BOOK REVIEWS


J.-M. AUWERS


The content and goal of the Analytical Lexicon to the Septuagint (= ALS) is formulated as follows: “all of the words of the Rahlfs text of the Septuagint (LXX) are fully parsed, and the lexical form for each word is listed” (p. ix), which “enables one to identify the lexical form, parsing and basic English meaning of any LXX word” (p. xxvi). The enormous amount of work that has been put into the preparation of this tool is beyond question. The foundation stones were laid by B.A. Taylor (= T.) in 1987, on the basis of the morphological analysis that was created under the supervision of E. Tov and R. Kraft in the framework of the CATSS project (Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies). The first
edition of the ALS was published in 1994. The volume that is under discussion here is a revised and expanded edition.

It is revised, since a number of errors have been corrected (see p. x). Understandably, some typos or incorrect analyses nevertheless escaped T.’s attention: they are listed by F. Shaw, in the Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies 43 (2010) 137-139. It can be added that in the introduction to the revised edition, one notices some errors pertaining to the accents: φωνη instead of φωνη (twice in n. 5 of p. xvi); ῥῆσσσο instead of ῥῆσσσο (twice on p. xxii). Remarkably, all of these Greek words are written correctly in the first, 1994 edition.

The 2009 edition is expanded, since its most important new feature is the inclusion of word definitions. These are taken from the revised edition of the Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint by J. Lust, E. Eynikel and K. Hauspie, which came out in 2003 (confusingly, T. dates it to 1992 on p. xvii n. 12; the correct dating is given on p. xix n. 19). The reader should keep in mind that the lexicon entries one finds in the ALS are abridged ones: T. retained the basic word definitions offered by Lust, Eynikel and Hauspie but “not the contextual meanings found in the subsequent paragraphs of many of that work’s entries” (p. xix). This decision is certainly understandable, since these word definitions are not the primary goal of the ALS.

In this regard, it can be remarked that the choice for the term “lexicon” in the title of the ALS is somewhat peculiar, since it brings to mind a dictionary rather than an instrument such as the ALS (or E. Hatch and H.A. Redpath’s Concordance to the Septuagint, which T. also calls a “lexicon” [p. xxii], although no word definitions are offered there). The subtitle A Complete Parsing Guide that accompanies the first edition but is dropped in the one under discussion probably is more adequate to describe the contents of the ALS.

The textual basis of the original ALS was A. Rahlfs’ 1935 manual edition of the Septuagint (Septuaginta. Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta lxx interpretes). For the revised edition, T. maintained this text but also consulted R. Hanhart’s revision of Rahlfs’ text (as can be deduced from p. xvi n. 4). In addition, he mentions that for certain words, “other relevant and available texts have been compared” (p. xvi), but does not tell the reader which words he is in fact alluding to. According to p. xvi, they are “particular forms” that T. suspects to be errors in Rahlfs’ text, but this is not very helpful. In the footnote in which he identifies the “other relevant texts” he consulted, T. lists several sources that are of an enormously different nature and value but which nonetheless are all put on par with each other: the Göttingen editio critica maior; the larger Cambridge edition (i.e., the volumes by A.E. Brooke, N. McLean [and H.St.J. Thackeray]; the concordance (!) of Hatch and Redpath; and a negligible edition of 1851. This rather uncritical way in which different sources are thrown together onto the same pile and the vague identification of problem cases in the source text are a shortcoming, since the precise textual basis upon which the ALS is built, is left unidentified.

In the introduction (p. xxv-xxvi), T. identifies four groups of users to whom the ALS will be most useful: students with limited Greek facility; New Testament students; students in advanced courses who focus on LXX Greek; and scholars or pastors who are somewhat familiar with Greek. Undoubtedly, these users will indeed benefit enormously from the ALS. Then again, they should not expect the ALS to be able to answer all of their questions. This can be illustrated on the basis
of the example ὑπάρξει, which is cited by T. in his introduction (p. xviii and n. 15). Coming across this word in the Septuagint, the reader with limited knowledge of Greek will find out in theALS that it can either be an inflected form of the noun ὑπάρξις or a conjugated form of the verb ὑπάρχω. On the basis of the revised edition of theALS, (s)he will be able to retrieve the meaning of both these lexemes but will not be able to decide which of both possibilities is the one that is used in the biblical verse in question. In order to decide on the morphological ambiguity of ὑπάρξει (s)he needs to turn to another instrument, such as Hatch and Redpath’s concordance. Only then will (s)he be able to choose the correct entry in theALS and deduce the correct morphological information: consultation of theALS alone will not allow him or her to identify this particular form in theLXX verse (s)he is working on.

In conclusion, theALS is a tool that should be welcomed since it stimulates and facilitates study of theLXX in its original language for a particular group of users. At the same time (and understandably), those users should not expect it to answer all of the questions they have: for particular search queries another tool needs to be consulted in addition to theALS. One could imagine that such an insight could in fact lead the reader to prefer digital resources over the printed parsing guide: not only biblical software programs such as BibleWorks, Accordance or Logos but also the online version of theThesaurus Linguae Graecaeallow users with a simple mouse click to produce all of the requested morphological analyses and respective word definitions onto the screen. It is to be hoped that theALS will be able to face these challenges.

R. CEULEMANS


After more than a decade of symposia and proceedings devoted to various stages of Israel’s history during the Iron Age – put in more traditional terms, the “monarchic” and “exilic” periods – the European Seminar on Historical Methodology turned its attention towards the very beginnings of the Iron Age, the so-called “premonarchic” period, during its meetings held in Budapest (2006) and Vienna (2007). A volume focusing on the archaeology of this crucial period in the emergence of ancient Israel has already been published in 2008; the present volume is concerned with the relevant textual sources. As usual in the Seminar’s proceedings, the bulk of essays, written by leading scholars in the field, is surrounded by an introduction and concluding reflections by L.L. GRABBE, who seeks to summarise the evidence and the conclusions that can be inferred from it.

As may be expected in a volume addressing the early Iron Age, the narratives about David in the books of Samuel receive considerable attention. Thus, for example, after an elaborate introduction on historical method in general and the history of Israel in particular, the essay by M. ZVI BRETLER raises the question whether any historical data may be inferred from 1 Samuel 24 and 26, but it lacks
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a clear focus and fails to convince. Focusing on the literary growth of Samuel, A.G. AULD reissues his well-known hypothesis that the earliest substantial source behind these books is to be found in an annotated list of kings of both Israel and Judah which he refers to as the “Book of Two Houses”, and which would have lacked most of the “great stories” about David, Solomon and other important figures. Doing so, Auld actually raises a good point: scholars often interpret the “composition” of the biblical texts as a process of merely “combining” sources, without paying attention to the creative dynamics from which the texts emerged. As the Dead Sea Scrolls have made clear for the late Second Temple Period, the texts developed in a much more organic way, and there is no reason why the earlier phases of textual development would need to be treated differently. The atomisation of the text in different sources is explicitly jettisoned by J. VAN SETERS, who points out that the references to mercenaries in the Davidic narratives are so pervasive that the entire David saga should be assigned a late date – the use of mercenaries only came into vogue from the 4th century BCE onwards – and thus cannot be used for purposes of historical reconstruction.

Even more fundamentally, N.P. LEMCHE wonders whether anything of interest may be gained from investigating the texts dealing with Israel’s early history, and explicitly states that recent discussions of the subject have scarcely yielded any new insights vis-à-vis his earlier monograph on the topic. Another notorious “minimalist” in the history of Israel, Ph.R. DAVIES, re-examines one of the most important – and widely quoted – sources for the early monarchy, the Tel Dan stela: in his opinion, the inscription bytdwd needs not imply the existence of an independent kingdom of Judah at the time of its writing, as it may also denote a mere chiefdom and thus render the biblical David even more fictional. R.D. MILLER II is somewhat more optimistic in his evaluation of the cultural history of early Israel, arguing that settlements, artefacts and remains of cultic practices from this period point towards a religion focused on the control of nature.

A more general perspective is offered by GRABBE’S own contribution, which continues his series of “If We Only Had the Bible” studies with a lengthy survey of sources relevant to the period from approximately 1250 to 850 BCE. Proceeding in his well-known detailed fashion, Grabbe tackles hotly debated issues such as the “low chronology”, the interpretation of the Merneptah stela, the existence of a united monarchy and the size and status of 10th century Jerusalem. As with his earlier studies of this kind, Grabbe does not unfold particularly surprising new insights, but extensively reviews the research conducted in each of these areas and moves in the direction of a synthesis in the form of a number of summary observations. Probing even further back into the history of Israel, E.A. KNAUF focuses upon the books of Joshua and Judges as sources for the Late Bronze and early Iron Age in two successive studies, and attempts to distil memories of early events that have been enshrined in these books. In addition, he also offers a succinct yet clear outline of the literary development of both books, particularly for the book of Judges, which grew through a complicated and centuries-long process from a pre-exilic “Book of the Saviours” into a bridge between the end of Joshua and the beginnings of Samuel. In a third essay at the back of the volume, reprinted from its German original, Knauf similarly addresses the historicity of the Exodus, and like other studies on the topic jettisons the idea of a large-scale emigration of foreigners, while also admitting that it cannot be excluded that some group of refugees from Egypt entered Canaan in the 13th or 12th century. In
addition, he discerns a number of “growth-rings” in Moses’s biography in Exodus 1–14, suggesting that it has been modelled on the biography of Jeroboam I, later enriched with an emanation of the Sargon I legend.

All in all, the essays in this volume give the impression that the European Seminar on Historical Methodology, which held its final meeting in this year’s summer, was nearing the boundaries of an enterprise from which a number of very insightful volumes have grown. Even if Grabbe’s concluding reflections speak of “an exciting and interesting study”, it becomes overwhelmingly clear that investigating Israel’s early history in the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age is fraught with many difficulties. At any rate, the biblical texts can only be used with utmost reservations, and many aspects of this period deemed crucial in Israel’s political and religious development remain elusive – but that, after all, may be a significant conclusion worth restating once in a while.

H. DEBEL


The Ezekiel section of the Greek papyrus 967 (p967) keeps inspiring researchers. Among the recent doctoral dissertations dealing with this document, the works of P. Schwagmeier (2004), A. Crane (2008), C. Rösel (2012), and now also I.E. Lilly, deserve special attention. They all see the Greek text (G) of Ezekiel preserved in the papyrus as a witness to a variant literary edition of this prophetic book. Lilly’s starting point is “Johan Lust’s pioneering work in the early 1980s.”. In her first chapter, she compares Lust’s “tradition-history” and “coherence” approach, with the “historical-critical” and “text-comparative” approach of A. Crane. She then turns to the questions concerning the textual priority between p967 and MT’s texts, and concludes that “Lust and Crane have not yet conclusively proven their positions on textual priority”. Chapter two of Lilly’s book contains a comprehensive discussion of prior study of p967’s text. Chapter three presents the meaningful variants in p967 and their coherence. Chapter four is strictly text critical. It tries to define the relation of p967 to the original Greek text (OG) and its Hebrew parent text. Chapter five provides a literary analysis of the main variants, presenting the meaningful differences between p967 and MT. Standing somewhat apart, chapter 6 presents a codicological analysis of the papyrus. The final chapter seven draws the conclusions.

The main aim of Lilly’s work is to define the scope of the variants distinguishing the Ezekiel version of p967 from that of MT. The largest part of her book, comprising chapters three to five, is devoted to that purpose. It is a pity that Schwagmeier’s important dissertation, which pursues a similar goal, was not available to her. Lilly groups the coherent variants according to the Tendenzen which she discerns in them. Since the word Tendenz figures prominently in her work, it may be useful to give her definition of this term: It is “a theme”, stichwort, or form present in the intertextual center that characterizes variants elsewhere across Ezekiel. So for example, the “Fate of the Slain’ Tendenz includes variants related to the major theme of death and the location of the dead.
This *Tendenz* was highly concentrated in Ezek 32,17-32, the intertextual center” (p. 65). The italics, used by the author, might suggest that the word *Tendenz* in borrowed from the German language. This does not seem to be the case, however, since the German *Tendenz* means exactly the same as the English “tendency”. The intertextual centers, to which the *Tendenzen* are connected, are four in number: Ezek 12–13; 32,17-32; 36,23c-38; 37,1-14. Since the second one (32,17-32) was taken up in the above description of the *Tendenzen*, we may as well have a further look at how it is treated in Lilly’s book.

The text-critical analysis of the second intertextual center, given in chapter three, is confined to verses 24-26 (p. 119-122). Interestingly, the discussion opens with a representation of the text according to three manuscript versions of the Septuagint: p967, the *Vaticanus* (B); and the Lucianic manuscripts (L’’ 62’’), followed by the Masoretic Text. The analysis reveals that the three Greek witnesses most likely reflect three stages of growth of proto-MT: “from the 39-word minus in p967 to the 24-word minus of B to the 13 word-minus of L” (p. 122). This reasoning is judicious and probably correct; nevertheless, some minor remarks may be to the point. A text-critical analysis of the complete passage might have revealed a relevant transposition (rhetorical question in v. 19 MT and v. 21 G). Moreover, the text of p967 is shorter than the one given by Lilly, and that of B is longer. In her rendition of p967 she mistakenly adds v. 26b (παντες απεριτή-ται τραυματια απο μαχαρας οι δεδωκοτες τον φοβον αυτων επι της γης). With some minor variants this verse is to be found in B and in the Lucianic text, but not in the papyrus. In the text of B she omits its version of 26b (οι δε-δωκοτες τον φοβον αυτων επι της ζωης).

The exegesis of 32,17-32 (p. 158-167), relating Farao and Egypt’s descent into the Netherworld, draws the attention to several *Tendenzen* or themes found in this passage: “the Fate of the Slain”, “the Pit and its Inhabitants”, “the Uncircumcised”, and “the Giants”. Among the “Inhabitants of the Pit”, MT lists several nations that go unmentioned in the version of p967. The appearance of Meshech and Tubal among them is remarkable. The same protagonists also occur in Gog and Magog chapters (38–39). The connection between these appearances and their historicizing tendency has been discussed by Lust. But Lilly observes that nobody has examined the other variants in the immediate context of chapter 32. She probably had no access to Lust’s contribution on this topic in *Bible and Computer* (ed. J. Cook) in 2002. It must also be admitted that this paper is hampered by printing errors due to problems with text processing and fonts.

In the papyrus, the Giants receive a more central role than in the more expansive text of MT. With them the papyrus opens its list of nations. They preceded the other nations in the Pit. In MT these Giants have a distinct location within the Pit. They have an honourable status, being the heroes of old. They are exempt from the shame of uncircumcision. According to p967, however, they descended into the ignominy of the Pit along with the other nations. They are no heroes, but emblems of the evil that came on earth in primeval times.

The *Tendenz*-approach allows the author to pursue throughout the book as a whole, the examination of a theme occurring predominantly in a certain intertextual center. Thus the theme of “the Fate of the Slain” is to be found in many texts and displays several variants in MT and in G. Likewise they do not appear in p967’s underworld. This leads the author to some interesting remarks on the slain and their dry bones in the in the valley of chapter 37. P967 leaves Egypt, Edom
and Gog in the open field. Nothing invalidates their candidacy for the revival in chapter 37. MT eliminates this possibility; all of them are in the pit. The introduction of Meshech in 32,26 allows Lilly to launch tempting suggestions concerning Meshech and wordplays on the root מְשָׁךְ which happen to be found exclusively in intertextual centers (12,25,28; 27,13; 32,20; 38,2-3). She is well aware of the fact that these wordplays are impossible in Greek (p. 215). Nevertheless, it is striking that, in every instance where this root occurs, MT presents a variant or is the longer text (p. 307).

Reaching the end of her analysis of the “intertextual centers” and of the “Tendenzen” coming to the fore in them, the author summarizes her argumentation supporting the view that p967 and MT are variant literary editions. The presentation of the Greek p967 as a “literary edition” comparable to MT is perhaps slightly confusing. It might have been more accurate to present its hypothetical Hebrew parent text as a literary edition on a par with MT. Lilly further cautiously concludes that MT’s edition of the Ezekiel text is posterior to that represented in p967. To her “it does seem possible to imagine sectarian debates about the interpretation of prophecy and divine determination contributing to the editorial activity”. Thus agreeing with most of Lust’s stands and further developing those, she rejects his proposal arguing that p967 was the more apocalyptic of the editions (p. 307). Perhaps we should return to that discussion elsewhere. Suffice it to conclude here that MT displays more traces of later editorial activity than the hypothetical parent text of p967, and that these traces reveal a historicizing tendency.

The present outstanding dissertation is enhanced with several helpful appendices, an excellent bibliography, and indices of modern authors, subjects, and ancient sources.

J. Lust


In past centuries, Gog and Magog have aroused the interest, not only of scholars, but also of politicians and a larger public as well. Thorough scholarly investigations of Ezekiel 38–39, however, the main biblical passage in which they occur, have been rare. Recently though, several authors have devoted dissertations and monographs to the topic: Margaret Odell (1988), John Mills (1989), Sverre Bøe (2001), Paul Fitzpatrick (2004), Volkmar Premstaller (2005), Anja Klein (2008). They are all dealt with and evaluated in the first chapter of Rösel’s work. Ashley Crane’s monograph (2008) is mentioned in the bibliography, but does not seem to have reached Rösel’s desk in time to be included in the discussion. Newer books, such as: William A. Tooman, Gog of Magog. Reuse of Scripture and Compositional Technique in Ezekiel 38–39 (2011), could of course not be incorporated in his well-balanced survey of past scholarship.

His own study is basically subdivided into three sections: The first one investigates the text of Ezekiel 38–39 and its text-critical problems (chapter two). The second discusses the interpretation of the section, verse by verse (chapter three).
The third section studies Ezekiel 38–39 against the background of its larger context: the Book of Ezekiel as a whole, and a selection of oracles against and about the nations in the other prophetic books (chapter four). The concluding section summarizes the theological perspectives gained from the foregoing analysis.

The text critical section offers a detailed comparison of the Masoretic Text (M) with the Septuagint (G). Convinced by the studies of Schwagmeier and Lust, the author sets out from the thesis that M represents a later stage in the development of the text than G. Most of the paragraph headers, consisting of chapter and verse numbers, receive a somewhat cryptic footnote, apparently referring to a previous verse in which a word or words occurring in the presently analysed verse have already been discussed. Thus in the header “38,795” the footnote 95 has: קהל; συνάγω: 38,4, implicitly asking the reader to turn to the observations on קהל – συνάγω in that verse. Rösel’s prudent approach does not lead to rash conclusions, but only to some suggestions that are to be confirmed by an analysis of the contents of the chapters and of their relation to a larger context.

The author’s careful text critical observations are marred by the fact that they do not seem to take into account the apparatus of The Hebrew University Bible, The Book of Ezekiel (Jerusalem, The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 2004), nor Barthélemy’s judicious notes in CTAT 3 = Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament, 3: Ézéchiel, Daniel et les 12 Prophètes ([OBO, 50/3], Fribourg – Göttingen, Éditions Universitaires – Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992). For a first example we refer to 38,14, Rösel duly observes that the end of the verse in M has זהר, whereas G probably translates זהר. He adds a useful reference to 38,7 but leaves the questions about the priority of G or M undecided (p. 71). According to CTAT, G preserved the more original text, alluding to the prophecies of Jer 6,22 (יחזק צְזֵרֶפֶת) and 50(27),41 (יחזק צְזֵרֶפֶת); M is to be explained as due to scribal error and metathesis of ז and ר (CTAT 3, p. 303-304). For a second example we turn to 38,17. In G (supported by S) doubts are excluded: Gog is the one about whom the prophets spoke in the days of old. M (supported by T) has a rhetorical question, demanding either a negative, or a positive answer. In agreement with most scholars, Rösel opts in favour of the positive. Indeed, in his opinion, the concluding expression in v. 17 העברים אתך להביא hardly allows a negative answer (p. 217). As far as I can see, he does not say why. According to Barthélemy, however, the answer is definitely negative, given that, in verse 4, the Lord undeniably states that it is his intention to lead Gog as an animal to the slaughter. It is obviously by no means the Lord’s intention to set him up as a conqueror against his own people (CTAT 3, p. 304-306). Similar reasoning can be found in the works of Block and of Fitzpatrick which are referred to by Rösel. In the same verse (38,17) he correctly notes the differences between M and G in as far as the temporal expression מתropolis התנהו is concerned, but does not pay much attention to the strange character of this Hebrew phrase. One wonders if he agrees with Talmon (Textus 1 [1969]) who finds here an example of a double reading.

