

kommer till att uttala sig om förgångna händelser. Nutiden med dess akuta frågor finns ständigt inbäddade i våra undersökningar, vare sig vi är medvetna om det eller inte. Och medan detta är sant i relation till historievetenskap i allmänhet så är det i särskilt hög grad så i relation till Bibelns skrifter – texter som fortfarande äger auktoritet för så många människor världen över.

Jag är rädd att den här boken kommer att läsas och uppskattas framför allt av de ”redan frälsta”, det vill säga de som redan är relativt medvetna om det som författarna tar upp. Dessa läsare kommer att ha stor nytta av att se artikulerat i skrift sådant som tidigare kanske mest anats, tänkts, och diskuterats informellt kollegor emellan. De som verkligen skulle behöva läsa och ta ställning till *De-Introducing the New Testament* är forskare och lärare som oreflekterat verkar inom fältet utan att vara förmögna att inse vilket moraliskt ansvar som kommer med uppgiften. Det är den grupp som fortsätter att göra saker och ting på samma sätt som man ”alltid har gjort” eftersom man inte ser hur det skulle kunna vara annorlunda.

Den här boken skulle lämpa sig synnerligen väl som kurslitteratur på avancerad nivå, gärna som underlag för en seminariediskussion. Kapitlen är relativt fristående så det vore inget problem att välja till exempel ett av dem för en sådan övning. Jag hoppas verkligen att många verksamma inom fältet kommer att läsa den.

Martin Wessbrandt, Lunds universitet

RYAN S. SCHELLENBERG

*Rethinking Paul's Rhetorical Education: Comparative
Rhetoric and 2 Corinthians 10–13*

Atlanta: SBL, 2013, Hardcover, 422 pages,
€59.95, ISBN: 978-1-58983-781-2

This monograph is a revised version of Schellenberg's dissertation at the University of St. Michael's College, University of Toronto, in 2012. It's an extensive, and innovative study, at its core is the attempt to challenge the paradigm of rhetorical studies on Paul. Schellenberg's view is that the rhetorical parallels which can be found between Paul (especially in 2

Corinthians 10-13) and the formal rhetoric in Greco-Roman *paideia*, is actually not evidence of Paul having a rhetorical education or being schooled in that tradition. The parallels can instead be accounted for by reference to a general rhetoric and Paul's the social environment.

Schellenberg uses a three-part strategy to achieve his goal of demonstrating his opinion. First, he accuses contemporary scholars of using a circular argument when assuming that Paul's elevated social status can be deduced from his rhetorical competence, while at the same time affirming Paul's rhetorical training due to his high-status family. Schellenberg instead turns to the church fathers, such as Chrysostom, who, schooled in rhetoric himself, considered Paul "unlearned, to the lowest degree of poor learning" (261). Schellenberg argues that Paul was actually viewed in a slavish manner by the Corinthians, and definitely not as part of the social elite.

Secondly, and quite naturally, Schellenberg focuses on 2 Corinthians 10–13; the text most commonly used as proof of Paul's rhetorical education. The part in which Schellenberg discusses this notion is quite long. He did not expect the connection between Paul and formal Greco-Roman rhetoric to be, in his view, so "unsubstantiated and illusory" (309), wherefore he has a lot to say in order to challenge the idea of Paul's rhetorical education. He evaluates six patterns in Paul's letter with a parallel in formal rhetoric, and finds none which supports the idea of a rhetorical education:

- a) Epistolary types. Schellenberg argues against John Fitzgerald's identification of seven letter types from Pseudo-Demetrius within 2 Corinthians 10-13. Fitzgerald's conclusion that it constitutes "a mixed letter" is dismissed by Schellenberg as a forced classification of Paul's writing.
- b) Paul's boasting (*periautologia*). Here Schellenberg compares Paul's boasting with Plutarch's *De laude ipsius* and concludes that the text does not contain rhetorical techniques, but rather a moral reflection on statesmanship. The parallels often adduced are those of Plutarch's observations that self-praise is permissible when one is forced to it, or in self-defence. These views are refuted by Schellenberg as being too vague; instead, Schellenberg says that Paul actually would fail a test at Plutarch's school since he compares himself to the "super-apostles."

- c) Peristasis catalogues. Here Schellenberg finds compelling parallels within the Cynic-Stoic diatribe, but as he puts it: “when we cast our net a little wider, we find these same stylistic features attested in a wide range of texts” (p. 127). Some of these parallels are very close at hand, namely from the LXX.
- d) Prosopopoiia. Evaluating Hans Windisch’s designation of 2 Cor 11:21-12:11 as a “fool’s speech” (*Narrenrede*), Schellenberg argues that the fool’s voice cannot be separated from Paul’s own, and that the voice in this passage is not consistently as that of a fool, but engaging in “a little foolishness” (2 Cor 11:1).
- e) Synkrisis. The order of comparison in Theon’s *Progymnasmata* follows a special pattern, which, according to some, is the same in Paul’s list in 11:24ff. But to demonstrate this connection we need to force Paul’s words and understand them as parody, but, according to Schellenberg, argues that this parody needs to be obvious in order to work, and in that respect that Paul’s wording is poorly executed.
- f) Irony. Here Schellenberg makes fun of the proposal that Paul mastered all rhetorical patterns, and then made ingenious adaptations, using irony to win the argument. Schellenberg finds it much more convincing that Paul never engaged in these advanced rhetorical strategies. Instead he used disclaimers in order to save some of his honour.

