

egna bibelläsningen. I liturgisk uppläsning i gudstjänsten passar nog B2000 bättre då dess översättning har haft högre litterär bearbetning för att passa högtidliga sammanhang. Redan idag finns en snarlik översättning, SFB, men nuBibeln fördel är att det i egentlig mening är en översättning, medan SFB är en revision av 1917 års översättning. nu-Bibeln fyller absolut sin plats för en modern bibelläsare idag.

Själv gör jag bedömningen att det som saknas på svenska är en mer litteral översättning. På engelska finns English Standard Version (ESV) som utgivningskommittén kallar ”essentially literal”, med syftet att inte ta bort eller lägga till ord, eller byta eller omtolka metaforer eller bildligt språk; men fortfarande ha en välskriven text utan ålderdomligt språk, och därmed lätt att förstå idag. Tyvärr kan man nog konstatera att den svenska marknaden är för liten för ett sådant projekt; vi som har behovet att mer tydligt se grundtextens ord och formuleringar får hålla oss till grundtexterna, och skatta oss lyckliga om vi av någon anledning skaffat oss förmågan att läsa dem!

Per-Olof Hermansson, Åbo Akademi, Finland

ALMA BRODERSEN

*The End of the Psalter: Psalms 146–150 in the Masoretic Text,
the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the Septuagint*

BZAW 505, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2017, Hardcover,
321 pages, \$114.99, ISBN: 9783110534764

One of the main trends in the last decades of research on the ‘Book’ of Psalms has been to understand Psalms 146–150 as a single unit, framing the entire ‘book’ and bringing it to an appropriate end. Observations brought forward to support this view are, beside the fact that they occur together in the Masoretic sequence, that all five psalms are framed with Hallelujah, and that they are connected to each other by means of intertextual links. In the revised version of her doctoral thesis, Alma Brodersen formulates a well-argued critique of this view.

Proceeding from a brief overview of research, Brodersen deals with the extant sources: the Masoretic text, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the Septuagint. Surveying the oldest known manuscripts, she finds consid-

erable variation as to how the psalms are juxtaposed, notes “inconsistent framing Hallelujahs,” and argues that the text forms should therefore neither be merged into one “hypothetical original text,” nor should each extant manuscript be treated “in its own right.” Instead, “the best representative manuscripts or editions of what are usually regarded as the oldest text forms” should be read and interpreted separately, and then compared to each other (19–21). Here, Brodersen also lays out the theoretical foundation for assessing intertextual references. Focusing on an “author-oriented approach to intertextuality” (23), she proposes a number of criteria to be met for a reference to be judged as likely.

First, a “synchronic identification” needs to take place, based on the *number* (high number of words = more probable reference), *order* (more syntactical similarity = more probable reference) and *frequency* (more rare words = more probable reference) of shared words. In addition, shared content or form is mentioned, and the possibility that similarities might point to a “formula or a common third source” (26) is also accounted for. Second, the direction of dependence need to be discussed. Either by means of absolute dates, or, more commonly, by means of relative dates (27).

Closing the introduction is a presentation of the structure of the book. Proceeding from the hypothesis of a “separate origin for each of Psalms 146–150” (28), Brodersen does not analyze the psalms in the Masoretic sequence, but rather reverses it, for two reasons: 1) Ps 150 merits extensive treatment since it “attracts an especially large number of contradicting interpretations and intertextual assumptions” (30); 2) it emphasizes the need to read Pss 146–150 individually.

The bulk of the book consists of detailed analyses of the five psalms. Each psalm is devoted a section, and in each of these sections, Brodersen first deals with the Masoretic version of the psalm, providing a translation and discussing its form (outline, syntax, structure, and poetic devices), intertextuality, content, genre, date, unity, and overall interpretation. Then, she proceeds to the Dead Sea Scrolls, and presents the psalm in the manuscripts in which it is found. The Masoretic text serves as a point of comparison. Then, the Septuagint version is analyzed. A

translation is provided, and the ensuing discussion focuses on the same topics as for the MT. Each section concludes with a comparison, where the three corpora are brought together and similarities and differences regarding framing Hallelujahs, the order in which the psalm is found, and intertextuality are discussed. The results are consistent: there is inconsistency regarding the framing Hallelujahs in all psalms, their order is different, and although some references are found (most notably in Ps 147), these are never to Pss 146–150, but either to other psalms in the ‘Book’ of Psalms, or other texts in the Hebrew Bible.

The analyses are followed by a summary of the conclusions drawn in the various sections of the book, as well as a brief discussion of the results. Ultimately, Brodersen concludes that a case cannot be made for an original connection of these psalms. Hence, she asserts, the hypothesis of a separate origin of these psalms has been confirmed, and as a consequence, “compilers rather than authors must have brought about the later coherence of the collection of Psalm 146–150 in the Masoretic Psalter” (277).

