

discordance that would undermine the volume's value. In fact, in some ways it could be said that the diversity of this collection of essays reflects the diversity of its object of study. The editors' introduction provides a summary of the themes and contents of the chapters and highlights how the purpose of the subjects treated 'reflect key aspects of the changing world of second-century studies' (p. 3). This changing world is one in which 'the aim of second-century history becomes a more comprehensive, nuanced, inclusive account, where the old certitudes of a once apparently familiar map, delineating a story of continuities, disappear and new accounts become necessary' (pp. 2–3).

The eighteen chapters are organised under four headings: 'Contexts' (four chapters), 'Discerning Continuity and Discontinuity in Early Christianity' (five chapters); 'Interpreting Texts and Engaging in Practice' (four chapters); and 'Modelling Identities' (five chapters). It is unfortunate that the limitations of space for this review do not allow for a discussion, or even the mentioning, of all eighteen chapters, each of which is worth close study and careful reading. From stimulating discussions of what role, if any, ideas of Christian continuity play and the manner in which diversity is to be viewed and understood (King, Edwards, Ayres) to the second century as a 'laboratory' (Lieu) for Christian theology as *philosophia* (Löhr), to considerations of Plutarch (Morgan) and oracles (Nasrallah) as evidence that it is too facile and an oversimplification to distinguish Christianity from pagan and Jewish religion categorically by identifying the first as a religion of doctrine or belief and the latter two as ones of cult or praxis, to issues of authoritative texts (Flemming, Verheyden), to questions of ethnicity (Gruen, Skarsaune), to pagan and Roman views of early Christianity (North, Whitmarsh), this volume is an outstanding and thoroughly engaging contribution to the scholarly voices engaged in dialogue about the second century.

JOHANNES GUTENBERG-UNIVERSITÄT,  
MAINZ

DIETER T. ROTH

*Sancti Cypriani episcopi. De habitu virginum. Opera pseudo-Cyprianea. De laude martyrii, Ad Vigilium episcopum de Iudaica incredulitate, De rebaptismate.* Edited by Laetitia Ciccolini and Paul Mattei. (Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina III F, Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera Pars IV, Opera Pseudo-Cyprianea I.) Pp. 626 incl. 26 graphs and 0 tables. Turnhout: Brepols, 2016. €335. 978 2 503 55790 8  
*JEH* (70) 2019; doi:10.1017/S002204691800146X

This book, beautifully produced by Brepols, well illustrates the very high standards that are regularly achieved in the editing of the Church Fathers, especially in the Francophone countries. All the certainly genuine works of Cyprian have now taken their place in the *Corpus Christianorum*, and these new editions of the spurious *De laude martyrii*, *De Iudaica incredulitate ad Vigilium* and *De rebaptismate* replace editions in Hartel's third *CSEL* volume. The two editors state that they take joint responsibility for the volume, but pp. 1–505 seem to be almost entirely the work of Laetitia Ciccolini, who has edited the first three of the texts listed above, and pp. 507–96 of Paul Mattei.

Ciccolini's monumental discussion of the manuscripts is in a different league of excellence from that of earlier scholars. For example, she shows better than her

predecessors how contamination occurring between late antiquity and the early Carolingian period precludes the use of the stemmatic method either to produce consistent groupings of the earliest witnesses or mechanically to eliminate readings. However, the most profitable use of my space may not be to summarise Ciccolini's general excellence but rather to point to the one significant weakness in her discussions: most of her many stemmata have at least one flaw, and manuscripts are far too often given a weighting equipollent to each other when in reality one is the source of (an) other(s). Although this does not affect constitution of the text, it does affect the classification of scores of *recentiores*.

Full justification of these observations would need a monograph and will be found when I publish my own researches into manuscripts of the Cyprianic *corpus*. I illustrate the problem with four examples where my collation (of other texts in the *corpus*, but the manuscripts are most unlikely to behave differently) has led me to different conclusions: (i) At pp. 134–9: Ciccolini makes 255 (Bodl. 210), 253 (Lambeth 106) and 257 (Cambridge, Pembroke 154) equipollent with each other, but 253 and 257 (also 651 [York XVI.I.1], which she confesses not to have seen) derive from 255, corrections to which they incorporate; (ii) At pp. 148, 358 and 464: 565 (Avignon 244) is not a younger sibling of 370 (Escorial S.I.11) but derives from it; (iii) At pp. 188–91 Ciccolini makes a host of Italian manuscripts equipollent to 216 ( $\Delta$ , Turin Naz. D IV 37, s. xii), but Diercks's discovery that  $\Delta$  was the source of this family of Italian manuscripts was his most important contribution to the study of the transmission of Cyprian; (iv) At pp. 347–8 Ciccolini makes 539 (Siena F V 13) and 566 (Reims 370) derive from a lost ancestor, which in turn shared another lost ancestor with 515 (Vat. lat. 9943); but the three shared errors that she claims to be found in 539 and 566 but not in 515 (*De laude* 8 *formido*] *fortitudo*, 75 *quam*] *quod*, and 82 *ac*] *et* are all found in 515. On p. 188 she rightly has 539 and 566 as descendants of 515, eliminating the two imaginary lost manuscripts.

