

Papal jurisprudence, c. 400. Sources of the canon law tradition. By D. L. D'Avray. Pp. x + 302. Cambridge–New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019. £75. 978 1 108 47293 7
JEH (72) 2021; doi:10.1017/S0022046921000191

To this day we do not possess a critical edition of the early papal letters which satisfies the expectations of the modern scholar. The latest 'complete' collection (produced by Andreas Thiel in 1868) only begins with the letters of Hilarius (461–8) and displays a number of serious shortcomings with regard to the quality of the text. Some years ago the patristic scholar Hermann-Josef Sieben published a fine edition in three volumes which reproduced indeed all the earliest papal letters from Cornelius (251–3) down to Sixtus III (432–40) and which also included a German translation and copious notes, but in many cases Sieben had to rely on pre-critical texts. David D'Avray (who often refers to Sieben's work) has chosen another approach: he has produced a 'half-critical' edition of a selection of those letters from Siricius (384–99) to Innocent I (402–17) which have had the greatest influence upon subsequent generations by having been included in three eminent canonical collections: the *Dionysiana*, the *Quesnelliana* and the *Frisingensis* (c. 500). (It is the ground work for a sister volume on *Social origins and medieval reception* which has not yet been published.) The edition is 'half-critical', because D'Avray has based his text on a number of important manuscripts which contain these collections, but has not undertaken a full examination of the textual tradition.

D'Avray does not quote the papal letters in full either, but groups them according to the subjects that they are dealing with under the headings: 'rituals and liturgy – status hierarchy – hierarchy of authority – celibacy – "bigamy" – marriage – monks and the secular clergy – heretics (two chapters) – penance'. So if the reader is looking for the popes' stands on any one of these issues he or she will find a convenient collection of relevant rulings (which, however, may be difficult to understand because of the stilted Latin in which they are often expressed).

D'Avray's interest in the reception history of these texts has not only guided his actual selection of texts, but has also led him to print these texts as they (supposedly) appeared in the above-mentioned canonical collections and not to try to reconstruct their 'original' versions. Whether one agrees with this decision is, to a certain extent, a matter of taste. I would print what I consider to be the earliest text and would relegate later versions to the apparatus, for the simple reason that otherwise one is forced to prefer one particular later version above all others without, however, being able to offer cogent reasons for one's choice. This is precisely what happens here: 'Where texts common to *Dionysiana*, *Frisingensis Prima*, and *Quesnelliana* are concerned, my first aim has been to reconstruct the *Dionysiana* text, in its original form' (p. 27). Why? Because the *Dionysiana* is earlier? Because it had a wider reception than the other two? Unless I have overlooked something, D'Avray provides no reason.

However, readers who have not perused his introduction and cannot be bothered with studying the critical apparatus may be led to think that they are dealing with the 'originals'. D'Avray says that he has tried 'to reconstruct the authorial text in the *apparatus criticus*' (p. 4). But in the apparatus he does not clearly state what the 'authorial' reading is in places where his witnesses disagree.

Let us take a random example: in a canon included in his decretal *Magna me gratulatio* (J³.691, LII [p. 168]) Innocent I writes: ‘Aspiciamus gentilem hominem Cornelium orationibus atque elemosinis revelationem Petrumque ipsum vidisse [Acts x *passim*].’ ‘[R]evelationem ... vidisse’ is found in all manuscripts consulted by the editor. But *PL* lxvii reads: ‘vacantem, per revelationem angelum Petrumque ipsum vidisse’. Which one, if any, is the ‘authorial’ version? Perhaps the one from *PL* lxvii, whereas the text printed by D’Avray is truncated. But the editor does not say so.

Similarly, Innocentius in J³.691, LV (p. 207): ‘quia Paulianistae in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus sancti minime baptizabant]’. For ‘baptizabant’ *PL* lxvii and cxxx read ‘baptizant’ (in which case the Paulianists would still be doing this). Is this possible? But who are they? D’Avray offers no explanation, except to say in n. 296 on p. 204: ‘Council of Nicaea, canon 19’ and to refer to a note to Sieben’s translation which says the same. (Sieben in another note provides an explanation by referring to Paulus of Samosata.)

In other places, the handling of variant readings is not always fortunate either. Some examples: p. 78 n. 95: adsumptione *Db, Da*] assumptione *PL* lxvii (assimilation); p. 198 n. 40: recte] rectae *Da* (confusion of e/ae is a regular occurrence in manuscripts); p. 198 n. 47: asserentes se] adserent esse *Da* (assimilation and word break); p. 207 n. 136: iisdem] isdem *Db*; p. 215 n. 252: baptisate] baptismatae *Da*. I did not understand either why the editor writes ‘praece’ instead of ‘prece’ (p. 198), but ‘que’ instead of ‘quae’ (p. 200).

