

to this. Moreover, that neither volume in the series so far discusses Manichaeism's virulent anti-Judaism is a puzzling omission after Paula Fredriksen's *Augustine and the Jews* (2008).

Furthermore, B.'s curiously unsophisticated view of ancient rhetoric as mere manipulation—for example, Augustine's constant “rhetorical bobbing and weaving” (419) unfailingly duped hearers because he “was, after all, a master rhetorician” (256)—is surprising in a book that offers its own quite self-consciously rhetorical (in the good sense) “performance.” Its contrarian angle of vision yields great insight and freshness, though it is dulled by persistent editorializing. Augustine ridicules (80) and smears (105) with arguments that are fatuous (115), far-fetched (173), and patently absurd (226); he descends into histrionics (83), shows a poker-face (161), and plays the illusionist (414); but then he gets embarrassed (263), feels himself in trouble (134), and so on. B. argues like a very smart and assiduous divorce attorney prosecuting the lawsuit of a first wife whose husband not only deserted her but also used her inheritance to make himself famous. Augustine and the Manichaeans indeed had a messy public divorce. B. ensures that no offense goes unnoticed, no claim unchallenged, no weakness unexploited, and every missing carpet nail is noted. But the book can also approach the tone of Augustine's anti-Manichaean tract that B. calls “a tedious and joyless exercise in petty sniping” (308).

Despite these criticisms, I enjoyed this book immensely. It is a must-read and with its predecessor makes an essential school for students of late antiquity and early Christianity to pass through. Readers can look forward to well-crafted, crisply written sentences that make the education a pleasure. A book to wrestle with, learn from, and build upon, its great achievement is to see Augustine more clearly in his own historical and theological context. The late J. Kevin Coyle, to whom B. dedicates his book, wrote truly, “to know Augustine, one must know Manichaeism.” It is also true that to know Augustine's Manichaeism one must know B.'s work.

Michael Cameron
University of Portland, OR

William of Auvergne: Rhetorica divina, seu ars oratoria eloquentiae divinae.

Edited by Roland J. Teske, S.J. Dallas Medieval Texts and Translations 17. Paris: Peeters, 2013. Pp. xiii + 465. €60.

Teske has devoted his academic career to the study of St. Augustine of Hippo and of two thirteenth-century Scholastic philosophers, Henry of Ghent and William of Auvergne. He has published many essays on all three, including his collected *Studies in the Philosophy of William of Auvergne* (2006). This edition of William's *Rhetorica divina* takes its place on the large bookshelf of T.'s editions and translations, the best known of which are probably the *Letters* he translated for the Augustinian Heritage Institute edition of Augustine's works (2001–2005). Through a series of translations over the past 20 years, T. has almost singlehandedly made William's theological works

available to a wider audience; these have appeared in the Marquette series Mediaeval Philosophical Texts in Translation.

For a modern reader, even a reader who is a medievalist, the *Rhetorica divina* is probably more interesting for what it sets out to do than as a text in itself: it is a long read. The audience for this facing-page Latin/English text is almost certainly specialists who know Latin; but the lucid, expert translation makes the text newly available to the large majority of its potential readers who are unlikely to plow through the Latin original; the original is also available here in an accessible, attractive format. William, the bishop of Paris for the 20 years before his death in 1249, is famous as the first philosopher/theologian to attempt the assimilation of Greek and Arabic philosophy to Christian doctrine—in particular, Aristotle as transmitted by Avicenna. The *Rhetorica divina* is at the periphery of William's central project, the seven-part *Magisterium divinale et sapientiale*, but makes an analogous effort at assimilation: to write an *ars orandi*, an art of praying, by thinking of prayer in the first instance as an *oratio*, a Ciceronian oration, as well as an *oratio*, a prayer. (As T. notes, the French *oraison* maintains the double meaning of the Latin word, which does not survive in English.) William argues that

a heavenly and divine rhetoric or a spiritual and most salutary oratory is necessary to teach those who have undertaken the patronage of the cases and business of souls and have become spiritual orators to enter pleas in such cases in order that they may plead such cases in the courtroom of God most high. (21)