In the second section Rösel proceeds in an even more cautious way. He carefully explores the traditions and motives used in chapters 38–39, and traces their history. He begins with a study of the “nations” featured in these chapters, then proceeds with an analysis of the verses dealing with Gog’s “army” (38,1-9), Gog’s plan and the Lord’s reaction (38,10-23), the Lord’s victory over Gog (39,1-8), the burial of the enemies (39,9-16), the victory banquet (39,17-20), and
the recognition of the Lord by Israel and by the nations (39,21-29). At the end of
this long journey through the Gog-chapters (p. 127-348), he finally turns to an
exploration of the name and figure of Gog, and concludes this major section with
a translation of chapters 38–39. The character of this translation is somewhat
eclectic. It is said to be based on the reconstructed Hebrew text based on the
comparison between M and G. Deviations from M are marked with square brack-
ets. They most often indicate that in these instances G was preferred over M.

The first part of the third section seems to reach the main goal of the author’s
research: the literary critical questions and the history of tradition and the dating
of Ezekiel 38–39. In the foregoing sections, these topics were repeatedly and
seemingly reluctantly postponed. The text critical data and the history of the tra-
ditions and motives in these chapters, as well as their larger context were said to
be in need of further study before answers could be sought concerning the literary
critical problems. After having finished these preliminary investigations, Rösel
appears to admit that it is still impossible to answer the literary critical questions.
He merely settles for a comparison between the M and G versions, and concludes
that G is a witness to the more original Hebrew text. G’s order of the relevant
chapters (36; 38–39; 37), and its shorter text of chapter 36, allow the reader to
see that the main theme of the original composition was the sanctification of the
Name of the Lord and the recognition of the Lord by the nations.

Although Rösel rather often accepts the proposals made by Lust, he does not
do so in so far as his suggestions are concerned regarding the diminished escha-
tological tendencies in M. He especially does not follow when Lust opines that
the names of Mesheh and Tubal, lacking in the G-version of Ezek 32,26, may
have been inserted there by the editors of M, trying to suggest that these nations
were no mysterious apocalyptic entities, but historical agents (p. 362). Rösel’s
major objection against this possibility, is that Mesheh and Tubal are already
listed among the trade partners of Tyre in 27,13. He fails to note that also in that
passage Mesheh and Tubal are not mentioned in G.

Rösel is right when he holds that the search for the meaning of the Gog-chapters
in both M and G cannot suffice with a study of particular details in which M and
G are diverging. A full investigation of the chapters as a whole, and of their con-
text, is needed. On the basis of his detailed description of each and every verse, and
of the content, motives, and traditions of the section, and of the related chapters,
Rösel reaches interesting and convincing conclusions in so far as the G-version is
concerned. But the reader is left with the impression that the reasons why M should
have introduced important changes are less satisfactorily explained. One has to
admit that the task is difficult, and that a fully satisfying theory is hard to come by.

J. LUST

André GAGNÉ – Jean-François RACINE (eds.). En marge du canon. Études
sur les écrits apocryphes juifs et chrétiens (L’écriture de la Bible, 2).

Cet ouvrage rassemble neuf contributions présentées lors du 65e congrès de
l’ACEBAC (Association catholique des études bibliques au Canada) qui s’est
tenu en mai 2008 et qui, pour la première fois, portait sur des écrits extérieurs au

La quantité de documents apocryphes étudiés, la diversité des angles d’approche et la richesse de la discussion avec la littérature scientifique fournissent un échantillon des questions qui se posent à propos de ces écrits «en marge du canon».

J.-M. Auwers

Although it presented the first fruit of the labours of the editorial team entrusted with the publication of the texts from Cave 4 (where the bulk of the fragments from Qumran had been found), the long awaited fifth volume in the DJD-series – the third and final to be published as *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan* – has been widely criticised for its inadequate transcriptions, questionable renderings and overall sloppiness. More specifically, two years after its appearance in 1968 it was coupled by a book-length review written by John Strugnell, one of the other members of the “team” who sought to correct his colleague John Allegro’s inaccuracies, while Allegro himself seems to have already lost his interest by then and, in the very same year as Strugnell’s review appeared, ruined his academic reputation by publishing his infamous *The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross*. An all-encompassing re-edition of the manuscripts allotted to Allegro that fully meets the standards of the later DJD-volumes has been underway for some time, and the contributors to this project present their ongoing work in these proceedings of a conference held at the University of Copenhagen in June 2009. The intriguing title of the collection was inspired by the fact that Cave 4 is said to have been discovered by a Bedouin retracing the steps of a hunter who once pursued a wounded partridge, whereas Copenhagen is widely known for its mermaid statue representing the fairy-tale by Hans Christian Andersen.

Due to the specific nature of the enterprise of revising DJD[V], many essays take the form of an interim report on a work-in-progress. Thus, for example, M. BERNSTEIN presents his analysis of *Ordinances* (4Q159), specifically with respect to the text’s genre – an issue that also predominates the reflections by Jesper HØGENHAVEN on *Tanhumim* (4Q176) and by M. LAUGHLIN and S. TZOREF on the *Eschatological Midrash* which Allegro named *Catena A* (4Q177). T. HASSELBACH attempts to make sense of the few words preserved on two of the fourteen fragments Allegro had classified as *Commentaries on Unidentified Texts* (4Q172), whereas S. HOLST ponders over an alternative identification for one of the fragments published as part of the *Pesher Psalms B* (4Q173). Other articles mainly offer a preliminary edition, particularly M.S. PAJUNEN’s study of *4QSapiential Admonitions B* (4Q185) and M. POPOVIĆ’s lengthy presentation of *4QZodiacal Physiognomy* (4Q186). The two final essays in this collection address other issues related to the pesharim in Allegro’s lot, viz. the historical allusions in *Pesher Nahum* (4Q169) and the similarities of the peshar method of interpretation to the interplay with Scripture in some writings from the New Testament, discussed by, respectively, G.L. DOUDNA and M. MÜLLER.

Interestingly, a number of contributions reassess the nature and contents of certain manuscripts included in DJD[V] from the perspective of the insights yielded by the many texts published at a later date, e.g. A. JASSEN’s rereading of *Pesher Isaiah A* (4Q161) in light of the war texts, or R. VIELHAUER’s comparison of the Hosea pesharim (4Q166-167) to the interpretation of Hosea’s visions evidenced in other compositions. Proceeding along similar lines, M.M. ZAHN revisits...
the textual nature of 4Q158, published by Allegro as Biblical Paraphrase: Genesis, Exodus, but later connected to the Pentateuchal Paraphrase texts from Strugnell’s lot (4Q364-367), which were eventually published by Emanuel Tov and Sidnie White Crawford as Reworked Pentateuch but are now often referred to as 4QPentateuch(?). By drawing attention to some instances of scribal “coordination”, Zahn emphasises 4Q158’s resemblances to the so-called “harmonic” texts from Qumran, in which the same type of textual changes occur as in the Samaritan Pentateuch. Irrespective of whether 4Q158 is to be classified as a “scriptural” text or as “rewritten Scripture”, this approach to the scriptural text clearly puts the manuscript on a continuum of textual development within the Pentateuch that extends from the earliest textual witnesses to the books of Genesis and Exodus to the more extensive rewriting of Jubilees – but Allegro simply could not know that at the time when he prepared his flawed volume. Finally, on account of the anthology which Allegro published as Florilegium (a title already jettisoned by Strugnell), G.J. BROOKE tackles the more general question whether a change of name reflecting a more accurate understanding of a text’s nature may be desirable in certain cases. Although Tov recently argued against it in his discussion of the 4Q(P)Reworked Pentateuch texts (even if he advocates their recategorisation as “scriptural” texts), Brooke answers the question in the affirmative, proposing to redesignate 4Q174 as Eschatological Midrash. Precisely this kind of challenging questions transcending the mere editorial work on the re-edition of DJD[III] V, which are to be raised for quite a number of other texts as well, turn this collection of essays into a volume relevant to other scholars wrestling with the interpretation of the textual evidence from Qumran.

H. DEBEL


Although the monumental series Discoveries in the Judaean Desert initially did not envision re-editions of the seven scrolls discovered by the Bedouin in 1947 in what was later to become “Cave 1”, its closure was marked by the appearance of two volumes incorporating three Cave 1 scrolls originally published outside the series, viz. the “large” and “small” Isaiah scrolls often referred to as “St. Mark’s” and “Hebrew University Isaiah scroll” in DJD XXXII, and the Hodayot scroll from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem in DJD XL. However, such volumes in the DJD-format are not as accessible as – and certainly more expensive than – most users would want them to be. As such, the appearance of this user-friendly re-edition of the large Hodayot scroll from Cave 1 is to be applauded: it offers a reliable transcription of the Hebrew with facing English translation, without the burden of detailed analysis and extensive notes. In addition, a short introduction to this study edition lists the basis material facts for 1QHᵃ, as well as for the other Hodayot manuscripts from Qumran, 1QHᵇ (1Q35) and 4QHᵃ–f (4Q427-432), from which letters and words missing in 1QHᵇ have been supplied. Two appendices to this introduction provide practical tables.
converting the “old” system of ordering and numbering the different parts and fragments of the damaged scroll introduced by Eliezar Sukenik and posthumously published in the *editio princeps* to the “new” system developed independently by Hartmut Stegemann and Émile Puech, which has been adopted in the *DJD*-edition. Finally, another appendix to the introduction offers a division of the scrolls into individual songs of thanksgiving, whereas a most useful concordance may be found at the back of the book. Inviting, affordable and meeting the same standards as the official edition, this volume offers all that most graduate students and scholars not specialising in this particular text are seeking in the *DJD*-series. It is to be hoped, therefore, that the future will bring us similar editions of other texts.

H. DEBEL


Ce beau volume constitue les Actes d’un colloque organisé à Lausanne par les deux coéditeurs en octobre 2009, sous les auspices de l’Institut Romand des Sciences Bibliques. Les seize contributions sont réparties en quatre sections: I. *Papyrology and the New Testament*: C. CLIVAZ illustre, à partir de quelques papyri (en particulier P12, P93, P128), la nécessité d’une meilleure prise en compte des papyri pour l’étude du Nouveau Testament, parce qu’ils conduisent à reconsidérer la question de l’origine du texte en même temps que celle du statut même des Écritures. T.J. KRAUS montre comment la papyrologie peut amener à repenser la critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament. J.K. ELLIOTT retrace l’historique de la recherche et présente une synthèse des 27 papyri du NT publiés depuis 1997 (avec une liste de leurs variantes les plus significatives), que les éditions du NT ne prennent en considération qu’avec retard: «Some scholars want to privilege papyri, whatever their age, merely because they are written on papyrus, and thus, almost by definition from one particular part of the ancient Christian world; other text-critics wish to rely, as NA does, on consistently cited witnesses allegedly with an inherently great authority, whereby these so-called “best manuscripts” are self-evidently conspicuous. Here oligarchy, not democracy or meritocracy, seems to have been determinative. Both groups of editors require and demand that the papyri are prominently and hastily included in the *apparatus criticus*» (p. 107).
— II. *Egypt, Papyri and Christians*: Le but de la communication de P. SCHUBERT est de couvrir, de manière synthétique, le paysage formé par les papyrus égyptiens sous le Haut Empire romain, au moment où commencent à apparaître les premiers papyri du Nouveau Testament. Il prolonge son propos par l’analyse de *P. Gen. inv.* 382, fragment d’une homélie chrétienne contenant une citation de Lc. S. HONIGMAN étudie, à partir d’une lecture croisée des sources documentaires et littéraires, la situation des Juifs dans la société de l’Égypte romaine, les diverses expressions que revêt leur identité de groupe, ainsi que leurs modalités d’interaction avec la société environnante, avant et après la révolte de 115-117, qui marque une rupture fondamentale. D. STÖKL BEN EZRA cherche à tirer quelques conclusions
des données quantitatives sur les papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens dans l’Égypte ancienne. Contre D. Boyarin, il montre que le christianisme égyptien constitue bel et bien une religion avec une identité indépendante du judaïsme au IIIe siècle au plus tard. Les résultats de l’analyse de la différenciation du christianisme et du judaïsme sont corroborés par les résultats d’une autre analyse concernant la canonisation. R. Burnet s’emploie à réinscrire le Nouveau Testament parmi les écrits du monde méditerranéen, cent ans après le maître-ouvrage d’A. Deissmann, Licht vom Osten, et il s’interroge sur la place que pouvaient avoir ces écrits dans un monde où l’illétrisme était la règle. K. Haines-Eitzén s’interroge, par-delà le portrait paradisiaque qu’Éusèbe de Césarée dresse du Didascalée d’Alexandrie, sur l’existence d’une scholarly and «Bookish» Alexandrian Community. — III. Every Papyrus tells a story: J. Zumstein montre l’importance d’une lecture exacte des manuscrits pour la pratique exégétique, en l’occurrence du papyrus 66 pour l’interprétation du quatrième évangile. A. Luijkendijk s’intéresse à trois papyri (P. Oxy. I 1, IV 654 et 655) comme témoins de l’Évangile de Thomas. M. Theophilos applique la technique de l’imagerie multispectrale à deux fragments inédits d’Oxyrhynque. D. Pastorelli applique une nouvelle méthode (Clustering Method) pour classifier le Papyrus Chester Beatty I (P45) et les principaux manuscrits grecs à partir de deux chapitres de Mc. J. Read-Heimerdinger et J. Rius-Camps présentent les résultats d’une comparaison exhaustive de tous les papyri des Ac avec le codex Vaticanus et le codex Bezae. C.-J. Gruber éclaire le sens du mot θωματίριον, tel qu’employé en He 9,4, à partir de la documentation papyrologique. — IV. Some further considerations: X. Gravend-Tirole cherche à préciser l’impact de la matérialité même de cette documentation sur la notion de canon: «Scriptural boundaries may thus be porous and evolutive, but not absent. The canon is best considered as a sketch, a colossal sketch; essential, yet still a sketch, with ambiguities, uncertainties, nebulous borders. If the canon has holes, it will breathe better. Its hesitant contours may thus represent the gage of freedom. As the Scriptures should be» (p. 381). Enfin, T.J. Kraus examine quelques cas où les papyri viennent combler les lacunes de notre documentation historiographique ou archéologique.

J.-M. AUWERS


The present volume originated with the first international Princeton-Prague Symposium held in Prague in the spring of 2005. The symposium was devoted predominantly to the methodology of Jesus research and to discussion about its theological and hermeneutical dimensions. Pokorný, one of the editors and host of the meeting, notes in the preface:

We realized that it was necessary to make a clear distinction between the history of Jesus and the ways in which his significance is expressed in Christian confessions of faith (including his post-Easter evaluation). At the same time it became obvious that it
is not possible to separate these two dimensions from each other. On the one hand, the Christ of Christian confessions of faith inspires our critical research into Jesus. On the other hand, the adoration of Christ is linked with some ideas contained in his earthly teaching (such as apocalyptic messianic expectations) and the earthly Jesus is the point of reference or hermeneutic key for all later Christology. This is the general framework of our discussion, Jesus research has to be aware of these complex relations (p. xxii).

In the “Introduction: Why Evaluate Twenty-Five Years of Jesus Research?” (p. 1-15), Charlesworth describes the purpose of the symposium as follows: “…evaluate where we are in the study of the historical Jesus and what makes it possible to move forward in a better re-presentation and comprehension of Jesus who descended from Nazareth and into the consciousness of the West” (p. 1). Such evaluation is necessary since what had been perceived to be a developing consensus in the 1980s has collapsed into a chaos of opinions:

Jesus cannot be a marginal Jew … and a Cynic … Jesus cannot be closely linked to the Essenes … and a Jew significantly influenced by Pharisaism … Jesus cannot be deeply influenced by apocalyptic eschatology … and also announce a message that is fundamentally non-eschatological … Such conclusions are not compatible. How can such divergent views be possible when all scholars employ a disinterested scientific methodology? (p. 1).

Charlesworth then moves on to describe five new dimensions of current Jesus research and places the contributions of this volume into this helpful grid:

– First, the quest for the historical Jesus has been enriched, and sometimes replaced, by Jesus Research (research since 1985 to the present).
– Second, the new research is improved by the inclusion of all relevant methodologies.
– Third, perceptions have been clarified and errors are more obvious, and often corrected.
– Fourth, Jesus Research is enriched by new sources.
– Fifth, scholars are beginning to recognise the fundamental importance of topography and archaeology (p. 2).

The twelve essays are: S.E. Porter, “A Dead End or a New Beginning? Examining the Criteria for Authenticity in Light of Albert Schweitzer” (p. 16-35); J. Schröter, “Jesus of Galilee: The Role of Location in Understanding Jesus” (p. 36-55); J.H. Charlesworth, “From Old to New: Paradigm Shifts concerning Judaism, the Gospel of John, Jesus, and the Advent of ‘Christianity’” (p. 56-72); C. Claussen, “Turning Water to Wine: Re-reading the Miracle at the Wedding in Cana” (73-97); G. Theissen, “Jesus as an Itinerant Teacher: Reflections from Social History on Jesus’ Roles” (98-122); M. Wolter, “Jesus as a Teller of Parables: On Jesus’ Self-Interpretation in His Parables” (p. 123-139); K. Haacker, “‘What Must I Do to Inherit Eternal Life?’ Implicit Christology in Jesus’ Sayings about Life and the Kingdom” (p. 140-153); R. Hoppe, “How Did Jesus Understand His Death? The Parables in Eschatological Prospect” (p. 154-169); P. Pokorny, “Demoniac and Drunkard: John the Baptist and Jesus According to Q 7:33-34” (p. 170-181); C. Evans, “‘Have You Not Read …?’ Jesus’ Subversive Interpretation of Scripture” (p. 182-198); T. Holmen, “A Contagious Purity: Jesus’ Inverse Strategy for Eschatological Cleanliness” (p. 199-229); and U. Luz, “Founding Christianity: Comparing Jesus and Japanese ‘New Religions’” (p. 230-
254). There is also a selected bibliography, written up by B. RHEA (p. 255-286). The volume closes with an index of modern authors and of ancient texts.

According to Charlesworth, the contributors to this volume tend to concur that a sketch of Jesus is beginning to appear that is both increasingly reliable, historically, and helpful, theologically. They concur, with different degrees of emphasis, that Jesus’ message should be studied within the creative and sometimes diverse world of Second Temple Judaism, that the Evangelists did use sources and altered them in light of their own theology, that attempts to portray the historical Jesus were often distorted by Confessionalism and Anti-Semitism, and – most importantly – that it is possible to pursue Jesus Research. The life and mind of Jesus from Nazareth is no longer lost in the fog of theological pronouncements (p. 14).

The essays in this volume are well-researched and offer several fresh perspectives on the historical Jesus. They indicate that Jesus Research, as Charlesworth calls it (in German, Jesusforschung has been the term of choice for decades) is alive, still a worthwhile pursuit and likely to lead to fresh portrayals of Jesus in the twenty-first century.

