

But the interest value of Büttner's work on Leo is not confined to the events of 1054. The eleventh century is a fascinating period in Byzantine theological and ecclesiastical developments. It is probably best known for its association with Symeon the New Theologian; but Symeon represents but one trend, and a rather idiosyncratic one at that, in a very complex world, which produced many significant personalities and has left behind copious and varied written sources. Although many of the major protagonists are well known – figures such as Keroularios himself, Peter of Antioch, Niketas Stethatos (Symeon's disciple and biographer), Theophylact of Ohrid, John of Antioch – the extent and scope of their writings is often not appreciated, and often the range of approaches represented in their writings, and the tensions between them, is not appreciated. Moreover, they are the cream on the top of a great body of lesser-known material, at times more mundane but, when studied in depth, capable of presenting a much more interesting picture of the richness of the period. Much of this material is only gradually becoming more well known and widely available, through projects such as the translations of Byzantine monastic foundation documents, published online by Dumbarton Oaks, the Belfast Evergetis project, and current work in Germany on Nikon of the Holy Mountain, the key source for 11th century Palestine and surrounding areas, to name but a few. Publication of Leo's 'Kephalaiia' therefore is an important contribution to building up understanding of the rich complexity of this period.

Unfortunately, as yet Büttner's work is not widely available. The current publication, which I acquired through personal submission to Dr Büttner's supervisor, Professor Günter Prinzing, is not on general release, although can be acquired. It is much to be hoped that it will receive the attention it deserves and see a further edition, more widely available.

JUDITH RYDER

ANSELM by Sandra Visser and Thomas Williams, *Great Medieval Thinkers Series*, Oxford University Press, 2009, pp. xii + 303, £19.99 pbk

In this volume on *Anselm* for the *Great Medieval Thinkers* series, Sandra Visser and Thomas Williams set out to provide 'a fresh reassessment of Anselm's thought as presented in his own writings' (p. v). It is intended primarily as exposition rather than evaluation, although understandably it is full of evaluation. My immediate reaction to a work such as this is, why not just read what Anselm wrote? After all, much of the bad exegesis to which Visser and Williams refer is based on a failure to read the texts adequately (if at all!). However, it does seem legitimate, given the controversial nature of the history of Anselmian interpretation, to provide an aide to understanding the texts. There seems little doubt that students reading Anselm (in particular, *De Grammatico*) need some assistance in getting their bearings, so this book is to be welcomed as an attempt to provide such assistance. By its nature and length, it can only skim over much of Anselm's thought, but in its fourteen chapters it provides many useful discussions and pointers.

The work is divided into three parts, 'The Framework of Anselm's Thought' (three chapters), 'God' (six chapters), and 'The Economy of Redemption' (five chapters). It takes a thematic approach. So, for example, discussion of *Cur Deus Homo* occurs in chapters 1, 10, 12 and 13, and of the *Monologion* in chapters 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 12. This approach allows the authors to show how integrated Anselm's thought is, how ideas from different works mutually support Anselm's 'program' (p. 254). However, the risk is that one cannot see the trees for the wood – Anselm's works were all written in a particular context with a particular aim as issues arose, and to that extent it might be doubted that Anselm had a

'program'. This may also explain why, as the authors point out, Anselm does not express a developed theory of universals or why he does not appear interested in the metaphysical problems of Christology 'for their own sake' (p. 239).

The first chapter, 'The Reason of Faith', provides a clear and accurate account of Anselm's view of the relation of faith and reason. Anselm expects the believer to accept on faith, but the unbeliever has to be met with rational argument, as his letter to Bishop Fulk confirms (p. 19). There is some attempt to place Anselm within the context of 11th century dialectic with discussions of Lanfranc and Roscelin, but generally the dialectical tradition in which Anselm operates is little discussed. In explaining the argument of *De Grammatico*, the authors make no mention of the central role of the topics in this tradition (see Peter Boschung's *From a topical point of view*.) A discussion of the background to Anselm's dialectic might have suggested that there is more to the title, *Proslogion*, than 'a bad rhetorical choice' (p. 74). Surely, it is a 'Greekification' of the Latin term '*proloquium*' (in some manuscripts that's the title given to the *Proslogion*), which itself is a translation of the Greek Stoic term '*axioma*'. Suddenly, the term becomes dialectically significant, rather than rhetorically bad.

Chapter 4, 'The *Monologion* arguments for the existence of God', contains a discussion of Anselm's view of the relation of 'goodness' and 'greatness'. By 'greatness' Anselm is not referring to physical magnitude, but to 'goodness' or 'worthiness' (p. 61, cf. *Monologion* 2). The authors miss the clue that one finds here concerning the origins of Anselm's phrase 'that than which nothing greater can be thought' in the *Proslogion*. In the *Monologion*, Anselm distances himself from Seneca's meaning in his *Naturales Quaestiones*: '*magnitudo . . . qua nihil maius cogitari potest*' (I, Pref. 13). He is then able to take up this phrase in the *Proslogion*, freed from the Stoic conception of God and the world.