Accordingly, prayer as *oratio* has “a likeness to worldly rhetorical speech and being in a likeness and proportion to its parts—namely, the exordium, the narration, the petition, the confirmation, the refutation, and lastly the conclusion” (33). It differs, however, in its intention: a secular orator “intends to move the judge by his speech and turn him to his side”; the spiritual orator does not try to move God, “whom he undoubtedly knows to be unmovable in the ultimate degree of stability, but rather to remove himself from the evil in which he is toward something good, or from something good toward something better, that is to say that he intends to make himself suitable by prayer so that he may be granted what he aims to obtain” (35). Prayer moves the one praying to prepare “for the grace of compunction,” thence “provoking and procuring the grace of internal and true repentance” (179).

As T.'s introduction points out, only the first part of the text compares prayer to a classical oration. Its other characteristics, expanded on in sequence over the course of the work, are as a messenger to God, as a canticle, as “the calves of our lips,” “as the smoke of incense,” “as a sacrifice,” and “as a fight or wrestling match against God” (1). Throughout, William offers examples, often very long examples, of prayers that serve as patterns for their readers; they are also performative utterances as prayers when read with proper devotion, “since reading enriches prayer and prayer illumines reading” (237). William recommends a reclining position, “by which one leans on some stool, especially on the left side,” as the best for prayer, less distracting than kneeling because “such reclining gives more rest to the body

and permits the heart to be freer” (197). In one of the few anecdotal additions to his discourse, he describes a Cistercian at Amiens who was “filled with such joy at the reception” of the sacrament “that he was seized up into the air a distance of two feet from the earth and stayed there for the period of around half an hour, not held up by any other support” (255). T.’s spare and very useful notes document William’s quotations from classical and patristic sources, sometimes incorrectly attributed or untraceable. William’s own rhetoric soars as he catalogues the many ways the elements of creation serve humankind (379–83); prayer serves as the fitting response to God’s beneficence.

John M. Flyer
Tufts University, Medford, MA

The German Roots of Nineteenth-Century American Theology. By Annette G. Aubert. New York: Oxford University, 2013. Pp. xii + 402. \$74.

This is an extremely interesting and well-researched book. Originally a dissertation at Westminster Theological Seminary, Aubert has produced a careful and convincing study of the influence of German mediating theologians (advocates of *Vermittlungstheologie*) such as G. A. Tholuck, Carl Ullmann, Isaak August Dorner, and Karl Hagenbach, on two extremely important American theologians: Emanuel Gerhart at Mercersburg and the inimitable Charles Hodge of Princeton Theological Seminary.

As A. notes in her introduction, American religious scholarship has tended to focus on the transatlantic influences on Transcendentalism, Unitarianism, and Protestant liberalism generally, while largely ignoring European influences on North American Reformed Protestantism. A. sets her sights on a quite focused project: the “roots” she so carefully traces are not of the European influences on the likes of Emerson, Finney, Bushnell, or the New Haven School, nor even on the North American Reformed Protestant tradition per se (such as Lyman Beecher and John Gresham Machen), but rather on the transatlantic conversations of one giant of American Presbyterian theology and an understudied and underappreciated thinker at Mercersburg. Thus A. has continued the tradition spearheaded by Claude Welch over four decades ago, of moving beyond “national” histories of American religion. In taking up Welch’s project, A. contextualizes the Reformed Protestant theological endeavor of two theological giants within a much broader framework that evinced an “international movement of ideas.”

A. traces how, starting in the 1820s and 1830s, North American religious thinkers in the Reformed tradition began to engage the rich scholarship being produced at German theological centers through both direct and indirect encounters. A classic example of the former is the career of Hodge himself, who studied under mediating thinkers like Tholuck at the University of Halle and Wilhelm Hengstenberg and Friedrich Schleiermacher at the University of Berlin. As A. shows so well, Hodge