

picture of “the major changes” that occurred within the rich Catholic doctrine of baptism, an image which obviously does not fully meet the actual transfer of knowledge assured by those lesser known authors who maintained and transmitted the tradition through their writings.

Nonetheless, the author still pays special attention to connecting the doctrines of later authors with the elements they had inherited from previous writers. For instance, the arguments of Alexander of Hales for the parity of all three forms of baptism (by blood, by desire and ritual baptism) are much indebted to Bernard of Clairvaux’s and Peter Lombard’s treatments. Parenthetically, as one may expect from a scholar with previous research background on the influential *Sentences* composed by Lombard, one of the strong points of Colish’s analysis are the subchapters devoted to Peter Lombard’s support of the baptism by desire and fictive baptism. Moreover, Bonaventure inherits much of the stance shared by the three aforementioned authors regarding the issues related both to baptism by blood and baptism by desire, while he is in turn followed by his Franciscan successors (Richard of Mediavilla, William of Ware *et alii*).

From the standpoint of intellectual history, the high quality of the volume is assured by the broad picture constructed by employing a large range of primary sources. Despite not exploring new manuscript material or editing previously unedited texts, the author manages to compose a synthetic volume, paying considerable attention to the historical context of the discussions. Colish’s substantial research testifies to the complexity of the baptismal question which has long received a multitude of divergent treatments, often unfairly concealed by the more recent teachings of the Catholic church, which claim that the church has always admitted only one position on all three of the baptismal questions.

IOANA CURUȚ
crtioana@yahoo.com

CATHERINE KÖNIG-PRALONG, *Médiévisme philosophique et raison modern: de Pierre Bayle à Ernest Renan* (Paris: J. Vrin, 2016).

Presenting the evolution of reception levels in a certain period in the history of thinking involves a critical attitude in evaluating the field’s possibilities of development. This is the subject covered in Catherine König-Pralong’s recent book, *Médiévisme philosophique et raison moderne*, ed. J. Vrin, Paris, 2016. The author narrates a history of the discovery of medieval philosophy as an academic discipline in the 16th–19th century. Such approaches were not completely absent from the field of medieval studies even before the book of the distinguished professor from Fribourg (see for example the important collection of studies on this topic published in 1989, compiled by R. Imbach and A. Maierù). So far, they have led to the idea that

the research of medieval philosophy took place within the Catholic tradition, partly shaped by Counter Reformation, and was usually directed against Protestantism and the rationalism of modernity. Due to the arguments presented in this book, this approach can be considered outdated.

The book explains how medieval philosophy research appeared within the German historicist school of the 18th century and how it had multiple levels of reception, both in German and French culture. Still, the evolution of this discipline in these cultures (the book does not make references to Anglo-Saxon culture, which could nevertheless provide a third level of reception, in itself highly distinctive) is intimately linked to their ideologies of identity and it varies according to their reorientations. The book analyses the way in which the identity mythographies of these cultures try to find themselves in the intellectual history of the 9th–15th centuries, often portraying certain medieval figures just in order to write a history that would favour some ideology of the moment. Actually, in its four chapters, the book presents precisely this mythographic logic and analyses it through four distinct cases: the first theme focuses on the very discovery of medieval philosophy studies; the second tackles the different credits given to the input of Arabic philosophy to medieval thinking; the third focuses on the avatars of the distinctions between “mystical” and “scholastic”, terms used by historians to distinguish, precisely in the field of medieval studies, the self-representations of German and French modernity; the fourth is an excellent case study regarding the figure of Abelard, rediscovered and edited by Victor Cousin in the 19th century, in order to extend to the Middle Ages the agenda of the 19th-century French university rationalism of Cousin’s time.

Therefore, the initiative of the Papal encyclical *Aeterni Patris*, which at the end of the 19th century re-launched the (predominantly Thomistic) research of medieval philosophy, merely turned into the outcome of a three centuries long French–German debate during which medieval philosophy took on various forms based on the changing opportunities and historical contexts of the times. While J. Brucker (around 1731-1736) was still strongly indebted to the depreciative ideas regarding medieval philosophy deriving from Petrarch’s or Boccaccio’s humanism, this view evolved into a French anti-scholastic era (in order to promote rationalism) and into a German anti-scholastic era (in order to reject Catholicism). However, the abandonment of these views caused a rediscovery of medieval philosophy in French culture (through excitement with Pierre Abelard’s rationalism) and German culture (with Herder’s apology of the Arabs as an Arian race from which medieval Europe borrowed so much and Tenemann, among others, putting forth the idea of a mystical vein in medieval philosophy, separate from the university tradition, representing a root of German identity). Of course, as in any two contiguous traditions, the terms are mutually borrowed; Mme de Stael and later Renan transmitted the ideas of the philosophy of culture from Germany to France, just like the German divisions of this period were often indebted to the periods of French development of university scholastics.

The entire book is a profound opportunity to reflect on the status of this field of study, on its central position in how we perceive Greek philosophy, the modern self-identity, and our irrepressible instinct to focus on novelties and separations in areas where documents show nothing but continuity. I imagine that, at some point, someone will write a wonderful chapter on the reception of medieval philosophy in Romanian culture, taking this book into consideration: a chapter that would show how much Brucker and other philosophy historians have been read in Romania, how much they have been referenced, that is: read, edited and transmitted, proving how much Romanian culture is indebted to the French and German passions for the construction of identity.

Translated from Romanian by Anca Chiorean

ALEXANDER BAUMGARTEN

alexbaum7@gmail.com

SANDU FRUNZĂ, *Fundamentalismul religios și noul conflict al ideologiilor* (Religious fundamentalism and the new conflict of ideologies), 2nd revised edition (Cluj-Napoca: Editura Școala Ardeleană, 2015).

Fundamentalismul religios și noul conflict al ideologiilor (Religious fundamentalism and the new conflict of ideologies), written by Professor Sandu Frunză (Department of Communication, Public Relations and Advertisement, Faculty of Political Science, Babeș-Bolyai University) was published in 2015 and it represents a revised and enlarged version of the 2003 edition. It offers a very exciting debate regarding two key concepts of contemporary society: “religious fundamentalism” and “spiritual regeneration movement”.

The study is structured in six parts, each with its adjacent chapters and subchapters. It begins by defining myth, religion and ideology in order to discuss not only the religious fundamentalist movements in the context of global relations, but also the way in which religion relates to ideology by pointing out the critical issues created by this relation: violence as a religious discourse, but also tolerance and multiculturalism.

Understanding religion as “a manifestation of the sacred”, Sandu Frunză analyses the way in which, in the contemporary world, it tends to transform into a rather “laicised cultural discourse” and even more so into a political one. Today, the ideological discourse greatly contributes to the individual’s “construction of identity” and to society’s “cultural memory”. The research thus pertinently shows that, in today’s society, there are two parallel tendencies: on the one hand, the phenomenon through which ideology transforms into a “secularised religion”, in which case the author offers Marxism as an example and, on the other hand, the process through which religion is given an ideological connotation that creates