

connection with the evidence he brings to it from his demonstration of the rootedness of the Qur'ān's legal culture in late antique thought and practice as disclosed by his discernment of parallel passages in the Qur'ān and the *Didascalía Apostolorum*.

I agree with Z. that the currency in the seventh century CE of either texts or teachings deemed to be “Jewish-Christian” in character is not sufficient evidence for postulating the existence of formally “Jewish-Christian” communities in Arabia at the time of Muḥammad just because similarities in concept and expression appear also in the Qur'ān. Rather, this evidence suggests that the pertinent texts, such as the *Didascalía* and others, like the “Pseudo-Clementine” corpus, simply continued to be of interest and importance to the wider Christian communities of late antiquity. Nevertheless, Z. speaks of Jewish-Christian legal culture as a point of departure for the Qur'ān. And sometimes this premise leads him to implausible conclusions. For example, inspired by what he thinks would be a pleasing parallelism between the Qur'ān's presentation of Jewish religious authorities (*aḥbār*) and Christianity's authoritative voices (*ruhbān*), Z. proposes to understand the Arabic term *ruhbān* to mean “bishops” rather than “monks,” as the term has been and continues to be understood among Arabic speakers. He points to the etymological associations of the root consonants of the term with fear and awe, as in the expression “God fearers.” The problem is that in no Christian tradition have bishops as a class been so characterized, while monks, whose voices were often in late antiquity heard with more authority than those of bishops, were widely esteemed precisely for their fear of God. What is more, in his *Ecclesiastical History* (6.38) the late antique historian Sozomen (d. 450 CE), originally from Palestine, recalled that the Saracens of his time “shared in the faith of Christ by intercourse with the priests and monks,” just as the Qur'ān has it!

Sidney H. Griffith

The Catholic University of America, Washington

*Saints or Devils Incarnate? Studies in Jesuit History.* By John W. O'Malley. Jesuit Studies: Modernity through the Prism of Jesuit History I. Boston: Brill, 2013. Pp. xiii + 312. \$182.

This volume collects 15 essays published by O'Malley over nearly a quarter century (1984–2008). The present chapters originally appeared in a variety of venues: articles in scholarly journals, introductions to conference proceedings and fine arts books, chapters in collections on spirituality, popular periodicals, and a presidential address. Assembled within a single volume, this diverse array of material is now readily accessible to scholars, both veterans and students. Moreover, thanks to updated bibliography and a detailed index (commissioned especially for this publication), topics can be traced for continuity and change over two decades of O'M.'s scholarly development.

The work is arranged thematically. Beginning with a historiographical survey of how the Jesuits have been interpreted for over four centuries, the initial three chapters offer an overview of the Society of Jesus and various dimensions of its mission

(pastoral, social, ecclesiastical, civic, and cultural). The next four chapters, beginning with O'M.'s presidential address to the American Catholic Historical Association (1991), survey his new portrayal of Ignatius of Loyola. The following three chapters (1984–1990) extend this reassessment to Jesuit spirituality. This rereading had been made possible by 20th-century publications of works forgotten for four centuries: correspondence, exhortations, memoranda, chronicles, pastoral aids, and catechisms. O'M. singles out three phrases used by early Jesuits in order of ascending frequency: “our way of proceeding,” “consolation,” and “helping souls” (166)—a stark contrast to stereotyped martial metaphors. This recovery of original mentalities would be consolidated in O'M.'s landmark work, *The First Jesuits* (1993).

Finally, five chapters published over nearly two decades (1990–2008) detail the irrevocable impact on Jesuit self-identity and mission made by renaissance humanism and the establishment of schools. The last two of these, originally serving as introductory chapters for fine arts books (2005 and 2008), signal recent developments in O'M.'s interests leading up to and following *The Four Cultures of the West* (2004). There O'M. unfolds four cultures: prophetic, academic (“scholastic”), humanistic, and artistic (including performing arts). This volume's two final chapters exemplify the fourth of these cultures: the Jesuits' “cultural mission.”