The Princeton-Prague project “intends at regular intervals to review and evaluate the main results of research, to provide further inspiration in the form of new stimuli, and to support small groups or individuals cooperation with us” (p. xxii). The second Princeton-Prague symposium on Jesus Research met in 2007 in Princeton. Its aim was to map “the various branches of research that can be useful as our allies in Jesus Research, ranging from linguistics to psychology, numismatics, hermeneutics, and archaeology” (p. xxii; see also Charlesworth’s description on p. 14f.).

C. STENSCHE


In der Geschichte der Bibelauslegung spielt die Galaterbriefauslegung durch Luther und durch andere prominente Exegeten des 16. Jh. eine wichtige Rolle. Im Rahmen des neueren Interesses an der patristischen Exegese, das sich unter anderem einer breiten rezeptionsgeschichtlichen Wende in den Bibelwissenschaften hin zur Kulturwissenschaft und der von H. Lubac angestoßenen Origenes-Renaissance verdankt, wurde der Galaterbrief bereits mehrfach behandelt; vgl. etwa M. Meiser, Galater, Novum Testamentum Patristicum 9 (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007). Das vorliegende Buch, der erste Band der neuen Reihe The Bible in Medieval Tradition, spiegelt die Einsicht wieder, dass die mittelalterliche Bibelauslegung nicht nur das patriotische Erbe konserviert oder leicht modifiziert hat (so die bisherige vereinfachte Darstellung), sondern dass es durchaus bemerkenswerte Neuansätze gibt, die im Rahmen eines rezeptionsgeschichtlichen Ansatzes ernst zu nehmen sind. Herausgeber der Reihe sind H. Lawrence Bond, P.D.W. Krey und T. Ryan. Im Vorwort (i) zur Reihe schreiben sie:

The series takes its shape in dialogue both with the special traditions of medieval exegesis and with the interests of contemporary readers. Each volume in the series
comprises fresh translations of several commentaries. The selections are lengthy and, in most cases, have never been available in English before. Compared to patristic material, relatively little medieval exegesis has been translated. While medieval interpretations do resemble their patristic forebears, they do not simply replicate them. Indeed, they are produced in new times and in new situations. As a result, they lend insight into the changing culture and scholarship of the Middle Ages and comprise a store-house of the era’s theological and spiritual riches that can enhance contemporary reading of the Bible. They, therefore, merit their own consideration, to which this series is meant to contribute (ausführlicher auf S. ix–xi).


In der umfangreichen Einführung (S. 1-78) stellt Levy die ausgewählten Autoren und ihre Texte knapp vor. Dem folgt eine Einführung in die mittelalterliche Bibelauslegungstradition (S. 9-15, mit Schwerpunkt auf dem Galaterbrief und pln. Literatur allgemein) und deren Verankerung in der patristischen Zeit (S. 15-24). Einzelne Abschnitte gelten der Galaterauslegung des Hieronymus (S. 26-29) und des Augustinus (S. 30-32). Weiter beschreibt Levy die Galaterauslegung in der karolingischen Renaissance und in der Entwicklung der Scholastik, in der Glossa Ordinaria, in der Spätgeschichtlich und bei Thomas von Aquin. In diesem hilfreichen Überblick werden die hier ausgewählten Interpreten des Galaterbriefs gekonnt eingezeichnet. Auf S. 77f. erscheint eine knappe Zusammenfassung und Darstellung des gemeinsamen Grundanliegens der Galaterauslegung des Mittelalters („... the continuity of salvation history that binds the two testaments and the power of grace that is grasped in faith and manifested in love“, S. 77; „... the soteriology of the medieval exegetes was integrated into a comprehensive creedal theology that understood salvation as a process of incorporation into the divine life of the Trinity, which is itself a communion of love. For the medieval commentators the question was not so much how one might be saved, but rather how one might love“, S. 78). Der Band schliesst mit Bibliographie und verschiedenen Registern.

Die neue Serie und ihren gelungenen ersten Band nimmt man mit Interesse zur Kenntnis. Sie hat durch die Einführung und die flüssig lesbaren Übersetzungen das Potential, einem weiteren Publikum eine bisher vernachlässigte Epoche und ihre Lektüre des Galaterbriefs nahezubringen. Dabei zeigen sich auch erste Verbindungs-
linien zur Galaterauslegung der Reformationsepoche (etwa die Aussagen der Glossa Ordinaria zur Rechtfertigung durch den Glauben, die mit der rettenden Wirkung von tugendhaften Werken aus Glauben zusammen gesehen wurde).

Mit den Übersetzungen und der ausführlichen Einleitung und Würdigung leistet Levys Band einen wichtigen Beitrag zur gegenwärtigen Rezeptionsforschung, zur Theologie- und Dogmengeschichte, zur Hermeneutik, aber auch für eine auch rezeptionsgeschichtlich orientierte Bibelwissenschaft, deren Grenzen zur allgemeinen Kulturwissenschaft zunehmend verschwimmen. Ferner bietet die mittelalterliche Auslegung des Galaterbriefs Anhaltspunkte, wie der Brief im Rahmen einer geistlichen Schriftauslegung ein neues theologisches und pastorales Wirkungspotential entfalten könnte, das vergangene und gegenwärtige Aktualisierungen auf der Grundlage des Literalsinns durchaus zu ergänzen vermag.

Die detaillierte Darstellung der patristischen Exegese durch Martin Meiser (siehe oben) wird nirgendwo in Levys Band erwähnt.

C. STENSCHKE


For twenty years, from 1989 until his retirement in 2008, Dietrich-Alex Koch, professor em. of New Testament of the University of Münster, has organised excursions for students in theology, archaeology and ancient history to Italy, Greece, and various countries in Northern Africa and the Middle East to study in loco and de visu the remains of ancient Greek and Roman culture. A selection of the many photos he took on these journeys has now been collected and published in the present volume. The large majority of the 437 pictures were made by the author (some twenty were borrowed from colleagues, see the list p. 271). The author regards the work as a complement to textbooks on the subject and compares it to the famous Umwelt des Urchristentums edited long ago by Johannes Leipoldt and Walter Grundmann.

The material has been divided into three parts that are entitled, “The twofold globalisation of the ancient world” (with three subsections and a conclusion), “The ancient city as ‘Lebensraum’” (seven subsections and conclusion), and “The religious world – the world and the cult of the gods” (eight subsections and a conclusion). Each section contains a part of running text interspersed with photos and comments. A map and a table detailing the chronology of the period, two indexes (Places and Texts), and a couple of references to other works, offer helpful information for the student for whom this book was composed. But students will certainly not be the only ones to benefit from this work and to enjoy its many beautiful pictures and the instructive comments that accompany them.

Readers who have travelled this part of the world and are interested in archaeology and ancient culture in general will appreciate the wide range of the selection that is made, and now and then probably be reminded of their own visit to a particular location. When browsing through the book one has the impression that
not one of the important places is missing; on looking more carefully into the selection one will discover that many other places are present as well. Ephesus is there, and on more than one occasion, and so is Rome (and the museums in Berlin and Mainz, but not the Louvre or the British Museum!). But one will also find here, as perfect neighbours to the great cities of the ancient world, references to such probably less known places as Mactaris in Tunisia, Allianoi in Turkey, or Sabratha in Libya (all of them on p. 120-121). The comments show that the author has an eye for detail and a consideration for the student who may not always be sufficiently well instructed to identify the details of a particular statue or representation (see photo 312, and many others).

The first part of the book may seem to be the more difficult one to present. In three sections Koch explores the boundaries of the Hellenistic world and how it influenced and was itself influenced by local traditions in art and in culture in general. Asia Minor is presented from the perspective of the symbiosis that was created in its territory; Cyprus is cited as an illustration of a meeting point between traditions; Syria for its capacity to create a new synthesis; Egypt as the outer limit of the Hellenistic empire; and Palestine as a place where this influence was often considered to be dangerous and traumatic. The second section deals with the Romans and the way they expanded their influence in the Eastern Mediterranean and in Northern Africa. The army and the famous Roman administration are key notions, but so are Roman mythology and the Roman emperors. The third section shows the influence these expansions had on infrastructure, trade and business.

The second part illustrates all possible aspects of daily life in cosmopolitan and provincial cities. The agora, and what it means for the public life, takes a place of honour, but Koch also deals with the water supply system, a critical issue for any city in antiquity, education (gymnasia and libraries), entertainment, the social strata, the private life in the houses, and the role of the family in respecting its deceased members. If education takes a relatively small place (only five photos), entertainment receives more attention (28 photos), but then I guess the excursions were in part also holidays! The latter section contains some of the more spectacular (theatres and amphitheatres) and more famous photos (the theatres of Pergamon and Ephesus, along with those of Bosra in Syria and Sabratha, but not that of Epidauros, which is of course much older, though its stadium is mentioned), but also some of the more amusing ones (photos of mosaics of sports heroes and of the whole range of wild animals featuring in the arena). Perhaps less spectacular but equally searching for ways to impress the passer-by are some of the photos of men and women in the next section, on social rank and status, expressing their importance through the statue they had made of themselves or through the inscription that was made in their honour. Of a more introvert character are the many photos of the private house, the place where one withdraws from public life, to rule over a micro-cosmos that all too often was modelled after that of the public sphere. As one could expect, Pompei takes a place of honour here, but there are also a couple of instructive photos from Ostia. Here again, the interest in architecture is balanced and completed with a series of pictures on the details of daily life (apotropaic symbols).

The third section contains photos illustrating the religious life, an aspect of which had been dealt with already at the end of the previous section on the cult of the dead. It opens with a series of pictures on the cult of the gods (sacrifice, processions and other festivals, the temple and its infrastructure). It continues with
sections on the most important Greek and Roman gods (with Cybele as something of an outsider), fertility and health cults (Silvanus and Asclepius), the cult of heroes (Hercules, of course, but also Achilles who managed to remain present), the mystery cults – old and new, the wave of gods invading the western world (Jupiter Dolichenus), the king/emperor cult, and an outsider in this religious pantheon – Judaism and the Jewish diaspora. The latter is illustrated with photos from Corinth and Ostia (but not Sardes!). The Flavii and Hadrian are the stars of the section on the king/emperor, as one would expect it, but they are closely rivalled by the impressive pictures from the Commagenes of Nemrud Dag. In terms of “international fame”, the emperors also had to rival with such gods as Mithras (one of the mithraeum in Ostia next to a picture from the mithraeum in Carrawburgh on Hadrian’s wall). From the Egyptian pantheon, Serapis take his modest place next to his much more popular wife and partner Isis, who is literally ubiquitous (photos from Perge, Rome, and Meroe, in the Sudan). The sequence of Demeter, Orpheus, and Dionysus illustrates in only a couple of pages the great differences there are between these cults – sober and introvert for the first two, quite more joyful and even somewhat frivolous for the third one (see nos. 363-372).

Many of us have the strong feeling that they are living in a period of transition, a period when the book is “finished” and all interesting things can be found on the internet. Many of the photos collected here can indeed be found on websites, and a good number of them even on good and instructive websites. Yet it remains a particular pleasure, at least for this reader, to be able to browse through a well-structured and informative selection of pictures, such as the one that has been produced by Dietrich-Alex Koch.

J. VERHEYDEN


Der vorliegende, reich illustrierte Band gibt einen hervorragenden Einblick in die Welt griechisch-römischer Ärzte. Im ersten Teil behandelt die Autorin die Themen griechischer Medizin: Asklepiosmedizin – Heilung im Schlaf, die Philosophenärzte – wer bin ich? Wie soll ich leben?, Räucherungen – der Atem der Götter, Knidos und Kos als rivalisierende Zentren griechischer Heilkunst, das Corpus Hippocraticum, Gesundheitspflege – vorbeugen statt heilen, moderne Gesundheitspflege – was gibt es Neues seit der Antike?, die Bedeutung der
Medizin in Alexandria sowie Sektionen und die durch sie ausgelöste Debatte („Ethos gegen Forschergeist“).


C. STENSCHE


In the “Introduction” (p. 1-8), Nobbs starts with a brief sketch of the development and use of the term “Late Antiquity”, recent developments in the field and Judge’s approach to it:

Much current research centres on issues of ethnicity/identity and cultural change versus continuity. Such new(ish) focal points may well enhance our perceptions of the interactions of the classical with the Christianised late Roman world, both east and west. They will expand and complement but not replace the insights offered here. These arise from close documentary studies into the interaction of Jerusalem with Athens and its ongoing significance for the present (p. 1).

Nobbs then summarizes and assesses the essays contained in the volume and places them in the wider discussion (p. 2-6) and describes, in closing, the origins and development of the Department of Ancient History at Macquarie University in the past forty years and mentions the scholars who were influential in these developments (p. 6-8).

The essays are, in *Part One*, based on the juxtaposition between “Classical Antiquity and Christianity”: “The Beginning of Religious History” (p. 11-31); “Group Religions in the Roman Empire” (p. 32-43); “Synagogue and Church in the Roman Empire: The Insoluble Problem of Toleration” (p. 44-57; a study of how synagogues and churches were treated differently from each other in Roman imperial thinking down to the time of Gallienus: “The Jews were a ‘nation’ with a strong sense of their national heritage, while Christians were ‘Roman’, and therefore expected to conform to the Roman state”, 2); “The Impact of Paul’s Gospel on Ancient Society” (p. 58-68; describing self-disclosure and the individual in relation to Paul, “Paul’s quest for the ‘inner man’… ran counter to the self-display found in classical drama and thought”, 2); “‘Antike und Christentum’: Some Recent Work from Cologne” (p. 69-79); “‘Antike und Christentum’: Towards a Definition of the Field” (p. 80-108) and “Athens and Jerusalem” (p. 109-117; a survey of Australian research from 1965-1990 on the ideas behind “Athens and Jerusalem”).

The essays of *Part Two* are devoted to “Documents of Late Antiquity” and provide illustrations of Judge’s way of using documentary evidence from papyri and inscriptions: “Jews, Proselytes and God-fearers Club Together” (p. 121-129; analysis of the “God-fearer” inscription from Aphrodisias), “A State Schoolteacher Makes a Salary Bid” (p. 130-136; including discussion of literacy and the churches in the third century); “The Ecumenical Synod of Dionysiac Artists” (p. 137-139; addressing the implications of the use of the terms “ecumenical” and “synod” for their adoption within Christianity); “The Puzzle of Christian Presence in Egypt Before Constantine” (p. 140-155; an overview of the surviving papyrus evidence for the Christianisation of Egypt, “a detailed, tabulated and fully up-to-date (2010)
distillation of all that can be deduced about the spread and organisation of church life up to AD 324”, p. 3f.); “The Earliest Use of monachos for ‘Monk’ (P.Coll. Youtie 77) and the Origins of Monasticism” (p. 156-177; in a secular document dated to June 324 AD); “Fourth-Century Monasticism in the Papyri” (p. 178-184); “The Quest for Mercy in Late Antiquity” (p. 185-197; papyrus evidence for the permeation throughout Egyptian society of the notion of mercy) and “The Magical Use of Scripture in the Papyri” (p. 198-208, dealing with “magic in relation to the kinds of everyday concerns which the Church preferred to address through intercessory prayer. The continued and pervasive appeal to magic (despite the attempts of the Church and in some cases of the state to suppress it) continued throughout the fourth century and beyond”, p. 4f.). The first three essays in this part originally appeared in the New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity-series.

Part Three bridges the gap “From Ancient to Modern”. Says Nobbs:

To study antiquity in the way set out in this and in the other collected volumes of Judge’s work is not simply to lose ourselves in the fascination of the past, nor merely to reflect on the common humanity which binds us across the millennia. For Judge, as for many others, the roots of the attitudes which form the basis of modern Western culture lie in the period roughly from 500 BC to AD 500. The tensions between the classical and the Judaico-Christian worlds still largely drive the mindset of their twenty-first century legatees (p. 5).

It contains: “The Conversion of Rome: Ancient Sources of Modern Social Tensions” (p. 211-231, Christianity encompassed all social classes and broke deliberately with the well-developed Roman system of rank and status, “Nevertheless as a movement it was driven essentially not by the disadvantaged, though it worked in their favour, but initially at any rate by the well-to-do leaders of the local Hellenistic Jewish establishment in the Eastern Mediterranean. Intellectual combined with social forces to promote and spread the Gospel through the period to Late Antiquity”); “Christian Innovation and its Contemporary Observers” (p. 232-253; a survey of fourth-century reactions to Christianity); “The Interaction of Biblical and Classical Education in the Fourth Century” (p. 254-260; the education system was a front line in the fourth-century conflict); “Conversion in the Ancient World” (p. 261-263); “The Absence of Religion, Even in Ammianus?” (p. 264-275, clarification by analyzing Ammianus’ language of what it was about the Christians that was causing such an impact and such havoc in public life); “Biblical Sources of Historical Method” (276-281) and “Ancient Beginnings of the Modern World” (p. 282-314, “It is vital to our future that we understand the world as the people of the past and we have made it. Here lies the challenge to integrate the world of scholarship, classical and Christian, with the concerns of our society”, p. 6).

The volume closes with a list of the occasional papers of E.A. Judge (p. 315-321), an index with documents recovered directly from antiquity, with authors and works from the literary tradition and an index of selected topics and terms. It is welcome that, with the present volume, the important contributions of Judge – so far scattered in a number of, at times little known and difficult to access publications – are now easily accessible. They show that the combination of erudite, detailed and creative interaction with the primary sources and the international, interdisciplinary scholarly discussion still yields fresh insights.

C. STENSCHE

When Prudentius receives attention, it is typically on account of his monumental poems, *Psychomachia* and *Peristephanon* – that is to say, as a Christian successor to the pagan epicist, Virgil. But Gerard O’Daly reports that Prudentius was shelved beside Horace, Rome’s foremost lyricist, towards the middle of the fifth century in “libraries in villas near Nîmes”, which suggests “a recognition of their affinity as writers”. In *Days Linked by Song*, O’Daly reintroduces this Horatian Prudentius, and invites us to revisit some of the most accomplished Christian lyric of late antiquity – Prudentius’ song-cycle, *Cathemerinon*.

*Days Linked by Song* is the first *en face* English translation of the *Cathemerinon* since H.J. Thomson’s edition (London 1949), and includes a revised Latin text on the basis of J. Bergman’s critical edition (Leipzig 1926), which O’Daly prefers to M.P. Cunningham’s later, less critical edition (Turnhout 1966). O’Daly’s twelve essays on the *Cathemerinon*’s songs amount to the work’s first commentary in English. These essays make a handsome contribution to the philological and theological literature on Prudentius, and thereby, to a set of disputes refocused by Alan Cameron in last year’s *The Last Pagans of Rome* (Oxford 2011), in which a section is devoted to Prudentius.

In 1976, Marion van Assendelft published a commentary in English on four of the *Cathemerinon*’s twelve hymns. The last monographs on the *Cathemerinon* were then published by Willy Evenpoel in Dutch, and Jean-Louis Charlet in French, in 1979 and 1982 respectively. Thirty years have passed. More recently, if more generally, there are signs of a wakening interest in Prudentius. In the English literature at least, this is the fourth title on Prudentius to appear since 2008 – albeit the first on the *Cathemerinon*.

*Days Linked by Song* is an unusually generous and perceptive work. It is preceded by O’Daly’s acclaimed study of *The Poetry of Boethius* and by his works, spanning several decades, on the Milanese Neo-Platonism of Ambrose and Augustine. O’Daly’s close acquaintance with Ambrose’s oeuvre is particularly evidenced in this new volume. Ambrose’s hymns and sermons provide us throughout with metrical, symbolical and doctrinal points of reference, while Ausonius, Paulinus of Nola and Augustine (*inter alia*) are also cited to good effect.

