around one-third of the book" (ix, n. 1); however, would-be redaction critics will be hard-pressed to distinguish two authorial hands.

The book is divided into relatively self-contained topical sections: good indexes and tables of contents mitigate the inevitable slight arbitrariness in the authors' distribution of material across topical headings. I sometimes wished for more cross-referencing. Sections begin with a bibliography and a general orientation. Main points are high-lighted, sub-sections are also graphically well set-off, and the authors often supply additional tables when appropriate. The whole is carefully designed to bring key material to the eye. Each main section concludes with a summary, and usually some hermeneutical reflections and tasks designed both to crystallize understanding and to provoke further questioning (an appendix offers "Solutions" to some of these, 573–612). Greek and Hebrew/Aramaic quotations are always translated.

For North American undergraduate students and general readers, these virtues of comprehensiveness and critical suggestiveness are perhaps also the book’s most serious faults. There is also a, perhaps daunting, German-ness to this Lehrbuch, though it is very well-served by its translator, John Bowden. Most English-language readers should welcome a guide so largely written by one who knows and has deeply influenced the explosion of North American HJR, but who also enjoys some distance from it.

I have not yet used the book directly in teaching undergraduates, but have recommended it for use as a resource in essay preparation. In this context all but the most determined undergraduate students found it difficult to meet the challenge of a guide that is more a map than an itinerary. Still, all caught some of the excitement of such an ambitious survey, so deftly executed. For undergraduate classes in HJR, I would therefore strongly recommend this as a teacher’s guide and students' reference work rather than as a required textbook. (I have in the past successfully used Theissen’s experiment in imaginative/narrative history The Shadow of the Galilean [1987] in the latter role: the two volumes would make an interesting contrast.)

In a field of research and writing that has long elicited the very best and the very worst in scholarship, this work must surely establish for some time to come a much-needed benchmark. This book is an essential addition to any personal or institutional library with more than two titles on Historical Jesus Research.

Ian Henderson
McGill University
has been a long-standing issue within New Testament studies. The question is particularly acute when it comes to the first epistle of Peter (1 Peter). This New Testament document appears to be constituted mainly of paraenesis, to the exclusion of doctrinal passages. Furthermore, its numerous commandments bear considerable parallels with the texts of contemporary Hellenistic teachers. In *Argument and Theology in 1 Peter*, Finnish scholar Lauri Thuren seeks to give more weight to a recent scholarly opinion that Christian paraenesis is unique, and distinguishes itself not by its commandments, but by the motivations to which it appeals to support them. His approach involves a rhetorical analysis of 1 Peter aiming at identifying the various motivational factors used by the author, classifying them, and describing the relationship between them.

Part I delineates the problem of Christian paraenesis within NT studies (chap. 1), and proposes an approach toward a solution (chap. 2). The section that surveys the history of 1 Peter research (14–27) is concise and helpful. Thuren also demonstrates the usefulness of rhetorical analysis in exposing motivations undergirding the paraenesis: first, because it respects the contingent and pastoral nature of the NT epistles; and second, because it takes us from the level of the text to the *ideology* of the author, where community values and priorities are drawn from in order to persuade. Thuren is agile in his manipulation of rhetorical concepts and creative in combining elements of ancient and contemporary rhetoric. In the end, he opts for a hybrid approach for analyzing paraenesis; namely, ancient rhetoric is used to break down the overall structure of the text, and Stephen Toulmin’s model of argument analysis is employed for the study of individual command-motivation combinations within the text. (Toulmin’s model is described in detail in his 1958 work *The Uses of Argument*; it is revamped by Thuren with certain categories drawn from speech-act theory).

Part II is by far the longest section and deals with the text analysis itself. Chapter 3 covers the foundational question of how to recognize the “motivating expressions” that support exhortations within the text. Thuren rightly emphasizes the ability to identify properly and interpret the syntactical markers that introduce these motivational expressions. His catalogue of signal words (conjunctions, prepositions introducing cause, and the like; 65–85) is rich in semantic information. Despite his questionable view that 1 Peter purposely uses such words ambiguously on a regular basis (see 88–89), Thuren does a fine job of surveying and organizing the text-linguistic data.

While chapter 4 focuses briefly on the rhetorical situation and strategy of the letter, chapter 5 delivers a lengthy and meticulous text analysis. The basic approach consists of two steps: first, paraenetic units of texts are identified; and second, the various commandments in these units are analyzed using Toulmin’s method of argument analysis. Unfortunately, the textual commentary is technical and difficult to read. The accompanying diagrams of all the arguments do not entirely solve this problem. Nonetheless, Thuren’s interpretation is careful and successfully integrates his argument analysis into the exegesis, bringing it into dialogue with the important commentators of the past and present. Due to its length and technical “thickness,” I suggest that this
section could be best used as a commentary; i.e., consulted for its analysis of specific passages and not read cursively.

