



PROJECT MUSE®

The Bishop as Disciplinarian in the Letters of St. Augustine
(review)

Joanne McWilliam

Journal of Early Christian Studies, Volume 11, Number 4, Winter 2003,
pp. 571-573 (Review)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/earl.2003.0066>



➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/49366>

may belong to either class. Much like Philo, Origen relied heavily on the interpretation of Hebrew names to give substance to his interpretation.

With this volume the Fathers of the Church series takes another commendable step toward making Origen's work fully accessible in English. The translation is readable and largely accurate although the mistranslation of "in Britanis" ("among the Britons") as "in Brittany" on 147 suggests a heavy reliance on Annie Jaubert's 1960 French translation in *Sources Chrétiennes*.

As they do in Jaubert's translation, the introduction and notes, though informative, do not take the reader substantively beyond pre-Vatican II Catholic scholarship on Origen. In doing so they present a domesticated Origen. Thus, on page 162, note 33 assumes without question that Origen identifies the priests and Levites of the Old Testament with Christian clergy. It fails to point the reader to the passage in his *Commentary on John* (1.2.10) that identifies them as "those who are really dedicated to the divine word and the worship of God" (most likely not "clergy" per se but teachers like Origen).

The introduction and notes also suggest that Origen accepted the historical factuality of the events narrated in the Bible. They do not remind the reader that in his treatise *On First Principles*, Origen taught that Scripture was interwoven with falsehoods and that he lashed out at "simpler" Christians who "take for granted things about God that they would not believe about the most savage and the most unjust of men." This concern to avoid suggesting that Origen did not accept Joshua as a factual historical account leads to one serious mistranslation. On page 139 the translator (following Jaubert) has Origen criticize those "who wish these things to be understood only according to the letter"; Rufinus's Latin provides no justification for the qualifying word "only". Perhaps, some day, Origen will no longer need to be saved from himself.

Joseph W. Trigg, La Plata, Maryland

Daniel Edward Doyle

The Bishop as Disciplinarian in the Letters of St. Augustine

Patristic Studies 4

New York: Peter Lang, 2002

Pp. xi + 396. \$70.95.

In this work Doyle advances "the hypothesis that any study of Augustine's understanding of episcopal ministry must pay careful attention to the specific role the bishop plays as disciplinarian" (xxi, see 216). He makes his point. The strengths of the book lie in the success of his argument and in his intensive knowledge of the primary sources and his wide reading in the secondary literature.

The reader is promptly reminded that 'discipline' in this work refers not only to punishment for wrongdoing but to therapeutic actions as well (35ff, 43). Doyle sees discipline as including the "encouragement, consolation, . . . correction and counsel" necessary to promote adherence to the "demands and

expectations" called for in a particular life style (6). He studies *disciplina* in terms of etymology, in terms of usage in the Bible and the North African tradition, and lexically. This last (27–61) is particularly interesting inasmuch as the many meanings of the word range from 'habit', 'tradition', 'lifestyle' through "the divine plan or order" and 'correction' to 'teaching', 'doctrine', and 'church law'.

Illustrating that discipline can be therapeutic, Doyle draws examples from (among others) *Letters* 93 and 185. It is unfortunate that he refuses to discuss these letters in context on the grounds that they involve "the delicate matter" of the collaboration between Church and state in the exercise of discipline (xx, see 99). The topic is too important to be omitted here. The letter to Vincent in 405 (#93) and that to Boniface ten years later (#185) explain why Augustine came to endorse 'conversion' of the Donatists through coercion by the state. The bishop never doubted that the path he followed to his own conversion—a long journey of prayer, intellect and will—was the better one, but he came to believe that for those who could not or would not follow this path coercion was a kindness. He likened it to rescuing an unwilling man from a burning house. Why Doyle considers the admissibility of state intervention in ecclesial affairs "delicate" is not immediately clear. He must know that Augustine would not have been a man of his age if he had thought otherwise. The ethos of the fourth and later centuries is shown not only in Augustine's position vis-à-vis the Donatists but again later when he appealed to the imperial court in the Pelagian controversy. I think the implicit reason for "delicate" is that Doyle recognizes such intervention to be out of step with Western modernity. Elsewhere in the work he makes *explicit* comparisons between Augustine's behaviour and what is acceptable now. Such comparisons are unnecessary and jarring.