In all, this is a well-argued and detailed study with a clear and lucid structure. The main chapters provide a wealth of insightful observations in relation to each psalm. Interpretive alternatives are carefully presented and weighed, and by mapping and evaluating every suggested intertextual connection, the analysis not only supports the conclusions drawn, but also provides an excellent platform for continuing discussion. Consequently, many aspects could be picked up on. I will mention two here.

First, since the act of referring is seldom guided by rules, there will always be problems with applying too strict criteria, and always more possible criteria to be considered. In light of the focus on diachronic intertextuality related to an author, one aspect that could perhaps have been considered in some more length would be whether similarities occurred in parts of psalms that could be seen as an addition to it, since an overlap with a later addition could be taken as a more likely reference. If having discussed the unity of the psalms *before* discussing intertextuality, and if applying the mentioned criteria, it might have been so that other conclusions had been drawn in relation to, for example, the possible re-

lation between Ps 148:14bc and Ps 149, not least in light of the curious addition (?) made to Ps 149 in 11Q5. As often interpreted, the possible addition makes no sense in the setting of the psalm in 11Q5, but more so in relation to the Masoretic sequence, so that a dependence on MT on the part of 11Q5 is possible. Although Brodersen notes these connections, they are not dealt with in any length, since she observes that Ps 148 is not preserved in 11Q5, and that no references are found between Ps 149 and Ps 148 in the MT. But since the common interpretation of Ps 148:14bc could possibly undermine some aspects of Brodersen's arguments, it would have been valuable to hear her view on the methodological issue of later additions to psalms in some more length.

A second issue that could be further discussed relates to sequences. Brodersen recurrently argues that since psalms are found in sequences conflicting with the MT in the DSS, it weakens the likelihood of an original connection of Psalms 146–150. This is a good point, but could be seen as somewhat in conflict with the fact that she also regards the LXX translation as possibly earlier than many of the DSS (16). If so, it is not entirely clear how the fact that psalms are found in various arrangements would necessarily point to a conclusion that they have not been originally (and intentionally) arranged otherwise. Instead of saying much about "original" sequences, could the arrangements not rather indicate something about the hermeneutics employed – that sequences seems to have played little importance for the interpretation of the individual psalm, much less than is commonly stressed in *Psalterexegese*? Admittedly, this falls somewhat outside the scope of the study, but since it would further strengthen her overall conclusions, it could have been interesting to hear Brodersen's thoughts about what interpretive effects the *compilation* of psalms into a collection had on the individual psalm, or about the issue of what *kind* of unity references to neighboring psalms would imply (literary, liturgical, canonical, etc.). But again, that would perhaps better be the subject for another book.

These comments do not, however, take away from the overall contribution of the work: a solid rebuttal of the view that Pss 146–150 were

composed specifically for the Masoretic sequence. In the end, Brodersen has provided a treasure of insightful observations that constitute a great resource not only for scholars working within *Psalterexegese* or those interested in these five psalms, but also for scholars interested in how to possibly identify and assess references in biblical compositions.

David Willgren, Academy for Leadership and Theology

JOSEPH R. DODSON AND DAVID E. BRIONES (EDS.)

Paul and Seneca in Dialogue

Ancient Philosophy & Religion 2, Leiden: Brill, 2017, Hardcover,
340 pages, €138.00, ISBN: 978-90-04-34135-7

I was thrilled to stumble upon this volume since I have given some attention to both Paul and the writings of Seneca in my own research from the standpoint of their practices in quoting interlocutors. I have therefore read this piece with great interest and attention. The authors contributing to this anthology are aiming at exploring similar theological and philosophical strands in the writings of Paul and Seneca. Previous explorations of the thought worlds of these two authors are said to have happened sporadically and not given comprehensive attention to many of the close similarities in the writings of Paul and Seneca. The purpose of this collection of articles is to put these two authors in dialogue, and one way in which this is done goes through comprehensive cross-references.

One of the first things the cautious reader notices are the letters that are attributed to Paul in this volume. Hebrews is the only missing letter of the fourteen that traditionally have been attributed to the authorship of Paul. Thus, the letters to the Colossians and Ephesians are both assumed to adequately represent the mind of one of the authors in this comparative enterprise. Except for some sporadic references to Seneca the Elder, a total of seventeen letters of Seneca the Younger constitute the primary comparative material to the thirteen considered to be Pauline. This choice will without a doubt subject many of the conclusions in this anthology to critique of several claims made that otherwise