that honor is due to God only (p. 26). I think Schwartz does not properly address the issue about the possible meanings of "honor". I would argue that honor and shame are crucial ideas in the HB, but often in the more "primitive" meaning of personal or family integrity, often connected to sexual behavior (e.g. Gen. 9, 20–27; Deut. 22, 13–20; Judges 14 etc.). What Schwartz actually appears to mean by "honor" is the more "advanced" or "civilized" notion of fame or glory, resulting in deference which is due to certain persons by the means of their rank (age, wealth or public position). He is right in that the deuteronomistic utopian legislation largely denies this for humans, as it stresses the principal equality of all Israel(ite men). The bewildering thing is then that the social-anthropological notion of "Mediterraneanism" appears to define honor more in the primitive way, and the reader is thus left wondering whether this actually is not precisely the characteristic of especially the patriarchal narratives, even if Schwartz claims that honor is largely absent in the HB.

In sum, however, Schwartz's book is essential reading for specialists in Ben Sira, Josephus and rabbinic values, and useful reading for everyone interested in social-scientific approaches to antiquity. In a country like Finland, where the studies of Judaism and of classical antiquity have been largely separated, approaches like Schwartz's are much needed.

Lotta Valve


Tra i testi inclusi, che destano tutti grande interesse, ho trovato particolarmente rilevanti quelli sulla posizione della religione nei dibattiti della Seconda Sofistica (Bendlin, Elm
von der Osten, Goldhill), in quanto essi fanno anche riflettere sul ruolo e valore di autori quali Luciano, Pausania e Plutarco come fonti per la comprensione della religione del tempo. Illuminanti anche i contributi di Auffarth e Henderson, nei quali si sottolineano i collegamenti, rispettivamente, tra alcune frasi espresse da Paolo e i rituali dei primi cristiani, con le tradizioni greco-romane.

Insomma, preziosa lettura per chiunque si occupi della vita religiosa romana dell'età imperiale. Il libro, nitidamente stampato, conclude con un Stellenregister. Ancor più utile lo avrebbe reso un index rerum.

Mika Kajava


One God. Pagan Monotheism in the Roman Empire introduces eight papers presented at the conference of the same name at the University of Exeter in 2006. Other papers from the same conference have been published in Monotheism between Pagans and Christians in Late Antiquity, also edited by Stephen Mitchell and Peter Van Nuffelen (Peeters 2010).

Both volumes continue the vigorous discussion instigated by the articles in Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity (eds. Polymnia Athanassiadi and Michael Frede, Oxford University Press 1999). The 1999 volume introduced the term "pagan monotheism", and one of the questions the writers of One God discuss is the usefulness of this term as a heuristic tool in analysing religious phenomena in Graeco-Roman paganism. By pagan monotheism the writers refer to monotheistic ideas that by the mid- and later third century CE had emerged as part of the pagan religious life of the Empire. Nonetheless, ideas of a single divine power had been a part of Greek philosophical speculations from the sixth century BCE onwards.

In the research of monotheistic tendencies, there has been a gap between scholarly approaches that have concentrated on ritual and those that have taken philosophical conceptions as their starting point. The gap is understandable: most of the evidence for monotheistic tendencies is derived from literary and philosophical sources whereas it is difficult to find unambiguous documentary evidence of pagan monotheistic cults. In their introduction to One God, editors Mitchell and Van Nuffelen insist that it is necessary to define monotheism not only as an intellectual construct of ancient philosophers, but also as a religious phenomenon arising from the religious experience of "normal" people. Therefore, the main emphasis of the volume is on monotheism as a religious phenomenon in its social context.

Van Nuffelen sets the agenda in discussing pagan monotheism as a religious phenomenon. He aims at deconstructing the distinction between belief and ritual traditionally drawn in the research of Greek and Roman religion. As Van Nuffelen points out – following John Scheid's Quand croire c'est faire (2005) – questions of belief and theology had their important part in Greek and Roman religion. In ritual there is presupposed theology involved since it is impossible to have a ritual without the cognitive element. During the Roman Empire, monotheistic ideas in paganism became a religious phenomenon in the sense that they were not restricted to the literary and philosophical elite. Van Nuffelen distinguishes three factors for this