

Second, I wonder whether H. too quickly dismisses the relevance of the possible conceptual background of Adam's reflection in the hymn in preference to the more traditional theory that posits the conceptual background of preexistence as informing the hymn. The latter obviously assumes the essential divine status of Christ, one that H. tends to privilege toward the conclusion of his discussion of the hymn. The former, however, emphasizes the earthly obedience of Jesus, an obedience that arguably better complements Paul's evident pastoral intention in Philippians.

H.'s focus on the pastoral program of Paul continues in his treatment of Colossians, which H. views as a letter likely authorized, but not directly composed, by Paul. With this appraisal H. aligns himself with an increasing number of contemporary scholars who argue that the question of the authorship of the contested letters is best approached on the assumption of a spectrum of authorship. The main strength of this section of the commentary rests in H.'s focus on the important theme of ethical transformation in the pastoral program of Colossians. In particular, H. shows that Paul's emphasis in the early chapters of Colossians on the full sufficiency of Christ functions primarily as the basis for Paul's later exhortation to the Colossian Christians to live morally renewed lives in fulfillment of their baptismal identity.

In my judgment, H.'s study should prove especially useful not only as a solid exegetical assessment of these particular captivity letters of Paul, but also as an accessible introduction to Paul's vocation as a shaper of early Christian communal identity in conformity to the countercultural narrative of Christ-like existence.

Kevin B. McCrudden  
Gongaza University, Spokane

*An Ancient Commentary on the Book of Revelation: A Critical Edition of the Scholia in Apocalypsin.* Translated and edited by Panagiotēs Tzamalikos. New York: Cambridge University, 2013. Pp. xix + 464. \$200.

The *Scholia in Apocalypsin*, attributed to Origen by Adolf van Harnack, is no pure text. One does not have to search far or wide through its contents to find material at odds with aspects of Origen's thought. But commensurability of doctrinal content is only part of the problem. Scholars have long questioned whether Origen ever produced a "Commentary" on Revelation in the first place. Nevertheless, more than a little material in the *Scholia* rings true to the ear tuned to Origen's authentic *oeuvre*. This text has for a long time called for critical reassessment: what of it can be traced reliably to Origen, what is owed to later emendations, and does it contain Origenian material in the authorial sense at all?

Tzamalikos's volume purports to provide just what Origen scholars have long hoped to know. In order to assess the extent to which T. has given us what the title claims—a "critical edition" of the *Scholia*—it does not take long for a scholar to realize that an attentive reader must do more than absorb the volume's extensive introduction, which discusses the history of the text of the Apocalypse and its fate in Alexandrian

and Antiochene tradition. A person must also read not one, but two, of T.'s other monographs, published separately in 2012 (*The Real Cassian Revisited* and *A Newly Discovered Greek Father*), neither of which is brief: the first weighs in at 548 pages, the second at 716. Because T. lines each volume with cross-references to the other two at crucial points of argumentation, only if one considers all three volumes synoptically does his thesis come fully into view.

According to T., the "Commentary" on Revelation contained in the *Scholia in Apocalypsin* is Cassian the Sabaite's product—one of the many "treasures" T. supposes he has discovered in Cassian's "companion volume" reproduced by Codex Metamorphosis 573. T. claims that the kernel of Cassian's *Scholia* is not the lost commentary of Origen, but that of Didymus the Blind, which T. supposes makes Didymus's commentary the oldest known set of comments on the nebulous text of the Apocalypse. In his other monographs, T. ascribes two pseudepigraphical texts to this new Cassian: the "Pseudo-Didymean" *De trinitate* and the Pseudo-Caesarian *Erotapokriseis*. Because Cassian the Sabaite's works were lost to history due to imperial suppression, T. speculates that swaths of pseudepigraphical literature, including the Pseudo-Athanasian dialogues and Pseudo-Basilian epistles, should be reviewed in light of the "real" Cassian's existence.

If T. is correct, the "John Cassian" invoked by so many medievalists of Latin persuasion never existed: his identification with so much monastic literature is an accident of history's amnesia regarding the Benedictine theft of the "real Cassian," and his identity as spiritual progenitor is a farce. In an isolated sense, T.'s publication of the *Commentary* is helpful: it gives a nebulous Greek text a fresh English translation and makes it accessible to so many scholars who do not have time to translate such a wide-ranging work. T. corroborates a number of valuable fragments with the Tura papyri of Didymus the Blind, and he suggests possible, if not always convincing, parallels with known Greek patristic and late antique literature.

