

4-2009

David G. Hunter, *Marriage, Celibacy, and Heresy in Ancient Christianity: The Joninianist Controversy*

Will Deming

University of Portland, deming@up.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://pilotscholars.up.edu/the_facpubs



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Citation: Pilot Scholars Version (Modified MLA Style)

Deming, Will, "David G. Hunter, *Marriage, Celibacy, and Heresy in Ancient Christianity: The Joninianist Controversy*" (2009). *Theology Faculty Publications and Presentations*. Paper 7.

http://pilotscholars.up.edu/the_facpubs/7

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Theology at Pilot Scholars. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theology Faculty Publications and Presentations by an authorized administrator of Pilot Scholars. For more information, please contact library@up.edu.

The Journal of Religion

gether with Olybrius and Nepos" (195). Osiek and Madigan agree with Giorgio Ottaranto in taking presbyteria as a title and in seeing Martia as ministering with the two men, who were most likely presbyters; argue that he misreads canons from two Gallic councils as referring to women presbyters rather than wives of presbyters; but join him (196) in reading the graffito in light of a letter from three Gallic bishops decrying "silly little women" who "pollute the divine sacraments by illicit assistance" (189).

Ordained Women in the Early Church is an excellent resource for deeper study of original texts as well as for informed entry into current ecclesial discussions of practice and polity. It offers no new evidence, nor can it. But, together with other recent scholarship, it lays to rest arguments of the "there have never been ordained women in the (ancient) church" variety. It shows clearly that women deacons and presbyters, whatever the extent of their liturgical functions, were certainly ordained and counted among the clergy for ritual and honorific purposes. What the book cannot do and does not attempt is to adjudicate the conflict between the history it documents and theological claims based on a mistaken view of that history as demonstrating the impossibility of ordaining women in the Roman Catholic and Orthodox churches.

FRANCINE CARDMAN, *Boston College School of Theology and Ministry*.

HUNTER, DAVID G. *Marriage, Celibacy, and Heresy in Ancient Christianity: The Jovinianist Controversy*. Oxford Early Christian Studies. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007. xx+316 pp. \$99.00 (cloth).

Rightly describing the Jovinianist Controversy as a "decisive turning point" in the history of Western ascetic discourse, David Hunter treats his readers to a "comprehensive study of the conflict between Jovinian and his opponents" (5). The book is structured in three parts. Part 1 offers an overview of early Catholic and Protestant polemical uses of the controversy, a reconstruction of Jovinian's theology, and some additional background supplied by an excursus on baptism and a chapter on the social undercurrents of religious authority in late antiquity. Part 2 traces the development of sexual asceticism in Christianity from its hazy beginnings with Jesus and Paul to the time of Jovinian in the late fourth century. In the late second and early third centuries Hunter locates the emergence of an initial "orthodoxy" in the writings of Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria, as they mediated between the views of radicals such as Marcion and Tatian and the profamily apologists. During the third and early fourth centuries, however, a "new orthodoxy" was forged, accepting many more ascetic practices as "orthodox," while rejecting others as "Manichaean."

In part 3, Hunter argues that three powerful and competing church leaders in the late fourth century—Siricius, Ambrose, and Jerome—saw political advantage in ascribing merit to acts of sexual asceticism. Pope Siricius advocated sexual asceticism as a way to elevate his clerics above influential laity and monastics. Ambrose, the bishop of Milan, promoted sexual asceticism as a way to increase monastic authority. He also saw political advantage in elevating the status of female virginity in the church, as the rite of *velatio*, whereby a virgin was consecrated as the bride of Christ, was the exclusive prerogative of a bishop. Jerome had his own agenda. Being a priest, but having no particular esteem for the priesthood, he promoted sexual asceticism as a source of spiritual au-

thority in itself, independent of existing church hierarchies. With vendettas against both Siricius and Ambrose, Jerome decided to enter the Jovinianist Controversy as the “arbitrator of orthodoxy,” writing a grand antiheretical treatise. In this way he elevated the controversy to a “heresy,” gaining the moral high ground to promote his own vision of ecclesiastical power at the expense of Siricius and Ambrose.

By comparison, Jovinian’s part in the controversy seems to have been rather innocent. He had intended to validate the orthodoxy of the previous century by arguing that Christians were saved equally through the rite of baptism and that no special merit or authority should be accorded those who chose to be sexually ascetic. But in the political climate of the late fourth century, this earlier orthodoxy was declared a “new heresy.” Jovinian’s fate was to be caught in a power struggle. Since each of his well-placed opponents “had a stake in the differentiation and distribution of merits based on ascetic practice,” it was, Hunter suggests, “perhaps the very instability of the ascetic project in the West” (241)—a “crisis of identity” (51–52)—that made Jovinian’s condemnation inevitable.

