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This volume of the Jahrbuch suggests a significant change in editorial policy. Detailed articles on many aspects of the history and archaeology of early Christianity remain, but the balance of the journal is tilting towards the publication of a large number of extended learned reviews. The twenty included in this volume widen its scope and enhance greatly its use to scholars.

The articles cover the usual broad canvas of interests. There are two studies concerning Galilee in late Roman times. Matthias Perkams examines the extent to which the erratic Comes Joseph was responsible for building the first churches in Tiberias, Sepphoris and other Jewish centres. Moshe Fischer, on the other hand, confines himself to Capernaum, suggesting from the proximity of the remains of the synagogue and church that the two communities must have coexisted in relative harmony at this period. The same period of Valentinian II (375–92) and Theodosius I (378–95) leads Ulrike Ritzerfeld to claim that the great obelisk built c. 390 (illustrated) that still dominates the Hippodrome at Constantinople was aimed at proclaiming the permanent triumphant rule of the house of Theodosius in that city and also downgrading the influence of the house of Valentinian, centred in the west. The continued influence of Virgil on Christian writing is examined in a detailed essay by Thomas Gärtner on the late fifth/early sixth-century poet Alcimus Avitus. The reviews include extensive studies by Ernst Dassmann, Albrecht Dihle and Winrich Löhr of books by Wolfgang Reinfold, Maurice Sachot and Stefan Freund on aspects of the mission and expansion of Christianity. The Christianisation of a single province, Provence, studied by Jean Guyon and Marc Heijmans is given an extensive review by Sebastian Ristow.

These are among the many important themes explored in this volume. The new emphasis on reviews by senior scholars will increase the already high standing of the Jahrbuch. The production is, as usual, faultless.
Professor Karl Hoheisel was Professor of Comparative Religion (Vergleichende Religionswissenschaft) in the University of Bonn and had worked closely with the Franz Josef Dölger Institut. Forty-one of his former students and friends have now contributed to a Festschrift celebrating his sixty-fifth birthday. Hoheisel was a scholar of wide and penetrating interests and these are worthily represented by articles ranging from Old Testament studies on the one hand, to Stefan Heep’s consideration of National Socialism and the Führer-myth as a Jewish–Christian heresy on the other. Antike und Christentum is, however, well represented. Karl Noethlichs examines the correspondence of Dionysius of Corinth (c. 170–80) with his episcopal colleagues in the Greek east as less a sign of Corinth acting as Rome’s mouthpiece as an assertion of his see’s importance through its claim to joint foundation by the Apostles Peter and Paul on a par with Rome. He writes like an archbishop entitled to command obedience. Georg Schöllgen asks whether the pagan charge against the Christians in the period 170–230, that they belonged to the ‘dregs of society’ and were ‘false philosophers’, echoed similar charges made against the Cynics earlier in the second century by Dio Chrysostom. Günter Stemberger points to Justinian’s concern that the Jews should not stray out of a strictly orthodox interpretation of Judaism, and Klaus Thraede points to a second-century pagan papyrus text describing an initiation ceremony (into a mystery cult) demanding exactly the same infant sacrifice and other horrific acts attributed to the Christians in the late second century. These are among a number of valuable contributions, but it is open to ask whether, in including problems relating to non-Christian eastern religions and modern issues, the net has not been cast too widely. Moreover, the title Haeresis, denoting both ‘choice’ and more technically ‘heresy’, could have attracted more contributions on early Christian dissenting traditions from Gnosticism to Monophysitism, and for the Middle Ages, on movements such as the Bogomils and Cathars. Despite the varied nature and excellent quality of many of the contributions, one cannot help feeling that a chance of a thorough investigation of non-orthodoxy within the Church in the early centuries and Middle Ages has been missed.

GONVILLE AND CAIUS COLLEGE,

W. H. C. FREND

CAMBRIDGE
dominance lasted even into the nineteenth century, and Trier which was abolished with the fall of the electoral state in 1798, and we may count Union Theological Seminary as well as a general article ‘Universität’, with its useful bibliography. Of religious there are not only Trappists but Ursulines. In the patristic age there is a statement of New Testament chronology in Urchristentum, articles on Tyconius, Valentinus and Venantius Fortunatus, and a long article on the Trinity which continues even into modern debates. In the Reformation we have Valla and Vergerio and Vermigli and Ubiquität and Ursinus, and Unitarians not only in the origins; while the article on dreams (Traum) is partly about Melanchthon; and the chief editor himself on the Council of Trent (Tridentinum) records the up-to-date editions and investigations since the volumes of Hubert Jedin on which everyone has relied as their guide; with the conclusion that Trent affected not only Roman Catholics, by an essential contribution to the confessionalising of all Christendom. Ecumenically there is a valuable collection of attempts in Unionen. As ever there are interesting articles on unexpected themes – for example that on mourning (Trauer). The history of religion in the USA (Vereinigte Staaten von Amerika) should not be overlooked.

Selwyn College, Cambridge
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This at first sight oddly conceived volume brings together a great deal of information about Christian Latinity which it would be exceedingly difficult to find between two covers elsewhere. The essays it comprises began life as papers submitted to a conference in commemoration of Pope John XXIII’s largely forgotten encyclical Veterum sapientia. The aim of that letter was to maintain (fond hope!) the use of Latin as the medium of philosophical and theological teaching, as well as worship and Church administration, in the western Catholic Church. That Rome has not abandoned the idea of Latinity as a normal feature of a high Catholic culture appears clear from the foreword by the Prefect of the Congregation for Catholic Education, though whether this proposition receives more than notional assent in that dicastery is another matter. After a substantial introduction (in French), directed to the sense in which the advent of biblical and patristic Latin can be said to have ‘renewed’ the language, the rest of the volume falls essentially into three parts. From the historical standpoint, the first 250 pages are the most generally useful. A wide-ranging survey of how Latin is employed in Christian prose and poetry in the age of the Fathers, with a lengthy excursus on the origins of ‘monastic Latin’ in the ascetical rules, culminates in an analysis of some key theological terms by the leading Italian patrologist Manlio Simonetti. (Somewhat predictably, this is largely confined to the vocabulary of conciliar Triadology and Christology.) The central section of the collection contains much less familiar matter, on the evolution of post-patristic Latin, with analyses of texts from the Late Renaissance and Baroque eras. Discussion of the Latin of the Roman Curia carries the story up to the present day, and the section closes with a
sophisticated attempt to establish a typology of Christian ‘Latinities’ (in the plural). The final part consists of a philologico-theological analysis of part of the Temporale of the present Roman missal (its approach could well be recommended to those about to rectify the flawed English translation of 1970), and a charming piece on the survival of fragments of Church Latin in the modern Italian dialects.

AIDAN NICHOLSON
BLACKFRIARS,
CAMBRIDGE
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This collection of conference papers originated as an exhibit illustrating monastic excavations. It was intended to demonstrate ‘that monasticism always involves various communal relationships [i.e. inside and outside the monastery] and that archaeology can provide information about such relationships that the literature does not provide’. The papers are divided roughly into three sections, treating Egyptian, Greek and western European monasticism, and the volume’s visual origins are apparent in the photographs, often illuminating though sometimes small and dark, which accompany most papers. Particularly convincing as illustrations of the monastery’s relationship with its environment are two papers, the first archaeological, and second architectural. John Soderberg’s analysis of animal bones at the Irish monastery of Clonmacnoise assesses the age of the bones and concludes that since the cattle were old they were raised elsewhere, not on-site, and that such a provisioning system indicates urbanisation at a surprisingly early date c. 700, ‘centuries before any other known settlement in Ireland’. David Walsh examines Cluny’s architectural and symbolic relationship with the surrounding town, noting that the town’s eleventh-century romanesque houses were designed by masons trained at the abbey and that their design was often deliberately chosen to reflect architectural aspects of the abbey – thus emphasising the power of the monastery and the town jointly, rather than presenting an image of monastic isolation and self-containment, as at St Gall. Two more essays are valuable for their suggestive methods of analysis; in both cases it is easy to imagine further uses for these techniques. Employing evidence from nineteenth-century French Cistercian female houses, Constance Berman divides the footage of the monastic church by the house’s statutory maximum number of nuns to produce what might be called the space allotment per nun (between ten and twenty metres). Berman is concerned to offer points about a particular house, but more broadly this melding of architectural and population information might produce comparative conclusions about higher or lower standards of living at individual communities and thus proceed to a regional or national overview. Studying the Kellia, a complex of multi-roomed hermitages in Lower Egypt built between the fourth and ninth centuries, Nicola Aravecchia uses a technique called space syntax analysis to posit function (how many rooms had to be traversed to get to a particular room?). Her conclusions regarding room use in these early buildings – an oratory at the farthest remove from the entrance, a servant’s
room, a vestibule in which visitors might be fed – are suggestive for the physical form of western anchorholds. The volume’s final essay, by Garth Rockcastle, a thoughtful conclusion, asks why monastic architecture continues to fascinate, and in answer lists six ways in which it is particularly effective. Perhaps the most compelling of these has to do with the use of space to conceal and reveal, as monastic building distinguishes the experience of the initiated from that of the uninitiated. Finally Rockcastle suggests that the simultaneous human need for refuge and for prospect (or outlook) is well-supported by monastic architecture’s provision of both enclosed spaces and lofty ones (the accompanying photographs of the shrine of St Michael, Val di Susa, Italy, powerfully illustrate these two modes).

MARY C. ERLER

*Fordham University*
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This commentary on the Epideixis is a work of systematic theology which sets the writing within the context of the great councils of 325, 381 and 452. It considers Irenaeus retrospectively from the councils and shows his continuing relevance for dogmatic theology; central is the incarnation which is linked with creation (pp. 173ff.) and with redemption (p. 197). Most retrospective accounts of second-century writers bewail their ignorance of fourth-century problems. This rightly applauds the richness of Irenaeus’ thought.

