reader for her conclusion, noting that "this study [concludes] where most references to the monastic episcopate begin" (210). She has clearly proven her thesis that the monk-bishop was a development well under way before the bitter and protracted controversy over iconoclasm in the Eastern Church-Byzantine Empire. The author provides a valuable conclusion to this vital dimension of Byzantine ecclesiastical development with her review of "The Slavic Context: an Example from Medieval Serbia" (229–44), which leads her to this ultimate conclusion that the "belief persisted in the Orthodox Churches that only [the monk-bishop] . . . was suited to lead the people of God" (244).

There are copious notes (249–347) with extensive documentation but not a complete bibliography, only "Frequently Cited Works" (348–50). Some modern scholars are cited in the Index (351–60), but most are not, which makes it a bit of an adventure to track Sterk's numerous bibliographical citations in the notes.

Harry Rosenberg
Colorado State University

Constructing Antichrist: Paul, Biblical Commentary, and the Development of Doctrine in the Early Middle Ages. By **Kevin L. Hughes**. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2005. xxi + 278 pp. $59.95 cloth.

"Imminence" and "immanence": these words, differing in spelling by a letter but differing in meaning by a gulf, offer the alternatives for what Kevin Hughes in this book calls "Antichrist's two bodies" (242). Tracing patristic and early medieval exegesis of Paul's Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, he demonstrates that the Fathers offered two modes of interpreting the Apostle's warnings about "the Son of Perdition." An earlier cluster of exegetes consisting of Ambrosiaster, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Pelagius, and Jerome took the literal, "imminent" tack: they understood 2 Thessalonians to be warning of Antichrist's advent in the near, albeit not precisely determinable, future. In contrast, St. Augustine, depending on the innovative hermeneutical principles formulated by Tyconius, understood the same epistle to be referring mainly to immanent evils. Although Augustine accepted the coming of a real Antichrist before the Judgment, his reading of 2 Thessalonians was primarily figurative: the "Man of Sin" was acting already by means of evildoers within the Church. After establishing these alternatives, Hughes devotes the rest of his book to proposing that early medieval exegesis (understood to run through Peter Lombard), bound them together: writers from Gregory the Great to the early scholastics combined the literal "imminent" approach with the figurative "immanent" one.

Hughes's account is admirably clear, alert, and thoughtful. He often provides valuable insights. Concerning the eschatological posture of St. Jerome, he observes that "Jerome's antipathy toward millenarianism in no way cast doubt on his faith in, and even interest in, the reality of a historical, personal Antichrist to come" (74). Reading Tyconius with 2 Thessalonians in mind, he maintains that the *Liber Regularum* is not just a list of rules, but "a well-crafted composition that explores in Scripture the ecclesiological problem [of] the presence of evil within the Church" (93). One of his most important findings, especially given recent controversies regarding early medieval apocalypticism, is that none of his gallery of exegetes who treated 2 Thessalonians

attempted to hide the reality of a coming apocalyptic denouement, yet neither did any focus on the coming of Antichrist in any given year.

But despite its strengths this book is too slender in both content and method to bear the weight of its title. The obvious deficiency concerning content is Hughes's exclusive concern with exegesis of 2 Thessalonians. He never defends his decision to choose just one biblical book for the tracing of Antichrist traditions, and he is silent about the fact that the book he has chosen contains no use of the word "Antichrist." Surely Hughes knows that patristic and early medieval exegetes treated Antichrist copiously elsewhere: preeminently in commentaries on Daniel, 1 Thessalonians, 1 John, and Revelation. He acknowledges this reality once when he refers to Haimo of Auxerre's commentary on Revelation, but his motive here is merely to rescue his thesis about the balancing of "imminence" and "immanence": Haimo sees Antichrist as "imminent" in his commentary on 2 Thessalonians but as "immanent" in his commentary on Revelation. With the cat out of the bag about diverse exegetical approaches even within the work of a single author, one worries about the many omissions. Indeed Marcia Colish (in an analysis Hughes ignores) shows that Peter Lombard's Antichrist exegesis makes sense only if we look at his treatments of Paul on 1 and 2 Thessalonians together.

The methodological weakness to which I refer is that Hughes is averse to employing manuscripts. Criticizing him for this might be a quibble were he able to depend preponderantly on good modern editions. But such is not the case. The lack of manuscript study is most troublesome when he arrives at the three weighty twelfth-century monuments, the *Glossa Ordinaria*, the "*media glosatura*" of Gilbert of Poitiers, and the "*magna glosatura*" of Peter Lombard, all of which lack modern editions. For the first he uses a copy of the *editio princeps* of 1480 without any consultation of other manuscripts even while admitting that "the *Glossa Ordinaria* is best conceived as an extended work-in-progress" (209). When he adds in regard to the *Glossa Ordinaria* that "there appears to be no set rule or rationale for attribution, and I suspect that there is considerable diversity among the various manuscripts," one really wonders why he never made any effort to test his suspicions. Regarding Gilbert of Poitiers, the problem is yet greater: admitting that "Gilbert's expanded gloss was considered well-nigh 'miraculous' by his contemporaries," Hughes excludes it from consideration because it has never been published. Finally, whereas it is known that Peter Lombard's exegesis underwent several redactions, and whereas Hughes's argument for a balance of "imminence" and "immanence" here depends entirely (and I think weakly) on the placement of glosses, he relies for his evidence of placement on the notoriously poor edition handed down by the Abbé Migne. *Tolle, lege*: in 2 Thessalonians St. Paul tells not only of the Man of Sin but holds up a model for imitation of "toil and labor."

Robert E. Lerner
Northwestern University

Sanctifying the Name of God: Jewish Martyrs and Jewish Memories of the First Crusade. By **Jeremy Cohen**. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004. xvi + 209 pp. $37.50 cloth.

Jeremy Cohen's new book raises profound questions about the narratives that recount the massacre of Jews in the Rhineland during the First Crusade.