

Nina E. Livesey. *Galatians and the Rhetoric of Crisis: Demosthenes, Cicero, Paul*. Salem, OR: Polebridge Press, 2016. 177 pp. \$26.00. Paperback. ISBN: 9781626982123.

Reviewed by John J. Clabeaux
Pope John XXIII National Seminary

This is an outstanding book in its composition and design. The introduction presents the basic problem and purpose of this work. Four chapters on the primary tools and strategies of deliberative rhetoric follow: “Creating a Sense of Urgency,” “Persuading through the Promotion of Self,” “Persuading through Emotive Language,” and “Persuading through Disjuncture,” with a seven-page conclusion wrapping up. The notes (fifty-eight pages) are clear and helpful, as are the bibliography (seventeen pages) and indexes (fifteen pages).

The introduction sets up the basic problem being addressed in the four chapters and the conclusion. It involves a clear and insightful explanation of what many call the “New Paul.” Luther’s view was that Paul was focused primarily on the ineffectiveness of the Law for salvation. The Law was more a problem than a solution. Faith in Christ was the center of Christian preaching, but today it seems to a growing number of biblical scholars, both Jewish and Christian, that this is not what Paul was writing about in his letters. Livesey’s contribution to the discussion of what is becoming a widely accepted view of modern biblical scholars is that Luther and others who held firmly to the impossibility of salvation except by surrendering and giving in to belief in the words and deeds of Jesus of Nazareth were promoting a view not actually central to Paul’s teaching, one that has too often contributed to a view of Judaism as the entirely wrong way of seeking salvation in God. Livesey gives a brief yet clear description of who holds such views and how they have supported them. Her contribution to the discussion is that we need to take into account the effect of Greco-Roman rhetoric on Paul. Livesey examines the rhetorical works of Demosthenes, Cicero, and Paul. Paul’s letters are written forms of what he would strive to preach if he were able to be present to his communities. Cicero, when he forcefully opposed Mark Antony, learned a great deal from Demosthenes about how one destroys the arguments of one’s enemies. Livesey’s book shows how Paul arrived at many of his rhetorical statements about Jews who opposed him. For example, within the context of deliberative rhetoric a speaker endeavored to describe the present time as one of great crisis. It was important for a speaker to do this in cases that were not entirely clear. The orator must be taught to make emotional appeals to his or her listeners, as emotional appeals often had a greater effect on what a crowd of listeners was thinking than did logical arguments. Livesey’s major demonstration of this is to take the reader to passages in Demosthenes and Cicero that look very much like the kind of statements Paul makes in the highly charged rhetoric of his Letter to the Galatians.

Livesey wisely presents four- or five-verse-long quotations in Greek or Latin with English versions within a page so that one can read on without consulting a Greek-English dictionary. It is repeatedly clear that Paul, in dealing with his opponents in Galatia, uses the rhetorical strategies of Demosthenes and Cicero in their opposition to Philip and Antony. However, Livesey’s argument does not depend entirely on Paul’s verses having expressions or purposes in common with those of the rhetoricians. Rather, we see Paul taking up not only particular images for his arguments but taking on certain kinds of arguments that orators were trained to use. One of the best examples is the expression of urgency. By presenting a particular action as urgent a speaker can tap into the human emotion

of fear, which might more immediately persuade a listener to accept the speaker's warning. Livesey provides many examples in speeches by Demosthenes, Cicero, and Paul.

Another important means of persuading people is what Livesey calls "dissociative terms" (168). When used by an orator, these can be highly effective. It is often in the interest of the orator to employ pairs of potential opposites, such as "strong and weak," "saved and lost," or "timid and brave," but these are not in every way opposites. Livesey notes that they are "situationally determined." The orator appeals to such terms, repeatedly establishing a basic mental or emotional agreement from the hearers, but when taken out of context the terms can have a very different effect. What is frightening is the extent to which national leaders in modern times who fancied themselves orators, e.g., Hitler and Mussolini, made extensive use of such rhetoric.

I find Livesey's presentation persuasive and thought provoking. However, how are we to use Paul's rhetoric without increasing the negative results? Can the Christian world take on the negative potential of this dissociative rhetoric, such as the ways in which Christians acted toward Jews when Christians became the overwhelming majority? I expect that wonderful discussions must happen in the classes that Livesey teaches.