

close to Hebrew in several aspects, as a significant impairment factor for Hebrew speakers/readers.

In the last part, Nissinen elaborates on the information drawn from the three analyzed sources and merges them into a conceptualization of the ancient prophetic landscape. Nissinen explores the prophets' ecstatic behavior, their relationship to ancient temples, with kingship, and their distribution in terms of gender. Such chapters are rich in details and Nissinen's integration of the information coming from Greece, the Near East, and the Hebrew Bible is responsible. It leaves clear boundaries among the distinct cultures and allows the reader to evaluate the argumentation. These boundaries are not left, however, as necessarily indicating either generic or genetic dissociation. Thus, for Nissinen, the three sources support the appraisal of ancient prophecy as a human phenomenon, in spite of how the Greek *προφήτης*, the biblical *נביא*, and the Akkadian *mubhûm* were appreciated in their distinct societies and how one's activity influenced another's throughout history.

"Ancient Prophecy" is a dense and well-articulated book. It draws from a massive amount of primary data and elaborates responsibly on the necessity of methodological rigor for the development of comparative studies. It also represents an impressive elaboration on the most recent bibliography in the field of comparative studies on ancient prophecy. As such, the book is both a competent introduction to the modern study on ancient prophecy for the non-specialist reader and a piece of high-standard academic work, proper to the current ongoing discussions of its type within professional circles.

Berrien Springs, Michigan

FELIPE MASOTTI

Siecienski, A. Edward. *The Papacy and the Orthodox: Sources and History of a Debate*. OSHT. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017. xiv + 510 pp. Hardcover. USD 78.00.

The question of authority in the church and the unique ministry of the Bishop of Rome within Christianity has been a matter of intense discussion for centuries. In *The Papacy and the Orthodox: Sources and History of a Debate*, Edward Siecienski, associate professor of religion, and Clement and Helen Papas Professor of Byzantine Civilization and Religion at the Richard Stockton College of New Jersey, set out "to trace the history of the Orthodox understanding of the papacy and the place it has played in East-West relations since the beginning of the 'estrangement' that eventually split them apart" (xi). Like his other book, *The Filioque: History of a Doctrinal Controversy*, OSHT (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), "this book intends to trace the history of a controversy—that is, the primacy of the Bishop of Rome as it has been received (or rejected) by Orthodox Christianity" (xii). His "intent is not to convince, but rather to lay out the history in as clear, objective, and interesting a manner as is possible" (xiii). And in this endeavor, I believe Siecienski succeeds admirably.

The polemics surrounding the primacy of the Bishop of Rome have centered extensively on very different readings of the biblical and patristic materials concerning Peter and the Church of Rome. In the first four chapters, Sicienski lays out the history of the apostle Peter and his role in the early Church of Rome. The historical Peter is the subject of chapter one, which surveys what modern scholarship has said about the historicity of the apostle and his presence in Rome. Here the author attempts to distinguish between the “Simon of history” and the “Peter of faith.” Chapter two looks at the “Peter of faith” in Scripture and discusses the various portrayals of the apostle in the gospels and epistles. Modern scholarship now readily admits that the biblical material presents multiple views of Peter. The third chapter moves into the discussion of how early church fathers read and commented on the biblical material about Peter and the post-biblical memory of the apostle’s ministry in Rome. The early church fathers employed the person of Peter for “a variety of homiletical and pastoral purposes without necessarily thinking that they were somehow commenting on the power and privileges of the Bishop of Rome” (6). Later commentators and church leaders in both East and West would grab these statements and use them to buttress their views of the primacy. Chapter four deals with the early church’s developing view of the Bishop of Rome and how individual authors and councils understood both the basis and limits of emerging papal authority in their dealings with it. Sicienski argues that “historically the Orthodox have claimed that the weight of the patristic evidence points to a conciliarly granted ‘honorary primacy’ that never granted to the pope any authority beyond that enjoyed by the other patriarchs” (7). Of course, differences continue to exist over this interpretation.