Pagan flourishes abound in the *Cathemerinon*, but they are often formal or allusive – and thus, elusive. O’Daly registers the echoes and cross-echoes of Ennius (*via* Cicero), Lucretius and Phaedrus (the Latin fabulist), Ovid and Virgil, and decisively, Horace. Prudentius exhibits most of the “predilections of later Latin poetry”, which is still to say, the predilections of ‘secular’ poetry. (Thus Augustine, Prudentius’ contemporary, can casually dismiss the poets’ *litteras saeculares* in a sermon.) Nevertheless, the *Cathemerinon* is resolutely, stridently Christian. At dusk, Prudentius sings: “fixed to the cross (*praefixa cruci*) our hope is strong.” And throughout, it is an intensely Christian hope, a sense and typology of temporality, that this poet celebrates – whence, of course, the song-cycle’s title (which may well be Prudentius’). The *kathêmerinôn* is a “book of songs for the day”.

At one point, Prudentius hails his lord, “you divide the time in regular sequences (*certis vicibus*)”, and *Cathemerinon* 1 to 6 track the day – any day – according to its quotidian “sequences”. They successively embellish six ‘hours’
of a devotee’s day and night. Predictably, then, Cath. 1 begins as Cath. 6 ends: with sleep. And sleep, for Prudentius, is an “image of death everlasting” from which Christ wakes us at first light (Cath. 1), and over which Christ graciously presides in the night hours (Cath. 6). “Darkness flies from the cross”, he assures us – the darkesses of sin, sleep and death. Cath. 1 to 6 recall the soul to this hope at “pre-dawn”, at table, at “the lighting of the lamps”, and so on. The soul’s “origin [is] in heaven”, and all future time – at every time – belongs to “none other than the Thunderer’s lamb (tonantis agnum”).

In Cathemerinon 7 to 12, there is no sequential “connection with the day’s course”, and O’Daly declines to “impose a unity” on these songs by relating them to “stages of the Christian liturgical year” – as Charlet does, for instance. Cath. 7 and 8 are “clearly about regular fasting”, while Cath. 11 and 12 “form a loose pair” corresponding to feast days. But beyond this, O’Daly will not go: “The title of the book [Cathemerinon], if it goes back to Prudentius, may refer to Cath. 1-6 only, with 7-12 added by him or a later editor of the lyric collection.” Cath. 7 to 12 include a serviceable “hymn for any hour” (Cath. 9), and a hymn “for the burial of the dead” (Cath. 10) that may be of particular interest to liturgical and social historians. Resurrection is vividly evoked in Cath. 10 to sanction “care with graves” (cura sepulcris), while casting a coat of dust over any exposed corpse – recall Antigone’s piety – becomes “a work of kindness / in piety to Christ”.

That all of this is to be sung can be heard in O’Daly’s title for the volume, which derives from a passage where Prudentius writes:

She [the poet’s soul] should link the days with hymns, / and let no night pass without singing about her lord.

The poet then exhorts himself (and his audience):

She should trample on the rites of pagans, / bring destruction, Rome, on your idols, / devote songs to the martyrs, praise the apostles.

Though these lines are taken from Prudentius’ Praefatio, which O’Daly appends to the volume, rather than from the Cathemerinon itself, they effectively convey an oscillation between lyric devotion and epic contestation that characterize his songs. Prudentius can lisp, sweetly, “Without you, Lord, nothing is sweet” (te sine dulce nihil, domine); but in this poet’s ars, even love songs – pious amatoria – are never less than songs of pious war.

O’Daly signals as much in a representative comment on Prudentius’ choice of metre for Cath. 9, a hymn that opens in a mock-lascivious vein (“Give me my plectrum, boy, to sing for the dancers”). This is O’Daly:

The triumph, with its military associations, is not the only context in which this metre is used in late antiquity: it is also the metre of the erotic Pervigilium Veneris. But it is, in addition, the metre of Hilary’s Hymn 3 (Adae carnis gloriosae), composed, like Cath. 9, in three-line stanzas, and, though incompletely transmitted, evidently a celebration of the victory ... of the second Adam, Christ, over Satan and sin.

Densely interlaced formal and typological elements are beautifully noted, like this, in all of the volume’s essays, even where – in a volume of this size – they can only be noted.

In his fine-grained, short-stanza renderings of these songs, O’Daly displays an acute sensitivity to the living language, and the dead. His literal verse is more
transparent than David Slavitt’s liberal version (Baltimore 1996), which Days Linked by Song should replace in syllabuses. And O’Daly’s translations are particularly noteworthy for the use of something like an Anglo-Saxon kenning – at times hyphenated, at times not – to parse the compact Latin. The technique is with us from the first page of Cath. 1, where Prudentius’ phrase, vox ab alto culmine, becomes a “voice from the high sky roof”. Much later, we see the deity in Cath. 10 addressed as ignee fons animarum, which becomes a “fiery soul-source” in translation.

It is perhaps in Cath. 3 that such ‘kennings’ are most frequent, with O’Daly stringing a trio of Prudentian neologisms on a thread of fresh compounds in the first lines of the hymn.

O crucifer bone, lucisator, / omniparens pie, verbigena ...
becomes,

O kind cross-carrier, light-sower, / caring All-father, Word-born ...

Put simply: this could not be older, purer English; and this could not be closer to Prudentius’ original. Yet there is nothing like mannerism or archaism in ‘cross-carrier’ (crucifer), ‘light-sower’ (lucisator) or ‘Word-born’ (verbigena).

Later in Cath. 3, we encounter this “Word-born” god in nearly Blakean images, but still ad-verbum English:

You, Christ, are for me the mighty dove (columba potens) ... / you are the snow-white lamb that keeps the wolf, / jaws agape, away from your sheepfold, / yoking the tiger (subiuga tigridis), closing its mouth shut.

The same figure is then praised for “the work of his mouth, fire-energy (vigor igneolus)”, while this song – which is Prudentius’ idea of a “hymn before the meal” – concludes with a Dantesque sweep from death and corruption to the “fire-stars” of heaven.

The same hope awaits my limbs, / which, bidden to lie (iussa quiescere) in the tomb / funereal, putrefying, / the leader risen from the same earth, / Christ, summons to the fire-stars (ignea Christus ad astra vocat).

While this “theme of the rotting corpse is frequent in Prudentius”, as O’Daly remarks here, nevertheless, “an ascent of the earth-born to the finest element, fire (and to no ordinary terrestrial fire) is the Christian hope”. This hope flames up Prudentius’ breviary. And we are fortunate to have this type of virtuosic, visionary Christian lyric, done into spare and striking English, by a scholar whose control of the late-antique Latin and the relevant sources – pagan and Christian – is likely unsurpassed.

D. VAN DUSEN


Actes d’un colloque consacré au Καιτό παπασόν αϊρέσεων ἐλεγχος en dix livres, composé en grec par un auteur actif à Rome sous l’épiscopat de Zéphyrin
(199-217) et de Calliste [ou Calixte] (217-222), sans doute après la mort de ce dernier. Ce document, dont la plus grande partie (les livres IV et suivants) a été découverte en 1842 dans un manuscrit du Mont Athos (aujourd’hui le Paris. Gr. Suppl. 464), a suscité de vifs débats depuis que Pierre Nautin a refusé son attribution à l’auteur du Contre Noët, Hippolyte, pour l’attribuer audacieusement à un auteur dont aucune œuvre n’est conservée, Josippe. Intervient également dans le débat la liste d’œuvres littéraires gravée sur le trône d’une statue retrouvée à Rome au milieu du XVIe siècle près de la catacombe de St. Hippolyte (statue acéphale, dont on ne sait si elle est celle d’un homme [Hippolyte?] ou d’une femme). Dans la contribution liminaire (p. 3-23), E. Norelli présente à la fois l’œuvre – en particulier la question fort complexe de son attribution à Hippolyte – et l’ensemble du colloque, qui est centré sur la compréhension de l’ouvrage en tant que tel ou, plus précisément, sur le discernement des stratégies textuelles et idéologiques qu’il met en œuvre.

W. Löhr («The Continuing Construction of Heresy: Hippolyt’s Refutatio in Context», p. 25-42) souligne que l’Elenchos se propose d’exposer les différentes hérésies qu’il décrit avant de les réfuter, au 10e livre. Löhr passe en revue les corrélation établies par l’auteur entre des hérésies et des écoles philosophiques et montre qu’elles ne sont affirmées en détail que dans quatre cas (Valentiniens, Basilidiens, Marcion et Noët), même si, de manière générale, le lien entre les hérésies et les philosophies est la caractéristique hérésiologique la plus importante de l’œuvre. Une nouveauté importante introduite par l’Elenchos dans la tradition hérésiologique est la fusion du discours apologétique, visant à démontrer que le christianisme est la sagesse la plus ancienne (et la seule vraie), et du discours hérésiologique, visant à stigmatiser la nouveauté de l’hérésie.

B. Pouderon («Hippolyte, un regard sur l’hérésie entre tradition et invention», p. 43-71) met en évidence les idées fondamentales de l’Elenchos: la notion de succession comme critère de vérité dans l’église catholique et la fausse tradition des hérésies; l’ancienneté et l’unité de la doctrine vraie opposées à la nouveauté et à la diversité des doctrines hérétiques; la dénonciation de l’allégorisation des Écritures telle que les hérétiques la pratiquent; le plagiat; le paradoxe entre la diversité des hérésies et leur unité fondamentale, due au fait qu’elles remontaient à un seul ancêtre, Simon de Samarie.


L’attitude de notre auteur à l’égard des philosophes fait l’objet des deux contributions suivantes. A.P. Bos («Basilides of Alexandria disqualified as not a Christian but an Aristotelician by the author of the Elenchos», p. 103-118) analyse la présentation (très orientée) que l’Elenchos fait de la doctrine de Basilide et la comparaison avec la philosophie d’Aristote (elle aussi déformée) de laquelle l’hérétique dépendrait entièrement selon l’hérésiologue. A. Longo («Empedocle e l’allegoria nella Confutazione di tutte le eresie attribuita a Ippolito di Roma», p. 119-133) étudie la comparaison que l’Elenchos établit entre Marcion et Empédocle en montrant que, si celle-ci est un unicum de notre auteur, la présentation d’Empédocle comme pythagoricien et de son accord avec Platon, pythagoricien lui

Cl. Scholten («Autor, Anliegen und Publikum der *Refutatio*», p. 135-166) examine de manière systématique le rapport entre le projet de l’*Elenchos* et le public que cet ouvrage pouvait viser: les couches cultivées de la ville de Rome, mais aussi tout honnête homme disposé à chercher la vérité et la vertu. En fonction de ce public, le christianisme est présenté comme renouant avec la philosophie primitive et vraie, par delà des formes corrompues représentées par les écoles philosophiques.

G. Ducœur («Les hérésiarques chrétiens à l’École des sages d’Orient?», p. 167-188) explore la manière dont l’*Elenchos* construit le rapport des hérésies avec les religions orientales. Selon lui, l’*Elenchos* aurait été rédigé en deux temps: d’abord un court ouvrage qui mettait en parallèle les écoles philosophiques et les hérésies chrétiennes; puis, après l’arrivée d’Hippolyte dans la communauté, un ouvrage plus développé qui faisait une large place aux sagesses orientales et ajoutait de nouvelles hérésies.

G. Sfamени Gasparro («I rischi dell’Hellenismòs: astrologia ed eresia nella *Refutatio*», p. 189-217) cherche à comprendre les éléments d’astronomie et d’astrologie que l’auteur de l’*Elenchos* trouvait – ou prétendait trouver – dans les sources hérétiques qu’il utilisait, en particulier un commentaire gnostique aux *Phaenomena* d’Aratus, que l’*Elenchos* exploite au livre IV, et la carte du ciel selon les Pérates, dont il est question au livre V.

E. Castelli («The Author of the *Refutatio omnium haeresium* and the attribution of the *De universo* to Flavius Josephus», p. 219-231) se demande pourquoi le traité *Sur l’univers* a été attribué à Flavius Josèphe. Un détour s’impose pour répondre à cette question: d’après Porphyre (*De l’abstinence* 4,11), Josèphe aurait parlé des esséniens dans la *Guerre juive*, dans les *Antiquités* et dans le second de ses deux livres *Aux Grecs*. E. C. montre que ce dernier ouvrage ne peut être le *Contre Apion*, mais est probablement l’écrit *Sur l’univers* qui aurait contenu une notice sur les esséniens s’inspirant de Flavius Josèphe et aurait circulé sous le nom de ce dernier dès le IIIe siècle.

E. Norelli («Construire l’opposition entre orthodoxie et hérésie à Rome au IIIe siècle», p. 233-255) analyse le «discours véritable autour du divin» (*Elenchos*, X,31-34) qui vise à montrer que la révélation chrétienne fournit la réponse correcte au problème des causes et des principes qu’Aristote définissait comme le problème fondamental de toute la connaissance et que, par conséquent, l’erreur principale de l’hérésie est une fausse compréhension de Dieu et du monde due au fait d’avoir suivi les philosophies grecques ainsi que les religions polythéistes et l’astrologie au lieu de la révélation accordée aux prophètes.

Les deux dernières contributions essaient de situer l’*Elenchos* dans l’évolution doctrinale et institutionnelle de l’Église romaine dans la première moitié du IIIe siècle. M. Simonetti («Per un profilo dell’autore dell’*Elenchos*», p. 257-273) replace la christologie de l’*Elenchos* dans le contexte doctrinal du christianisme romain où, entre le milieu du IIe siècle et le milieu du IIIe, la théologie du Logos est fortement concurrencée par une théologie monarchienne et regardée comme suspecte. Par ailleurs, l’étude de l’écclésiologie de notre auteur conduit Simonetti de formuler l’hypothèse qu’il aurait essayé de prolonger la situation d’une com-

Une bibliographie des travaux sur l’Elenchos publiés entre 1940 et 2010, rédigée par G. Aragione, clôt ce beau volume, qui ouvre de nouvelles perspectives sur un ouvrage d’importance exceptionnelle dont le rôle dans l’histoire du christianisme antique a été bien moins étudié qu’il ne le mérite.

J.-M. Auwers


Dossey’s work Peasant and Empire in Christian North Africa is a powerful new addition to the expanding library of research being conducted on late antique North Africa and Donatist Christianity. Even more than that, it fills a major lacuna in understanding some of the greatest unresolved matters in Roman Africa: especially the social dynamism that empowered the Donatist Church to begin with. Dossey’s insights into the social/political/economic context of 4th and 5th century North Africa and how that fuelled Donatism rightly place this work in the lineage of the likes of W.H.C. Frend and his magisterial The Donatist Church. I say this because Dossey brings forth a penetrating account of archaeological and source analysis (including the evidence contained in Augustine of Hippo and other contemporary church documents) that fills the gaps of previous works on Roman North Africa and Donatist Christianity and moves to answer why Donatism was such a potent movement within Africa: because of the social and political changes that were emboldening ordinary Africans, that is, the peasant class. This change of emphasis, away from a view to the opinions of literati and ruling Romans in Africa who wrote most of the surviving sources means that Dossey is able to escape the age-old tendency to get bogged down in polemics and find the underlying substance of African society.

Peasant and Empire consists of seven chapters contained in three parts, but also contains an introduction and historical overview that is helpful to newcomers to this area of study as well a healthful refresher for the experienced reader. Particularly helpful is her use of data charts, mosaic reproductions, an appendix containing a list of identifiable rural bishoprics in Africa, and a bibliography that is valuable for the continued study of Donatism. Going beyond that, in chapter seven, Dossey presents a very original explanation of the Circumcellion phenomenon in North Africa, an area of research that is still debated. An additional gem in the book is Dossey’s description of the Donatist Compendium, that is, the
collection of recently uncovered sermons that are now classified as written by anonymous Donatist writers.

Part One presents the bulk of Dossey’s approach from archaeological evidence. Here she lavishes data from recent site surveys in North Africa and the existence of ceramic and ware production at digs throughout the region. She is able to point to statistical evidence that in the 4th and 5th centuries there was a dramatic proliferation in ceramic wares in North Africa outside the major cities, in peasant villages and other farming locales that lacked a strong aristocracy or decurion class (the mid-level class of Roman society). Corresponding to this were traceable increases in the availability of metal and glass production, domestic architecture quality, bathhouses, coinage, and more intricate and elaborate clothing for peasants indicated in mosaics evidence. What Dossey takes away from this analysis is that the Roman colonial strategy of the 2nd through 3rd centuries of trying to remake African in the image of Rome, which focused on ridding rural communities of Berbers in favour of more controllable cities and estates, began to break-down. What this evolution in political and social control meant concretely is that African peasants were experiencing an unprecedented level of material wealth as they began to attain means of production at rural sites throughout Africa and became less dependent on imports from Carthage and beyond. This meant that by the 300s there was increasingly less of an extreme between the wealth found in cities and in rural communities. Incidentally, this means that rural, peasant Africans were attaining success via more acceptance of Roman life, i.e. Romanisation, and not through a rejection of it as has often been the narrative of the Donatist controversy in 20th century works. But this bottom-up success story of Roman Africa also was the source of tensions, especially observable in the Donatist controversy, namely that the decurion class resented their evaporate status and loss of control over the rustic class, which led to noteworthy anxiety amongst the ruling elites as well that social changes were too extreme to be sustained.

In Part Two, Dossey expands this social analysis to show how Christianity filled the void left by the Romans in the process of dissolving rural communities in favour of estates and cities. The existence of disproportionately large numbers of bishops in the African provinces in relation to other places in the empire has confounded scholars since before the time of W.H.C. Frend, and has often been explained as a means of polemical one-upmanship between Catholics and Donatists to see who had numerical supremacy in Africa. Instead, Dossey applies her same analytical and statistical rigour to deduce that bishoprics that were often located on farms or settlements with very small populations were social organisational elements. These bishops were merely replacing what Roman colonial practice had taken from Africans in the first place. A by-product of this idiosyncratic practice of installing so many bishops throughout Africa was a tradition of increasingly empowered peasants being involved in the process of selecting and supporting bishops. Peasants were increasingly romanised in mindset and material culture and were assiduous users of this method of social organisation to achieve a level of cultural status that had been denied by the Roman elites in Carthage, other luminal cities, and the large estates. This is a key point in this book: emerging rural villages and its leaders became the source of the Donatist Church’s potency.

Part Three is where Dossey describes the spark that ignited Christianity in North Africa to become a controversy a la Donatism. The author points to the effect of sermons of local clergy (especially looking at the Donatist Compendium), preaching in Latin and Punic or Berber, in fanning disruptions in power
relations between peasant and powerful in the African countryside. This was not an intended result, instead the introduction of sermons and rural ministry led to what Dossey describes as “the consequence of rural populations being exposed to the techniques of literacy for the first time and, as a result, attempting to use documents, normative texts, and communications networks in their own interests” (p. 198). Such preaching created a context allowing for “textual communities” where a theological and canonical application could be applied to settlements of families in rural villages, and a Christianity that was markedly different than in the larger Roman cities in Africa. Indeed, the romanisation of rural Africans and their integration of the master culture in a uniquely rural way meant that tensions between the rustici and urbs were inevitable. As the power of the elite classes of Roman society began to fracture and change, the christianisation of the African countryside meant that its clergy would be a powerful voice at the imperial and magisterial level. It was only a matter of time till these changes would manifest into a full-on conflagration between the established power elites and the emerging and increasingly self-confident backwater peasants of Africa.

M.A. GAUMER


Over the last decade, the figure of Augustine has been integrated within Late Antiquity studies. Next to the more traditional Patristic/theological-philosophical research of Augustine, he is now also studied as an historical figure situated within the historical, cultural, socio-economic context of Late Antiquity. The present volume combines both the approach of Augustine as an exponent of the Late Antique social, intellectual and cultural context (parts I-V) and the more “traditional-theological” approach of Augustine’s thinking and writing (part VI). The companion concludes by discussing the reception and influence of Augustine’s ideas (part VII). Each chapter is written by a scholar internationally recognized as an expert on the specific topic under discussion. All of the 38 chapters are conceived of as ad rem and clearly structured essays, combining a presentation of sources and scientific research devoted to each topic. Every chapter ends with a selection of further reading.