The third part of Schellenberg’s study contains innovative ideas. In order to account for the style of Paul’s writing, but not as derived from formal education or influence from the Greco-Roman culture, Schellenberg turns to general rhetoric. Depending on George Kennedy, who traces rhetoric strategies all the way back through humanity’s evolutionary history, Schellenberg proposes that rhetoric is something that runs in our human veins. Schellenberg’s proof seems far-fetched, but could be viewed as an argument *reductio ad absurdum*; he compares Paul to Sagoyewatha (or Red Jacket), a famous orator among Native Americans, and finds the same rhetorical patterns. Needless to say, no Greco-Roman rhetorical education is the origin of the rhetorical tradition among Native Americans. Schellenberg argues that this proves that the parallels between Paul and formal rhetoric does not constitute evidence of a rhetorical education. Here I think some critical remarks are in or-

der. The samples of texts from Red Jacket are very (very) few. There should have been a discussion concerning the rhetorical culture of Native Americans and whether that can account for the rhetorical patterns in these texts. This way of reasoning may raise objections to the arguments *for* Paul having an rhetorical education—but it is definitely not arguments *against* Paul's partaking of an education in formal rhetoric. Schellenberg takes steps to refute these objections. In chapter 9 he discusses informal social practice, namely the way people pick up rhetorical strategies: by observation, imitation and practice. This happens without organized schooling, and could therefore serve as an explanation for the evidence of a general rhetoric found in Paul's texts.

In his last chapter Schellenberg focuses on the two key verses 2 Cor 10:10 and 11:6. Schellenberg first claims that good rhetoric is characterised by clarity and good grammar, and finds Paul lacking in these respects. Schellenberg lists about 65 syntactic errors within chapter 10–13, in order to demonstrate how clumsy Paul's language is, even when he is expressing quite simple ideas. Paul's interpretation of one of the key texts is also mentioned: in 10:10 Schellenberg proposes a new reading. The epistles written from afar were viewed negatively and fear-provoking (as possible translations of the adjectives, which fits with v. 9), whereas the question was: Will he deliver on arrival? Ergo: "He talks big, but what he says comes to nothing." Thought this interpretation, Schellenberg challenges us to understand Paul's social location, not as a freeborn man, but rather as a marginalised prisoner with whip scars on his back. And one last quote: "If this is Paul, perhaps the real puzzle is not why the Corinthians wavered in their loyalty, but why they attended to Paul and his gospel in the first place" (322).

To summarize: Schellenberg claims that the extent of parallels between rhetorical figures and strategies in rhetorical handbooks and Paul's letters are highly overrated, and in the cases where there really are parallels, the connections are not due to Paul's education, or even cultural influence. Rather, the common ground between the rhetorical strategies we find in Paul, and in rhetorical handbooks in antiquity, might be that they all stem from human rhetoric in general, and from

people trying to convince someone else. Rhetoric flows in our veins and arises naturally when we find ourselves in certain situations. Rhetoric is shaped mainly by our social environment, and is the “voice” we have acquired through our experiences.

Some concluding remarks. First—the study is too black and white, without nuances. Could not Paul have had an education—or at least an informal education—albeit not in an elite school of students producing texts similar to Ciceros and the like? Secondly, as mentioned, the study by Schellenberg is extensive and his ambition, and the broad outline of his thesis, are interesting. However, the strategies chosen are not altogether convincing and other conclusive arguments would seem to be needed in order to support his proposals. As the book reads, it may serve as a thorn in the flesh for those who are too comfortable in the old paradigm, and for those who are more sceptical, it opens a window in the wall from which to be hoisted down.

Johannes Leckström, Lund University

PATRICK SCHREINER

The Body of Jesus: A Spatial Analysis of the Kingdom in Matthew

LNTS 555, London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016, Inbunden, xiv + 188 sidor,
\$122.00, ISBN: 978-0-567-66720-5

Föreliggande monografi är Patrick Schreiners doktorsavhandling från 2014. Dess huvudsakliga ärende är att med hjälp av postmodern teorbildning om rumslighet (“spatiality”) skapa ökad förståelse av hur begreppet ”himmelriket” konstrueras i Matteusevangeliet. Schreiner menar nämligen att traditionella uppfattningar om vad som utgör rumslighet måste nyanseras och utvidgas genom att kopplas till den mänskliga kroppen, samtidigt som den sociala konstruktionen av rum lyfts fram, och det hela förbinds med fantasin. ”In *metaphysical* terms, the spatial aspect of the kingdom is localized in the human body, and human bodies create ‘imagined’ kingdom spaces by social living” (14). Med inspiration och terminologi hämtad från bl.a. från den politiske geografen E. W. Soja argumenterar Schreiner sålunda för en tria-lektisk (“trialectic”) förståelse av rumslighet. Enligt detta synsätt bör varje rum förstås som