However, T.'s commentary probably will not persuade "those who consider John Cassian in the current and hackneyed manner" (*Real Cassian* 57). It is hard to overstate the extent to which T.'s presupposed thesis about Cassian the Sabaite is provocative. It is also hard to see how it is not viciously circular. One need not take up blind devotion to the cult of the "Western" Cassian to find T.'s logic puzzling. If we push just slightly on the presupposition that underlies the edifice of the whole—that Cassian the Sabaite is the author of a vast island of pseudonymous material—the undisputed foundation for critical assessment of the *Scholia* crumbles. If we deny T.'s redistribution of other pseudonymous texts like the Didymean *De Trinitate* and the Pseudo-Caesarian *Erotapokriseis* to "Cassian the Sabaite," T. loses his grip on doctrinal criteria for judging "Cassian's" intellectual signature. In that case, what had at first seemed a mountain of evidence for "Cassian the Sabaite" as author of the *Scholia* would collapse, and the subsequent critical edition would slide into prejudiced and fanciful attribution. No mystery, then, as to why the presentation of such questionable evidence is sequestered in two other lengthy volumes.

In one of those other monographs, T. is forced to explain away Codex Metamorphosis 573's own self-ascription to "Cassian the Roman Monk." According to T., "Κασσιανός

‘Ρωμαῖος’ need not indicate the Latin monk John Cassian of Marseilles of Gennadius’s notice; instead, it refers to the Greek monk heretofore unknown—on the grounds that Paul, a “Jew from Tarsus,” could call himself “Roman” (*Real Cassian* 230). But those are thin grounds on which to speculate negatively on what otherwise seems plausible. Why suppose Gennadius’s notice to have been “forged” in the first place? Even though we have to thank T. for the English translation of an overlooked text, his portrayal of it as deriving from “Cassian the Sabaite” is at worst unconvincing and at best a tenuous and speculative assertion that begs for more cogently articulated support.

Kellen Plaxco  
Marquette University, Milwaukee

“*The Tragic Couple*”: *Encounters between Jews and Jesuits*. Edited by James Bernauer and Robert A. Maryks. Boston: Brill, 2014. Pp. xvi + 357. \$189.

An irony of the Jesuit–Jewish relationship is that the founder of the Jesuits, Ignatius of Loyola, took a courageous stance in 1540 allowing *conversos* (Jewish converts to Catholicism or their descendants) to enter the Society of Jesus, while their so-called “tainted ancestry” excluded them from church positions and religious orders. The second superior general of the Society, Diego Lainez, Ignatius’s secretary, Juan de Polanco, and his biographer, Pedro de Ribadeneira, were all of Jewish descent. However, the Society’s Fifth General Congregation (1593–1594) legislated “purity-of-blood,” thereby excluding *conversos*, ostensibly to ensure unity in the Society. This legislation was not abrogated until 1946—after the Holocaust. At Vatican II (1962–1965) Jesuits played a pivotal role regarding the Jews, particularly Cardinal Augustin Bea, S.J., a major figure in the passage of *Nostra aetate* with its Article 4 on the relationship of the Catholic Church to the Jewish people.

Since 1998, five meetings have taken place sponsored by Jesuit leadership to try to repair the centuries-old breach. This volume results from a conference at Boston College (2012). The essays include Dean Bell’s discussion of the similarity of depictions of Jews and Jesuits in the early post-Reformation era. “Animal imagery,” Bell contends, “places both Jews and Jesuits in a threatening jungle where they may be recognized as subhuman and yet also possessed of a superhuman ability to devour and destroy. Jews and Jesuits are painted as sinister conspirators and agents in the poisoning of Christianity” (13). Diego Lucci’s “The Suppression of the Jesuits and the Enlightenment Discourse of Jewish Emancipation” parallels the political and cultural dynamics that led to the suppression of the Society of Jesus in 1773 and the emancipation of the Jews—both in the period of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution. Jews and Jesuits were seen as international entities threatening the modern state.

Jeremy Clarke’s “From Kaifeng to Shanghai via Rome and Paris: Jesuits and the History of Judaism in China” offers new insights regarding the Jesuits in Asia. Few, I suspect, know that Matteo Ricci welcomed into the Beijing Jesuit residence in 1605 Ai Tian, a Chinese-Jewish scholar. Ricci’s journal entry of this encounter was exciting