Following two alphabetical lists of the works of Augustine (in Latin and English), a concise chronological overview of his life and an introduction about the goal of this companion by editor M. Vessey, the first five parts are devoted to the multi-disciplinary analysis of the life, writings and thinking of Augustine within the contextual framework of the late Roman world. The first part sketches the threefold context: political history (Ch. Kelly), cultural geography of Roman North Africa (W.E. Klingshirn) and religious sociology (É. Rebillard). The next part deals with Augustine’s *Confessions*, on how to read this autobiography (C. Conybeare; P. Fredriksen) in which Augustine portrays his initial worldly ambitions (R.S.O. Tomlin) and personal relationships (K. Cooper) against the background of the social patterns of the time. The topic of the *Confessions* as a form of communication is deepened by a series of studies of the use of media in Augustine’s time and by himself: his perception and praxis of language
(Ph. Burton), his epistolary network (C. Sotinel), the influence of Roman public spectacles on Augustine’s “dramatization” of his writings (R. Lim), and his reflections on books (G. Strouma). Part IV presents Augustine’s textual context: the Latin Classics in which he was trained as a schoolboy (D. Shanzer), the philosophers who fostered in him a quest for truth (S. Byers), the Manichean literature that initially seduced Augustine (J. Van Oort), Augustine’s struggle with Scripture which was solved by his discovery and further deepening of allegorical and Christological exegesis (M. Cameron), the latter inspired by preceding and contemporary Christian authors (M. Edwards; M.S. Williams) amongst which Augustine took a prominent place due to his leading role in the “the textualization of Latin Christianity” (O’Donnell, 1991, p. 22, quoted on p. 253) (M. Vessey). The fifth part gives an overview of the diversity of roles Augustine played: philosopher (G. Clark), dialogue partner (Th. Führer), spiritual leader (J.P. Kenney), preacher for his flock (H. Muller), administrator of his diocese (N.B. McLynn) and controversialist (C. Humphress).

Part VI addresses the content of Augustine’s thinking, and the positions he took regarding human will (J. Wetzel), the body (D.G. Hunter) and friendship (S. Rebénich), on the nature of the Church (A. Evers) and its relation to the secular and political world (R. Dodaro). Important aspects of his theology, such as his reflections on Scripture and the Trinity (S. MacCormack) and Redemption (L. Ayres), are presented. The last part is devoted to the circulation of Augustine’s writings (C. Weidmann) and his reception in Late Antiquity and the Western Early Middle Ages (C. Leyser), the High and Later Middle Ages and the Renaissance and Reformation era (E.L. Saak), and in modern and postmodern philosophy (J. Brachtendorf; J.D. Caputo). J.J. O’Donnell ends with an envoy which lists avenues of possible further research in Augustine. The monograph is complemented with an extensive bibliography and index.

Because of the specific emphasis on the Late Antiquity approach of Augustine, the crucial themes of his (theological-philosophical) thinking are discussed, but, compared with the elaborate attention given to the contextuality of Augustine, receive perhaps less attention than they deserve. The editor, however, states from the beginning that it was precisely the intention of this volume to do so, and refers to existing scientific literature and established reference works within Augustine research for the study of the content of his philosophy and theology. As such, this present inter- and intradisciplinary companion to Augustine gathers and presents new flavours within Augustine research, which certainly leaves us yearning for more.

A. Dupont


Within the study of Augustine, his homiletic activities and the Donatist controversy has enjoyed an increase in academic interest in the last decades. The
present volume, the result of the doctoral dissertation of Horace E. Six-Means, combines both research interests. Based on a selection of Augustine’s sermons, letters and writings, against the background of African councils and Imperial religious legislation of the last decade of the fourth and the first decade of the fifth century, the author investigates what he designates as Augustine’s campaign of catholicization. He considers Augustine to be the “African Catholic Church’s key articulator and ‘spin doctor’ in a comprehensive, multivalent campaign to Catholicize Roman Africa” (p. 4), through an internal reform of the Church and an external campaign against “religious others”, mainly Donatists.

The first section presents the thematic foundations of Augustine’s Catholicization activity. The author begins with explaining Augustine’s self-understanding in this perspective, and shows how this self-understanding evolved through the subsequent social roles in the life of Augustine. The Confessiones illustrate Augustine’s pre-baptismal identity shifts: ambitious rhetor, searcher for truth, Manichee, Sceptic and (Christian) Neo-Platonist. The Confessiones combined with other early writings of Augustine, reveal his post-baptismal identity shifts: monk, priest and bishop. Central in this inner growth of Augustine is humility: taking distance from the sin of pride, opening up for God’s grace, in faithful service to the people of God, subordinate to the mediator and model of Christ. Key concepts in Augustine’s theological thinking are thus rooted in his personal existential quest. Moreover, the author argues, “Augustine’s views on habit, pride and humility begin with self-understanding, but ultimately translate to a project of social order” (p. 35).

Subsequently, Augustine’s opinion on social order is studied. The author sketches the background of the imperial religious legislation: the promotion of Catholic Christianity against other forms of Christianity, the defence of Christianity against other religions. The bishops played a primordial role in this defence of Christian orthodoxy, and they tried in this regard to take over the important role rhetors previously played in Roman society. Augustine understood the Episcopal office as: proclamation of the Gospel, administration of the sacraments, making people Catholic Christians. Two cultural contexts shaped Augustine’s Catholicism: Milan (Christian Neo-Platonism, Ambrose’s ecclesiology) and North Africa (Optatus’ universalism, Tyconius’ exegesis of “the blessed seed” of Gen 22,18, Cyprian’s preference for ecclesial unity – three arguments used by Augustine against the Donatists). Within this framework the author expands on the first pillar of Augustine’s Catholicization: internal renewal and reformation. Sources presented here are: Epistula 22 from 392 to the newly appointed bishop of Carthage Aurelius; De fide et symbolo addressed to the council fathers gathered at Hippo in 393; Councils held in Carthage (June 397, June 401, September 401, August 403, June 404, June 405) and Milevis (August 402).

The bishop of Hippo, well trained in rhetoric, used his rhetoric skills in his attempt to Catholicize Roman North Africa. Six-Means shows how Augustine himself perceived the use of rhetoric. Augustine succeeded to “defeat” Manichæans in public debate. Donatists however refused to participate in such debates. Augustine thus had to innovate his rhetorical strategy. Not in public debates, but in polemical writings – written as they were held as public debates – he tried to win the minds and the hearts of the African Christians. In order to better understand Augustine’s self-understanding as rhetor, the author gives an overview of Augustine’s rhetorical schooling and his De doctrina christiana (a handbook on
how to understand the Bible [modus inueniendi] and how to communicate this understanding to others [modus proferendi]).

This presentation of the theoretical framework of Augustine’s part in African Catholicization brings the author to the conclusion: “Thus, Augustine is the Spin Doctor, the Catholic Church is the party, and the message to be communicated is that, in terms of humans’ relationship with the Divine, there is only one way that works: that is, the Catholic way. The Catholic way is universal in its extent, both geographically and socially” (p. 114).

The second section deals with the Donatist controversy around the Edict of Unity. Augustine preached intensively between August 403 and June 404, endeavouring reconciliation with the Donatists, to prove the truth of the Catholic position against Donatism and Paganism (to which civic notables still adhered, mainly since the pagan cult was a part of their power). After sketching the social-political and conciliar context, Six-Means presents the preaching tours of Augustine between the summers of 403 and 404: Enarrationes (which is the correct spelling, not: ennarationes) in Psalms 32 (s. 2), 36 (ss. 1-3), 44, 56: Sermones ad populum 32, 114B, 159B, 198, 299A, 359B, 360A&B. The context and content of each homily is concisely sketched within the perspective of Augustine’s attempt of Catholic Christianization.

In this context, the author offers Augustine’s vision – achieved by reading his Contra Cresconium and Epistula 93 – on Honorius’ Edict of Unity of February 405. Contra Cresconium (405) – citing historical documents against many of the Donatist claims – rejects the Donatist argument that they represent the true Church because they are persecuted. This persecution is their poena, which does not constitute the causa for genuine martyrship. Augustine indicates that the Donatists themselves persecute their own schismatics, and they do so ruthlessly. In Epistula 93 (407/408) Augustine defends his change of mind regarding religious coercion; while previously he attempted reconciliation with the Donatists based only on dialogue and debate, he now advocates the Catholic application of legal coercive measures on the Donatists.

Augustine and Catholic Christianization offers an interesting approach to the Donatist controversy and Augustine’s role in it. It is based on a study of the sources, in interaction with established (mainly English) scholarly literature (especially in the first section, while the secondary literature regarding Augustine’s sermons is somewhat less studied in the second section). We can only but express the hope that this approach, initiated in the present volume, in the future will be more substantiated by enlarging the corpus of sources (both in Augustine and his contemporaries) and of existing scientific literature (on the several domains this book touches upon, and especially regarding Augustine’s preaching). The book shows the important influence Augustine had in the religious field of his time, how he used his homiletic and polemic rhetoric to achieve the Catholicization of African Christianity and how all this is rooted in both his self-perception as a humble bishop at the service of the people of God and in his interpretation of social order.

A. Dupont

Sylwia Kaczmarek – Henryk Pietras in collaboration with Andrzej Dziadowiec (eds.). Origeniana Decima. Origen as Writer: Papers
This impressive volume gathers most of the papers that were presented at the Colloquium Origenianum Decimum that was organized in Kraków two years earlier under the direction of H. PIETRAS (see the report in ETL 85 [2009] 616-618). The tradition with which this book ties in is well-known: since 1973, an international conference on Origen has been organized every four years. From the fifth conference onwards (1989, published 1992), proceedings have been published in the BETL series.

This tenth volume contains 2 introductory articles and 54 other articles, which in one way or the other, treat the theme of Origen as a writer. The introductory articles are from the pen of two well-known Bolognese Origen scholars: L. PERRONE wrote on “‘Origenes pro domo sua’: Self-Quotations and the (Re)construction of a Literary Œuvre” (p. 3-38) and A. CACCIAРИ wrote on “From Grammar to Theology: History of a Word. On διαστολή and related terms in Origen and the Origenian Tradition” (p. 39-60).

The other articles are dispersed over eight sections. Two papers on “The Literary Milieu of Alexandria and Caesarea in Origen’s Time” (p. 63-87) are followed by sections on the “Complexity and Scope of Origen’s Work” (p. 91-123) and on “Hermeneutics” (p. 127-248). The latter section includes a short paper by K. METZLER on “Namensetymologien zur hebräischen Bibel bei Origenes” (p. 169-177), in which she argues that Origen relied upon Jewish tradition when he included onomastic explanations in his exegesis of Genesis and that the speculative interpretative use to which he put these explanations were not his own invention either but were offered to him by Jewish tradition.

Following this is a short section on “Apologies” (p. 251-304) and a much longer one on “Commentaries, Homilies and Apocrypha” (p. 307-559), which includes two papers by collaborators of the project which is financed by the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften and will produce a critical edition of the Greek remains of Origen’s exegesis of the Psalms. F.X. RISCH (“Die Prologe des Origenes zum Psalter”, p. 475-489) deals with the sequence of the prologue materials to Origen’s exegesis of the Psalms that were edited by G. Rietz (1914) and H. Achelis (1897) and with the identification of their origins. He distinguishes several sources: a prologue to the Hexapla in general; one to the book of Psalms in the Hexapla; an excursus in the commentary; and a homily. In addition, Risch proposes some corrections with regard to Achelis’ edition, on the basis of the Oxoniensis, Bodleianus, Baroccius 235, an important witness to the Palestinian catena. This catena is investigated by Risch’s colleague B. VILLANI (“Zur Psalmenauslegung des Origenes: Einige Beobachtungen am Beispiel von Psalm 2”, p. 491-506). She treats the question whether one can retrieve the precise origins of the Origenian fragments that can be found in the Palestinian catena. Are they taken from the homilies, the scholia, or the commentary (and if so, which commentary)? Villani concludes that all of the Origenian fragments are taken from one and the same source (probably a commentary), but refrains from identifying it with certainty.
Two short sections on “The Language of Origen” (p. 563-646) and “Philosophical Sources” (p. 649-686) are followed by the eighth and last part, which is very extensive and gathers papers on “Disciples and Followers of Origen” (p. 689-965). Authors who are treated include (in random order) Jerome, Rufinus of Aquileia, Eusebius of Caesarea, Olympiodorus of Alexandria, Ambrose of Milan, Augustine, Methodius, Cyril of Alexandria and Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite. One of the scholars who focuses on Didymus the Blind is E. PRINZIVALLI (“A Rediscovered Author and Origen’s Heritage: Didymus the Blind”, p. 779-789). Her paper includes a quite convenient bibliographical overview of recent research on Didymus.

The great value of this volume is beyond question. It will be consulted not only by scholars of Origen (who will find useful information, whether they deal with the transmission history of his writings or their theological contents) but also by other researchers: general topics (such as the identification of exegetical genres in Antiquity) which transcend the œuvre of Origen also find treatment in this volume, which without any doubt lives up to the high standard set by the previous volumes in the Origeniana series.

R. CEULEMANS


Athanase a écrit son Tome aux Antiochiens (CPG n° 2134) au nom du synode qui s’est réuni à Alexandrie au printemps de l’année 362, quand l’empereur Julien autorisa les évêques exilés à récupérer leur siège. Il ne traite que de questions doctrinales. Il précise, à l’intention des communautés chrétiennes d’Antioche, quelle est la condition de communion: c’est l’adhésion à la foi de Nicée, jugée meilleure et plus exacte que celle de Sardique. Encore faut-il que cette foi soit clairement élucidée, et que soient apportées les précisions nécessaires sur l’Incarnation, sur le Saint Esprit et sur le mot ὑπόστασις. C’est ce à quoi Athanase s’emploie. Le texte, repris à la récente édition d’A. von Stockhausen (Athanasius Werke, II/8), fait ici l’objet d’une introduction développée et d’un commentaire détaillé, bien utiles après qu’A. Martin (Athanase d’Alexandrie et l’Église d’Égypte au IVe siècle, Rome, 1996) a mis en cause l’interprétation traditionnelle de l’écrit. Soucieux de souligner la réalité de l’Incarnation contre la doctrine du Verbe-créature professée par les Ariens, le Tome met l’accent sur l’union de l’homme et de Dieu dans le Fils (7,3: «le Fils de Dieu qui est venu avant Abraham n’était pas autre que celui qui est venu après Abraham […] Le même était celui qui, avec son corps, crachait comme un homme, et qui, divinement, ouvrait les yeux de l’aveugle-né en tant que Fils de Dieu») et développe une christologie qui est dans la ligne de la tradition Logos-sarx: ce qui donne vie à la nature humaine du Christ, c’est le Logos, et c’est le Logos lui-même qui assure le salut de l’homme. D’autre part, en imposant à «tous ceux qui veulent être en paix avec nous … d’anathématiser ceux qui disent que le Saint-Esprit est une créature et une division de l’essence (οὐσία) du Christ», Athanase engage le
combat contre les pneumatomaques. L’objectif principal du Tome est donc de resserrer les rangs autour de la foi de Nicée, qui apparaît à Athanase comme la seule réplique efficace face au sabellianisme et à l’arianisme radical qui est en train de se développer en Orient, foi qu’il importe de faire accepter en l’explicitant de manière autorisée. Moyennant quoi, Athanase, dans un esprit de réconciliation, autorise le libre usage de deux langages trinitaires: soit celui d’une seule hypostase (pour autant que l’on n’affirme pas que le Fils et l’Esprit sont sans substance ou sans hypostase) soit celui de trois hypostases (pour autant que cette formule ne recouvre pas la doctrine arienne des trois substances différentes). Les préférences de l’évêque d’Alexandrie vont à la première formulation, et il défend une interprétation de l’ὑπόστασις qui renvoie dos à dos les Sabelliens et les Homéousiens.

J.-M. AUWERS


Considered in hindsight, the development of Trinitarian doctrine took a decisive turn between the late 360’s and the council of Constantinople in 381. Building on the endeavours of their predecessors, the theologians of these years gradually managed to arrive at terminological clarity and an agreement on theological content. The efficacy of what is often termed the “Cappadocian solution” rests on this combination of a clear terminology (mia ousia – treis hypostaseis) with the coming about of a quite widely shared agreement regarding what exactly this articulated about the relationship between the Father and the Son and, by extension, the Spirit. From an historical-theological point of view, the person and writings of Eunomius of Cyzicus were absolutely essential. His theological position, in that it made the Son a ktisma (a created being), was so extreme in its subordinationism that it contributed to making more moderate theologians (such as the homoiousians) rethink their own position or reformulate it with more vigour and sharpness. A prominent example of this process is the Cappadocian Fathers’ reaction against him. Eunomius’ Apology was the start of a high-level theological exchange with Basil of Caesarea and, after he had passed away, with his brother Gregory of Nyssa. As Basil and Gregory’s writings Against Eunomius have been preserved in their entirety and we also do have (partly through quotations in these) substantial parts of Eunomius’ writings, we are in a unique position to follow in great detail the twists and turns of this theological controversy that went on for 15 or more years.

A comprehensive study of this exchange does not exist to date, but has become a feasible enterprise thanks to the foundational efforts of scholars such
as Jaeger, Ziegler, van Parys, Vaggione, Kopecek, Pottier, Drecoll, Winling and many others. In this regard mention may also be made of the International Colloquia on Gregory of Nyssa that have been devoted to Gregory’s *Contra Eunomium I-III* (Pamplona 1988, Olomouc 2004 and Leuven 2010). The proceedings of the Gregory-colloquia contain Stuart Hall’s translation of the whole of *CE I-III* and it is of equal importance now that a French *équipe* under the aegis of Sources Chrétiennes is engaged in preparing a French annotated translation of this text. In 2008 and 2010 the first two volumes of this enterprise were published. They cover the whole of *CE* I and offer an extensive general introduction, the Greek text of the Jaeger-edition, a French translation and an extensive commentary in the notes to the text. An important feature of these volumes is the assistance they offer to the reader through the introduction of subdivisions with subtitles and through the general survey of the argumentation in the general introduction. *CE* is a quite dense writing, in which many themes are touched upon. Yet, working oneself through the text can be a tedious exercise because of its sheer length and repetitive character. These SC-volumes equip the reader to do this with greater ease and this proves to be very rewarding for many reasons. One of them is that it helps the reader understand how the long introductory historical-polemical first part (*CE* I, 1-146) functions. At first, the way in which Gregory discredits Eunomius, his teacher Aetius, and those of like mind seems excessively over the top. Only gradually does one see how this polemic is an integral part of the whole of Gregory’s reaction against Eunomius’ theological project and the theological position it amounts to. Parallels with Athanasius of Alexandria’s historical-polemical writings present themselves here. A second praiseworthy aspect of this edition is the extensive general introduction on the historical and theological context and content of *CE* I and the theology of Eunomius to which it reacts. Third, and most important, there are copious notes to the text. Here, parallels to other writings are indicated, philological explanations given and, where necessary, Gregory’s thought elucidated. The present edition makes the reader look forward to the volumes on *CE* II and III. One would also hope that eventually the editors will consider making a volume with quotations from Eunomius, culled from *CE* I-III, which can serve as an addendum or companion to Vaggione’s *Eunomius of Cyzicus: The Extant Works*. Undoubtedly, this would be a great help for understanding with more precision what exactly was at stake in this exciting theological controversy on the Trinity.