In assessing Hunter’s accomplishments, it is clear that he is at his best in sorting out the various elements of the Jovinianist Controversy proper. By giving such admirable clarity to the many issues involved, and by analyzing these issues to a level of detail not previously attained, Hunter has opened a new window of understanding into the history of Christianity’s valuation of human sexuality. On the other hand, Hunter’s summary of the developments that led up to the Jovinianist Controversy is not as satisfying. There are smaller problems—for example, the discussions in parts 1 and 2 are not always up-to-date (e.g., 43–50)—and larger, more basic problems. Hunter’s account of the emergence of “orthodoxies” in the late second and late third centuries, for example, is a bit too tidy. Support for marriage in the apologetic literature is not really a “recurrent theme”—rather, it is mentioned briefly by most apologists. The suggestion that “not all Christians in the second century disapproved of remarriage after the death of a spouse as strenuously as did Athenagoras” is a vast understatement (99). And Hunter’s analysis of Clement’s orthodoxy (105–13) avoids all the troublesome ambiguities in this author.

Beyond the above, I find Hunter’s continued use of “enkratism” problematic inasmuch as it is not a consistent theology or practice. Indeed, although Hunter all but deconstructs this term as an invention of Irenaeus (101–5), he nonetheless presumes to be able to identify “radical” and “moderate” forms of enkratism and speaks of “classic enkratite teaching” and “the fundamental enkratite principle” (128, 153, 169). Finally, I still maintain that until scholars distinguish between “sexual asceticism” and “celibacy,” no clear picture of this period can emerge (see my *Paul on Marriage and Celibacy*, 2nd ed. [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004], xiv–xv). The pastorals do not, as Hunter claims, insist that “both eating and sex are activities that are capable of being ‘sanctified’” (95). Rather, they address the status of eating and marriage. Admittedly, these distinctions largely vanish by the third century, with “celibacy” and “sexual asceticism” becoming practically synonyms. But precisely when and in which authors the meanings of these words converge is vital for understanding the development of ascetic theology. To assume, without further qualification, that “sexual renunciation,” “the ascetic life,” and “virginal holiness” are always and

The Journal of Religion

everywhere the equivalent of “celibacy” (see, e.g., 1, 5, 83, 90, 95) is not reasonable.

In summary, Hunter’s analysis of the Joninianist Controversy is a major contribution to our understanding of the development of Christian sexual asceticism. At the same time, his book illustrates the ongoing challenge that all patristic scholars have in situating their authors in the ascetic discourse of the earlier centuries: a coherent history of sexual asceticism in the first two hundred years of Christianity has not yet been written. Until it is, the late antique period, as an extension of earlier developments, will remain somewhat obscure. WILL DEMING, *University of Portland*.

KAPLAN, BENJAMIN J. *Divided by Faith: Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007. viii+415 pp. \$29.95 (cloth).

What exactly was life like for the mixed religious communities of early modern Europe? What did religious toleration look like? Benjamin Kaplan’s wonderful new book takes us into the everyday lives of people living in Europe between the religious reformations of the sixteenth century and the end of the eighteenth century to show us how the then new religious pluralism actually worked on the ground. From house churches and mixed marriages to carefully planned parade routes and city planning, European Christians of the early modern period contrived often ingenious ways to accommodate different styles of worship and different social practices, not because they regarded religious difference as inconsequential, and not always without conflict, but with remarkable success nevertheless.

Kaplan declares at the beginning of this fascinating book that he wishes to oppose to the reigning myth of the growth of religious tolerance the messier social history of a more modest and episodic achievement of stable coexistence. Rather than the gradual triumph of enlightened reason over primitive faith, Kaplan sees a constellation of local arrangements that allowed Europeans of different Christian confessions, as well as their Jewish and Muslim neighbors, to find relatively stable ways to continue to practice their religions without either insisting on conformity or retreating into separatist enclaves. The chapters are gathered into four parts—“Obstacles,” “Arrangements,” “Interactions,” and “Changes.” Kaplan brings together for the nonspecialist the work of social historians of the last half century to argue his point that what he calls the “practice of toleration” is a more interesting and more convincing story than the story of the triumph of secular reason over passion and a more useful story for the twenty-first century, when reason is under attack and religious communities must find ways to live together.

The first part shows us the obstacles to peaceful coexistence that presented themselves after the fracturing of the medieval consensus: the confessional nature of post-Reformation Christianity in both its Protestant and Catholic forms, emphasizing creedal differences; the presumption of the necessarily close overlap between sacred and civic identities leading to an easy link between heresy and sedition; and the social customs that provided occasions that enflamed differences, including festivals and public processions. The second part, “Arrangements,” describes how the new divisions sorted themselves out spatially.