

viewpoint when they contemplate in which way the hereafter is informative for the here and now. To strengthen the comparative analysis, I think Engberg-Pedersen would have to ask *how* this informativeness is imagined coming about by the two authors and *what* content the authors believe to be the commodity to be inquired in the here and now. Asking these questions, I think Engberg-Pedersen would add a more analytical element to his inquiry and potentially have found aspects in the thought-worlds of Seneca and Paul that would be more mutually informative.

Even though I am a bit reserved to many of the conclusions drawn in this anthology, I would still commend it for being refreshing and thought-stimulating. There is a lot of potential in comparative studies to this, which I think will come to fuller fruition as the theories and methodologies develop.

*Adam Sabir, Uppsala University*

JOSEPH R. DODSON AND ANDREW W. PITTS (EDS.)  
*Paul and the Greco-Roman Philosophical Tradition*  
 LNTS 527, London: T&T Clark, 2017, Hardcover, 320 pages,  
 \$107.70, ISBN: 978-0-567-65791-6

In this anthology, the reader encounters the subject of Pauline Christianity's relationship to Greco-Roman philosophy from the standpoint of difficulties involved, potential new fields of study, and reinterpretations of popularly held views. Since the contributors represent diverse scholarly backgrounds, there are to be found arguments of both technical and exegetical nature alike. A total of seven letters traditionally attributed to Paul have been included and analyzed. The Greco-Roman source material is on the other hand extensive enough to include as late authors as Augustine, but limited in the sense that non-literary sources are excluded. Most attention has been given to Paul's first letter to the Corinthians.

Runar M. Thorsteinsson has in his essay "Paul and Pan(en)theism" taken upon himself the task of looking at Paul's concept of God from a new perspective. Paul has traditionally been understood monotheistical-

ly (135). For Thorsteinsson monotheism is the view “[...] of God as the creative source of the world, who transcends and yet is immanent in the world, and of whom one may also speak in personal terms” (135). This definition becomes pivotal for Thorsteinsson’s introduction of two concepts he believes to be present, but not usually accounted for in the Pauline material. The first being *pantheism*, by which is understood that “God is the world and the world is God,” and the second being *panentheism*, meaning that “God is ontologically different from the world, but that God is (literally) in everything” (135).

The author is interested in exploring the latter concept in Paul’s writing and how it relates to the pan(en)theism among the Stoics. The author notices three passages he thinks may reflect pan(en)theistic influences in Paul. His first suggestion is Rom 11:36 where it is said about God that “everything is of him, through him, and to him.” The second in 1 Cor 15:28 which reads “so that God may be all in all.” The third is in Rom 8:9–11 and the saying “the spirit of God dwells in you.” In Seneca the pan(en)theistic concept is encapsulated in expressions such as God is “all that you see, all that you do not see” (*Nat.* 1.Pref. 13) – in Thorsteinsson’s words “God does not just come to people; he comes into people” (143). The central concept is that God as the active principle and matter as the passive principle are always simultaneously conjoined and inseparable. The concept of panentheism is, on the other hand, not unbalanced by other theologies in Seneca. Tendencies of panentheism do therefore not exclude expressions that at other times are anthropomorphic or even more reminiscent of either monotheism or polytheism. By showing that diverse theological speculations in Seneca could be simultaneous, indicates for Thorsteinsson that a similar conceptual plethora would not be unexpected in Paul’s letters.

There are primarily two significant difficulties with this attempt at demonstrating pan(en)theistic influences on Paul. The first difficulty lies in which approach that should be taken to disclose such tendencies. One possible approach is to first determine criteria for how which Paul, in this case, is read in dialogue. The major problem with such an approach is that the Pauline corpus is analyzed according to which expres-

sions that either do fit or do not fit preconceived criteria of thought. The other approach would mean going through what Paul says about the God he believes in and to systematically arrange the views that consequently may correspond to pantheism, another theology, or simply constitute a category of its own. Since Thorsteinsson's approach is the former, his preconceived definitions of the categories that Paul's thoughts could be fit into are significant but also restraining. Paul may be either such or such, but that which is unique in his thoughts will not be accounted for. The additional problem is that Thorsteinsson operates with nonstandard definitions that are constructed and aimed only with the approach at hand. The inquiry also presumes a comparison of theological ontologies of God. The comparative statements utilized and taken from Paul could, on the other hand, at best be accidental reflections of Paul's ontology of God. These presumptions are not the only or even the best ways of understanding the ontology underlying the quoted statements (even if they are to be taken in the strictest literal sense that God inhabits his followers). In fact, the very notion that God chooses to dwell in some people could exclude the pan(en)theistic notion that God inseparably dwells in everything.