J. LEEMANS


The first thing that struck me about Russell Friedman’s book was the apparent contrast between the scope of the title and length of the book. At 170 pages, minus appendices, this is a trim but ambitious volume, that seeks to illustrate the “central aspects of and developments in the trinitarian theology written in the Latin West roughly between 1250 and 1350 AD” (p. 1). For its brevity, the
volume is in fact able to give a detailed overview of the topic with a depth that would be difficult to achieve even in a longer work. The structure is essential to effective delivery, and Friedman has organized his work into four chapters: “The Trinity and the Aristotelian categories”, “The Trinity and human psychology”, “The Trinity and metaphysics”, and “The Trinity, divine simplicity, and fideism”. While the chapter headings are themselves dense, their internal structure is centered around discussions of specific authors from the period in question, roughly moving forward in time as the book progresses. The chapters breakdown in this manner: introduction and explanation of the topic, introduction of one or more authors’ views on the topic, and finally a critical assessment of those authors’ views in relation to one another. This gives the book the feel of an actual lecture, and a full reading of the text is more like taking an academic course rather than having read through an exhaustive history of the problem of trinitarian thought in medieval scholasticism. The discussions are often front-loaded, such that the most complex and technical explanations of the argument at hand are presented first, followed by diagrams and a more drawn out and colloquially phrased explication.

While the first chapter begins with a rather dense discussion of the Franciscan’s emanation and Dominican’s relational theories of the Trinity, Friedman is able to quickly and clearly make these two currents both understandable by themselves and easily differentiated from one another. By staggering the discussions in this manner the text becomes truly didactic, answering questions along the way that may come up in the mind of the reader during the initial discussion. The use of visual diagrams is particularly effective and they are even given verbal explanation within the body of the text for further clarification. For a book on medieval scholasticism, there is surprisingly little Latin except for necessary technical terms that are often contextualized and used consistently throughout the book, while full Latin quotations can still be found in the footnotes for scholarly use. On the whole, this approach makes this work a balancing act between catering to students and scholars; the complexity of the subject makes the scope of interest for this work somewhat limited, but the author’s presentation opens up its accessibility to a wider audience. On the whole, Medieval Trinitarian Thought from Aquinas to Ockham is a perfect text for MA students and possibly advanced undergraduates studying the medieval period. At the same time, Friedman’s use of relatively obscure authors whose work is representative of the wider currents in medieval scholasticism (e.g. Peter Auriol, Gregory of Rimini, Frances of Marchia) gives it the requisite gravitas to appeal to specialists. Finally, his use of a well known paradigm authored by Étienne Gilson in the fourth chapter to compare and contrast the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries is particularly well situated, because it shows just how nuanced and contextual any scholarship must be in approaching the scholastics. Indeed, Friedman points out in his conclusions just how diverse medieval authors were, even amongst themselves, and ultimately parsing them into discrete time periods and schools which can be positively or negatively evaluated has, at best, heuristic value. Overall, Friedman has taken what could otherwise be a difficult and even esoteric topic, and produced a well-structured, clear, and interesting text, accessible to several levels of students and scholars.

D. MINCH

Scholars agree that Walter Kasper’s 1965 \textit{Habilitationsschrift} is still one of the best theological studies about Schelling’s late philosophy. It discusses the content of Schelling’s thought as well as its consequences and it does so both in breadth and in depth. It engages the entire development of the \textit{Schellingforschung} until the mid-sixties of the former century (which had been almost exclusively German), it presents a thorough theological discussion of Schelling’s writings, and it applies all that material to topics which were as important as they were revealing of the interests of 20th century Catholic theologians (in the West).

In the preface of the present edition, Kasper repeats why he chose this topic for his habilitation. The figure of Schelling was instrumental in the development of the 19th century Catholic Tübinger Schule, with which Kasper was already familiar and of which he could be seen as a 20th century representative. In this respect, it is relevant to mention that one of Kasper’s teachers had been Joseph Rupert Geiselmann, the renowned scholar who specialized in the history and theology of the Tübingen Schule and who had put its peculiar way of thinking again on the theological agenda. Kasper’s scholarly activities in delving into the later Schelling are, moreover, almost contemporaneous with the time when in France some “nouveaux” theologians (like Congar) discovered the work of Tübingen theologians (mostly Möhler) and expressed similar views about history, tradition, and the transmission of revelation. Kasper additionally says that his intensive study of German idealism made him think about modern philosophy in a particularly nuanced way. This observation is to be understood as a hidden critique of contemporary schools of thought which reject modernity all over the line. Kasper believes that such a stance is neither intellectually tenable nor fruitful, for it doesn’t foster the necessary dialogue between Church and world and may in the end be more of a threat than a blessing for the future of Christian faith in Western civilization. Moreover, Kasper learnt from Schelling that the great tradition of metaphysics is an old and trustworthy partner for theology. He suggests that it would be unwise to throw that partnership overboard and seems to deplore the fact that so few young theologians go through the effort of thoroughly studying the great philosophers of the Western tradition.

Kasper’s book comprises three elaborate parts after two introductory sections (§1-2). The first part basically surveys the development and content of Schelling’s later thought and thereby focuses on the role attributed to history (§3-8). The second part discusses God as ground (\textit{Grund}) and master (\textit{Herr}) of history (§9-12). A great deal of attention is paid here to Schelling’s concept of creation, which Kasper understands as revelatory of God’s freedom and independence. He also adds a critical discussion of Schelling’s doctrine of the Trinity, which has often been suspected of heterodox elements up until the present day. The third part is devoted to the “Christological mediation (\textit{Vermittlung}) of history” (§13-16) and anticipates many topics and insights which Kasper later developed in his own Christological studies. Schelling’s Christology commences from the beginning of history (with the fall of the human race), is interwoven with the
mythologies of paganism and Judaism, and finds its completion in the Christ event as the culmination point of God’s revelation. Kasper concludes his study with a reflection about correspondences between Schelling’s “form of thought” (Denkform) and Catholic theology (§17).

Evidently, Kasper’s approach reflects the academic customs and culture of the time in which this work was written. It was a time when studies could claim semi-exhaustiveness and when philosophical and theological author studies were aimed at comprehensiveness. Their innovative character essentially consisted in the fact that no one else had ever written a similar work about the same corpus and from more or less the same perspective. Although that time, marked as it was by an encyclopedic method and mass-paraphrasing of primary sources, is no longer ours, it must be said that Kasper’s study realizes more than an incontrovertible theological presentation and interpretation of the later Schelling’s achievements. Kasper certainly goes beyond the discussions about the meaning of Schelling’s Weltalter and philosophy of revelation. In addition, Kasper recognizes that Schelling took an important step beyond Hegel, which implies at least two things. First, Schelling opened the way for a “real” understanding of history. Second, Hegel was criticized as an unsatisfactory partner of theology in his endeavor to explain and understand faith as humanity’s response to God’s revelation. Whether this double move was to be interpreted as the fulfillment or breakdown of German idealism is not Kasper’s problem. His real concern is more theological than historical or philosophical: the acknowledgment of the historicity of history is critical in accounting for theology’s theologizing.

The editorial quality of the present volume reaches a level of perfection of which not many contemporary publishing houses are capable (anymore). Type page, font, lay-out, index of names, double paging (so that one can easily refer to the first edition), etc. are excellent. The only minor point is Magnus Striet’s epilogue, which does not succeed in adding something really interesting to Kasper’s book. Most important, however, is that this book has become available again, since the original version was long sold out and difficult to find among antiquarian and second-hand booksellers. It is all the more important in the present-day context of (Catholic) theology, which may need to be reminded of the theological significance of history. For Kasper is probably right when he supposes that the metaphysics of the course of time is grossly underdeveloped today and that this may not be conducive to a kind of thinking which hands on things from the past to the future and which tries to connect that tradition with God as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

J. GELDHOF


Ce volume, qui reprend la première édition (parue en 2000), décrit la vie et l’œuvre scientifique du Père Alberto Vaccari, excellent connaisseur de la Bible et de tous les domaines de recherche apparentés, notamment le travail de Jérôme sur l’Ancien Testament.
L’ouvrage se compose de trois parties. Dans la première (Le radici, p. 10-23), les auteurs livrent des informations sur le milieu d’origine et les années de jeunesse de Vaccari (né en 1875 à Bastida de’ Dossi, une commune minuscule dans la province de Pavie), ainsi que sur sa famille et ses études au séminaire de Tortona (dans la région piémontaise). Cette partie assez brève est suivie par une deuxième plus étendue dans laquelle le développement de la foi chrétienne de Vaccari occupe la position centrale (Il cammino di fede, p. 26-90). La première moitié de cette section est entièrement centrée sur l’amitié entre Vaccari et Luigi Orione, dont le cheminement est retracé depuis leur première rencontre au séminaire jusqu’à la mort d’Orione et – plus tard – sa sanctification. Dans les pages suivantes, on revient sur le parcours effectué ultérieurement par Vaccari. Les éléments constitutifs en sont: son entrée, à 17 ans, au noviciat chez les jésuites à Chieri (1892), et son premier poste, où il est assigné en 1912, au sein du Pontificio Istituto Biblico qu’on venait d’établir à Rome et où il restera jusqu’en 1959 en occupant diverses fonctions. Une carrière professionnelle aussi longue dans cet institut renommé reflète une expertise énorme dans le domaine des sciences bibliques (voir aussi, p. ex., ses activités comme co-fondateur de la revue Biblica en 1930). Cet aspect du savant Vaccari est traité dans la troisième partie, la plus étendue du volume (Cultore di scienze bibliche, p. 92-192). Quelques-uns des sujets entrant en ligne de compte sont: la traduction italienne du texte hébreu de la Bible (le grand projet dans lequel Vaccari a joué un rôle important et qui s’est étendu sur plusieurs décennies), les discussions (dont quelques-unes assez vives) avec d’autres scientifiques, etc. Enfin la quatrième partie du livre s’intitule Bibliografia (p. 184-225): elle contient une liste impressionnante des publications de Vaccari (p. 192-211) mais aussi d’autres informations intéressantes, tel un bref curriculum vitae (p. 212-214).


Un des attraits du volume est le fait que les auteurs n’ont pas seulement eu recours à la littérature secondaire, mais qu’ils ont aussi rassemblé beaucoup de documentation primaire: des documents rédigés par Vaccari lui-même, des témoignages de personnes qui lui étaient proches, des photos, etc. Parfois le ton s’approche un peu trop de celui d’un éloge, mais globalement, le texte reste très agréable à lire. Le rapport que Vaccari a lui-même rédigé (p. 59-61) sur les excursions qu’il a faites alors qu’il étudiait à Beyrouth dans les années 1907-1909 en constitue un bon exemple. Mais non content d’être un récit amusant, un tel récit s’avère en outre un document intéressant au plan de l’histoire des sciences:
on observe qu’à l’époque, les participations aux congrès (même sans y donner de conférence) sont un événement si extraordinaire que Vaccari les a explicitement mentionnées et que les auteurs les ont incluses dans le *curriculum vitae*, une démarche proprement inconcevable aujourd’hui.

Ainsi ce volume ne rend-il pas seulement justice à un grand savant bibliste mais il nous offre l’occasion de porter un regard sur la pratique scolaire italienne dans la première moitié du XXe siècle, un regard qui nous dévoile les changements rapides de cette pratique.

R. Ceulemans


Although rather thin, this collection of revised essays by one of the most knowledgeable canonists and theologians of our time turns out to be especially rich in insights. For anyone familiar with the history of canon law in the second half of the twentieth century the main message behind Professor Orsy’s inspiring book will not come as a surprise: the ecclesiology of *communio* as expressed at Vatican II is yet to be fully unfolded through a slow, but deep conversion in the habits of thoughts and operations (e.g. p. 83 and 147). It is difficult to do justice to the immense wealth of insights contained in *Receiving the Council*, but it would seem that three concerns, closely related to the author’s interpretation of Vatican II, run as a red thread through each of the ten essays: 1. the need to take the role of all the members of the Christian community, including the laity, seriously; 2. the need to foster a climate of trust, openness and debate in doctrinal matters; 3. the need to develop a canon law that truly implements the values of Vatican II.

It might be noted that the analysis made in this book is at the same time an urgent invitation to fully appropriate Vatican II and to expose the Church to the transforming light and force of the Spirit (p. 152). “Our times”, the author admonishes (p. xi), “are the times for the reception of the Council”. Incidentally, Professor Orsy, whose work is deeply informed by a praiseworthy degree of historical consciousness, dismisses the “imaginary case of Conservatives vs. Liberals in the church” as misplaced and misleading (p. 87, n. 22). However, in a footnote he regrets that the majority of the representatives of the most “open” currents in the wake of Vatican II neglected the necessity to implement their ideas through legal provisions, finding canon law unattractive … They thus left this field to Opus Dei, which immediately took an active role in the *Committee on the Revision of Canon Law* and now has the most flourishing faculties of canon law around the world (p. 86, n. 21).

The first concern expressed in Professor Orsy’s elegantly written essays is that the new vision announced by the Council still has not been fully implemented – a vision of the Church in which Christians are increasingly free to use their gifts of grace and where the Spirit is not hampered by unduly burdensome rules (p. xiii). Even if the author by no means distracts from the sacramental power of the pope and the bishops to manage the household of God, he does point out the Council’s
emphasis on the need to recognize the priority of the people of God in building the Church (p. 70). More audacious is his claim that Canon 129 should be subjected to revision, since it stipulates that the laity can cooperate with (cooperari possunt), but not participate in the power of governance (potestas regiminis). Professor Orsy believes that little can be done to implement Vatican II unless the “non-clerics” are allowed to contribute to the building of the Church (p. 44). Lumen Gentium’s affirmation of the dignity of the universal people of God should be reinforced (p. 37). In short, the “energies latent in our dedicated laity” must be liberated (p. 148).

The second concern which permeates Professor Orsy’s exposition derives from the observation that the culture of openness, trust and debate which is typical of the Spirit does not seem to prosper at the moment. For example, there is a feeling that the Decree on Ecumenism, approved by the bishops assembled at Vatican II, has fallen short of expectations (p. 46). More importantly, there are signs that the culture of debate might have come to a stand-still even within the Roman Catholic Church itself. Clearly, the author draws on his own experience here. In 1998-1999 he was involved in a notorious dispute with the (then) Cardinal Ratzinger following his rather critical remarks on the Motu Proprio Ad tuendam fidei, which established the conception of “definitive doctrine”. This dispute is covered in chapter 9 of Receiving the Council. It is certainly to the credit of Professor Orsy to document this controversy sine ira et studio, but it might not be a coincidence that the Church’s age-old “venerable tradition of disciplined and respectful debates” is invoked at the outset of chapter 9 (p. 115). Professor Orsy also emphasizes the ancient adage that “unity is needed in necessaries, liberty in doubts, and charity in all” (p. 107 and 141), while observing that Ad tuendam fidei has transferred many doctrines from the field of doubt to the realm of necessity.

The third concern expressed in Receiving the Council follows from the author’s observation that post-Vatican II canon law did not succeed in overcoming the misgivings of post-Tridentine canon law. An expert in the history of the Western legal tradition, Professor Orsy cannot help but regret the fact that canonical jurisprudence has gradually lost its vital link with theology, becoming the victim of legal positivism (p. 81). The author recalls – not without a certain nostalgia – the attitude of Gratian, the twelfth century father of classical canon law. Gratian is famous for applying the scholastic method to matters of morality and canon law, initiating the great canonical tradition of raising questions, arguing for both sides of a problem, meticulously searching for values behind canonical rules. However, after Trent, canon law increasingly became static, ahistorical and almost inimical to development (p. 82). The spirit of the Council should have enabled canonists to reverse this deplorable evolution, but – in the author’s opinion – it failed for reasons which are mentioned above. Moreover, Professor Orsy calls for more prudence in bolstering official teaching with the threat of criminal sanctions (p. 110), as has happened with regards to the doctrine of definitive teaching (CIC 750§2 and 752 jo. 1371, 1°). From a comparative legal perspective, he rebukes the lack of consideration for due process in the Regulation for the examination of doctrines, which is said to violate basic rules of criminal procedure in secular jurisdictions (p. 102-103). In light of the present state of canon law, the author tentatively explains the current aversion to canon law throughout the Church by referring to people’s instinctive sense that many of the canon laws are not in the service of values of higher order (p. 81, n. 12).
In conclusion, Receiving the Council is a thought-provoking invitation to reconsider, and, even more importantly, to implement the legacy of Pope John XXIII’s aggiornamento. In the author’s opinion, il papa buono, who wanted to be a learner rather than a teacher, reversed a trend of nine hundred years of centralization. Professor Orsy believes (or hopes?) that “his [=Pope John XXIII] stature will again increase” (p. 84).

W. DECOCK


In the introduction to this volume, K. Schelkens tells the reader that he had set out to write a comprehensive redaction history of Dei Verbum, but ended up creating a work focusing solely on its ill-fated predecessor, De fontibus revelationis. This schema prepared by the Theological Commission headed by Cardinal Alfredo Ottaviani and the secretary of the Commission, Sebastiaan Tromp would ultimately be rejected at the first session of the Council in 1962, leading to one of the first major sea changes in St. Peter’s basilica where the Council Fathers began to assert themselves against the perceived lines of influence coming from the curia. As historians and theologians we should, however, not only inquire about the vetting and eventual rejection of De fontibus, but also about the document itself. Schelkens organizes the book along familiar lines by distinguishing between the “pre-preparatory” and the preparatory phases of the Council. He includes in the former a great deal of background material on the “modernist” crisis of the early twentieth century as well as the still smoldering controversies over French nouvelle théologie, especially in reference to biblical studies and the recent methodological advances. This background is necessary and even acts as a cushion for the book, buffering some of its more technical aspects by setting them in the wider context of the Catholic debates over the interpretation of Scripture. Ultimately, the composition of De fontibus was the final skirmish in this same debate, which only really ended with the schema’s rejection by the Council.

As a “redaction history”, this volume follows the members of the various commissions and sub-commissions that contributed to the schema through composition or criticism. To one versed in the history of Vatican II or nouvelle théologie, the cast of characters includes many familiar names but also many who are less well known. In this sense, it requires careful and attentive reading to keep track of both the commissions and their members while also taking note of the various tensions between individuals and institutions (the debate between the Biblicum and the Lateranum is significant and particularly well described). A general familiarity with the historical context is a minimum prerequisite for what must be termed a volume aimed squarely at specialists. References to the original sources including personal notes and diaries as well as official minutes are all given in their original languages (primarily Latin, French, Italian, and German), making this a multi-lingual work requiring great diligence on the part of the reader. The footnotes are more often in Latin than in English, making
them a valuable resource without always being an absolute necessity to the reader. The book is of great value for scholars looking for a detailed analysis of the time period in question, although this very depth and attention to detail makes it too advanced for use in the classroom or for non-specialists in the field.

While the book is a technical marvel in many ways, Schelkens does not forget that he is telling a story and in so doing records some of the major shifts in Catholic theology during the period in question. Notably, during the redaction of De fontibus the authors turned a corner in recognizing that “Scripture is not revelation, rather it bears witness to revelation” (p. 196; cf. Dei Verbum §4). Further, the final chapter of this volume, together with the conclusion, illustrates that the internal debate over De fontibus prepared the way for the debate between the “minority” and “majority” factions at the Council itself by showing how De fontibus was already a schizophrenic document prepared by a diverse group of experts whose theologies were at times mutually exclusive. The divisions already present within the text made it clear that a new approach was necessary to present a more united and updated theology of revelation; this might not have been as evident to the Council Fathers without a text that in its final form showed the scars of the long and serious internal discussion that preceded the first session in 1962. Ultimately the title Catholic Theology of Revelation on the Eve of Vatican II is a better description for the whole of the work than its more specified subtitle, because the growing pains experienced in drafting De fontibus revelationis turned out to be more important than the schema itself.