The value of this commentary is three-fold. First, it is theological and indicates some of the great theological themes, which permeate the work of Irenaeus. It will be read with appreciation and benefit. Further, it brings out with striking clarity the difference between dogmatic and historical theology. Second, it shows that a discredited retrospective method, which reads back from a chosen fourth-century goal, can still provide a limited but useful introduction to Irenaeus. The retrospective method has today lost ground among historians of thought. Philosophy and theology do not move in steady progression over unchanging problems to a perfect solution. Quentin Skinner takes as the first axiom of interpretation ‘that the history of thought should be viewed not as a series of attempts to answer a canonical set of questions, but as a sequence of episodes in which the questions as well as the answers have frequently changed’ (J. Tully (ed.), *Meaning and context*, Cambridge 1988, 234). Collingwood insisted that ‘Bach was not trying to write like Beethoven and failing; Athens was not a relatively unsuccessful attempt to produce Rome; Plato was himself, not a half-developed Aristotle’ (*The idea of history*, New York, 1956, 329). On the other hand, if one walks backward into an author, one gains a partial and simpler view. Recapitulation becomes a secondary concept, despite the recent brilliant and extended treatment of Sesboët (p. 31) and ‘image and likeness’ is straightforward without the careful study of Fantino (p. 108). Indeed the whole wealth of the last hundred years of European scholarship is bypassed. This is possible for a dogmatic theologian but not for an historical theologian.
Third, in view of this neglect, the book raises the problem of the relation between dogmatics and historical theology. Meijering has shown that dogmatic theologians do not have the time to look at sources and therefore use the handbooks of their youth. When their building blocks are discredited their integrity comes under stress. Meijering has posed this problem in several places, especially in his Von den Kirchenvätern zu Karl Barth: das altkirchliche Dogma in der kirchlichen Dogmatik (Amsterdam 1993).

It is clear that historical theologians are not merely doing something different from dogmatic theologians but acting in creative opposition. For the history of ideas is directed first to challenge syntheses by destroying conceptual parochialism, and second to recover the better ideas which history left behind. Two concepts of liberty were abroad in the seventeenth century, said Skinner in his inaugural lecture. The narrower concept was followed and we are still suffering the consequences. Similarly we can learn most from the Irenaeus who was left behind.

To sum up, this book is valuable because it offers a useful commentary and points to two major problems. The text is depressing when it comes to Greek and Latin, for even the critical words χρύνγια and περιχάρης are misspelled in Greek, while the Latin ‘in image dei’ and ‘cardis’ are meaningless (pp. 36, 213, 42, 29).

LA TROBE UNIVERSITY, VICTORIA, AUSTRALIA

ERIC OSBORN


The excellence of this book is two-fold. First it demonstrates that the conclusions which Origen reached were those of a Christian not a Platonist and that he did not hold the views for which he was condemned. Second, and equally important, the book indicates the need for revision of method in patristic studies. The history of ideas is the same pursuit whatever text it examines. Theology does not absolve historical theologians from the logical stringency practised by other historians of ideas.

Origen’s philosophy is autonomous and includes (pp. 160f.) five claims:

1. No being (apart from the Trinity) can survive without a substrate to preserve its form and individuality. A creation populated by incorporeal entities is impossible.
2. God transcends what we call mind but is known through his revelation, especially in his son, as finite.
3. The Christian goal is not to deliver soul from body but to subsume both in spirit. Origen does not speak of a fall of the soul from heaven.
4. Souls do not pass from one body to another.
5. Scripture is body, soul and spirit. The literal sense (which includes historical truth) is purged but not discarded.
All of which shows that ‘Origen’s work contains the antibodies to Platonism, as proof that he has suffered and resisted its attacks’ (p. 161).

For Origen, the Bible was simultaneously a document of history, a guide to conduct and a reservoir of truth. On the other hand philosophy was for him, as for Clement, an eclectic and preparatory study. Edwards challenges at least two popular views. Alexandria, he claims, was not dominated by ‘middle Platonism’. Further, the popular antithetical assessment of Greek and Hebrew mentalities (pp. 47f.) attributes to the former a transcendent and to the latter an immanent God. ‘Yet, strange to tell, in every other generation from ancient times to the early twentieth century, it was the converse view that held the field’ (p. 48). Greeks were always seen as pantheist worshippers of the elements while Hebrews looked to an ineffable God who created a world of which he was not part. Secondly, Origen’s dependence on the Bible is not compromised by the philosophical terms he uses for he employs them in a new sense. Recent patristic study ‘has laboured under the fallacy that a word can never mean anything but what it was devised to mean – that it must remain for ever Stoic, Platonic or Aristotelian in tendency because it was Stoic, Platonic or Aristotelian in origin. In making this assumption the historian belies his own vocation and that of the authors whom he professes to interpret: a scholar must learn to think the thoughts of others, as a philosopher must learn to think his own’ (p. 114).

The concept of ‘spirit in matter’ governs Origen’s anthropology and understanding of Scripture. In humanity, ‘the body, which in Platonism remains at best the luggage of the itinerant soul, is for Origen the condition of our historical integrity as persons’ (p. 76). He transferred to Scripture this understanding and took ‘this Biblical concept of the body as his key to the spirit within the letter of the text’ (p. 76).

All of this confirms the general aim of the series (Ashgate Studies in Philosophy & Theology in Late Antiquity) which is to look at major theologians ‘as individuals immersed in the intellectual culture of their day’. ‘Each book concentrates on the arguments, not merely the opinions, of a single writer or group of writers from the period 100–600 and compares and contrasts these arguments with those of pagan contemporaries who addressed similar questions’ (p. ii). By this attention to argument, theologians and classicists accept the tradition of analytic philosophy. Edwards’s book shows that the neglect of Origen’s argument and the extraction of phrases led to misunderstanding and condemnation. At creative periods of thought only a writer’s argument will show how he is using words. Patristic argument raises challenges because the early Fathers needed great powers of synthesis. Irenaeus has two chains of argument, each of twenty moves, which link the summing up of all things in Christ to the summing up of the law in the love command. Consequently the summit of recapitulation is reached in the words from the cross, ‘Father, forgive them’. Many readers of Irenaeus do not have the conceptual stamina to follow an argument of so many moves, and therefore miss one of the greatest insights of Christian theology. Again, on Tertullian, misunderstanding persists because his ‘credible because inept’ and ‘What has Jerusalem to do with Athens’ both involve arguments of more than one move.

Two final brief points remain. First, a good monograph on Origen has long been needed in the English language. Edwards is clearly able to supply this need. We must hope that he will do so. Second, by ending his account with the exegesis of Scripture, he has shown where the treasure lies. Justin, quite explicitly, substitutes the prophets for philosophers and their visions of truth for Platonic forms (dialogue 7). Irenaeus
builds his work on this basis, as the recent work of Polanco (*El concepto de profecía en la teología de san Ireno*, Madrid 1999) has shown. Clement goes so far as to make the world of types his true dialectic. Origen follows Clement here. Whether this source of knowledge be called ‘anti-Platonism’ or ‘horizontal’ (because tied to historical events and persons) Platonism is a matter of choice. The important thing is that it provided access to universals, which led to knowledge of the truth under Christ as first principle. The nature of this metaphysic was seen clearly in Origen by de Lubac, who distinguished these spiritual realities from Platonic forms on the one hand and Gnostic dramas on the other hand. ‘Elles sont, comme le dit Origène, “la réalité même des qui concernent le Fils de Dieu” telles que nous sommes appelés à en vivre. C’est toute la sphère du “royaume des cieux” tout entière contenue dans Celui qui est lui-même ce royaume en personne: αἵτινες σωσίλειτο (*Histoire et esprit*, Paris 1950, 294).

Dr Edwards’s book is to be warmly commended both for its content and for its method.

**La Trobe University, Victoria, Australia**

**ERIC OSBORN**


*JEH* (54) 2003; DOI: 10.1017/S0022046903288084

Origen regarded the Epistle to the Ephesians as the crowning work of Paul; the eminent position of his own commentary in ancient times is attested by the freedom with which others drew upon it. As Heine demonstrates, quietly disposing of the argument for a Valentinian predecessor (pp. 5–6), Origen had the advantage of priority, and even when he acquired a reputation for heterodoxy, the Greek catena on Ephesians could not spare him. This yields a handful of passages, most of which have been digested, often word for word, into Jerome’s *Commentary on Ephesians*. Heine’s lucid and accurate translation juxtaposes the work of Jerome with the fragments from the catena, and italicises passages in Jerome which he believes to be derived from Origen. His conjectures are always reasonable, grounded as they are on Jerome’s preface and on statements made in the course of his altercation with Rufinus. Evidence of the latter type should perhaps be used with caution in view of Heine’s observation that the charge pressed by Rufinus is not one of plagiarism but of holding Origen’s doctrines (p. 11), so that Jerome would have had an interest in maintaining that the words were not his own. It is also clear, from Jerome’s more inimical citations in other works, that literal rendering is no guarantee of fidelity to the meaning of one’s author; this *caveat* can be illustrated indeed from Heine’s own quotation of *On first principles* 3.4.5 as a testimony to Origen’s alleged belief that the visible world was created to house the souls who had fallen from a higher realm (p. 50). In fact, although we hear of an ubiquitous propensity in souls to be seduced by the diversity of matter, I see nothing to prove that these souls are disembodied except perhaps at the very instant of creation; and the souls of a peculiar type that descend from the invisible to the visible are clearly those of celestial luminaries, mired in the present world for our sakes, not to expiate personal transgression. Such questions
are, no doubt, of little moment in an introduction to Origen’s principles of exegesis, and few will be inclined to deny that in the proems to separate books of his commentaries he makes use of the stock features that were subsequently enumerated in Neoplatonic writings, but were exemplified already by Alexander of Aphrodisias in his prefaces to Aristotelian lemmata (pp. 23–32). One might, however, ask what is explained by such discoveries: the assumption that the title of a book is a clue to its purpose, for example (p. 34), is not so much a scholastic commonplace as the recognition of an authorial practice that was meant to be obvious to every reader. Rhetoric in antiquity is a practical not a theoretical discipline: it taught young orators how to attain a decorous mediocrity, but for modern scholars, at least when they deal with authors who are more than mediocrities, it is only the beginning of a critical enterprise.

Christ Church, Oxford

Mark Edwards


JEH (54) 2003; DOI: 10.1017/S0022046903298080

The *Vita Polycarpi*, which purports to relate Polycarp’s arrival in Smyrna from Syria as a boy, and his ascent up the ecclesiastical *cursus honorum* until he became a bishop, and ends, probably incompletely, with a series of miracles, was the subject of some debate and discussion in the late nineteenth century. But it has not received serious attention since E. Schwartz’s study *De Pionio et Polycarpo* of 1905, and no new critical edition since that of J. B. Lightfoot (*Apostolic Fathers* ii.3) in 1889. Alistair Stewart-Sykes, a widely published patrologist with a specialist interest in early Christian liturgy, has sought in this new edition and translation to rectify what he sees as nearly a century of surprising neglect.

