stabendes von 7Q5, die Hinweise für die Identifizierung des Fragments mit Markus 6: 52-53, die Probleme, die gegen diese Identifikation sprechen (Auslassung von ἔπι τήν γῇν, weil andernfalls die Stichometrie von 7Q5 nicht stimmend ist; Lautverschiebung von δ und τ bei δια-περάσαντες), die Einwände an der Identifizierung durch Kurt Aland und die vorgeschlagenen Zuordnungen von 7Q5 zu anderen neutestamentlichen Textstellen, zu alttestamentlichen Texten sowie zu Thucydides I.41.2 und einem Text aus Homer.

Verf. mag mit Recht hervorheben, daß es letzten Endes keine ausschlaggebenden Argumente gibt, welche die Identifizierung von 7Q5 mit Markus 6: 52-53 ausschließen. Es bleibt jedoch zu beachten, daß die wenigen Buchstaben, die im Fragment mit Sicherheit zu bestimmen sind, die Auslassung der Wörter ἔπι τήν γῇν, die in allen vorhandenen Textzeugen von Markus 6: 53 belegt sind, und die im Interesse der vorgeschlagenen Identifizierung angenommene Lautverschiebung von δ zu τ, in nicht geringem Maße die These, es handle sich in 7Q5 um Reste einer Markushandschrift, beeinträchtigen. Nichtsdestoweniger bietet das Buch von R. eine abgewogene Behandlung der durch das Fragment ausgelösten Diskussion, die volle Beachtung verdient.

A.S. Van der Woude


Seeley’s book is one in an expanding number of studies on the relationship between pagan and/or Jewish martyrology and Paul’s concept of salvation. Scholars caught sight of pagan notions of a heroic death with effects for the survivors only recently (a.o. S.K. Williams, K. Wengst, M. Hengel and H.S. Versnel), whereas the relevant Jewish material had been investigated for a longer time.

The title of Seeley’s work is somewhat misleading, since it covers actually only the last two of the six chapters of the book. Jewish texts like 2 Macc. 6-7 and 4 Macc. are being counted as texts in which the Graeco-Roman martyrlogy comes to the fore. In fact Seeley discusses several patterns of motifs viewed by scholars as the traditio-historical background of Paul’s soteriology: patterns related to the temple cultus, the suffering servant, the qəedat ḫishaq, the mystery religions and the Graeco-Roman noble death. Seeley comes to a negative conclusion with regard to all these models except the last one.
According to Seeley the concept of the noble death contains five elements: 1) obedience; 2) the overcoming of physical vulnerability; 3) a military setting; 4) vicariousness, and 5) sacrificial metaphors (p. 15). In ch. 5 Seeley shows that, except for number four, these elements are present in 2 Macc. 6:18-7:42 and all five of them in 4 Macc. as well as in the letters of Paul. In ch. 6 he enters into the historical context of this pattern and discusses Seneca (in particular Epistula 24), Epictetus, Silius Italicus, Plutarch, Tacitus and Lucian. He demonstrates that the combination of the five motifs is found in these authors as well. Seeley does not discuss 2 Macc. and 4 Macc. in the final chapter, but he is clearly of the opinion that these texts present almost the same pagan pattern.

The value of Seeley’s book lies in the first place in its criticism of the hypotheses which suppose another traditio-historical background of Paul’s soteriology than the noble death. It is improbable that ἀναστήριον in Rom. 3:25 has to be related to the kapporet of the ark (in LXX usually rendered with ἀναστήριον). As in the related passage 4 Macc. 17:20-22 the word probably refers to a propitiating expiation by the death of the martyr. The only passage where Paul possibly alludes to Is. 52:13-53:12 is Rom. 4:25a. Seeley’s discussion of this passage brings him to the following conclusion: “All these reasons lend credence to the proposition that 4.25a, if it is an allusion to Isaiah 53, remains isolated in its context and does not contribute to any larger pattern.” Also the binding of Isaac (Gen. 22) and the mystery religions are being repudiated as models for Paul’s soteriology, because there is no concrete evidence that Paul incorporated traditions with these bases. So Seeley, with P.R. Davies and B.D. Chilton, considers unfounded the hypothesis of H.J. Schoeps and N. Hillyer that Paul was familiar with a tradition according to which the offering of Isaac took place on Passover, because this tradition is not explicitly mentioned earlier than in early rabbinic writings. In the second place Seeley rightly considers conceptions related to the noble death in pagan literature alongside ideas in Jewish texts like 2 and 4 Macc. as the historical context of Paul’s sayings about the death of Jesus.

But one can be more specific about the connection between Paul’s ideas and pagan conceptions than Seeley is and here his analysis suffers from his ignorance of the research by H.S. Versnel (see for a summary H.S. Versnel, “Quid Athenis et Hierosolymis? Bemerkungen über die Herkunft von Aspekten des ‘effective death’”, in: J.W. van Henten e.a., Die Entstehung der jüdischen Martyrologie, SPB 38, Leiden, 1989, pp. 162-196) and other experts (see for instance M. de Jonge, “Jesus’ death for others and the death of the Maccabean martyrs”, in T. Baarda e.a., Text and Testimony, FS A.F.J. Klijn, Kampen, 1988, 142-151, and C. Breytenbach, Versöhnung: eine Studie zur paulinischen Soteriologie, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1989). Seeley’s cluster of the noble death with the