involved. Although Kapitaniak’s work discusses John Cotta’s writing, his conclusions extend to most textual investigations.

The study of demons in antiquity, with relation to illness in particular, is in its infancy. This comprehensive volume will surely contribute greatly to the field. As such a pioneering work, it would have been helpful if there had been a bibliography following each work (rather than only in some essays) to supplement the excellent and extensive footnotes which appear throughout the book. Alternatively, a fuller bibliography for each of the four topics would have provided a solid foundation for further research. The index of texts and subjects, however, is excellent, and covers a plethora of materials.

One of the strengths of this volume is that it acknowledges its limitations and invites further collaborators. It is a welcome exploration of a highly complex field; complexities are exposed and mapped out. Some of these are explored, but plenty remain for continued work. Bhayro and Rider should be commended for their masterful editing of these fascinating essays which, individually and collectively, equip and encourage scholarship on demons and illness.
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Can we still think of God as having a body, or is this belief a survival of an archaic way of believing? It is this question that Christoph Markschies discusses in his latest, elegantly published book. He concentrates on antiquity, but starts with a chapter (pp. 19–40) on the body of God after the Greco-Roman world, from Maimonides until today, which shows a general marginalization of the belief in a bodily God despite many biblical texts that presuppose God having a body. This leads Markschies to a number of questions, such as the influence of the biblical texts on later Jewish and Christian ideas, the influence (positive and negative) of the pagan milieu, pagan ideas of bodily gods, and,
last but not least, the question whether there is an intellectual hierarchy between the idea of a non-bodily and a bodily God? From a brief survey of the Forschungsgeschichte of the body, Markschies deduces five insights, amongst them the observation that ideas in antiquity about God’s corporeality are under-researched, and that ideas about the human body should continuously be taken into account in studying God’s body.

In his second chapter (pp. 41–112) Markschies investigates the biblical passages about God’s body and notes that the ontological differentiation between God and humans is already to be found in the later parts of the Old Testament. He notes the indications of God’s corporeality in the Old Testament, but also observes the lack of a clear gender determination—unlike, we may add, many modern popular representations of God as an older man. Yet Aristobulus, like Philo, already explains the ‘anthropomorphic’ qualifications of God metaphorically. Pagan philosophers differed in opinion, with post-Platonic philosophers such as the Epicureans, Stoics, and Aristotelians often more open to a corporeal God than Plato himself. These two ideas, a corporeal or an uncorporeal God, would be shared by early Christians, as the work of Origen shows, who, like Clement of Alexandria, decidedly argued for God’s uncorporeality, but evidently against a number of educated Christians who thought differently. In the end, we can observe that the more people believed in a unity of body and soul, the more they would believe in the idea of a corporeal god.

Markschies proceeds in the third chapter (pp. 113–43) by studying the bodies of the pagan gods and their statues. Although he shows that people generally believed that the gods were present in their statues, he could have strengthened his case by paying attention to the early Greek vase paintings, which actually show statues of gods moving and reacting to humans (cf. J. N. Bremmer, ‘The Agency of Greek and Roman Statues: From Homer to Constantine’, Opuscula 6 [2013], pp. 7–21).

The fourth chapter (pp. 145–77) discusses the corporeality of the soul and shows that once again opinions were divided. Many Christian theologians, though, accepted the corporeal soul, such as Tertullian, who probably also coined the term corporalitas. In fact, in earlier late antiquity the corporeality of the soul had become accepted, in various ways, by both pagan and Christian intellectuals, although not by Augustine. His thought, however, would become the most influential stance in the succeeding periods. It fits this development that for Christian theologians at the end of the fifth century the corporeality of God no longer was an option.
In his fifth chapter (pp. 179–246), Markschies moves to Jewish mysticism in late antiquity. Whereas Aristobulus and Philo had interpreted statements about God’s corporeality in the Old Testament in an allegorical manner and strongly rejected the idea of God’s corporeality, this was different in rabbinic and non-rabbinic late antique texts, in particular in the so-called Hekhalot literature. Markschies shows that in this complicated literature, especially in the Shi’ur Qorna texts, God is described with all kinds of huge numbers, proportional relations, and *nomina barbara*. The knowledge of God’s proportions and of his name constituted the secret of the mystic. Markschies rejects claimed parallels for the numbers with the Book of Elchasai or Gnostic authors and persuasively concludes from the absence of parallels to a relatively late emergence of the Shi’ur Qorna traditions. (Markschies suggests, p. 180, that the terms ‘Merkava-Mystik’ and ‘Hekhalot-Literatur’ were coined by Gerschom Scholem in his 1957 book on Jewish mysticism, but the latter expression is already used by K. Schubert, *Theol. Ltz.* 78 [1953], p. 506.)

In his sixth chapter (pp. 247–372) Markschies persuasively shows that Melito of Sardis argued for a corporeal body of God, whereas this is not clear for Irenaeus, who, perhaps for that reason, one might think, did not play an important role in later discussions. Subsequently, Markschies presents a very interesting discussion of the Clementine *Homilies* (17.3.5–7), in which he shows neo-Pythagorean influence, but again notes the acceptance of God’s corporeality, even though different from Melito and Irenaeus. Next Markschies discusses Lactantius, Eusebius (from Emesa, not the church historian), and Augustine, who show that the pendulum had changed and most theologians in the fourth and fifth centuries had accepted God’s incorporeality. Markschies concludes with the so-called ‘anthropomorphite controversy’ (his discussion does not indicate that the relevant Greek terms are extremely rare), which he reconstructs in great detail, with much attention to Theophilus of Alexandria. In the end, Markschies once again notes—it is a running theme in his book and not without his sympathy—that believers in God’s corporeality were not just simple people from the countryside. (See also the interview with Markschies in the *Frankfurter Rundschau*: http://www.fr.de/kultur/kirchenhistoriker-christoph-markschies-die-ewige-frage-nach-dem-leibniz-keks-a-733625 [accessed 26 December 2017]). However, after the end of the fourth century proponents of God’s corporeality gradually lost so much territory that medieval and modern scholars have overlooked their once considerable popularity.
Markschies’s final chapter discusses Christ’s incarnation (pp. 373–418) in the writings of Julius Cassianus, Valentinus, and several Docetists, as well as the various opinions of Jesus’ body after his resurrection (although the early Christians did not reflect upon God’s body in relation to that of Jesus) and even, albeit rather sketchily, the martyrdom of Polycarp.

In his conclusion (pp. 419–31), Markschies notes that we need both ‘die Wahrheit des Mythos und die Notwendigkeit der Entmythologisierung’ (p. 426), that is, the truth of myth can prevent us from transferring simple dualisms, like body and soul, onto God, whereas demythologization helps us not simply to identify the human body with the body of God. With these and some other theological reflections Markschies concludes his rich and magisterial book. It displays an impressive mastery of the often extremely fragmented evidence in many languages, even though one would have liked to have had his opinion on the Passio Perpetuae, where Perpetua sees God as ‘an old man dressed as a shepherd, tall’ (4.8) and Saturus, in a kind of heaven, ‘someone who looked like an old man, with white hair and a youthful countenance, whose feet we did not see’ (2.3). Do we not have here a reflection of lived Christian religion? A second important aspect of his book is that Markschies does not discuss Jewish, Christian, and pagan ideas in isolation but rightly sees them as often reacting to one another. His argument is supported by more than 300 pages of notes which generously quote the passages discussed and a 100-page bibliography. Misprints are few, but a thematic index would have been helpful.
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ILARIA L. E. RAMELLI’s Social Justice and the Legitimacy of Slavery, an investigation of the relationship between asceticism