The edition and translation come with an erudite and admirably clear introduction of eighty-six pages. After noting that the *Vita* is ‘worthless’ as an historical record of the life of Polycarp (its presentation of the bishop as a career clergyman does not cohere with what we know of the historical Polycarp who was a household-bishop), Stewart-Sykes makes a very good case for seeing it as dating from the middle of the third century. Negatively he shows that the *Vita*’s anti-quartodeciman prescript, often taken as a sign of its fourth-century, post-Nicene date, was not original to the work, and positively he highlights some aspects of the work which in his opinion clearly point to the earlier third-century date. So, for instance, heresy is mainly seen to be exemplified in Montanism and Marcionism, rather than in the adoption of certain attitudes towards the Trinity, such a feature of fourth-century Christianity. Stewart-Sykes goes on to argue that the work, the product of a literary school which met to discuss Christian subjects and was probably responsible for the writing of the *Martyrium Pioinii* and the preservation of the *Martyrium Polycarpi*, should be seen as a philosophical *Bios*, whose function was not only to preserve the memory of its founder but to legitimate the subject of its teaching, namely Catholic Christianity. In generic terms, then, it has its origins in classical intellectual biography, and is not dissimilar to Philostratus’ *Vita Apollonii,*
adding further support to the view of a second-century date. Stewart-Sykes goes on
to discuss the author’s attitude to Jews, pagans and heretics, and concludes with a
most informative account on the liturgiological implications of some of the practices
evidenced in the text. Particularly notable here are Stewart-Sykes’s comments on the
apparent proximity of some of these to earlier Jewish practices, whether pertaining
to parallels between episcopal ordination and the ordination of rabbis, or sabbath
practice. His view that the sabbath practice witnessed in the \textit{Vita}, which differed
from known Jewish practice in the third century but was compatible with that of an
earlier age, leads him to the interesting conclusion ‘that the keeping of Sabbath
by Christians was not a post-Nicene development but a custom of considerable
antiquity’ (p. 58).

The present reviewer cannot comment on the quality of the edition (there is in fact
only one defective and lacunose manuscript, Parisinus graecus 1452, but Stewart-
Sykes helpfully, and for the first time, brings together in the critical notes the various
emendations suggested by scholars who previously studied the text), but the
translation is certainly fluent and accurate, and the notes illuminating.

Stewart-Sykes is to be thanked heartily for bringing this unduly ignored text to our
attention. In spite of its obvious particularity, as its erudite editor so ably shows us,
the \textit{Vita Polycarpi} tells us much about aspects of Christian development in the third
century. Anyone interested in third-century Christianity, whether in, for instance,
issues pertaining to the development of liturgy and ministry or in the perhaps
neglected subject of Christian interaction with elements of what Philostratus named
the Second Sophistic, will find much to chew on here.

\textsc{Peterhouse, Cambridge}\hspace{1cm} \textsc{James Carleton Paget}

\textit{Athanasius of Alexandria, Epistula ad afros. Intro., comm. and trans. by Annette von
York: Walter de Gruyter, 2002. DM 98. 3 11 017159 7; 0553 4003
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The \textit{Epistula ad afros} is a short piece, of five pages (489–594) and 11 paragraphs in
Robertson’s translation for \textit{NPNF}. He heads it ‘To the bishops of Africa: letter of
ninety bishops of Egypt and Libya including Athanasius’. This title derives inexacty
from one (admittedly important) manuscript tradition; the oldest citations say
merely that they are from (a letter by) Athanasius addressing the African bishops.
The main themes of the piece are the sufficient authority of the Council of Nicaea,
which even taught the full Godhead of the Holy Ghost, and the error of Auxentius
still in charge of Milan. It starts abruptly; the anonymous addressees are called
‘dear’ which means they are ‘orthodox’ and probably ecclesiastical inferiors; only
the heading reveals that they are African bishops; and Athanasius is unmentioned. It
ends with a doxology to the one God known in the holy and perfect Trinity. It is
written in the ‘we’ style, but there is a curious line: ‘It is not only ourselves that
write, but all the bishops of Egypt and the Libyas, some ninety in number. For we
are all of one mind in this, and we always sign for one another if any chance to be
absent.’ So, who wrote the piece, and can the author (who should at least be a
bishop) really mean what he says? Is it a synodal letter, as has generally been
assumed in accordance with the longer title, or a personal statement? What, if anything, has it to do with the historical Athanasius? There are abundant points of connection with his De synodis and Contra arianos III, as also with Pope Damasus’ Confidimus quidem to which it seems to have some direct relation. Charles Kannengiesser, in a too brief essay in the Festschrift for Luise Abramowski (Logos, 1993) argued that this piece was a fabrication using inter alia designations like ‘anomean’ and ideas such as the divine inspiration of the Nicene Creed (‘the Lord’s word mediated by the ecumenical synod at Nicaea’ – in contrast with Rimini or Nike – ‘abides for ever’) inconsistent with the historical Athanasius. He did not help the case by his attempted disproof elsewhere of the Athanasian authorship of Contra arianos III. Annette von Stockhausen rejects Kannengiesser’s arguments and reads the text in a different way: as an epistolary essay by Athanasius not a synodal letter; as not replying to Damasus’ Confidimus quidem but provoking it and naturally drawing on previous writings of his own. She places it in 367, five years earlier than the dating usual when it is seen as responding to a Roman synod. Her discussion of the text is grounded in a careful reading along with detailed stylistic analysis and historical background. I do not know whether she is right about the authorship. I should never have noticed anything suspicious in the piece if Kannengiesser had not drawn attention to what are certainly odd features and if I did not share the long-standing doubts about the corpus of Athanasiana. I do not believe that this is a personal theological essay. I think it has a strongly ‘western’ approach to the Nicene Creed. If it is a slightly tendentious rehash by someone (who?) of sentiments by Athanasius (and once suggested that is difficult to disprove, because you cannot point to similarities!) it is an ancient one. It does not change the picture of Athanasius much to bracket it out. I think this argument may run and run. There is not much that Annette von Stockhausen has not found an answer for. But I am not convinced – except of the fact that this is a fine and thought-provoking presentation.

SKELMANTHORPE, LIONEL R. WICKHAM
WEST YORKSHIRE
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This book is the published version of an Oxford doctoral thesis completed in 1992 under the supervision of the late Edward Yarnold, and reflects the latter’s interest in the genre of fourth-century catechetical homilies. At least since the seventeenth century the attribution of the five mystagogical catecheses to Cyril of Jerusalem has been questioned, particularly as some manuscripts attribute them to Cyril’s successor, John. In more recent years the discussion was intensified with the publication of an article by W. J. Swaans in 1942. Yarnold vigorously defended Cyril’s authorship of the mystagogical catecheses, and Doval sets out in depth why Yarnold is correct. He examines the authorship attribution in the manuscripts, noting that those which attribute the mystagogical catecheses to John are in a minority. He compares the mystagogical catecheses to contemporary external evidence, namely
Egeria’s diary and the Armenian lectionary, suggesting that nothing in these contradict Cyrilline authorship. Thirdly, he presents a detailed literary and theological study of the mystagogical catecheses, comparing them with Cyril’s undisputed catechetical homilies, and with the alleged Origenist theology of John and his few known writings. Though Doval concedes that Cyrilline authorship cannot be conclusively proved, on balance there are no good grounds for disputing the traditional attribution.

Doval’s cumulative case is compelling, and the onus must now be on those who dispute Cyril’s authorship to justify continued dissent. However, this judgement does not mean that all Doval’s arguments should go unchallenged. For example, the comparison between the styles of Cyril and John as they relate to the mystagogical catecheses is rather unbalanced, since on the one hand the comparison is between material of the same genre for Cyril (mystagogical catecheses and the catechetical homilies) and for John, dissimilar material (the mystagogical catecheses with the Apology preserved by Jerome, the confession of faith from the Pelagian controversies, and a homily on the Church). Furthermore, some of the liturgical considerations show a lack of awareness of more recent work. Doval thus defends Yarnold’s reading of the mystagogical catecheses, that the Jerusalem anaphora at this time contained an institution narrative, when in fact most scholars suggest that the more obvious reading points to an anaphora analogous to Addai and Mari, with no narrative. He appeals to Geoffrey Cuming’s article of 1974, where Cuming argued that the Jerusalem anaphora was akin to the Egyptian – an opinion which Cuming publicly withdrew at an Oxford Patristic Congress (but regrettably never retracted in print). Doval’s treatment of anointing in baptism is equally suspect. He commences by appealing to the studies of Ratcliff and Brock that in the latter part of the fourth century the eastern rites began to introduce a post-baptismal anointing, in contrast to the earlier pattern of only a pre-baptismal anointing. Doval notes that the mystagogical catecheses knows of this post-baptismal anointing, and so fits in with later fourth-century developments. Since Ratcliff and Brock trace the change to Cyril in the mystagogical catecheses, Doval has presented a circular argument showing that Cyril confirms Cyril! That being said, this book is an important contribution to studies on Cyril of Jerusalem and the fourth-century liturgy of the Holy City.

BRYAN D. SPINKS

YALE UNIVERSITY DIVINITY SCHOOL


Professor Van Dam presents here the first of a projected triad of books dealing with late Roman Cappadocia. Its successors, he tells us, will look at personal relationships and Christian conversion. Kingdom of snow focuses on Cappadocia itself: on social and political relationships and structures and on the roles of the Cappadocian Fathers as patrons and brokers. Basil and the two Gregories are not the main theme, but since their letters and sermons provide so much of the evidence their careers and personalities figure prominently. The first four chapters (‘Badlands’) look at the milieu and its notables including an amusing vignette of a certain Diogenes Akrites from
a rather later period whose legendary exploits illuminate the ‘feel’ of Cappadocian life. Subsequent chapters deal with the imperial context (‘Empire and province’) and the tension between classical paideia and Christian commitment (‘Culture wars’). The emphasis in this last section is on the Cappadocian Fathers in counterpoint with the Emperor Julian who can, with a certain latitude be called a Cappadocian himself, brought up as he was at Caesarea. Professor Van Dam finds some fresh things to say here about the ever fascinating apostate and his intentions. He suggests an intriguing contrast and parallel between the ambivalence of Basil and Gregory Nazianzen towards Hellenistic literature and science (in Basil’s Ad adolescentes and Gregory’s diatribes Against Julian) and Julian’s rejection of Christian claims to belong to the world of educated spirits. Elsewhere there is much to value in the clear presentation of the network of relationships sustaining the social life of the province – or provinces as they were to become for reasons which are excellently set out here. The Cappadocian Fathers emerge as polished and not too scrupulous wheelers and dealers. The evidence lies pretty close to the surface when you read Basil’s letters to Modestus or when you reflect upon the tale of Basil’s own election. It is good to have it brought together and systematised. New to me, though, was the information that Julian ‘on his final trip to the eastern frontier met Basil and Gregory Nazianzen and may have invited them to join his enterprise’. Evidence? It is an interesting thought whatever its basis. A study such as this, which focuses attention on an area, a landscape and a society, does much to nuance and qualify general assessments of the ancient world. Conversely, for this reader at any rate, the impression is left that not only would many of the conditions described so well here obtain equally almost anywhere you might select in the early Byzantine world outside Constantinople, but that so far as church life is concerned ‘plus ça change plus c’est la même chose’. Bishops will always defend their territorial rights and find themselves drawn into relations with the state. A final carp: how absurd to publish a book about an area without maps or pictures.

