scholarship on this topic; she claims that “the Christian depiction of Pharisaism as a fraternity of men and of synagogue worship is tantamount to Judaism becoming a surrogate for particular Christian desires”.
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Scholarly consensus maintains that 2 Corinthians is a conglomeration of letters due to its literary and logistical inconsistencies. However, a new consensus is emerging of which Long’s monograph is but one of the voices. Already on the first page, Long introduces the objective of his monograph (originally a doctoral dissertation, p xv) namely, that “if 2 Corinthians is not understood as a unity, an ambiguity arises concerning how the church can adequately appropriate this composite letter in its final form …”. On form-critical grounds, Long relied on what Young and Ford already argued in 1987: “... to try and establish the unity of 2 Corinthians as an apologetic letter.” From page 98 he discusses the kind of letter 2 Corinthians is and finally reaches the conclusion on p.101 that “Paul has composed an official apologetic letter.” According to him Paul responded to damaging charges about his methods and growing suspicions about his motivations. Therefore, he constructed an official apologetic letter.

For Long “The best way to argue conclusively for the letter’s unity … must be within the discipline of ancient rhetorical criticism and involve a rigorous genre analysis of the letter” (10). To address this, Long places the text within the context of Classical literary and rhetorical conventions. He argues for its unity based upon numerous parallels with ancient apology in the tradition of Andocides, Socrates, Isocrates, and Demosthenes. He provides a comprehensive survey and rigorous genre analysis of ancient forensic discourse in support of his claims, and shows how the unified message of Paul’s letter can be recovered. Long then investigates 2 Corinthians through Greco-Roman rhetorical theory and practices to address the question of unity of 2 Corinthians.

In the opening chapter, Long briefly reviews the critical issues surrounding the integrity and chronology of 2 Corinthians. He argues that both the literary and chronological problems should suggest to interpreters that a dynamic exigency existed, which is likely to have been met with an equally dynamic rhetorical response. Therefore, interpreters must account for this rhetorical dimension to appreciate the unity of 2 Corinthians.
He divides the rest of his research into two parts: Part 1 comprises “A survey of ancient forensic discourse” (Ch 2-6) and Part 2 “A rhetorical analysis of 2 Corinthians as ancient apology” (Ch 7-10).

To establish that 2 Corinthians conforms to ancient apology, he surveys a significant portion of the numerous extant examples of forensic rhetoric as listed in Chapter 2. He points out at least 12 distinctive and characteristic features of forensic discourse in the areas of exigency, invention, and disposition. These features are treated respectively in Chapters 3-5. In Chapter 6, Long significantly points out how ancient apology merged with early epistolary practice. He suggests that 2 Corinthians on the basis of its extended setting, length, extensive argumentation, and lively conversational style, is an official apologetic letter.

In the second part of his study he seeks to demonstrate that 2 Corinthians conforms to ancient apology. In Chapter 7, Long aims to show that 2 Corinthians addressed a particular exigency. Paul sent 2 Corinthians to address a number of charges and criticisms against him—he was worldly and unapproved of. Because some of the Corinthians most likely applied Paul’s own particular directives against him, an apologetic letter was necessary.

In Chapter 8, Long endeavours to show that 2 Corinthians is structured as an apology. According to him it contains a prooemium, a distributed narration, a divisio and partitio, a probatio, refutatio, self-adulation, and a peroratio. The function of each of these sections contributes, substantially to one’s understanding of the strategies and aims of Paul’s discourse.

In Chapter 9, Long explores the inventive side of Paul’s discourse. This chapter seems to be the most speculative. Here he tries to explain the process and strategies Paul followed in the construction of 2 Corinthians.

Chapter 10 is a summary and spells out the significance of the forensic rhetoric of 2 Corinthians. Long concludes this chapter with a brief discussion on the relation between Paul’s rhetoric and theology. According to him, it is a critical starting point for interpreting Paul and constructing a Pauline theology to recognize and become familiar with the fact that Paul’s theological presentation is rhetorically conditioned. The two are inexorably merged.

The methodology used by Long is historical-rhetorical criticism. The argumentation and verification of statements are sound and excellent. At first glance his research seems to be convincing. However, studies that seek to understand the corpus Paulinum in the light of rhetorical and epistolary conventions are ambiguous as to whether Paul deliberately followed the models described in ancient literature. Therefore, it is difficult to determine whether, according to these modern researchers, the rhetorical analysis of the corpus Paulinum corresponds with Paul’s deliberate intention or whether it simply reflects general knowledge and competency of rhetoric that is also discernable in other Pauline epistles.

For the reviewer the value of this monograph lies in the fact that this publication will initiate further discussion and debate on the nature and character of Pauline
rhetoric. This links with the author’s wish that his monograph will contribute to the goal of the “complete analysis of New Testament rhetoric.” It is also a good piece of research on ancient rhetoric. His index of ancient authors and sources on rhetoric, at the end of this document, is of great value for future research on rhetoric in the NT. His study will be of relevance to Classicists and NT Scholars alike.
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The present book consists of three lectures delivered by I. Howard Marshall of Aberdeen as the Hayward Lectures at Acadia Divinity College, Wolfville, Canada. They are followed by essays by K.J. Vanhoozer and S.E. Porter who respond to Marshall’s lectures by summarising, assessing and critiquing his argument. Both scholars add their own insights to the subject addressed (“... what they have done in their chapters here is not so much to interact with the details of the lectures as to provide some stimulating supplementation on the basis of their own work”, 8). Marshall, one of the doyens of British evangelical NT scholarship, describes the thesis presented and argued here as follows:

... it is right so seek a principled way of moving from Scripture to its contemporary understanding and application, and ... the way to do this is to explore how the principles can be established from Scripture itself, whether explicitly in terms of what the Bible itself has to say about how to understand the divine Word or implicitly in terms of how the biblical actors and writers actually understand the sources that were at their disposal. I have explored the way in which ... there is ongoing development of insight into God’s revelation in Scripture, and I maintain that this process can provide us with guidelines for the ongoing and necessary task of apprehending what Scripture says and understanding and applying it in our own situation (9).

In the preface Marshall briefly describes the origin of this volume, summarises the responses by Vanhoozer and Porter and comments on them. In his first lecture, Evangelicals and Hermeneutics (11-32), he emphasises the importance of evangelical hermeneutics and describes various levels of interpretation (general hermeneutics, exegesis, application). He argues that as the NT authors wrote their books “within the boundaries of their particular world and did not foresee the world of which we are part” it is legitimate and necessary to ponder “how their works can continue to function as Scripture for us” (15). Marshall then gives a partly