The next few chapters survey historical developments and statements throughout the Middle Ages. Chapter five reviews the seventh through the tenth centuries, a period of church history that was critical in the development of the papacy and the Eastern response to it. Various controversies (such as the monothelite and iconoclastic controversies) greatly enhanced the role of the papacy in the East as various theologians turned to the Pope for support for their positions. During the Photian Schism (863–867), however, Pope Nicholas I pressed a view of the papacy that required universal acceptance of his role and obedience to his will, something that the East refused to grant. The papacy’s self-understanding continued to evolve during the pontificates of succeeding popes, moving well beyond what Orthodox Christianity could allow.

“The Age of the Great Schism and the Gregorian Reform” is the subject of chapter six and relates how the relationship between East and West was drastically transformed by the excommunications of 1054, the reforms of Gregory VII (1073–1085), and the Crusades. The estrangement between the Latin- and Greek-speaking churches increased substantially when Western theologians, during the second half of the eleventh century, stressed the universal nature of papal supremacy over ecclesiastical and secular authorities, best seen in the document *Dictatus Papae* (1075) (240, 258). For the East, these claims were a departure from their understanding of tradition.

However, it is the Fourth Crusade (ch. 7) and the sacking of Constantinople that “marks the true start of the schism between the Latin and Greek Churches” (282), thus revealing to Eastern Orthodoxy the ultimate aim of papal primacy and ecclesiology toward the East, which required nothing less than obedience to its claims. As the Eastern Empire weakened in political strength and independence over the next two centuries, the Byzantine Emperor sought an alliance with Rome; even a willingness to submit to papal authority. Yet, at the same time, Latin theologians tempered the authority of the pope in adopting *Haec Sancta* during the fifth session of the Council of Constance (1415), and thus limited the authority of the pope to end the Western Schism, a decision welcomed by Eastern theologians.

The following “Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438–1439) was exactly what the East had been requesting for centuries—a genuinely ecumenical council where the issues separating the churches could be debated and discussed” (327), but as Sicienski describes in chapter eight, the developments from Ferrara-Florence to Vatican I (1870) did not result in what many in the East had hoped for. The centuries after Florence were difficult for both East and West, as Rome had to deal with the Protestant Reformers, and Constantinople had to learn to survive under the Sultan. Dialogue was difficult and the following centuries exhibit little progress toward a possible reunion of churches. But it was Vatican I that placed an insurmountable obstacle to any further hope with the *Pastor Aeternus* declaration of papal infallibility and universal jurisdiction. For the Orthodox, there was little to debate as the teachings of Vatican I “were serious errors and had to be rejected in the strongest possible terms” (367).

In chapter nine, “The Twentieth and Twenty-First Centuries,” Sicienski explores the more recent developments from the Second Vatican Council and Pope John Paul II’s encyclical *Ut Unum Sint* (1995). The theology of *communio* (fellowship) holds perhaps the most hope of a possible reunion. Yet, Sicienski is clear in his epilogue that “the Orthodox are firmly convinced that the dogmas of Vatican I remain incompatible with both the witness of the first millennium and their understanding of the Church. As long as the pope’s universal jurisdiction and infallibility are taught as Catholic doctrines many Orthodox believe union is an impossibility” (417–418). It may be that any solution to disunity may not come any time soon.

Overall, Sicienski has written a very valuable and credible assessment of the development of the debate between East and West over the role of the Bishop of Rome in the Christian Church. His knowledge of the issues, already explored partly in his study of the *filioque*, is commendable. His familiarity with the various documents and authors that contributed to the Orthodox response to the papal claims is impressive. And his extensive bibliography (eighty pages) is a great complement to a remarkable study, making it an invaluable resource for this debate. Indubitably, this volume is a welcome addition to the Oxford Studies in Historical Theology series.