D. MINCH


Jörg Ernesti appears to be a tireless writer. In recent years he has published a multitude of monographs – as well as an interesting ecumenical lexicon, together with his Doktorvater Wolfgang Thönissen –, most of them devoted to the history of ecumenism. The present volume unites his clear preferences for the theme of church unity with that of contemporary church history in the study of one person: Paul vi, the “forgotten pope”. The subtitle to the volume rightly indicates that historical research has often neglected the historical significance of this pope, while ample attention and study has been devoted to popes such as Pius xii and John xxiii. The Istituto Paolo vi in Concesio, Italy, ranks among the few institutes to fill this lacuna, and the author has clearly profited from his collaboration with the institute. This led, in February of this year, to the gathering of an international colloquium on Paul vi and the postconciliar crisis under the title Paolo vi, timoneiere in tempi difficili.

I move now from the book’s author to the book itself – even though there is no denying the fact that all biography involves a portion of autobiography. If anything, the biographical genre is an ambiguous and complex one, requiring a manifold of capacities from the historian tackling it. Therefore, it should be said from the start that this biography has successfully managed to avoid some of the genre’s classic pitfalls – a preference for context rather than person, a focus on
petite histoire and irrelevant details, etc. For this reason alone the book deserves to be praised. Moreover, Ernesti had to overcome methodological obstacles such as the lack of available archive sources, since the Vatican Archive section documenting this pontificate will remain closed for long decades to come. At this juncture the author has opted to rely mostly on Montini’s own writings and secondary literature, which has been translated into a wide variety of languages and a necessary Auseinandersetzung with other biographies. For, even if Paul VI has not received all the attention he deserves, other biographies have recently been written – e.g. the eminent 2008 book Paolo VI. Il coraggio della modernità by Giselda Adornato, and a year later another authored by Andrea Tornielli – not to mention others in the process of publication such as an upcoming biography by Prof. Philippe Chenaux, who authored an outstanding biography of Pius XII in 2003. Thus, not a few challenges were faced and successfully overcome in the course of the writing of this volume. But, the role of the reviewer is not just to applaud, it necessarily also involves criticism.

The biography closely, and chronologically, traces the itinerary of Montini’s life, starting with some interesting pages on his early years in Brescia, then moves on to his career in the world of Vatican diplomacy, followed by his – unexpected – episcopate in the archdiocese of Milan. Although the author carefully touches on all of the necessary points for this era, this section would not have suffered from a more elaborate account. To put it another way: one is clearly dealing with a biography of “Paul VI” here, rather than a biography of “Montini”, since the earliest period, from Montini’s birth in 1897 until his election in the Sistine chapel in June 1963 – in all more than sixty five years of personal development and ecclesiastical career – is dealt with in about thirty pages of text, illuminated as is the entire book with some nice photographs. The pontificate itself then, spanning over the remaining fifteen years, is covered in about 250 pages of text. Although this does not do away with the content quality of the first section, a certain imbalance cannot be ignored. In fact, Montini’s Vatican years, as well as his period in Milan do constitute the fundamental backdrop against which his papacy is to be understood. The author appears to have been aware of the problem, for in the rich pages devoted to the pontificate of Paul VI he repeatedly inserts flashbacks harkening back to earlier phases in Montini’s career so as to provide the reader with the necessary background. Nevertheless, given the fluent and accessible style of the author, the readers would not have minded having to digest some more materials in the first part.

Then, the author arrives at the pontificate itself, which is embedded in the conciliar atmosphere from scratch. This arrives somewhat suddenly, since the previous chapter did not devote ample attention to the particular (and by all means quite remarkable) role played by cardinal and council father Montini if one compares him with the entirety of the Italian episcopate during the first period of Vatican II. This too provides the experiential background for Paul VI’s behavior and his often ill-received interventions (on celibacy, on birth control) during the next three council periods. A preeminent and painful episode here is the insertion of the Nota praevia – where one would have expected to see references to the full dossier on this event by J. Grootaers already published in 1986, and which illustrates the roles played by the pope’s theological right hand man Colombo (whose archives are accessible in Milan), but also the actions of Philips and Bertrams in preparing the infamous Note.
When discussing the ecumenical engagement and Paul VI's obvious and strong desire to engage the church in dialogue with the modern world, the biographer reaches his most worthwhile results. Sketching the importance of the journeys to India and New York, and the striking encounter in the Holy Land in January 1964 one notices how familiar the author is with the subject. This biography also offers its own proposal to acknowledge various phases in the career of Paul VI. The first was Vatican II, followed by the period from 1966 until 1970, dubbed as the period of postconciliar crisis (although it is striking to see this title altered in the endnote apparatus on p. 332, where it says “Die konziliare krise”). The period of implementation is covered thoroughly and with sufficient distance to offer interesting perspectives, e.g. where the author discusses the neglected parts of the notorious encyclical Humanae Vitae. Highly interesting passages can be read with regard to the difficult emergence of synodality, the celibacy crisis and crucial steps such as the 1968 curial reform.

After this, Ernesti enters into the last phase of Montini’s life and times, covering the era from 1971 until the death of the pope in 1978. Painful but highly relevant episodes, such as the friction with Mgr. Lefebvre and the Pius X society, are discussed with sufficient balance, rightly prompting Cardinal Lehman in his preface to praise this book for its capacity to bring twenty-first century readers to a better understanding of a multitude of issues that are central to the Catholic church of our days. The Vatican Ostpolitik under Paul VI comes to the fore here, but so too do elements often neglected, such as the pope’s profound and whole-hearted support for modern artists.

All of this undoubtedly makes clear that the foregoing book is worth buying, and not merely because of its elegant cover. It invites readers to dig deeper, and come to comprehend the complexity and richness of the personality of Paul VI. In sum, it does what a biography should do.

K. Schelkens


This volume compiles Walter Kasper’s studies in the field of liturgical and sacramental theology, which appeared over a time span of more than four decades (1967-2010). The book appeared as volume ten in the series of the “collected works” of the cardinal and theologian but it was not the tenth to be published – it was actually one of first volumes to appear in the series. This emphatic chronological detail may have to do with the fact that the liturgy is high on the agenda in the Roman Catholic Church today, especially since the promulgation of pope Benedict XVI’s motu proprio Summorum pontificum in July 2007. Moreover, Joseph Ratzinger’s collected essays on the liturgy also appeared in a volume of his own collected works with the same publisher (Joseph Ratzinger, Theologie der Liturgie. Die sakramentale Begründung christlicher Existenz, Gesammelte Schriften, Bd. 11, Freiburg – Basel – Wien, Herder, 2010).

The individual essays and articles are grouped thematically. In a certain sense, one could say that their organizing principle is quite classical. They first treat
questions of general sacramental theology before individual sacraments are discussed. Not all sacraments, however, are dealt with; there are no articles on confirmation, anointing of the sick, and ordination (Kasper’s essays on ministry and the priesthood are taken up in another volume of the collected works). The thematic sessions consecutively deal with sacraments as “signs of faith” (Zeichen des Glaubens) – which reminds one of Thomas Aquinas’ definition of the sacraments as belonging to the order of signs –, baptism, Eucharist, penance, and marriage. The section on the Eucharist is the most innovative one, in the sense that it contains two texts which are published here for the first time as well as Kasper’s remarkable 2004 brochure about the Eucharist as the sacrament of unity par excellence. It develops a stable theological vision and reflects his many experiences as president of Rome’s ecumenical office.

The most interesting part of the book, however, is the extensive introductory contribution, which was not previously published elsewhere and which may be considered as Kasper’s liturgico-theological testament. As always, Kasper’s insights testify to his thorough scholarship, spiritual depth, and wise judgment. The text is an elaborate plea for a new liturgical culture which aims to understand the liturgy according to its original nature, and from there tends to lift it up beyond ecclesial and theological struggles which often harm the liturgy more than serve it. It is not certain that Kasper’s moderate and traditional position will be accepted by everyone, but at least it has the merits of disconnecting the liturgy from heated ideological debates and seeking a safe middle path between extremes.

Kasper does not avoid those issues which are at the root of most liturgical controversies within the Roman Catholic Church nowadays: the translation of the Latin original text to vernacular languages and the rigidity of the translation principles proposed by the Vatican; the discussion about celebrating the Eucharist “with the back towards the people”, which is, besides, a misleading terminology to frame the whole discussion; and, most conspicuously, the issue surrounding the reintroduction of the usus antiquior. Kasper shows himself to be a thoughtful and prudent guide, for whom the Eucharist as the sacrament of unity as well as the future of the Church are of the utmost importance.

Another strong point of this text is the intensive way it connects with biblical sources. In doing so, Kasper does not merely show erudition – on the contrary, he concretely demonstrates how important it is to anchor the liturgical tradition of the Church in both the Old and New Testament. In addition, Kasper interestingly uses the liturgy itself as a theological source – a major desideratum of many a liturgical theologian working in the wake of the Liturgical Movement. Clearly, for Kasper, the liturgy serves not only as a resource for ornamenting theological ideas but also as a genuine source which pushes one to theological discourse and reflection. Therefore, it does not come as a surprise that Kasper gives concrete practical suggestions for improving liturgical customs. Kneeling before receiving communion can properly express reverence for Christ’s presence in a bodily way; a reintroduced aspersion rite can concretely remind one of one’s baptismal status; and a more profound understanding of what is actually celebrated in the Eucharist should foster a renewed praxis of penance. Kasper realizes, however, that these concrete proposals should be accompanied by a process of deepening the faith, an ongoing conversion as it were, and that it cannot go without renewed catechesis. It must be said that Kasper’s ideas could come across as somehow unrealistic. Quite beautiful, however, is the fact that he sees a connection between
the practice of incensing and what *Sacrosanctum concilium* says in nr. 7 about Christ’s manifold presence in the liturgy. Faithfulness to the Second Vatican Council is generally very important for him. In that sense, it is a pity that the text is not better embedded in the history of liturgical scholarship. A brief look at the references teaches that his major sources are Augustine and the post-synodal apostolic exhortation *Sacramentum caritatis*, promulgated by his compatriot pope Benedict XVI in February 2007. It is strange that Kasper attributes the authorship once to Benedict’s predecessor.

Finally, it must be mentioned that the editorial quality of this volume is impeccable, a good example of the renowned *deutsche Gründlichkeit*. It is to be hoped, however, that the present book will not only be purchased and put on shelves but also read and studied. Although Kasper does not have the typical profile of a liturgist and is not known as such, his theological insights related to liturgical issues are certainly worth considering and spreading more broadly than is often the case nowadays.

J. GELDHOF


A. JOIN-LAMBERT


Dans le contexte de la réforme liturgique de Pie XII, le bénédictin belge Placide Bruylants, de l’abbaye du Mont-César, a publié en 1952 deux volumes sur les
Les oraisons du Missel romain (P. BRUYLANTS, *Les oraisons du Missel romain. Texte et histoire, I. Tabulae synopticae fontium Missalis Romani. Indices, II. Oratio-

num textus et usus iuxta fontes* [Études liturgiques 1], Louvain, Abbaye du Mont-

César 1952 [anast. 1965]).

Le présent ouvrage, le cinquième et dernier de la collection «Monumenta Liturgica Piana», qui clôt la réédition des derniers livres liturgiques avant le con-
cile Vatican II (*Missale, Rituale, Pontificale, Breviarium*), rend de nouveau accessible l’œuvre précieuse de Bruylants depuis longtemps épuisée.

Les deux premières parties sont constituées de la reproduction anastatique des volumes du bénédictin. Le «tableau synoptique des sources du Missale Romanum» indique la présence de chaque formule eucologique dans les sacra-
mentaires les plus importants. Le «texte des oraisons et leur usage selon les sources» reprend, quant à lui, les formules eucologiques dans l’ordre alphabé-
tique de leur *incipit*, en indiquant les variantes textuelles dans les sources et pour quelles occasions elles y sont utilisées.

Les deux dernières parties de l’ouvrage assument à frais nouveaux le travail de Bruylants. La troisième partie offre, pour chaque livre liturgique tridentin, une synopse des formules entre l’édition tridentine et celle de la réforme liturgique de Pie XII. La numérotation des formules renvoie aux éditions des livres liturgiques dans les collections «Monumenta Liturgica Concilii Tridentini» et «Monumenta Liturgica Piana». La dernière partie contient un index avec le nombre d’occurrences de chaque parole et une concordance avec un contexte limité à 70-80 caractères.

Uni à d’autres outils, surtout à la concordance de l’édition actuelle du Missale Romanum (M. SODI – A. TONIOLO, *Concordantia et indices Missalis Romani. Editio typica tertia* [Monumenta Studia Instrumenta Liturgica, 23], Città del Vat-
ican, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2002), ce livre aidera les chercheurs à mettre en valeur le patrimoine liturgique dans sa continuité et à dégager une véritable théo-
logie liturgique.

P. BOVENS


Spécialiste incontestable des manuscrits enluminés, auteur et directeur de nombreux ouvrages, le professeur Christian Heck nous livre ici un volume tout à fait remarquable. Réalisé dans le cadre d’un projet sur *Les cycles iconographiques comme réseau du savoir et espace encyclopédique dans le livre au Moyen Âge*, cette étude sur le *Ci nous dit* de Chantilly (vers 1340) intéressera bon nombre de scientifiques dans des disciplines variées. Le titre retenu par la tradition correspond à la formule *Ci nous dit* ouvrant chacun des enseignements contenus dans le livre, sorte d’encyclopédie ou plutôt de manuel d’instruction chrétienne rédigée vers 1320 par un dominicain. L’exemplaire ici édité serait le plus complet du genre, en tout cas parmi les 18 exemplaires con-
servés. C’est aussi le plus illustré, présentant 812 enluminures, ce qui plonge le

A. JOIN-LAMBERT


This book is collection of 17 essays, which were read at a conference organized by the Thomistic Institute of the Dominican Friars of Warsaw in 2010. All the contributors are Dominicans, and the book is designed mostly for internal circulation. The two editors remark that Aquinas is no longer largely studied among his fellow Dominicans, and call for a new appraisal of his thought within the Order of Preachers. That notwithstanding, this collection contains some fine papers, which certainly deserve wider attention.
S.-T. Bonino (Faut-il une “philosophie thomiste?”, p. 25-45) follows M.-D. Chenu in maintaining that Aquinas was mostly interested in theology, and did not think of himself as a philosopher. However, “Thomistic philosophy” is not the result of “Leonine Thomism”, but was already developed in the Order of Preachers in the first generations after Aquinas. Bonino calls for a new appraisal of this tradition of the Thomistic school, since theology cannot be developed without a coherent and solid underlying philosophy. Bonino claims that H. de Lubac’s criticisms of the “natura pura” actually turned out to be criticisms against a philosophy, which could be presented as independent of theology. Even though I am a bit sceptical about the historical accuracy of this latter claim, I think that Bonino is right when he says that “l’Église exprime […] le besoin d’une authentique philosophie thomiste, […] la médiation de la philosophie est en effet indispensable pour éviter un face-à-face direct et souvent improductif entre la foi et la culture contemporaine” (p. 45).

L. Dewan (St. Thomas and philosophia perennis, p. 47-72) restates in this paper his disagreement with J. Maritain and E. Gilson on the very nature of esse, and stresses that Aquinas’s texts show that God is the most perfect Essence there is. This paper shows that contemporary Thomism should always be compared with Aquinas’s texts, and that historical research cannot be omitted in any attempt at revitalising Thomism.

J. Brent (Groping towards Aristotle: Some Hopeful Trends in Analytic Philosophy, p. 73-83) picks up as significant examples of contemporary theories, which challenge the students of Thomas, the following currents: 1. epistemological externalism, 2. direct perception theory, 3. externalism in philosophy of language, 4. essentialism in metaphysics and 5. teleology in ethics (such as that of Philippa Foot). David Oderberg’s Real Essentialism (Routledge, London, 2007) is presented as one of the best examples of Thomistic attempts at meeting the challenges posed by the above theories. This short paper is certainly designed to give a sketchy overview of theories which are analogous to Thomism; however, one cannot but regret the omission of contemporary “Neoaristotelian metaphysics” among the most appealing challenges – this is one of the most interesting developments of modal essentialism, and has much more point of contact with Aquinas’s metaphysics. For an introduction to this new current, see T. Tahko (ed.), Contemporary Aristotelian Metaphysics, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2012.

G. Émery is the author of one of the best papers in this collection (Theologia and dispensatio: the Centrality of the Divine Missions in St. Thomas’s Trinitarian Theology, p. 85-130). Émery presents Aquinas’s understanding of the Trinity, and asks himself what role the Trinity plays in the dispensatio, namely in the economy of salvation. To answer this question, Émery dwells on Aquinas’s commentary on John, and explains what divine missions are, according to Thomas. Aquinas’s view is contrasted with K. Rahner’s identification of immanent and economic Trinity. Aquinas states that divine missions are essentially identical with Trinitarian processions (cf. In 1 Sent. d. 16, qu. 1, a. 1, quoted on page 130); however, Émery maintains that Thomas seems more careful than Rahner in distinguishing between the eternity of Trinitarian processions and the temporality of the effects of divine missions. Émery’s paper is one of the few contributions in this collection that might be said to be a scholarly and text-based essay; most of the remaining papers have the character of surveys, with no intention of adding something to scholarship.
M.J. Dodds (Unlocking Divine Action: Thomas Aquinas and Contemporary Science, p. 131-141) is an example of this latter attitude: Dodds says that causality is crucial both in science and in Aquinas’s thought, and thus that Thomism is compatible with science, as long as secondary causes are defined as contemporary science define them.

T.J. White (The Enduring Significance of the Dominican Doctrine of Grace: The Case of Obediential Potency, p. 143-156) tackles again the theme of nature and grace, which appeared in Bonino’s paper too. White defends Cajetan’s interpretation of Aquinas’s treatise De gratia; according to White, Cajetan found an equilibrium between the tendency to conflate the two orders of nature and of grace (a tendency which White envisions in H. de Lubac) and the tendency to see no link between nature and grace (K. Barth is presented as a supporter of this view). White is right in criticizing some superficial interpretations of Cajetan, but does not seem to be more accurate in presenting the views of de Lubac and of Barth.

W. Giertych (Gratia esti sit efficacior quam natura, tamen natura essentialior est homini, et ideo magis permanens: Nature and Grace within Moral Theology, p. 157-182) gives to his provocative paper the structure of a medieval quaestio. His thesis is that moral theology should be interpreted “as theology, as an unraveling of the mystery of grace present within human action” (p. 174), and Giertych sees such a claim in Veritatis Splendor, 29. In other words, moral theology is not primarily concerned with moral norms or with human acts, but is more fundamentally a part of theology which deals with the return of human beings to God, thanks to the grace offered by our Saviour Jesus Christ. According to Giertych, this is Aquinas’s own understanding of moral theology, as it emerges from the structure of the Summa theologiae.

M. Sherwin (The Return to Virtue: Challenges and Opportunities, p. 183-202) dwells on the challenge posed by virtue ethics and by contemporary psychology, according to which human beings are more able to change their habits than had been maintained by Aristotle. Students of Aquinas should understand the flaws and the advantages of these new philosophical currents.

G. Berceville (Une question disputée: le statut épistémologique de la “Théologie spirituelle”. Les contributions de Jacques Maritain, Antonin Lemer-neyer, Thomas Deman et Pie-Raymond Régamey, p. 203-221) asks what spiritual theology should be accounted for by a student of Aquinas. Berceville dwells on the thought of some contemporary thinkers, and ends by answering that for Aquinas spiritual theology is the theology of the progress in the supernatural path of charity.