The author argues that Augustine was indebted to Roman law, which he knew well but which he considered flawed because it derives from the human city. He owed much more to the Bible for his understanding of church discipline. Doyle describes Augustine's attitude to the Bible briefly but well (233–44), and he stresses the bishop's belief in its inerrancy. But when he moves on to Augustine's use of his predecessors' writings, the position is badly presented. In the space of seven lines (228) Doyle remarks that "[e]ven Augustine was compelled to recognize that theologically the Donatists were the true heirs of Cyprianic Christianity" (quoting Marcus, *Saeculum*, 110). He continues immediately with a comment:

Here, Augustine was using the moral authority that Cyprian rightly enjoyed . . . as a means to correct the mistaken practices of the Donatists. Not even Cyprian dared to rebaptize heretics because they have the same sacraments; baptism performed by schismatics is not baptism at all.

Doyle is trying to make the point (correctly) that for Cyprian schismatic baptism was no baptism because schism breaks the unity of the church. But, for Augustine, schismatic baptism was valid (but not efficacious) although he, too, saw the sin of the schismatics as precisely that of destroying ecclesial unity. Augustine chose to honour one of Cyprian's theological tenets but not the other. An editor should have untangled this passage.

The tone throughout the volume is so benign that the occasional mild criticism tends to disappear. The index is not entirely accurate; I found three mispaginations; there may be more. On the whole the presentation is clear and correct but wooden. This weakness makes it a difficult book to read from beginning to end, but, that said, this exposition of almost everything one could want to know about Augustine as disciplinarian and the book's excellent references, both primary and secondary, should prove a useful resource.

Joanne McWilliam, University of Toronto, Emerita

Stefan Rebenich

Jerome

The Early Church Fathers

London and New York: Routledge, 2002

Pp. xi + 211. \$14.95.

Our shelves groan under the weight of tomes introductory to Augustine, his life, theologies, and times. Accessible, available introductions for his contemporary Jerome are not so burdensome. Few today consult (or can find) Grützmacher's three volume monument to critical biography (1901–8); Cavallera's massive French biography (1922) retains value but more as a guide than as a critical biography; not many (in my experience) consult A. La Penna's Italian studies of Jerome the classical scholar. That leaves the modern student with J. N. D. Kelly's fine, balanced portrait of Jerome the literary man (1975), but a full appreciation of Kelly's biography demands of the reader a fair amount of introductory background and acquaintance with the wider world of patristic and late antique scholarship. Rebenich has now given to readers of English an introduction which provides that kind of preparatory knowledge.

Routledge's series "The Early Church Fathers" (capably edited by Carolyn Harrison) already includes a range of volumes by distinguished authorities. Rebenich is known well in late antique scholarly circles for his prosopographical study, *Hieronymus und sein Kreis* (1992) as well as for a number of other studies on Jerome's life and writings. He here offers a welcome and worthy addition to a series aiming at introductory studies setting an author in literary, doctrinal, political, and social contexts along with translations of "key selected texts."

Rebenich's introductory "biographical" chapters sketch well the social and economic background of his subject as one of several (consider Rufinus and Augustine) young provincial male Christians on the make in the late fourth century. Welcome also is the author's attention to Jerome's continually evolving literary presentations of his own life. Rebenich strikes an appropriate critical balance in assessing his subject and his works as well as in citing the (few) modern standard biographies. He notes when the often hyper-critical Grützmacher was surely correct, when Cavallera was insufficiently critical, and when Kelly was too gentle. In sum, Rebenich's biographical sketch is critical but fair to his