Ciccolini edits her texts with care and discrimination. *De habitu* must have been the easiest to edit: the text is well preserved and there is rarely doubt about what Cyprian, who had a logical mind and knew how to express himself clearly, wrote. The other two texts are less well preserved, and editing is made difficult by the style of the authors, who did not always manage to express themselves with ease; many passages provoke doubt, but only very rarely did I conclude that another reading is clearly preferable to that chosen by Ciccolini. Her own conjectures include: *De laude* 21 *fide deuotionis*, 56 *dominus* for *domus*, 131 *diuturnis factis* for a desperate set of manuscript readings, *Ad Vigilium* 172 (deletion of *qui*), 213 *promiscam* for *proximam* or the like, 221 *te* for *et*. At *De habitu* 91–2 her repunctuation restores proper sense. I offer two objections. *De laude* 24–6 *Nam et* [*et om.* eAns] 'quis est quem non ista res terreat, quis quem non admirationis suae pauore subuertat?' The sequence 'Nam et quis' seems to be unparalleled in ancient Latin (as is 'Nam equis est'), and since *et* is omitted by almost half the tradition, I should follow Hartel in deleting it. *De laude* 87–8 'Christus ... cuius aguntur exempla quae petimus, cuius uirtus est qua repugnamus'. Only one manuscript, which on its own carries no authority, has *est* and omission of it seems better to suit the style of this author. He likes parallel clauses such as is given by *cuius ... cuius* (often as here introduced by anaphora) and regularly has a part of the verb *esse*

in the first member that is then understood in the second; cf. lines 24–5 (quoted above), 114–16, 119–20, 120–1. Even though *aguntur* is not quite *sunt*, the same principle seems to apply.

The transmission of the *De rebaptismate* is entirely different from that of the treatises edited by Cicciolini. A manuscript at Reims, destroyed by fire in 1774, served as the basis for the editions of Rigault (1648, and our earliest extant witness) and Baluze (1726) and for MSS Vat. Reg. lat. 324 and Barb. lat. 653 (both *s. xvii*). Mattei reports these witnesses with great thoroughness. But the text must have been very difficult to edit. The author's thought is very often unclear and illogical, and there abound modes of expression that would have been intolerable to a traditionally educated writer like Cyprian. Very often it is impossible to know whether what is ungrammatical is due to the author or copyists. In a series of helpful notes Mattei shows that many of these 'lapses' can be paralleled in other writers of late substandard Latin; in principle, therefore, he must be right to adopt a conservative text. I rebel, however, at the appalling 'et dixit dicens' at 102, which could be removed by, for example, Schueler's 'diuisit' for 'dixit'.

EMMANUEL COLLEGE,  
CAMBRIDGE

S. P. OAKLEY

*A history of exorcism in Catholic Christianity.* By Francis Young. (Palgrave Historical Studies in Witchcraft and Magic.) Pp. ix + 275 incl. 3 tables. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016. £63. 978 3 319 29111 6  
*JEH* (70) 2019; doi:10.1017/S0022046918001902

The subject of exorcism, the liturgical rite to expel demons from the possessed, has attracted considerable attention in the past few decades. Most of the scholarship on the subject has focused on the exorcism of demoniacs in late medieval and early modern Europe, but the revival of the practice in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries has aroused popular interest as well. Francis Young's authoritative study of exorcism in the Catholic Church from the fourth century to the present differs from much previous scholarship in that it deals not only with the exorcism of demoniacs but also with the use of exorcism liturgies in baptism (in which the Catholic liturgy originated), the exorcism of houses and holy water, and even exorcism of the atmosphere. Young also expands the geographical scope of the subject in a chapter on the use of exorcism by Spanish and Portuguese missionaries in the New World and Asia during the Counter-Reformation. The scope of the book is limited only by Young's exclusive concern with Catholic Christianity, as he chooses not to discuss the history of Jewish exorcism (either in biblical times or the Middle Ages) or in some Protestant confessions.

Young charts the waxing and waning of the popularity of liturgical exorcism during a history punctuated by periods of crisis, the first being between the years 900 and 1500, a period marked first by charismatic rather than clerical exorcisms in which demoniacs took refuge in shrines and monasteries to be exorcised by holy men. Between 1100 and 1300 liturgical exorcism almost disappeared, but it revived somewhat in the fifteenth century, and by the sixteenth it flourished during the golden age of demonic possession. The problem for the Church that