Luke-Acts as a significant event. Furthermore, in the Wisdom tradition, the δίκαιος was vindicated by God through resurrection, and this feature also is useful to Luke as he asserts the glorification of Jesus and encourages his audience to emulate Jesus' teachings and life.

Doble offers a useful and very thorough review of scholarship on Luke's theologia crucis and elements in Luke 23:46-47. His arguments are detailed and well-stated, and his methodology for deriving word meanings using semantic criteria is sound. Doble's proofs regarding the influence of The Wisdom of Solomon on Luke are not iron-clad but they are persuasive. He realistically notes that the δίκαιος model is but one of the many concepts Luke employs in his christology. Doble is in dialogue, sometimes critique, with a wide variety of New Testament translators, commentators, and scholars. He makes a strong case for re-opening the "closed" case of how δίκαιος should be translated at Luke 23:47, and his book should be read by those engaged in translation and commentary. The book contains an extensive bibliography and helpful indices of Biblical references and authors. One caveat: Doble (pp. 114, 159) relies too heavily on Jeremias' portrait of first-century Pharisees. Doble, following Jeremias, characterizes the Pharisees as a powerful and respected group in Judaism, one which despised the am ha'aretz for their lack of rigour regarding Torah-observance. The role of Pharisees within first-century Judaism and their attitude towards other Jews is more complex than this simple assessment, as many scholars (e.g., Jacob Neusner and E.P. Sanders) have noted. This caution aside, Doble's book is a closely argued presentation of a subtle aspect of Lukan christology.

Steven Muir


How might a first-century professor in rhetoric have looked at Paul's letters? This is the question Dean Anderson attempts to answer in his recently defended dissertation. Before studying theology in Canada and then going to the Netherlands for research, Anderson studied classical languages and literature in New Zealand. In this lucidly written book Anderson proves himself to be very capable of writing
a book on the question—hotly debated today—of the relationship between Graeco-Roman rhetoric and the Pauline Corpus. No one interested in this field can ignore this monograph.

Anderson’s dissertation first offers an assessment of the proper sources for the use of ancient rhetorical theory for the interpretation of the Pauline letters. After a careful evaluation of a broad range of possible rhetorical sources, Anderson selects only a very few relevant sources, e.g., the Rhetorica ad Herennium and the writings of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Anderson takes conformity to typical Hellenistic rhetoric taught in schools as his standard. This means that parts of Theron’s προσημασία are relevant but not Aristotle’s Rhetoric, a work very rarely used in the Hellenistic era (but popular among New Testament scholars).

Next, Anderson deals with the relation of rhetoric to epistolography. He follows many of the arguments advanced by Stanley Porter in The Theoretical Justification for Application of Rhetorical Categories to Pauline Epistolary Literature (JSNTSS 90, pp. 100-122). Both Anderson and Porter are critical of applying rhetorical genres to epistles. Anderson, however, further researches the question by pointing to some ancient letters with a clear rhetorical character (although not showing signs of a standard dispositio). H.-D. Betz’s thesis of the “genre of the apologetic letter” is heavily criticized. Anderson suggests that Betz would have done well to compare Galatians with Ep. 2 of Demosthenes. The latter is an example of a letter that combines deliberative and apologetic characteristics.

Anderson’s own reading of Galatians (through the eyes of a contemporary professor of rhetoric) leads, e.g., to the following results: Galatians 1:1-5:12—the parenthetic section is left out—is essentially a letter of rebuke (ἐπιμημητικός τύπος). In this rebuke Paul ignores much of the advice given by ancient theorists of rhetoric. Gal. 1:11ff. is not a narratio as described by the theorists of rhetoric but a narrative excursion with an apologetic character. One may compare the fifth speech of Demosthenes or the fortieth speech of Dio Chrysostom. Anderson’s approach to Peter’s speech (2:14b-21) as an ἔγγραφος λόγος, whereby Paul softens his direct rebuke to Peter is novel. He views the Hagari story as essentially sarcastic. As far as I know, this is an original thesis which deserves further study. Anderson concludes that the “professor of ancient rhetoric” would certainly not have regarded Galatians as a judicial nor as a deliberative speech. A standard dispositio of a judicial speech cannot be found. Paul would probably have been regarded as a kind of philosopher who rebukes his pupils through the medium of a letter. In some respects however Galatians does conform to rhetorical theory. The ἐπιλογος (4:12-5:12) conforms to the advice of the theorists in so far as we find a fitting use of pathos here. As regards style, the “professor” would have noticed the lack of extended periods as well as the use of several artificial rhetorical figures. Anderson suggests that in this respect Paul’s style breathes the language popular among the more or less educated masses of his day.

Anderson’s analysis of Romans is shorter. In this letter Anderson sees a shift from persuasive argument (chapters 1-5) to teaching and exhortation (chs. 6ff.): “The lack of sustained argumentation severely limits the applicability of rhetorical theory to these chapters” (205). Our “professor of rhetoric” probably would have regarded Romans as a kind of philosophical thesis. Furthermore he would almost certainly have complained about the lack of σαφήνεια (clarity): In Romans “Paul’s Greek is more than often annoyingly ambiguous” (215).

The last epistle Anderson analyses is 1 Corinthians. For the most part this chapter reads like a challenge to M. Mitchell’s Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation. According to Mitchell, 1 Corinthians is cast in the form of a deliberative speech on unity. Anderson’s analysis, however, reveals some weak points in Mitchell’s use of classical sources which severely affect her thesis. Anderson decides to forego a rhetorical analysis of 1 Corinthians: “It is, of course, possible to comment upon