LIONEL R. WICKHAM
WEST YORKSHIRE
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This useful collection arises from a conference held in Vienna. It was a great relief to this reviewer to find that the first contribution, Z. Alexidze on ‘Four recensions of the “Conversion of Georgia” (comparative study)’ (pp. 9–16), was the only one which had been inadequately edited: the poor English distracts from the what is a valuable discussion of manuscripts from Tbilisi and Sinai. I. Arzhantseva, in ‘The Christianization of north Caucasus (religious dualism among the Alans)’ (pp. 17–36), gives an historical sketch and details on particular sites (especially Kiafar). W. Djobadze’s ‘Georgians in Antioch on-the-Orontes and the monastery of...
St Barlaam’ (pp. 37–53, and plates) follows on from his excavations in 1962–6. Next there are contributions on the early Armenian Church: A Drost-Abgarjan and H. Goltz, ‘Zur Christianisierung Armeniens im Spiegel des Hymnariums Saraknoc‘ der Armenischen Apolostolischen Kirche’ (pp. 55–79), and B. Harutyunyan, ‘Die Diözesan-Gliederung Armenischer Kirche im Zeitalter Gregors des Erleuchters’ (pp. 81–94) (with an addendum by M. K. Krikorian at pp. 95–8). Krikorian’s own specific contribution is ‘The formation of canon law of the Armenian Church in the ivth century’ (pp. 99–106), which is followed by J.-P. Mahé, ‘Die Bekehrung Transkaukasiens: eine Historiographie mit doppeltem Boden’ (pp. 107–24), and W. Seibt, ‘Die historische Hintergrund und die Chronologie der Christianisierung Armeniens bzw. der Taufe Königs Trdat (ca. 315)’ (pp. 125–33). Iconographic studies (with fine illustrations and plates) are provided by M. Thierry: ‘L’Histoire de Saint Grégoire peinte dans l’église Saint-Grégoire de Tigran Honenc à Ani (1215)’ (pp. 135–49), and N. Thierry: ‘Sur le culte de Sainte Nino’ (pp. 151–7). The influence of Syriac-speaking Christianity on the early Armenian Church, including the adoption of the Addai legend, is explored by R. W. Thomson in ‘Syriac Christianity and the conversion of Armenia’ (pp. 159–69). M. van Esbreeck writes on ‘Die Stellung de Märtyrerin Rhipsime in der Geschichte der Bekehrung des Kaukasus’ (pp. 171–9). Finally there are two contributions relating to ethnicity and national consciousness: K. N. Yuzbachian, ‘Einige Bemerkungen über die Entwicklungen der nationalen Bewusstseinsbildung im kaukasischen Albanien’ (pp. 181–7), and B. L. Zekiyan, ‘Die Christianisierung und die Alphabetisierung Armeniens als Vorbilder kultureller Inkarnation, besonders im subkaukasischen Gebiet’ (pp. 189–98). The latter contains impressive bibliographies showing knowledge of modern thinking about ethnicity: discussions by social anthropologists often use Armenia as a model case study on the subject.

JOHN F. HEALEY

UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER
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The so-called Syntagma on the holy synod of Nicaea, which was written by a man from Cyzicus who is usually (and unjustifiably) called Gelasius, has never attracted much scholarly attention. Although the 1918 edition by G. Loeschke and M. Heinemann provided a solid base for further research, few historians dealt with this author, who seemed to be an uninspired follower of previous historians such as Socrates, Sozomenus and Theodoretus. Günther Christian Hansen, the great editor of late antique church historians, has now published a new edition of the Syntagma, which he a bit clumsily calls Anonyme Kirchengeschichte, anonymous church history. His work is based on a fresh recensio of the manuscripts, which he has carried through meticulously over many years. The changes in the text are less far-reaching than, for example, those in Hansen’s edition of Socrates, but there are nevertheless improvements in many details. The Namenregister unfortunately is not as detailed as the respective indices in the other editions of the church historians.
Hansen’s discussion of the sources of the Syntagma in his introduction is very thorough. It even influences the typography of the text edition: the sources of the Syntagma and the alterations in them are meticulously indicated. Hansen again shows that the Syntagma made use of Eusebius, Socrates and Theodoretus as well as of Gelasius of Caesarea. The work of this Gelasius is lost, but it can be partially reconstructed from several sources, mainly from the Syntagma, which nevertheless does not cite Gelasius verbatim. A new aspect is Hansen’s discussion of the influence of an anti-Eusebian historian, whose style he defines as rhetorical in character. Hansen proposes to identify this author, whose name is not mentioned in the Syntagma, with Philippus of Side; this is an intriguing (if not cogent) idea. Other sources are less important and less clear.

This is an excellent book. But there is one point where I am doubtful: Hansen seems to undervalue the critical competence of the Syntagma’s author. I am not sure whether the spiteful remarks on page xlii and words such as ausschlachten are appropriate. Hansen himself hints at critical comments made by the Syntagma’s author, for example on Theodoretus, he moreover makes clear that the author intermingles diverse sources. Should it really be true that its author had no ideas of his own? The new edition should inspire fresh studies on the handling of the sources by the Syntagma’s author and on his Weltanschauung.

FRANKFURT-AM-MAIN
HARTMUT LEPPIN
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John Philoponus has been recognised as one of the most original intellectual figures of the sixth century AD and his important critique of the Aristotelian world view has attracted considerable attention among scholars, especially in recent years. But besides his philosophical writings John Philoponus has also left a number of theological works concerning the Christological controversies surrounding the definition of faith at the Council of Chalcedon (451). Because John belonged to the opposition to Chalcedon, his writings on this topic no longer survive in Greek, and are known today only in Syriac translation. Lang examines John’s position on Christology using as his focal point the eirenical treatise entitled the Arbiter, which sought to resolve the controversy between the pro- and anti-Chalcedonians (the work was written shortly before the second Council of Constantinople of 553). Special attention is paid to the history of the Soul–Body paradigm, since this is an aspect central to John’s miaphysite, or one-nature, Christology. A translation of the Syriac version of the Arbiter is provided at the end, along with an edition of the surviving Greek fragments. This excellent and very well informed study presents the complexities of the subject with admirable clarity.

WOLFSON COLLEGE,
OXFORD
SEBASTIAN BROCK
One of the principal sources for the history of the controversy about Origenism amongst the monks of Palestine in the sixth century is the *vitae* of various Palestinian monks written by Cyril of Scythopolis after the final condemnation of the Origenists by the Fathers of the fifth ecumenical council (if not formally by the council itself) in 553. For the most part scholarship has regarded Cyril as a reliable historian, even though it is evident that he is no dispassionate recorder of events. In this doctoral thesis, defended in Rome in 2000, Daniël Hombergen subjects Cyril to a thorough appraisal as an historian. By carefully analysing his narratives, and comparing them with other accounts we have of the events he describes, he arrives at a much more objective assessment of Cyril’s reliability. The nature and extent of Cyril’s bias becomes evident. It is not just that Cyril is opposed to the Origenist monks. In his account of Palestinian monasticism he is a partisan of the semi-eremitical monks of the *laurae* over against the monks of the *coenobia*, consistently presenting the archimandrite of the *laurae* as the sole representative of Palestinian monasticism, when the reality is rather that he was generally subordinate to the archimandrite of the *coenobia*. In his account of the doctrinal controversies of the sixth century—Christological as well as Origenist—he projects back into his narratives clear-cut positions (the heretical status of Theodore and Origen, and indeed the nature of this heretical Origenism) that belong to the time of his writing, after the Second Council of Constantinople. The detailed indictment of Origenism in the *vita* of Kyriakos is shown to be an elaborate literary refutation of Origenist appeal to Gregory of Nazianzen by covert citation of the same Father, that can only have come from Cyril’s pen. The central issues discussed in the book regard Origenism and the particular case of Leontios of Byzantium, whom Cyril ranked as a leading Origenist. It is now generally accepted that this Leontios is the author of the three books *Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos* and two much shorter works against Severus, works which contain no trace of the doctrinal Origenism condemned in 553 (or even at the earlier condemnation by Justinian in 543). Scholars have dealt with this contradiction in two ways: either by finding in Leontios an Origenism disguised as a matter of political expediency, or by taking the epithet ‘Origenist’ to be a loose term of disapprobation. Hombergen suggests a more satisfactory solution, based on clear evidence in Leontios of Evagrian spiritual theology: Leontios’s ‘Origenism’ is genuine, but concerns the nature of the spiritual life, not unorthodox theological doctrine. This leads to a far-reaching suggestion that the ‘Origenism’ Cyril opposed so bitterly was a movement of inward spiritual renewal that rejected the institutionalised monasticism defended and justified by Cyril in his *vitae*. This book is an important contribution to our understanding of the controversies of sixth-century Palestine.
This work is avowedly a ‘brief survey’ of the source materials for the history of the Byzantine world in the eighth and ninth centuries, and also ‘a guide to the sorts of problems with which the historian will be confronted’ (p. xxii). As a handbook it marks an important advance, introducing material culture into a debate generally dominated by literary source-problems and art history of the typological kind. The section on ‘The architecture of iconoclasm: the buildings’ warns of the limited amount of light shed on iconoclasm by study of Byzantine buildings. Mosaic crosses were inserted in lieu of figures in churches, as in St Sophia in Constantinople (pp. 20–1), but it is pointed out that cross decoration was not an exclusively iconoclast motif and that the decision not to decorate a church with icons may have been prompted by lack of competent artisans, rather than iconoclastic principles (p. 24). Running through many of the chapters are questions as to how far iconoclast bans on icons were actually enforced and how far drives against figural representation were locally inspired. The iconography of surviving seals and coins expresses imperial policy, but surprisingly few other works of art or artefacts can even be assigned with confidence to the reigns of the iconoclast emperors. Conversely, it is very likely that some figural imagery continued to be produced during the iconoclast era, albeit not under the noses of iconoclast emperors in Constantinople. The extant icons of the period found in Mount Sinai’s St Catherine’s Monastery seem to be the work of painters trained or working in a variety of styles and, probably, an assortment of places out of the emperors’ range. More arrestingly, measures to replace figural with non-figural mosaics in Palestinian churches can be inferred from dated inscriptions on the original mosaics. These actions of the second quarter of the eighth century or later cannot have been taken at the behest of iconoclast emperors and may have been prompted by, or been in emulation of, the Muslim ban on representations of living creatures. Yet it was Palestine that harboured such outstanding defenders of icons as John of Damascus and Theodore Abu Qurrah. Thus there were cross-currents in the debate and icons had their active opponents at local level, as well as devotees. These variations are more immediately apparent in the material culture than in the written sources. Our extant narrative accounts of the iconoclast period are the work of iconophiles and although a substantial body of hagiographical writings derives from the iconoclasts (who approved of written images of saintliness), these, too, often underwent re-touching at the hands of later iconophile writers. So the position of the iconoclasts tends to be viewed monochromatically, if not merely in hostile caricature. Yet fuller investigation is revealing the nuances of the positions taken by the proponents of or sympathisers with iconoclasm, and it is also raising the question of how far the issues of icon-veneration were of paramount concern, actively engaging hearts and minds right across the social spectrum throughout the period. This work’s chapters on ‘Historiography and chronography’, ‘Hagiography and related writing’ and ‘Theological and polemical writings’ offer erudite yet clear guidance through the thickets. This fully
interdisciplinary exercise makes a major contribution towards re-evaluating Byzantium’s ‘Dark Age’.