Another essay found in this volume is "Early Conceptions of Original Sin," in which the author Gitte Buch-Hansen looks at Galatians through the prism of Philo's *De Opificio Mundi*. Buch-Hansen is interested in Paul's anthropology especially from the standpoint of whether the ancient author operated with a concept of original sin. A central background explored is the ancient *cradle argument* which originally had been proposed by the Epicureans as the philosophical standard for how to deem something good or evil. The observations of infants identified their search for pleasure as the ultimate good, and the deference from pain as evil. The Stoics came to modify this argument by the theory of *oikeiosis* chiefly explained in Cicero's *De Finibus*. The theory displaces pleasure and pain as *epiphenomena*, or secondary to the more basic instinct of awareness of the self, and the search for whatever benefits one's constitution. For the Stoics, this self-awareness could not exist at the expense of the whole of which the self was an integral part. One's actions

were hence to be subject to a reasoned approach which also benefitted the extended self (meaning the cosmos).

In Philo's approach to this argument, there is an association between bodily pleasure as necessary for conception and the Epicurean doctrine of pleasure as the primary driver. In Philo's view, however, the notion of pleasure as an end of itself, rather than as a vehicle for other purposes, is a corruption to be moderated by a disciplined observance of the law (230–31). Buch-Hansen also finds Philo to be inspired by the stoic insight that pleasure generated in intercourse develops subsequently into a great desire for the progeny. To the Stoics, the care for one's progeny was a healthy progression from the self-centered pleasures into greater awareness of the extended self. Where Philo parts from the Stoics, however, is that he does not treat the care for progeny as a springboard for a cosmopolitan self-awareness. For Philo, there is rather a danger in that affection for the family runs the risk of becoming slavery under the passions. In Paul's metaphor of the law as a tutor and his exposition of the Hagar-Sarah story, Buch-Hansen finds some key features that inform the reader about Paul's anthropology. Hagar is for Paul the allegorical symbol for procreation driven by pleasure. Consequently, the drive (pleasure) is transmitted to the offspring begotten through Hagar, which as a consequence needs to master desires in order to become free from the inborn slavery. The offspring through Sarah, on the other hand, is heavenly driven and spiritual. For the Christian, this spiritual regeneration happened in baptism. Buch-Hansen hence suggests, contrary to Krister Stendahl, that the concept of original sin already has its constituents in Paul's anthropology.

I find this anthology to be refreshing from several standpoints. Historical inquiry has, among many other important tasks, the expressed ambition to see things where they belonged originally and in its right context. The flip side of the project of systematizing chronologies is that it easily becomes cemented truths that preclude re-readings of materials that could be read in other ways. In this anthology Buch-Hansen and other authors do a splendid job in distinguishing between a concept and later versions of that same concept. This approach allows them to delve

into areas where others would perhaps not dare to go in fear of being accused of anachronisms, but I think the approach utilized in this anthology is sound and discerning.

*Adam Sabir, Uppsala University*

GUNNAR MAGNUS EIDSVÅG

*The Old Greek Translation of Zechariah*

VTSup 170, Leiden: Brill, 2015, Hardback, 270 pages,

€104.00, ISBN: 978-90-04-30273-0

This very well researched, revised version of the author's doctoral thesis deals, as the title suggests, with the Old Greek (OG) version of the book of Zechariah. In short, Eidsvåg suggests that although the OG is a source-oriented translation which seeks to convey the Hebrew text in a faithful manner, there are cases where the translator allows contemporary concerns to colour his translation. In particular, Eidsvåg maintains that the OG translator of the book of the Twelve supported the Maccabean revolt and also favoured the temple in Jerusalem up and against competing sanctuaries.

The Introduction opens with a brief discussion of the OG manuscript tradition, a short history of research, and a succinct discussion of the date and origin of the translation, opting for an Egyptian locale and a mid-second-century BCE dating. In addition, Eidsvåg discusses the arguments for and against seeing the OG of the Book of the Twelve as the accomplishment of one or several translators, concluding that the extant evidence points towards a single translator. This conclusion has significant bearing on Eidsvåg's subsequent study, as he will appeal to other texts in the Book of the Twelve to support a given interpretation of the OG Zechariah.

The rest of the monograph falls into two parts. Part I begins with a short but informative chapter on translation techniques, carried out in dialogue with the views of a wide range of Septuagint scholars, before speaking in more details about homonyms and homographs, i.e. words that either look the same but have different meanings and words that look similar but may be pronounced differently. These two concepts cre-