The collection addresses a quandary produced by O'M.'s ultimate success. Because his vision has become a settled matter, the earlier received narrative about which O'M. argued is easily forgotten. For centuries, both friends and foes had identified Jesuits as shock troops, elite missionaries formed to combat “heretics and schismatics” in service of the “Counter Reformation” papacy and council. Putting this Jesuit stereotype to rest had depended largely on rethinking the epoch as “Early Modern Catholicism,” a task culminating in O'M.'s *Trent and All That: Renaming Catholicism in the Early Modern Era* (2000), and *Trent: What Happened at the Council* (2013). A decade earlier, O'M. had made the connection explicit in his presidential address, “Was Ignatius of Loyola a Church Reformer? How to Look at Early Modern Catholicism” (1991, reprinted in this collection). Rethinking Jesuits entailed rethinking Catholicism.

With this move, the crucial years forming early Jesuit mentalities could be seen not as Trent years (1545–1563) but rather as the preceding turbulent half-century marked by renaissance humanism and the post-1492 age of new world explorations. (Loyola had been born in 1491; Faber and Xavier in 1506; Nadal in 1507.) As early as 1548 (founding of the first Jesuit college), this “rebirth” of Greco-Roman antiquity—a cosmopolitan global vision celebrating human culture in this temporal, terrestrial world—would shape the Society's vision, identity, and enterprises. In terms of O'M.'s *Four Cultures*, the first Jesuits could now be seen as embodying not so much the culture of (medieval) “academic” Scholasticism as (renaissance) “humanistic” culture. In short, Jesuits were no longer a rear-guard action, reactionary remnants from the autumn of the Middle Ages. Rather, Jesuits were “Early Moderns,” challenging the definition of “modernity” itself. Fortuitously, scholars like Stephen Toulmin (*Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity*, 1992) were also engaged in this postmodern reevaluation of “modernity.”

Given its underlying current of contested “modernity,” *Saints or Devils Incarnate?* serves as a fitting inaugural volume in the new series edited by Robert Maryks: *Jesuit Studies: Modernity through the Prism of Jesuit History* (titles available at [brill.com/js](http://brill.com/js)). Proposing such a series 30 years ago—when O’M. first published “To Travel to Any Part of the World: Jerónimo Nadal and the Jesuit Vocation” (1984; reprinted here)—studying modernity via Jesuit history would have seemed an oxymoron at worst, a paradox at best. That today’s association of Jesuits with “modernity” is not only possible but commonplace rests on a remarkable revolution in thought over the past decades. This retrospective survey remembers the revolution.

Stephen Schloesser, S.J.  
Loyola University Chicago

*Turning to Tradition: Converts and the Making of an American Orthodox Church.* By D. Oliver Herbel. New York: Oxford University, 2014. Pp. ix + 244. \$27.95.

The last few decades have witnessed a considerable number of Protestant and Catholic Christians in the United States embracing the Eastern Orthodox faith, a phenomenon that shows no signs of abating in the first years of the 21st century even as a higher proportion of Americans claim no religious affiliation than at any other time in history. Since the year 2000, a number of academic and popular publications—such as Alexander Bogolepov’s *Toward an American Orthodox Church* (2001) or Anthony Vrame’s *The Orthodox Parish in America* (2004)—have set out to explore the unique situation and the challenges of Eastern Orthodoxy in America. This ecclesial reality is well known for its uncompromising fidelity to an ancient theological heritage but also, more prosaically, for the ongoing struggles between the Orthodox Church in America on one hand, and a variety of ethnic ecclesial jurisdictions on the other.

Herbel’s study of a number of American converts to the Orthodox faith is a timely contribution to this ongoing conversation about the emergence and the specific characteristics of a typically “American” Orthodox church. He echoes Amy Slagle’s argument in *The Eastern Church in the Spiritual Marketplace* (2011) that America’s positive attitude to “choice” and self-expression—together with a long-established tolerance toward religious “originals” and mavericks—has ensured that many Americans could embrace the Orthodox faith far more easily and “naturally” than in other Western societies (10). In addition to this undercurrent of religious liberalism, H. observes that in America conversion to Orthodoxy is paradoxically made easier by the widespread evangelical search for a “purer” and more “authentic” form of religious practice that continues to be visible in the “restorationist” tendency of many non-denominational churches (152).

The bulk of the volume explores the life and work of four prominent converts, whose decision to embrace the Eastern Orthodox faith reflects very different sociocultural, no