Kew

Jonathan Shepard
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There has never been a full-length biography of Louis the German, who ruled the eastern part of the Frankish empire until his death in 876, so it is good to have this work. It complements recent biographies of Louis’s grandfather Charlemagne, father Louis the Pious and brother Charles the Bald by Roger Collins, Egon Boshof and Janet Nelson respectively. Hartmann has produced a thorough treatment of Louis’s rule from relatively meagre resources, covering not only the king’s family, the events of his reign and regional and international politics, but also political structures, the Church, cultural life and the economy. It is valuable to have such a broad range of information brought together in one place, whether it be the Old High German poetry composed during Louis’s reign, the construction of churches in his kingdom, the royal itinerary or the king’s theological interests (he was once late for a summit with Charles the Bald because he was engrossed in a discussion over biblical interpretation with a brace of bishops). The latter example underlines the fact that the Church is Hartmann’s own specialist subject, and the forty pages devoted to the East Frankish Church during Louis’s reign is one of the book’s strengths. By contrast, just nine are given over to the economy, covering agriculture, coinage, taxes and trade. For this Hartmann blames the poverty of his sources, but much more could have been made of the surviving material: there is, for example, not even a list of Louis’s mints, nor any discussion of the circulation of his coinage. This highlights the book’s significant weakness, namely that although the author has brought together a great deal of data, there is all too little analysis. For instance, Hartmann discusses the forty-five royal assemblies held by Louis the German, giving details of when and where they were held and, in a few cases, who attended them. But why did they take place at these particular times in these particular places, and how significant were they? Why, for instance, were there more in November than in September, when it was said to be customary to hold them in spring and autumn? What was the impact on other regions of holding so many in the Rhineland? Such questions are not even asked, let alone answered. To give one other example, Hartmann notes that Louis’s territory bordered Denmark but suffered only one Viking raid, in 845 (pp. 109–10). But why were, say, Fulda and Paderborn spared the fact of St Bertin and Paris, particularly when on p. 184 a letter of Louis is cited which explicitly refers to the threat of Viking attack? Did it have anything to do with the diplomatic relations referred to on p. 106? Or the commercial contacts mentioned on p. 248? The connections are not even made, nor their significance discussed. In sum, this is indeed a timely and useful book, but one which could have been so much better.

Simon Coupland

Worthing
The study of medieval concepts of time is one that has received increasing attention in recent years, thanks not least to the efforts of Arno Borst. Nevertheless, the genre of calendars, as he points out in the introduction to this edition of what he calls the ‘Carolingian Reichskalendar’, remains comparatively undervalued. These texts provide evidence not simply for attempts to establish more or less objective systems for the reckoning of time, but also grant insights into the wider cultural and political mentalities of the earlier Middle Ages. Borst’s work is very much concerned with these broader implications. His edition, a truly impressive feat of scholarship, rests on the thesis that a single standardised calendar was commissioned by Charlemagne in 789, coinciding with the promulgation of the Admonitio generalis, and that with the help of royal endorsement it became the standard template for such texts all the way through until the twelfth century. This argument, which both reflects and reinforces widely-held views of the aims and ambition of the Carolingian ‘Renaissance’, is given in the introduction only in outline: for the full justification the reader will need to turn to the more comprehensive discussion in Borst’s Die karolingische Kalenderreform (MGH Schriften xlvi, Hanover 1998). Unfortunately, however, the hypothetical 789 original only survives in later copies, with the best examples dating from the first half of the ninth century. Accordingly, this edition sets out to reconstruct the text of Charlemagne’s original calendar, which Borst believes was made at the monastery of Lorsch, and its later additions.

In the course of this ambitious exercise in textual archaeology, Borst’s study takes in over 250 manuscripts dating from the Carolingian period until the twelfth century. The detailed description of these texts, based primarily on sixty-three ‘stem-manuscripts’ organised into eight transmission families, takes up the bulk of the 390-page introduction, which also contains discussions of the historical background and of the role of calendar illustrations. The text itself is short and inevitably somewhat swamped by the editorial apparatus. The individual months are prefaced with a small amount of poetic and astronomical material, as is the calendar as a whole. Each day of the year contains information divided into three sections, separated on the page by clear formatting, and reflecting the organisation of the material in the originals: computistical codes; a list of liturgical anniversaries; and finally references to other astronomical and earthly phenomena. The edition, although superficially daunting, is in fact relatively user-friendly. The text is articulated by means of three fonts: bold denotes items drawn from the alleged original of 789; Garamond is used for ‘primary additions’ (ninth-century); and a smaller font for ‘secondary’ entries (generally post-Carolingian). The footnotes are extensive and useful, providing cross-referencing of manuscripts and historical information. Borst is commendably careful not to ‘correct’ the calendars’ entries, nor to treat their information as mere deviations from his hypothetical original. Comprehensive information from many later manuscripts is therefore provided, though the details have to be carefully distilled from the critical apparatus. Fortunately, the text and commentary are made easily navigable by the inclusion of almost 200 pages of indices, organised by manuscript, ancient/medieval sources, people and places, and words and subjects.
The usefulness of these volumes is therefore not limited to study of the reconstructed Lorsch calendar. The edition also reproduces the text of a table of lunar cycles, which survives in 18 manuscripts, and which, Borst argues, circulated with the main calendar from the early ninth century.

It is, of course, potentially problematic that this is an edition of a text which no longer exists and which, theoretically, may never have existed. Although he justifiably argues that the formulaic nature of the calendar makes it easier to identify lines of transmission, Borst’s reconstructed families of manuscripts are often quite extended, meaning that the idea of a single exemplar dating from 789 remains a plausible hypothesis rather than a settled fact. The inclusion of Charlemagne’s birthday (2 April), and of the date 789 in one of the ninth-century manuscripts, strongly supports the argument for a Carolingian endorsement of the calendar at this date. It is more controversial, however, to claim that this year saw the creation of the text as Borst sets it out. Paul Meyvaert, in *Analecta Bollandiana* cxx (2002), has argued persuasively that the form and contents of the calendar retain a strong English flavour, and that its originator was probably Bede, whose work may have been brought to the continent by Alcuin. Clearly this has implications for the conceptualisation and emphases of Borst’s edition. The editor’s quest for an ur-text also inevitably suffers from the same problems as that of most composite editions: the outward appearance of the calendar may impose an apparent unity on the text and tends to minimise the importance of variations which, included in the footnotes, will be of primary interest to many scholars.

However, none of this invalidates the great value of this edition. Editors are entitled to expect that their texts will be interpreted as contributions to debate rather than as definitive statements. The explicitness of Borst’s agenda and the clarity and comprehensiveness of his critical apparatus ensure that the fruits of his excellent research will remain an essential tool even for those who disagree with his basic premise.

UNIVERSITY OF ST ANTONIES

SIMON MACLEAN


This special issue of *Gender and History* consists of nine essays and four thematic reviews. The emphasis, as the editors lament, is on the study of women. Masculinity is only discussed in one of the contributions, the rich essay by Cooper and Leyser on the gender of grace, which proposes a re-evaluation of the role played by asceticism in the ‘end of antiquity’ described by the heirs of Gibbon and Foucault. They argue that historians of gender have been guilty of lumping all the church Fathers together under a single ‘patristic’ (for which read Augustinian) umbrella. Ironically, a similar reductionism is demonstrated in two of the subsequent essays (by Schmugge, and Volden and Volf) which locate discussion of women as petitioners to the papal penitentiary and the childhood of male and female visionaries respectively within an uncritical insistence on the medieval Church’s ‘misogyny’. More nuanced are Synek’s exploration of how women fitted into the lay/clerical dichotomy (drawing on early medieval canon law) and Mulder-Bakker’s account of women’s acquisition
of knowledge, which works outwards from Guibert de Nogent to the Wife of Bath and Christine de Pisan. The remaining essays are more secular in their emphasis. Brubaker and Tobler detail the representation of Byzantine empresses on coins; Skinner considers the typicality of the career of Sikelgaita of Salerno; and Nolte describes some German princely dynasties. Far more wide-ranging is Julia Smith’s essay ‘Did women have a transformation of the Roman world?’ which is one of the two most rewarding pieces in the volume.