In the conclusion to chapter 5, 'The *Proslogion* argument for the existence of God', the authors put forward the essential structure of the argument in *Proslogion* 2 as:

A necessary being is possible
If a necessary being is possible, it exists
Therefore a necessary being exists (p. 92).

To me this seems to have moved far beyond Anselm's text. As Desmond Henry pointed out there may be non-divine necessary beings, which is why I would suggest Anselm eschewed such language in the *Proslogion*. For Anselm, 'necessary being' is not to be equated with God, whilst 'that than which nothing greater can be thought' is.

In chapter 6, 'The Divine Attributes', the authors ask whether Anselm is a 'presentist' or 'eternalist'. He is, they suggest, 'unequivocally a presentist' (p. 101). Not only that, he is also an 'endurantist', since he states in *Monologion* 21: 'A human being exists as a whole yesterday, today and tomorrow' (p. 102). But if that is what Anselm says, then he is not a presentist. Herein lies one of the problems or benefits (depending on your point of view) of this kind of book. What Anselm actually says is '*quemadmodum homo totus est heri et hodie et cras, proprie dicitur quia fuit et est et erit*'. It is only by going back to the text that the student can realize that the confusion in the argument is due to the authors' choice of quotation, rather than a confusion in Anselm.

This book attempts to cover the whole range of Anselm's written work and does so surprisingly effectively, given its length. (See for instance the discussion of modality in chapter 10 and the section on Anselm's soteriology in chapter 13.) This comes at the cost of spreading the argument too thinly at times. The success of *Anselm* should be measured on whether it will encourage students to pick up

Anselm's writings and (re-)read them. That was certainly the effect on me. The frequent references to Anselm's works would be better captured in the text or in footnotes, rather than in endnotes.

IAN LOGAN

NEWMAN AND THE ALEXANDRIAN FATHERS: SHAPING DOCTRINE IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY ENGLAND by Benjamin John King, *Oxford University Press*, 2009, pp. xvii + 289, £50 hbk

One of the most frequently quoted (and abused) citations from Newman's *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* has it that 'In a higher world it is otherwise; but here below to live is to change, and to be perfect is to have changed often'. The citation is much abused because Church-progressive critics fail to note the preceding sentence. There Newman explains how the change in question takes place is in order that some great idea may 'remain the same'. What Newman held was true of the narrative of revelation as carried through history by the Church – namely, its substantial identity over time – he would not, of course, have claimed was true of the history of his own opinions. So much is clear from what he termed the withdrawal of 'arguments' against Rome in the 6 October 1845 'Advertisement' for the *Essay on Development*. Benjamin John King's subtle and carefully crafted study takes further Newman's retractions by showing how his view of the Fathers – and above all the Alexandrians in whom he most delighted – itself changed in interestingly significant ways in the course of his life.

Here is the story, somewhat simplified. In the 1830s, in the heady days, then, of early Tractarianism, Newman's ideal was the pre-Nicene Alexandrian pair, Clement and Origen, whose mystical view of Scripture appealed to his Romantic sensibility and enthusiasm for a moral and spiritual renaissance in the Church of England. Not surprisingly, he was relatively indifferent in this period to conciliar definitions of doctrine: for the oldest of the Alexandrians there had been none (unless we are to count the condemnation of Paul of Samosata by a mid third-century synod at Antioch). Newman did, however, begin to see the need for a greater lucidity of doctrinal outline which the later Alexandrians, Athanasius and Cyril, and indeed the Byzantine doctors up to Damascene, would eventually provide.

After the rejection by the Anglican authorities of Tract 90, with its plea for a catholicizing interpretation of the Thirty-Nine Articles, Newman became much more interested in the process, or act, of dogmatic definition whereby the Church took firmly articulated possession of the contents of her own mind. Hence the replacement of Clement and Origen in his affections by Athanasius the Great whose importance for him subsequent students of Newman's patristic learning and inspiration have, thinks King, emphasized too unilaterally and with insufficient attention to the diverse ways in which Newman appealed to him at different points in his life.

In the 1860s, deeply hurt by the adverse reaction of the Catholic hierarchy (successors of Athanasius!) to his *On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine*, Newman looked again at his former heroes, and found much to praise in, especially, Origen, who was an 'ecclesiastical writer', according to Catholic terminological usage, rather than, strictly speaking, an authoritative Father of the Church. In King's words, he 'glosses' Origen, who died, after all, in the peace of the Church, so as to save him from the imputation of being a 'father of heresy'. Newman's struggle to come to terms with the Scholastic theology alien to him as an Anglican enabled him to find some 'loopholds' in a presentation of Origen