Part III moves from the text level to the ideological substratum from which the arguments are constructed. It can be viewed as the “results” section as it seeks to present the motivations that the author of 1 Peter calls upon to persuade his readers to heed his teaching. Chapter 6 is perhaps the most revealing, for it provides a catalogue of different persuasive “motifs” (the themes of the motivational expressions; Thuren draws a fitting parallel between these and the *topoi* of classical rhetoric). The “motifs” are divided into four categories: non-religious, anthropological, theological, and “other religious.” The relationship between these categories of motivations in the argumentation is also analyzed. For example, Thuren shows that in most arguments non-religious motifs are usually subservient to theological ones (192).

Chapter 7 is presented as the main result of the study. It reveals the overarching logical structure which unifies all the motifs of the paraenesis in 1 Peter. Three elements comprise its core: (1) a “basic motivation”—through which the addressees’ current situation and ideal identity are presented as something they can identify with (212–7); (2) a “specific motivation”—an incentive to obey the author’s commands because they are the appropriate thankful response to God (218); and (3) a “supporting motivation”—involving specific themes such as the authority of the Scriptures, the *ethos* of the author and the imminence of the return of Christ. Thuren is probably right in affirming that “every motivating expression fits into this matrix” (221). But unfortunately the structure may strike the reader as disappointingly skeletal; lacking in ideological and theological material, especially in the light of the content-rich results of chapter 6.

The work ends with a short conclusion relating the results of chapter 7 back to initial questions about paraenesis. One of its main points underscores that it is the motivations—and not the commandments—that are distinctive in 1 Peter. These motivations cannot be neatly traced back to the propositions of an organized early Christian theology, but are seen rather as diverse themes of a unique pedagogical strategy, involving paradoxes, yet unified, and in which practice and theology are inextricably intertwined. One paradox discussed at length is the puzzling coexistence of positive and negative motivations in the epistle. For instance, there are passages (e.g., 1 Pet. 1.13–21; analyzed 106–16) where a command is supported by more than one motivating expression, some of which encourage thankfulness to God for salvation received (the positive motivation), while others evoke the danger of not meriting salvation if the command is disobeyed. Thuren suggestively connects this duality to a presumed mixed composition of the audience: the mature believers will readily respond out of thankfulness, but others (newcomers to the community, visiting outsiders, or retrogrades) will react more promptly to the warning.

Thuren’s work is an important contribution to the developing field of rhetorical criticism. He masters the various concepts and issues of both rhetoric and argument analysis, and explains them clearly. He is methodologically creative and sensible, particularly in the decision to complement classical
rhetoric theory with modern argument theory. Above all, he clarifies the 
necessity of rhetoric analysis in order to cross the chasm between public speech 
(the text) and actual authorial thinking (this chasm is often ignored in pre- and 
non-rhetorical exegesis). For lying between text and thinking is a cultural 
ideology common to audience and author, from which the latter must draw 
means of persuasion. This ideology intersects with the author’s thinking but is 
not identical to it. Chapter 6 in particular is a valuable contribution to its 
description.

On the other hand, the study raises questions about the boundaries of 
rhetorical analysis as a contributing discipline to New Testament exegesis. For 
although it sets out to describe the “thinking” of the author (13), the final 
result of the study would be better described as an investigation of a 
document’s strategy of persuasion. In the end it only hesitantly skims the 
author’s thinking. In the concluding sections, Thuren seems to shy away from 
opening the window onto the actual theology of the author.

Perhaps this limitation is part and parcel of the vocation of rhetorical and 
argumentative analysis. This type of study can be viewed as one step in the 
quest for the origins of Christian paraenesis, which must be complemented by 
other steps provided by historical analysis and biblical theology. Provided that 
these boundaries are kept in perspective, I certainly recommend this careful 
study.

Marc Debanné

Philosophical Works of Peter Martyr Vermigli: On the Relation of Philosophy 
to Theology. The Peter Martyr Library, volume 4. Translated and edited 
by Joseph C. McLelland. Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Essays and 

To mark the Quincentenary of Vermigli’s birth, an International Symposium 
was held in Kappel, Switzerland in July 1999. Several dozen scholars from all 
over North America and Europe delivered papers. The current marked vitality 
of Vermigli studies has been building up for a considerable period. The last 
generation has witnessed nothing less than a renaissance of critical interest in 
the life and thought of this great Italian reformer. One of the early, influential 
contributors to this renewal is Joseph C. McLelland, Professor Emeritus and 
formerly Dean of the Faculty of Religious Studies at McGill University. 
McLelland’s own doctoral dissertation (written at Edinburgh under the supervi-
son of Thomas F. Torrance and published in 1957 under the title The Visible 
Words of God: An Exposition of the Sacramental Theology of Peter Martyr Vermigli) 
marks the beginning of the modern resurgence of interest in the reformer. 
Through his dedicated contribution to the organization of a series of confer-
ences and to spear-heading the publication of the Peter Martyr Newsletter,