Fitzwilliam College, Cambridge
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This is the first volume in a series aimed at presenting scholarly considerations of the historical evidence about women’s ordination for a non-specialist, largely Roman Catholic, audience. The two essays here (by Gary Macy on the early Middle Ages, followed by John Hilary Martin up to the sixteenth century) are both reprints, Martin’s being also translated from a little-available Spanish Dominican journal. The intention of the series is to show that the topic of the ordination of women has a substantial history. The editors in their introduction, and Macy in his essay, follow Yves Congar in showing that the concept of ‘ordination’ has undergone change over time. Given that it has not always signified ‘a rite effecting a metaphysical and irreversible change in spiritual status’, ordination in the sense of an entry into a new, ministerial or vocational status was, from the early Christian era to the twelfth century, available to women. Macy’s clear and straightforward treatment provides examples of abbesses, deaconesses and other women whose status was governed by the Latin word ‘ordinare’. Up to this time the meaning of ‘ordinare’ was still flexible; it hardened in the twelfth century under the cumulative influence of the Gregorian Reform, the canons of the Lateran councils (which aimed to make the Church more clearly ‘clerical’) and the codifying genius of twelfth-century theologians, especially Peter Lombard, who produced a generally accepted list of sacraments with definitions, under the terms of which women simply could not be ordained. After Macy’s rather positive slant, Martin’s longer treatment is, by and large, a report on the impossibility of ordaining women. The only real debate in his sources is on whether women do not lack that essential quality (maleness) which would enable the grace of ordination to ‘take’, if they were to go through the rite, and whether women lack the attributes (such as discretion and intelligence) needed by an ordained person. It is clear, however, that many scholars did not bother to consider these questions, presumably because they thought them too ridiculous, but also because, since Peter Lombard did not cover the topic in his Sentences, medieval academics who worked by making commentaries on existing material had no obvious place to start. One of the fullest accounts is by Bonaventure in his Sentences commentary. I read his arguments in favour of women’s ordination as rather stronger (at least in tone) than Martin allows, and that he concludes that the denial of ordination is simply a discipline of the Church. However, reading scholastic dialectic
for the balance of tone is, I concede, a tricky matter of opinion. Nevertheless, such
nuances, along with a number of slips and inconsistencies, which may confuse the
non-specialists the book is aimed at (and certainly confused the indexer), make one
less inclined to take Martin at face value. Overall I would have welcomed more com-
mentary and explanation: especially for non-specialists, the opinions of medieval
canonists and theologians are not self-evidently clear or useful. But this was a very
interesting read.

HARRIS MANCHESTER COLLEGE,
OXFORD

LESLEY J. SMITH

Medieval concepts of the past. Ritual, memory, historiography. Edited by Gerd Althoff,
Johannes Fried and Patrick J. Geary. (Publications of the German Historical
Institute.) Pp. xi+353 incl. 14 ills. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,
2002. £37.50. 0 521 78066 7

In the nineteenth century American medievalists were quite strongly influenced
by German medieval studies, but from the time of the First World War the two
traditions diverged. Only over the last three decades or so of the twentieth century,
partly thanks to the work of medievalists of German origin working in Britain, have
the two traditions found some common ground again. This volume contains the
proceedings of a conference held at the University of Heidelberg in 1996 at which
equal numbers of German and American scholars were brought together to look at a
range of closely connected themes from the early and high Middle Ages: the use of
ritual in politics and legal procedure, and its presentation, historical consciousness,
memory, and the ways in which textual traditions were adapted to fit particular
contexts. Unfortunately it is only possible to pick out some of the fourteen con-
tribution here. Two studies, by Stefan Weinfurter and John Bernhardt, look at the
Emperor Henry II’s demonstrative piety and his concept of kingship; Gerd Althoff
and Philippe Buc take issue over ritual, Althoff stressing the role of ritual in
communication, even when variations developed, while Buc takes Louis II’s visit to
Rome in 864 as a case study for how medieval historical accounts could lie about
ritual. Hanna Vollrath looks at the concept of contumacy with respect to twelfth-
and early thirteenth-century political trials. Memoria, the preservation of the memory
of the dead, is the subject of several articles: Bernhard Jussen looks at how the
interpretation of the story of the faithless widow of Ephesus shifted in the Middle
Ages as attention moved away from the widow’s lust to her crime in destroying her
husband’s memoria; John Freed shows how Austrian nobles threatened with
downward mobility tried to preserve family memory; Amy Remensnyder examines
the topography of monastic foundation legends in Gascony, and Felice Lifshitz
argues that fourth-century bishops mounted a successful campaign to take away
control of the shrines of martyrs from the hands of powerful female patrons. While
coherence is not one of the strong points of this volume, its individual entries repay
study, and any historians interested in ritual and memory should take note of it.

UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM

JULIA BARROW
Immo Eberl deserves thanks for updating Louis J. Lekai’s now classic work from 1977, *The Cistercians: ideals and reality*, and making available to a new readership a further generation of research. Eberl looks upon the Cistercians in an open and generous manner and has dropped Lekai’s dualistic ideals–reality approach. Instead he sees the Cistercians as a European order whose origins and first century are central, but whose later development is also significant. Lekai divided his book between what he called ‘Cistercian centuries’ and ‘Cistercian life and culture’. Thus he provided an overview of Cistercian history in sixteen brief chapters, followed by eight chapters on such subjects as spirituality and learning, liturgy, art, economy and the nuns. Thanks to a generation of gender studies and new interest in the nuns, Eberl gives the foundation and spread of Cistercian houses for women ample consideration at a much earlier point in his history. His approach is much less sweeping; he examines questions of Cistercian spirituality, liturgy, architecture, intellectual life and economics within the context of different periods: the development of the order until 1265; the order in the later Middle Ages and early Reformation; the order in early modern times, including the era of secularisation; and finally the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (perhaps the chapter which becomes most compressed). Unfortunately there is only a single map, showing medieval houses in central Europe, and so there is no attempt to visualise the contemporary extent of Cistercian monasticism all over the globe. For anyone interested in the Cistercians after their initial ‘golden age’, this book will provide much-needed materials and interpretations. But for those concerned with the beginnings of the order, I am afraid that Immo Eberl unfortunately did not manage to include the new work of Constance Berman and the editions of the early documents by Chrysogonus Waddell that appeared a year before Eberl completed his book in 2001. However much I disagree with the radical views of Berman in her *Cistercian evolution*, any treatment of the first decades must take her opinions into account, as well as the severe criticisms of her work made by Chrysogonus Waddell. David Knowles long ago pointed out how the Cistercians, because of debates about their origins, had changed from being the best-known of medieval monastic orders in terms of origins to one of the most obscure and controversial. That situation is more true than ever today, and Eberl’s clear, almost magisterial, treatment of the issues does not hint at the uncertainties that exist and the discussions now taking place. He is to be saluted for making a grand effort to encompass the whole history of the order; his book will be useful to students and researchers for many years to come. But *Die Zisterzienser* will probably be used more as a work of reference, with its rich bibliography and full documentation, than as an interpretation of the meaning of Cistercian monasticism.

Brian Patrick McGuire
Roskilde University, Denmark

The relative input of patrons and artists into the art of the Middle Ages is a notoriously knotty problem, and when those patrons are women the difficulty is compounded. Dr Gee has assiduously collected information, mainly from printed sources, about her selected patrons but cannot move discussion of their contribution much beyond speculation. On the very first page we are told that the contribution of Blanche of Artois to the tomb of her husband Edmund Crouchback ‘cannot be deduced with any certainty, but …’. Such tentativeness is perhaps inevitable, and certainly honest, but it makes for a rather unsatisfying book in which the collection of detail about the women and the surviving works of art with which they were associated takes the place of analysis. In the chapter on architecture, for example, the buildings are described and parallels suggested, but proof of the patrons’ influence on their creation amounts to little more than that they chose the mason. The author’s claim that ‘It has proved possible to suggest a very positive, imaginative and dynamic picture of the achievements of noblewomen in England as artistic patrons’ is true in the sense that the women’s lavish expenditure on ‘art’ (defined very broadly) has been documented. But most of the more challenging questions posed in the introduction remain unanswered.

ROSEMARY HORROX
FITZWILLIAM COLLEGE,
paper by Binski which attempts to place the Westminster pavements within a local context as a precocious pavement, shrine and royal tomb ensemble in a modern gothic abbey in England. As in all firework displays there is the occasional damp squib, but the emphasis on the multifaceted nature of English court tastes under Henry III and Edward I, and the wide-ranging resonances of the stylistic choices made at Westminster make a notable contribution towards locating English art within its contemporary European frame.

University of Warwick

JULIAN GARDNER


While the publication of volumes of essays has increased massively in recent decades, to be the recipient of a Festschrift is still a mark of distinction and appreciation. That Barrie Dobson has been honoured with three such collections attests the wide-ranging and deep respect which his work has earned over the years. This volume, the last of the triad to appear, commemorates his involvement with the annual Harlaxton Symposium. The title’s emphasis on learning reflects one major strand among his many interests; the contents allude to others. The twenty-three essays are separated into four groups – ‘The monasteries’ (eight articles), ‘The cathedrals’ (five), ‘The universities’ (three) and ‘The parishes’ (seven) – to match headings under which Barrie Dobson’s own output might well be set. Nevertheless, some groupings seem slightly stretched and arbitrary: Carole Rawcliffe’s piece on education in English hospitals sits somewhat uneasily under ‘parishes’; while Joan Greatrex’s essay on Norwich cathedral priory might as easily – perhaps more fittingly – have been placed under ‘monasteries’ as ‘cathedrals’. The emphases of individual articles recall particular career stages: A. J. Piper on the monks of Durham in old age; Patrick Zutshi on the friars at Cambridge; John Barron on the Augustinian canons at Oxford; and, of course, several essays on York (Pamela King on the treasurer’s cadaver in the Minster; Claire Cross discussing sixteenth-century clergy and their books; Alexandra F. Johnston analysing the play cycle). However, Harlaxton’s Anglocentrism means that one phase of Barrie Dobson’s career – St Andrew’s – finds no echo here. Of the remaining contributions some are biographical (Benjamin Thompson on Archbishop Pecham; Nicholas Vincent assessing Elias of Dereham), others deal with larger clerical groups (David Lepine on the learning of Hereford’s canons; Virginia Davis and Jeffrey H. Denton offering two comments on the secular clergy) or laity (Clive Burgess discussing parishioners in pre-Reformation London and Bristol). Books and book collections attract some attention (Martin Heale on books and learning in dependent priories; Fiona Kisby surveying books owned by London parishes prior to 1603; Joel Rosenthal on clerical book bequests). Harlaxton’s characteristic multi-disciplinarity is reflected in contributions which draw in art and cultural history (David Crook touring the churches shown on a fifteenth-century map of the Lincolnshire Fens; Lynda Dennison and Nicholas
Rogers comparing decorated copies of Higden’s *Polychronicon*; Pamela Tudor-Craig examining the frontispiece to a copy of the *Bible historiale*. To complete the tally, James Clark surveys late medieval monastic education; Andrew Wines looks at the London Charterhouse; and Compton Reeves discusses creative scholarship in the cathedrals. Overall, this is a valuable collection, with much to offer. It provides a fitting tribute to an admired and respected scholar.