P.-A. Holzer (Why Thomists Should Present Themselves as Anti-Realist, p. 225-233) maintains that D. K. Lewis’s modal realism is incompatible with Aquinas’s metaphysics. However, possible worlds semantics might be used to describe Aristotle’s modal notions, inasmuch as Aristotle endorses the principle of plenitude (cf. p. 233, especially n. 12). This latter claim is simply wrong: there is no consensus among scholars about Aristotle’s alleged endorsement of the principle of plenitude; the only supporter of this interpretation, J. Hintikka, is quoted by Holzer as evidence in favour of the claim, but Holzer does not discuss Aristotle’s texts, and does not refer to alternative readings of these texts. Furthermore, possible worlds semantics does not entail the existence of such things as possible worlds, as Holzer seems to think.
L. Dewan (Design, Darwinism, and Metaphysics, p. 235-249) maintains in this second paper that both Intelligent Design theory and Darwinism are compatible with Aquinas’s thesis that God is the cause of being, qua being. Dewan presents the texts in which Aquinas says that the creation has an intelligent direction, and those in which Aquinas speaks of accidental influences in the causal process.

J. Torchia (Aquinas, Personhood, and Postmodernism: in Search of an Elusive Common Ground, p. 251-259) states that bioethics should find its solid ground in anthropology; today’s anthropology is reductionist, but D. Dennett’s rejection of Cartesian dualism is a move similar to that of Thomists, who also reject dualism, and, unlike Dennett, have a hylomorphic anthropology.

T. Bellamah (Qui primo per verba intenditur: Notes on Thomas’s Understanding of Authorial Intention and the Literal Sense, p. 261-277) has produced a brilliant paper on Aquinas’s theory of Biblical exegesis. Bellamah underlines the importance of the literal sense(s) of the Bible for Aquinas, and suggests that this could have been a consequence of Thomas’s Aristotelianism: since knowledge is attained through the senses, the spiritual understanding of the Bible cannot be directly obtained, but should be gained through the mediation of the literal sense. There could be many literal senses of the same passage, and the interpreter should carefully look for them.

D. Legge (The Son’s Proper Work: Aquinas on the Trinitarian Structure of Christ Manifesting the Father, p. 279-288) stresses that Aquinas sees the Word as “manifestativum Patris” in his mature commentary on the Gospel of John. This interpretation of the Second Person of the Trinity shows that Aquinas had not a merely abstract and philosophical understanding of the relations among the Persons of the Trinity.

R. Mayer (The Relation of Nature and Grace in Thomas Aquinas and His Interpreters, p. 289-311) dwells on the question of nature and grace, which he discussed in many of his publications, and which is tackled by other contributors to this collection too. According to Mayer, Aquinas managed to avoid both the extrinsecism of Cajetan, and the thesis of H. de Lubac, which is not able to fully acknowledge the gratuitousness of grace.

R. Plich (St. Thomas Aquinas on the Beginning of Human Life, p. 313-324) observes that Aquinas’s theory of delayed animation of the human being cannot be used in today’s bioethical debate: Aquinas’s biology is too obsolete, and his theory of animation depends on this mistaken biology.

In the last contribution to this collection, W. Golubiewski (The State of Aquinas Studies in China, p. 325-338) speaks of the increasing interest in Aquinas among Chinese intellectuals; the Summa theologiae has been recently translated into Chinese, and the Department of Religious Studies of the University of Wuhan has opened a centre to study Aquinas’s thought.

The book has a useful index of names (p. 339-346), and I found no misprints. Despite a certain variety in the quality of the contributions, this collection is a fine addition to scholarship, and shows the lively growth of Aquinas studies among Polish Dominicans, who deserve our appreciation for their efforts.

L. Gili

Voici un livre qui arrive à point nommé, non pas tant à cause de l’effet d’annonce qu’il pourrait susciter – on songe par exemple à la polémique entourant les caricatures de Mahomet, l’exposition *Irreligia* à Bruxelles – qu’aux rapports, plus objectifs et aussi plus ambigus que le cinéma a pu entretenir avec le sacré et le religieux en général, la foi chrétienne en particulier. L’A. a le souci de l’histoire, détaille les rapports du cinéma et de l’Église, explique l’aniconisme du Judaïsme et de L’Islam, rappelle la querelle iconoclasm, mais s’avance résolument vers les accointances entre le cinéma et le fait religieux, relevant au passage l’idée de croyance qui irrigue un art censé restaurer le lien entre l’homme et le monde. Le cinéma possède non seulement une puissance d’évocation, mais aussi d’invocation qui méritait d’être approfondie, au point que certains y voient un phénomène religieux en soi. L’iconoclasme, nous rappelle l’A. (et l’aniconisme) touche bien entendu à la question du représentable sur le plan spirituel. Pourquoi le cinéma relance-t-il ainsi le débat? On peut penser qu’à la différence de la peinture par exemple, le rapport au réel, et donc au spirituel est remis en jeu. Le cinéma, comme art «total» collant au plus près d’une saisie plus immédiate, photographique du réel, invite à une implication plus large des spectateurs. Même si le cinéma implique une convention fictionnelle, que l’on soit devant ou derrière la caméra ou que l’on regarde le film dans une salle obscure, le vraisemblable ou le crédible se trouve renforcé par le fait que l’image exerce avec un son, un récit et un montage, un rapport à la temporalité qui permet le renvoi à une autre dimension, spirituelle cette fois. Une réflexion qui va d’une philosophie de la nature au mystère de l’incarnation ne lèverait sans doute pas tout à fait le voile sur un art fondamentalement profane (donc aux antipodes du travail de l’icône qui implique bon nombre de conventions religieuses), mais qui ouvre à des univers où l’imaginaire est roi, les passions exaltées, dans un temps ou la rationalité semble avoir pris la mesure du crédible, du vraisemblable, pour ne pas parler du vrai, mais marque aussi le pas face à ce qui échappe *in fine* aux puissances de l’esprit. La question ne peut donc, pour le moment, que rester entière: il n’y a pas de cinéma iconoclasm (il serait plutôt iconophile par nature) il n’y a que des réalisateurs qui le sont en certaines circonstances (Buñuel, Pasolini …) et encore faut-il se demander s’ils n’ont pas eux aussi fait œuvre utile en critiquant ce que toute image peut avoir d’idolâtrique, de faux, d’appâté, d’idéologique (mais y ont-ils échappé eux-mêmes?) et en cela, comment s’abstraire des justes questions que pose le non-croyant au niveau des représentations du divin, du numineux, etc.? L’A. par ses analyses nous invite à réfléchir sur des réalisateurs dont l’iconoclasme est probablement plus inspiré par le rejet d’une Église trop compromise dans la politique et dont l’empreinte sociale a parfois posé question, que par le fait religieux en tant que tel, mais déjà un Kieslowski échappe aux catégorisations trop hâtives, sans parler d’un Zvyaginstsev, qui, avec *Le bannissement* (2007) mériterait plus que le bénéfice du doute. La vraie question aujourd’hui est peut-être celle de l’héritage culturel: en quoi les images procédant de l’histoire de l’art et interprétant le fait religieux peuvent-elles encore irriguer, inspirer et donc enrichir la compréhension des enjeux contemporains? Une question parmi d’autres, au moment où les questions spirituelles ne peuvent être écartées du débat sociétal.

J.-L. MAROY

Cette publication des Cahiers internationaux de théologie pratique se fait l’écho du Colloque Européen des Paroisses tenu à Mons, en juillet 2009. Du fait du caractère international de ce colloque, elle comprend des contributions en français, en allemand et en italien. La problématique de la transmission de la foi y est abordée sous différents angles, comme en rend compte le professeur L. BRESSAN (Faculté de théologie de l’Italie septentrionale à Milan) dans l’introduction. – Les deux premières interventions (en allemand) plantent le décor. Pour le professeur WINDISCH (Université de Freiburg i.B., p. 9-12), la rupture de transmission actuellement expérimentée oblige à assumer que la mission est la figure de la foi de notre temps. Cette attitude missionnaire est à vivre non seulement vers l’extérieur mais aussi à l’intérieur de l’Église. – Le professeur VELLGUTH (Theologische Hochschule Vallendar) prolonge ce constat sur base de résultats de recherches empiriques; il en ressort que la demande religieuse reste manifeste. Il en déduit que les dispositifs actuels de communication utilisés par les institutions ecclésiales ne parviennent à rejoindre cette demande que de façon limitée, faisant perdre au message chrétien une grande part de son potentiel missionnaire («Wie religiös ist Europa? Reflexionen über die religiöse Situation in Europa», p. 15-21). – A. FOSSION (Institut Lumen Vitae), à travers une réflexion de théologie fondamentale, invite à mettre la proposition de la foi sous le signe de la gratuité. La foi chrétienne est une offre totalement gratuite, car la grâce de Dieu est à l’œuvre, que nous reconnaissons ou non son œuvre. Mais cette offre est précieuse parce qu’elle permet de vivre de façon radicalement neuve. L’enjeu de la proposition de la foi, c’est donc d’être d’abord affecté par cet amour exsüsif de Dieu pour en témoigner à travers un amour gratuit et une capacité de «voir Dieu en toute chose». Se situer dans cette perspective gratuite, c’est aussi accueillir les résultats de cette offre gracieuse comme la manifestation de cette grâce toujours à l’œuvre («Pourquoi proposer la foi? “Pour que notre (votre) joie soit complete” (1 Jn 1,4)», p. 24-35).

Trois interventions s’arrêtent ensuite à divers lieux de la transmission. S. NOCETTI (Faculté de théologie de l’Italie centrale – Florence) s’intéresse à la pastorale du baptême des petites enfants. Pour que celle-ci soit fructueuse, elle propose de déployer le dispositif pastoral pré- et postbaptismal. Ce qui justifie théologiquement ce déploiement, c’est la conviction que la foi baptismale est d’abord l’expérience d’un don reçu, et que les relations vécues entre parents et enfants sont un espace de découverte et d’appropriation de ce don («Luoghi di trasmissione della fede. Battesimo e pastorale battesimale», p. 36-44). – La contribution de L. AERTS (diocèse de Gand) sur la transmission de la foi aux jeunes s’inscrit dans la dynamique de confiance des frères de Taizé; le prêtre du diocèse de Gand a appelé à conjuguer ouverture – accueillir les jeunes comme ils sont – et identité – leur partager le trésor de la foi parce qu’il ne peut plus être supposé connu; il en ressort trois voies privilégiées pour l’annonce de la foi aux jeunes: proposer une liturgie simple et belle, laisser résonner la Parole de Dieu et faire découvrir la dimension diaconale de la foi («La transmission de la foi aux jeunes», p. 45-52). – Face à la réalité des migrations, et en particulier face à l’Islam,
M. GOFFOËL (Centre El Kalima) invite à développer le dialogue comme moyen pour grandir mutuellement dans la foi («Migrations: défis culturels et pastoraux», p. 53-59).

S’arrêtant aux ressources qui peuvent être mises au service de cette transmission, P. SCOLAS (UCL) met tout d’abord l’accent sur l’Évangile comme ressource, l’Évangile qui a pris le visage d’un homme qui éveille et réveille la vie malgré la puissance des forces de mort. À partir de là, il appelle à faire confiance à la culture actuelle du sujet, reflet de la confiance que Dieu fait à l’homme, et à s’appuyer sur les innombrables traces que le christianisme a semées dans notre culture. Mais, selon le théologien, le plus décisif dans cette période de crise, c’est, à travers toutes ces ressources, «de naitre et renaître franchement à cette nouvelle» de l’Évangile («Transmettre la foi: nos ressources d’aujourd’hui?», p. 60-65).

Le colloque se conclut par une intervention du professeur A. BORRAS (UCL) qui, reprenant l’image du trésor, situe la foi du côté du désir, car «la foi invite à reconnaître que je ne suis pas sans l’autre». La relecture qu’il propose des différentes interventions du colloque fait ressortir que, derrière les différents apports de ce colloque, l’expérience de foi est présentée comme mise en relation, comme mise en route, comme service de l’autre et accueil de sa propre pauvreté («De la croyance à la foi. Pour une Église en voie de dépouillement», p. 77-78). L’intérêt de cette publication réside dans cette approche positive et stimulante de l’actuelle crise de la transmission, reçue comme un appel pour raviver notre désir de l’autre.

C. CHEVALIER

Norbert LÜDECKE – Georg BIER. Unter Mitarbeit von Bernhard S. ANUTH. 

This textbook, written by experienced canon lawyers from the universities of Bonn and Freiburg im Breisgau respectively, intends to introduce Catholics, particularly students in theology and law, to the basic principles of Roman Catholic canon law. Its primary aim is pedagogical, and the authors indeed deserve full credit for their efforts to make the student’s first encounter with canon law as smooth and engaging as possible. The textbook is structured around 15 thematic units, each introduced by a case illustrating the concrete relevance of the rules from the 1983 Code of Canon Law (hereafter: CIC 1983). Apart from the reference to the notorious Edgardo Mortara-case, in which a Catholic child was removed from its Jewish family (see Unit 9), most practical illustrations are drawn from recent events in German dioceses. One example is Professor Zapp’s decision in 2007 to leave the Church as an institution recognized by German public law by not paying the typically German Church tax anymore while claiming to stay a member of the Church as a community of believers (see Unit 3) [note by the reviewer: in September 2012 both the German Bishops’ Conference and the Federal Administrative Court dealing with this lawsuit ruled that such a partial secession from the Church is impossible]. However, because of the rather universal nature of most of the problems described – for instance the abuse
scandals (see Unit 15) – the textbook will prove useful as an introduction to Roman Catholic canon law in other countries, too. The tables and pictures summarizing important principles laid down in CIC 1983 are very helpful and may even invite non-German speakers to take a preliminary look at this manual.

The advanced reader might want to take notice of the preface to this introductory textbook in order to avoid a sense of wonder at the rather “orthodox” nature of the viewpoints expressed. According to the authors, it is possible to make a neat distinction between “instructing” and “evaluating” Roman Catholic canon law. Hence, they decided to concentrate on the status quo of canon law without claiming to comment upon or critically evaluate the contents and the official interpretation of CIC 1983 (p. 9, nr. 3). Moreover, the textbook starts from the official ecclesiology behind the Code of Canon Law, thus hoping to “protect readers from idealization through ignorance, and, hence, from feeling disappointed about the Church as it really exists” (p. 9, nr. 4). The advanced reader might find it worrisome for an academic textbook to expressly endorse that kind of guiding principle, but she/he will wish to take them seriously if she/he wants to avoid disappointment about the textbook under review. As can be expected from the guiding principles underlying Das römisch-katholische Kirchenrecht: Eine Einführung, the emphasis clearly is on the hierarchical nature of the Church as an institution and on the paramount power of the Holy Father. As a consequence, from the first through the fifteenth unit the reader is imbued with a reverential sense for the Church as a fundamentally unequal and stratified society (societas inaequalis), with the clergy actively ruling and the laity passively obeying.

The authors’ appeal to abandon naive representations about the functioning of the Roman Catholic Church turns out to be justified. On several occasions they even seem to suggest that the laity should abandon their “pointless” efforts to fight for their “rights” or “participation” in the Church. The textbook explains that it does not make sense for lay movements such as “Kirche 2011: Ein notwendiger Aufbruch” (“Church 2011: A necessary awakening”) to try and legitimate their claims for modernization by appealing to the Second Vatican Council. As Unit 2 spells out in great detail, CIC 1983 is the only legally valid translation of the documents ensuing from Vatican II, and the Supreme Pontiff is the only competent body to give an authentic interpretation of those documents. Consequently, Vatican II must be understood in terms of CIC 1983, not the other way around: “Correct canon law refuses to adhere to a certain form of ‘progressivity’ which ascribes standpoints to the teaching office or to the legislator which he does not stand for”. (p. 41, nr. 26). Incidentally, the authors recall the Apostolic Signature’s affirmation in 2007 of the Bishop of Regenburg’s decision to fire a teacher of Roman Catholic religion on account of his active involvement in the lay movement “Wir sind Kirche” (“We are the Church”) (p. 219, nr. 27). Unit 5 is entirely dedicated to an exposition of the laity’s duty of obedience toward the magisterium, which logically follows from the ecclesiological image of the Church as the body of Christ – “where this image is interiorized and has become part of people’s identity, that impressive form of stability emerges which sets the hierarchical system of the Church apart from caste or class systems, in which the lower classes strive upwards” (p. 77, nr. 1). However, the authors do not fail to mention that there is a frightening abyss between official Church doctrines, on the one hand, and the life of Roman Catholics, on the other (p. 93, nr. 29).
Jurists and social scientists tend to share the view that a community’s laws are an expression of its identity. The textbook under review insists time and again—and not without reason—that the identity of the Church is radically different from modern, democratic societies. For example, “equality” in the sense of canon law (c. 208 CIC) is radically different from notions of equality in the constitutions of democratic countries: by virtue of baptism, the faithful are of equal dignity, but the Church remains stratified in a hierarchical way, so that they do not necessarily enjoy the same rights (see Units 4, 6, 8, 10). The Church is not primarily interested in fostering subjective rights and individual freedom (p. 72, n. 28). Particularly, women are thought to be substantially different from men by virtue of different physiological, psychological and ontological characteristics which mean that they are destined for motherhood rather than priesthood (p. 66 jo. p. 171). The Church’s legal structure reveals that it is an absolute, male, clerical monarchy which can even be said to resemble a totalitarian system (p. 25, nr. 23 jo. 25). The question, then, at least for this reviewer, is what role is left for canonists to play in such a system? If a good legal system cannot be frozen in time, and if the task of a jurist is to accompany a legal system in gradually adapting itself to developments in society, then what responsibility does the Church grant to (lay) canonists who wish to use their talents in the service of the Church? Unfortunately, the textbook does not address this question. One wonders, then, what message it ultimately wants to convey to its students. The reader can decide that it is best for him to refrain from critical thinking, as the authors seem to suggest in the introduction to their textbook, certainly if that reader plays with the idea of making a career in the Church. But the other option might be for that reader to advocate radical reform in light of the blatant disjunction between existing canon law rules and the reality at grassroots level: “Wer die Sonntagsglocken hört, weiß: Es geschieht wieder millionenfacher Rechtsbruch” (“if you hear the bells toll on Sunday, you know: millions of Christians are again breaking the law”, p. 204, nr. 21).

W. DECOCK

Alessandro SARACO. 
La penitenzieria apostolica: Storia di un tribunale di misericordia e di pietà. 

This is a brief but useful introduction to the history of the Apostolic Penitentiary (Penitenzieria Apostolica), one of the three tribunals in the Roman Catholic Church. From the late twelfth century onwards the Apostolic Penitentiary has mainly dealt with matters concerning the so-called internal forum (forum internum), absolving people from sin and granting dispensations for marriages and benefices. Before the major reforms of the Penitentiary by Popes Pius V (1566-1572) and Benedict XIV (1740-1758), successively, the Apostolic Penitentiary even had jurisdiction in matters relating to the external court, such as the recovery of debts and the punishment of crimes. The booklet was written by Don Alessandro Saraco, the current archivist of this venerable institution, on the occasion of the opening of the archives of the Apostolic Penitentiary to the scholarly community in November 2011. It also includes a foreword by the then Regent of the
Apostolic Penitentiary, Don Gianfranco Girotti. Although this short introduction to the subject is primarily addressed to laymen and not necessarily to experts in the field, it contains an overview of the documents that can be consulted in the archive (p. 66-71), which will prove useful to any scholar who considers investigating the Archivio Storico della Penitenzieria Apostolica. Unfortunately, the appendix containing a chronological list of the Major Penitentiaries seems to be slightly flawed (compare W.J. Kubelbeck, The Sacred Penitentiaria and its Relations to Faculties of Ordinaries and Priests, Washington DC, Catholic University of America, 1918, reprinted in 2004). Also, the quite frequently occurring typographical errors in the bibliographical references seem to suggest that the booklet had to be written against a looming deadline. However, the author has largely succeeded in his praiseworthy effort of making the history of one of the most important yet often neglected institutions of the Roman Catholic Church available to the general public.

W. DECOCK