D’Avray’s collations of the manuscripts which he has consulted are reliable, and his translations are, on the whole, accurate. However, on pp. 89/91 he translates ‘Missae ad Arelatensem episcopum ... praeceptiones’ by ‘A letter was sent ... to the bishop of Arles’ (which corresponds to the reading ‘missa ... epistula’ in *Qa*), but ‘praeceptiones’ here clearly means orders that were issued. On p. 200 ‘quod tetigerit inmundus, inmundum erit’ should be translated ‘that which an unclean person (not: thing) has touched will be unclean’. (As a consequence, ‘ei’ in the following line probably also refers to a person rather than a thing.)

The notes are uneven. Sometimes biblical referencei are missing (e.g. on p. 87 where ‘sic opera vestra luceant’ alludes to Matthew v.16). The editor is not very familiar with the diversity of Christian groups. In late antiquity many early ‘heresies’ had long disappeared, but continue to be mentioned in anti-heretical discourse. We have already come across one such example. The same is probably true for the Montanists. Thus when in *Etsi tibi* (J³.665, XV [p. 196]) Innocent I speaks of ‘Montenses’ he, perhaps, had no clue what he was talking about or he may have meant another group such as the Donatists (cf. *Constitutiones Sirmondianae* 12 of 25 November 407: ‘in Donatistas, qui et Montenses vocantur’), a possibility which d’Avray does not consider. (Incidentally, his translation ‘Montanists’ is contradicted on p. 217 where he says that the *Montenses* may have been Novatians who are, of course, yet another group.)

In J³.691, LV (p. 206) canon 8 from Nicaea is quoted, but d’Avray does not provide the reference. In the same context the Novatians remain unexplained (one does find some explanation on pp. 192f., yet without reference to this passage). The same is true for Photinus and Eustathius in J³.691, LVII (pp. 210–12: translation at pp. 212–14: text).

The index is eclectic: the Paulinianists already mentioned are missing as are the bishop Daniel and the subdeacon Fortunatus mentioned on pp. 89f., 90f. and the bishop Ursus on p. 102. The page numbers for the Novatians are incomplete (e.g. missing references to pp. 204, 206). The same is true for Bonosus who is mentioned on pp. 205, 207f., references to which are not listed.

D'Avray's book is strong on Church law, but it is less so on the history of doctrine. His description of this history is often outdated (for example, his remarks about the role of Leo the Great at the Council of Chalcedon [p. 190] or the literature quoted for the Novatians [p. 192]). In addition, his explanations of the provisions in the letters are open to questioning. Innocent's epistle *Etsi tibi* (J³.665, XV (p. 196)) deals with baptised converts from Novatianists and *Montenses*: here a laying on of the hand suffices, since the heretics' baptism was liturgically identical with that of the catholics. An exception is made for those who were baptised into the catholic faith, then passed over to the heretics (where they were 'rebaptizati' – not simply 'baptised' as the translator has it) and, finally, returned to the catholic fold (where they had to undergo a 'long penance'). In his explanation of the text on p. 193 d'Avray does not clearly distinguish between converts and returnees. The same is true with the same pope's letter *Superiori tempore, si* (J³.685, L [pp. 196–9]). Here again Innocent deals with clerics having been ordained by Bonosus before the latter's condemnation who are then not 'taken back' (as d'Avray translates), but 'received' or 'accepted' ('reciperentur') by the catholics.

Unfortunately, in the case of J³.605, J³.675, and J³.701 the editor provides only a translation but not the Latin text without giving an explanation except to say that they have already been edited critically (p. 29) or there was 'no need' (p. 53). Which reader has these expensive editions at hand?

Finally, not all references in the footnotes (where they appear in abbreviated form) are listed in the bibliography (cf., for example, Oexle in n. 5 on p. 68).

All in all, this is a useful collection, as far as it goes. But much more work remains to be done on the text and interpretation of these letters.

EVANGELISCH-THEOLOGISCHES SEMINAR DER UNIVERSITÄT BONN

WOLFRAM KINZIG

Syria. Archéologie, art et histoire, XCVI: Année 2019. Dossier: Églises paléo-chrétiennes à absides saillantes au Levant. À propos de nouvelles découvertes. Coordinated by W. Khoury and M.-C. Comte. Pp. 496 incl. 419 colour and black-and-white figs and 6 tables. Beyrouth: Presses de l'Ifpo, 2019 (for Institut Français du Proche-Orient). €91 (paper). 978 2 35159 764 4
JEH (72) 2021; doi:10.1017/S0022046921000348

The present review addresses only the first part of this *Tome* – the thematic folder (*Dossier*, pp. 11–258). Its focal point is the *chevet* of the *martyrium* of St Simeon the Stylite (d. c. 459) at Qal'at Sem'an, Syria, and its architectural interrelation and impact on the *chevets* of other churches of the Levant. This sumptuous *martyrium*, erected during the years 470–90 around the column on the top of which the renowned monk spent the last thirty years of his life, was financed by subventions from the emperors Leo and Zeno. Its fame spread far and wide and it became a major centre of pilgrimage. The *martyrium*, cruciform, was comprised of four basilicas with an octagon at their intersection, built around the venerated column. The