**University of Birmingham**

R. N. Swanson

---
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The difference between literal and spiritual meanings in Christian biblical exegesis has always been easier to assert than to maintain. According to this fine study, it became particularly unstable in the Latin theology of the later Middle Ages. In the ‘classical Christian’ hermeneutic of the Fathers, the insightful reader proceeded from knowledge of the biblical text to the truth of a world beyond it; this was still the position of the Victorines in the twelfth century. Following the rediscovery of Aristotelian logic, medieval interpreters developed a ‘new textual attitude’, making the letter of the text the site of a less privileged theological knowledge that was shared by biblical writers and readers throughout the ages. In doing so, they prepared the way for the rhetorical exegesis of Renaissance humanism and for Protestant biblicism. The key to this displacement was the theory of ‘verbal’ (as distinct from ‘natural’) signification outlined by Aquinas, which allowed for ‘a kind of figurative explanation that remain[ed] literal’ (p. 40) and thus for the positing of a large-scale homology of biblical narrative and Christian doctrine. The ‘*literalizing turn*’ (p. 68) in scholastic hermeneutics entailed important shifts in the understanding of tradition and authority (pp. 75–7), biblical stylistics (87ff.), biblical authorship (pp. 123–42, nuancing Alastair Minnis’s account of the ‘rise’ of the *human* author), and the inspiration of biblical writers and interpreters (pp. 149–61). In every case, the emphases of scholastic reading practices can be seen reinforcing a general conviction of ‘the nearness of a present religious world of thought to the text’ (p. 185). The core of this study is three long chapters (‘Signification’, ‘Rhetoric’, ‘Divine speech’) which combine thematic and chronological exposition with annotated excerpts from selected authors; some of the most important Latin texts are included as an appendix. Along with a strongly argued thesis, the book offers a useful anthology of less known and largely unpublished scholastic commentators. Lyra’s stock falls a little (pp. 179–83), to the benefit of Nicholas Gorran, Hermann of Schildesche and Heinrich of Langenstein, among others. On the evidence presented, the scholastic revision of a ‘classical Christian’ hermeneutic was consistently justified by reference to texts of such ‘classical Christian’ authors as Jerome and Augustine. No-one interested in the long history of Christian—or, more broadly, ‘western’ hermeneutics—can afford to ignore Ocker’s work.

**University of British Columbia**

Mark Vessey
The would-be reader of this Companion – which is (so we are told) ‘ideal for upper-level students seeking an overview of the later middle ages’ – should be issued with four health warnings. The first should explain the title: ‘Britain’ here refers to ‘Britain and Ireland’ and ‘the later Middle Ages’ begin in 1100. The second relates to the word ‘companion’. Should the reader expect maps, diagrams, genealogical and chronological tables and plates which might ease his journey across the Middle Ages and titillate his historical imagination, he will be more or less totally disappointed. Bibliographies he will find in abundance, though even they vary from the overwhelming to the skeletal; but for the rest the landscape is one of unremitting academic prose. Thirdly, he should not, in the words of one of the bibliographic comments, try to read this volume ‘at a gallop’; severe reader exhaustion will set in at a very early stage. Finally, the reader will be required to construct his or her own re-integrated view of the medieval history of Britain and to explore his own comparative paradigms. The volume is, unlike Gaul, divided into four parts (Economy, Politics, Church, Culture), and each of these parts is then subdivided in turn into four – to correspond with the current four countries of the British Isles, with a single chapter (one of the best in the book) given the awesome task of injecting a ‘British perspective’. The resulting composite volume is, therefore, never more than the sum of the parts of its twenty-eight chapters. Consequently it has none of the unity of conception of Robin Frame’s The political development of the British Isles (1990, 1995), nor the provocative lightness of touch and comparative challenge of Barbara Harvey (ed.), The short Oxford history of the British Isles: the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (2001), nor the freshness of approach of the Nouvelle Clio series. But once one accepts that this is indeed a collection of twenty-eight individual essays and should (and indeed can only) be read as such, then it is indeed a very considerable success. The editor has, by and large, assembled a very impressive team of contributors and the vast majority of them have discharged their task with great distinction. Many of the chapters provide outstanding summations of current knowledge and future directions of study. The most successful contributions are those which eschew an overloaded narrative and concentrate instead on a few broad themes to make their subject-matter manageable and palatable. The editor has encouraged his team to identify current historiographical issues and controversies. Though this occasionally leads to some tiresome name-dropping, it is an effective way of engaging the interest of the student with current historical literature. The text is written in a businesslike fashion, though an occasional sentence (such as the one which proclaims that ‘women in late medieval England were both fully human and profoundly other’, p. 195) must rate high in the stakes of fatuous historical statements. It is the fate of composite volumes such as this often to be overlooked and to be left unread. That would be utterly unfair to this Companion. Many of its individual chapters should occupy a prominent place on our bibliographies hereafter, as among the better, most nuanced and thought-provoking introductions to aspects of medieval British and Irish historiography.

All Souls College, Oxford

Rees Davies
These studies on the chancery and documents of the Emperor Henry VI rest principally on the register (i.e. the modern collection of his charters, not a contemporary registered record of the products of his chancery) edited by Gerhard Baaken and published by the Austrian Academy between 1972 and 1979. For Sicily the Codex Diplomaticus Regni Siciliae, ed. Bruhl, Enzensberger, Zielinski and Kolzer, which came out between 1982 and 1996, provides a conspectus of documents for the kingdom from Roger II to the Empress Constance, the wife of the Emperor Henry VI, and hence is essential for this study. There are also numerous contingent articles on the diplomatic of royal, imperial and papal chanceries, too numerous to specify, but many of them associated with Professor Hageneder and his students, which the present work has taken into account. The book is divided into two parts: the first covers all aspects of the chanceries, staff, products, formule and authentication, the second is a discussion of forgeries. The imperial chancery, much of whose business was with the papacy and with Italy, absorbed certain influences from that source especially in the use of formule. There were new forms to protect validity and Italian petitioners came to expect the same protection from imperial privileges as they received from papal privileges. Imperial notaries were concerned with the production of documents for the Emperor Henry VI, many of them petitioned for by Italians. Ertl has concluded that 80 per cent of the diplomas of the emperor sealed with the golden bulla were for the Regnum Italiae and the Regnum Siciliae. After 1194, and Henry’s successful enforcement of his claim to the kingdom of Sicily through his wife Constance, the daughter of Roger II, the imperial chancery functioned at Palermo. Ertl discusses the administration and shows both the continuities and changes. Henry’s documents were dated by his Sicilian regnal year as well as his German one and there was a special seal for his documents issued there. The second part of the book deals with forgeries for the Bavarian abbeys of Steingaden and Kaisheim. They are a clear case of ‘improvement’ of the houses’ rights and possessions. They are not quite in the same league as the so-called testament of the Emperor Henry VI. This document, supposedly sealed with a golden bulla at Monreale, made provision for the imperial lands in Italy and was found in the baggage of Marward of Anweiler, the imperial steward, after he was driven from the island in 1200. The final part is a judicious consideration of this document for which the only text is a garbled one in an unusual papal source (the contemporary gesta or deeds of Innocent III). This book, with its informative chapters, excellent plates, detailed analyses and tables, is important not only for its clear account of the Emperor Henry VI’s cancellarial arrangements in his widespread territories, but also for its demonstration of the inter-connected nature of the developments in European chanceries.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LONDON

JANE SAYERS
This third volume in the Westminster Abbey Record Series is undoubtedly a masterpiece of scholarly research and writing. Clarity of exposition and succinctness of narrative are combined with eloquence in style and expression to introduce the reader to the complexities of the abbey’s financial administration in the final two and a half centuries of its monastic existence. The surviving financial records which are the raison d’être of this book are those pertaining to the monk officials or obedientiaries, who were in charge of the various departments or obediences and together ensured the smooth running of the abbey’s day to day affairs by supplying all its material needs. There was an intricate nexus of changing relationships between these departments, as Barbara Harvey lucidly explains in her prefaces to each of the sections devoted to the twenty-four obedientiary offices and the four additional offices in secular hands. She describes the historical development of each of these offices in turn, its regular sources of income (rents from lands and tenements, issues of manors and churches, sale of wool and livestock, etc.), customary items of expenditure (food supplies, textiles, stipends and wages, repairs to the fabric, etc.) and other details relevant to the interpretation of the lists that follow. These lists are in chronological order and every account is identified by date, name of the obedientiary, or obedientiaries, in office, the Westminster Abbey Muniment (WAM) number and the number of membranes or folios used for the account. In a substantial introductory essay the author suggests that an obedientiary system at Westminster was in place by, if not before, c. 1100 during the abbacy of Gilbert Crispin. She traces the gradual process by which income was assigned to the various offices, and describes the method of appointment and removal of the obedientiaries, their living arrangements, their participation in the liturgical services of mass and office; and, finally, she gives a detailed analysis of the accounting, auditing and record-keeping procedures exemplified in the obedientiary accounts. Westminster Abbey was in several respects unique among English monasteries, most notably because of its close and continuous royal connections which had set it apart from the time of Edward the Confessor, king and saint. Chosen as the favoured final resting place of succeeding kings and queens the abbey found itself charged with the responsibility for observing the royal anniversaries. This entailed administering the estates that had been granted to the monks to cover the necessary expenses, and resulted in the development of a separate obedientiary office in the care of two or more monk wardens of the royal manors; some 640 accounts survive from this office alone. This superb collection of financial records is now rendered easily accessible to scholars by means of a practical guide, the culmination of many years of painstaking investigation in the unrivalled monastic archive that survives in situ at Westminster. May Barbara Harvey’s achievement prove to be the long awaited model that future scholars will follow to the benefit of us all.
In recent years medieval confraternities in general and Italian confraternities in particular have been the objects of increasing research with very heterogeneous approaches. Thomas Frank’s Habilitationschrift attempts a promising method of dealing with these associations and their multifarious functions and duties. Confraternities are central to some of the main issues associated with the study of social history, the history of the law, religion and urban environments. This monograph provides convincing evidence to refute the numerous attempts made by historians to reduce confraternities’ modes of action to one main function and to standardise and to categorise them; especially the attempt to separate the secular from the sacred and to assert that their affiliation was to either the State or to the Church, to the ecclesiastical or to lay sphere. Thomas Frank argues that the process of defining confraternities is an integral part of studying them, especially given the great contemporary variations in terminology. For the author these communities were permanent personal unions that functioned as much for religious and charitable purposes as for their social and economic roles. Their activities were therefore not just important for their members but also had considerable implications for society as a whole. It was this combination of internal and external functions that gave confraternity members – in interdependence with the controlling demands of society and the interests of their members – their group identity. Given the complexity of this approach, which requires spatial and temporal restrictions, Frank focuses his study on central Italy and examines the confraternities of Viterbo, Orvieto and Assisi in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. His aim is to compare the development of these associations in relation to these three different social and political contexts. He also examines the relationship of confraternities to the ruling elites, to monastic institutions, to municipal corporations and their leaders, and offers insights into the reasons behind local competition between confraternities. Frank places the development of the confraternities within the context of wider issues, in particular the so-called ‘crisis’ and long-term changes of the fourteenth century, especially in relation to the growth of flagellant movements in the three cities. In this comparative study Frank emphasises that although the religious, political, social and economic conditions were comparable in his three urban examples, the development of the confraternal organisations varied. Thus confraternities illuminate the reciprocal interrelation between social and political conditions and religious norms in late medieval society. It is to be hoped that this excellent study will pave the way for future research, which should leave behind more ‘traditional’ categorisation and open new vistas on confraternities as multifunctional nuclei of urban societies and as determinants of urban order.

MONIKA ESCHER-APSNER
UNIVERSITY OF TRIER, GERMANY
The penitentiary as a well of grace in the late Middle Ages. The example of the province of Uppsala 1448–1527. By Kirsi Salonen. (Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemian Toimituksia, 313.) Pp. 458 incl. 23 tables, 5 figs, 1 map and 12 plates. Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica, 2001. €30 (paper). 951 41 0890 6; 1239 6982
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The medieval province of Uppsala consisted of six dioceses within modern Sweden and the diocese of Turku corresponding to modern Finland. Kirsi Salonen’s book studies the traffic between this outlying region of Christendom and one department of the papacy, the Sacred Penitentiary, mainly – with a few complementary items – on the basis of the registered supplications to that office opened to scholars in 1983. The Penitentiary’s activity as registered includes a wide variety of canonical business – regulating confessional matters (licensing choice of confessors, granting faculties in reserved cases), dispensing for marriage and for promotion to orders (notably in the case of illegitimacy), absolving or exculpating as regards offences (where necessary with rehabilitation), licensing portable altars or special celebration, relaxing fasting or vows, facilitating study in case of benefice-holders or where there was other impediment, licensing pilgrimage. As a comprehensive analysis of the Uppsala supplications from the material’s commencement in series until their cessation (confirmed by the author’s search beyond) with the Reformation in Sweden and Finland, the book is an important addition to a rapidly growing body of scholarly literature. The interest for all ecclesiastical historians, regardless of their geographical focus, is reinforced by the book’s structure. The first part (about half) describes the working of the Penitentiary. The second, after an initial survey of the Scandinavian context and the relations of the province of Uppsala with the papacy, examines the 424 supplications extant for the period. However, although clearly structured accordingly, the subject is not divided. A large part of the book’s contribution is the extent of interlocking between the two parts and particularly the augmented understanding of the Penitentiary that flows from the case histories examined in the second – representing the crucial archival source denied to the great pioneer, Emil Göller, whose work has stood for almost a century as the first point of reference and now yields. Salonen’s minutely documented account can thus be read with equal profit as a study of papal government and the functioning of canon law in the concrete and as a review not only of the northern Church but of society there at large, to which topics it represents a rare point of access for those not adept in Scandinavian languages.

The opening of the Penitentiary registers to scholarship coincided neatly with the expansion of the new technology facilitating data bases. Accordingly, notable progress has already been made in statistical evaluation of the material. Yet much remains to be understood. For example, in the statistics for issue of confessional letters presented here (derived from the work in progress of Ludwig Schmugge who has pushed research on the Penitentiary at a brisk pace) we learn that these decline in proportion from some 20 per cent of all grants under Calixtus III and Pius II, through 10 per cent under Sixtus IV to 7 per cent under Innocent VIII (these percentages varying significantly for individual countries over the same period). While interpretation is complicated by uncertainty regarding the comprehensiveness of registration and the activity of legates, the search for an explanation of such patterns in a range of business must involve scrutiny of recourse to the various departments of the papacy according to their competence in the issue of graces. It is a task that
might ideally, with support, be conducted at pan-European level. To date, both investigation of the Penitentiary archive (still technically a separate entity) and its integration with the information available in principle for almost a century and a quarter in the holdings proper of the Vatican Archives, have been accomplished either by individual scholarly effort or through the promotion of national institutes. The German Historical Institute in Rome and, most pertinently in the present context, the Institutum Romanum Finlandiae, have been particularly active beyond their specific national remit in encouraging the comparative approach. As a doctoral dissertation published with admirable expedition, the present book is a happy fusion of individual and national institutional dynamism. If its depiction of the Penitentiary at work must eventually be supplemented by more of the local studies for which the author provides so splendid an inspiration, its review of the material for Uppsala is unlikely to be superseded. ‘Well of grace’ was an Englishman’s description of the late fifteenth-century papacy. Its adoption as a title here is a signal of the range of the author’s comparative view.

The production standards are generally high: the severe reduction (scale not given) limiting the utility of a number of the diplomatic samples is the more regrettable for that they are so well chosen.

MICHAEL HAREN

IRISH MANUSCRIPTS COMMISSION,
DUBLIN


Big ideas can come in slender books. Anne Thayer contends that regional variations across Europe (including England, though not Scotland or Ireland) in accepting or rejecting the Reformation might be explained by parochial preaching about penitence from 1470 to 1520. Her sources are the model sermon collections that helped parish priests prepare for preaching on Sundays and feasts – a major (and neglected) publishing phenomenon of the period. Looking for the most influential ideas, she considers only the most popular collections, identified by frequent republication. All collections agree that God desires to be merciful, but since the hour of death is unknowable, people must be constantly mindful of repenting their mortal sins. As one preacher put it, ‘God has promised you forgiveness, but He has not promised you tomorrow.’ Forgiveness depends on three linked elements of the penitential process: contrition, confession and satisfaction. There are, however, significant differences over which of the components is most crucial to forgiveness. For ‘rigorist’ preachers it is contrition; if contrition is profound enough, it may even obliterate the need for satisfaction. ‘Absolutionist’ preachers, on the other hand, emphasise the power of sacramental confession and priestly absolution – which is so great that it can overcome imperfect contrition. Some ‘moderate’ preachers staked out the ground between these extremes. Thayer identifies distinct regional patterns to these approaches, and they correspond roughly with regional responses to Protestantism. For example, rigorist collections were most popular in northern Germany. This prepared people there (like Luther) to feel burdened by the demands
placed on individuals to be perfectly contrite and to be responsive to Luther’s
message. Italians, however, heard mostly absolutionist preaching. Penitence was less
frightening to them since they were taught to be confident in the sacrament, and they
rejected religious reforms that abolished the source of their consolation. This is a
stimulating argument and it merits further study. Thayer deserves thanks for making
us aware of model sermon collections as sources, and her translations give a terrific
sense of their tone and texture. She has also done a great service by illuminating the
substantial differences in their view on penitence. All of this is presented in clear,
economical prose (although the effect is marred by excessive repetition and sloppy
proof-reading). There are, however, big problems with the methodology. First,
Luther can’t represent the entire Reformation as Thayer has him do – for starters,
his views on confession are markedly different from Calvin’s – and her summary of
Luther’s views is deceptively static, implying (inaccurately) that they didn’t change
over the course of his career. It is also unclear that counting editions published in
certain places is an adequate way to measure regional influence. For England,
Thayer notes nineteen editions of the ‘moderate’ Mirk’s collection but only one
edition of each of two rigorist collections popular elsewhere. Yet when the early
evangelicals Thomas Becon and Wilfrid Holme attacked sermon collections, it was
three rigorist collections (including two not printed in England) that they named
specifically, suggesting that they were well-known and influential. Her treatment of
England generally is alarming: her maps identify it as primarily ‘Anglican’ by 1550,
though a blob of ‘Calvinist’ dominance spreads roughly from Swindon to
Scunthorpe. In spite of these problems, Thayer deserves praise for daring to think
big and in so doing she has set the agenda for future research. Her methodology and
conclusions need refinement, but she has sent us down an interesting and promis-
ing path.

GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS COLLEGE

ERIC JOSEF CARLSON

xvi + 343. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. £45. 0 521 81126 0
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Nowhere in early modern Europe was mortality more starkly apparent than in the
great cities, where deaths outnumbered births, a third or more of all individuals born
probably died in infancy or early childhood, death knells and funerals were part of
daily experience, and terrifying, unpredictable epidemics sometimes killed a fifth of
the inhabitants, forcing the living to find new space for the legions of the dead.
London and Paris were by 1670 by far the biggest cities in western Europe. With over
450,000 inhabitants they were roughly equal in size. London had, however, grown
far faster than Paris; much smaller in 1500, it was in 1670 about to overtake the
French capital. Another clear contrast was that in London, Europe’s foremost
Protestant metropolis, the Reformation had brought to an end the varied in-
tercessory services of medieval Catholicism and the endowments and institutions
that had supported them. In the light of these contrasts, the conclusions of Vanessa
Harding’s long, richly detailed and vividly illustrated comparison of burial and
funeral practices in the two cities are in some ways surprising. In both capitals the
wealthy were able to buy themselves more elaborate funerals and monuments and