

only a preliminary study, but it does bring attention to the tendency in scholarship to treat such texts as solely written material. If *Thunder* was performed, it is fascinating to think what kind of reaction it may have wished to incite in its audience.

The final chapter concludes some of the discussions of the previous chapters and reflects on the role of *Thunder* in today's society. The text's challenge and critique of gender and other social categories can also be applied to modern issues regarding identity. Lastly, there is the Coptic edition of *Thunder* and the editors' own English translation. These are accompanied by extensive annotations that justify some of the editors' unconventional translation decisions and demonstrate knowledge of other existing translations.

This volume represents the first book-length treatment in English of *Thunder*. In summary, it applies various methodologies to the text and approaches it by looking at different issues that affect the ancient meanings of *Thunder* and the potential interpretations for today's world. At times the chapters can be repetitive, where the editors discuss issues that were dealt with in previous chapters, with the insights worded only slightly different. Overall though, this volume brings attention to some issues that have not been dealt with adequately in the scholarship on *Thunder*.

This volume is commendable for not simply treating *Thunder* as a "Gnostic" text, as is often the tendency in scholarship. The editors have done great work in opening the door for the scholarship on the performance of *Thunder*, where much potential lies. The editors make some fascinating observations regarding gender blurring and destabilization due to the presence of both masculine and feminine copulas in the Coptic text, but some of the arguments begin to fall apart when one considers that *Thunder* is likely a Greek to Coptic translation. These observations may not hold up as well with the non-gendered ἐγὼ εἶμι of Greek. The editors have chosen to highlight the gender nuances found in the Coptic that are difficult to translate in English, a decision which may be controversial to other scholars of the field, but it offers a fresh perspective on *Thunder* that paves new possibilities in understanding the intent of such a bizarre, yet fascinating, ancient text.

The Salvation of the Flesh in Tertullian of Carthage: Dressing for the Resurrection.

Carly Daniel-Hughes. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

ISBN: 9780230117730. Pp. 192.

Reviewed by Jennifer Otto, McGill University

It is a pleasure to review *The Salvation of the Flesh in Tertullian of Carthage: Dressing for the Resurrection*, the first monograph by Carly Daniel-Hughes,

Assistant Professor of Early Christianities in the department of Religious Studies at Concordia University, and a friend and colleague of the Faculty of Religious Studies, McGill University.

In this focussed study, an adaptation of her Harvard dissertation, Daniel-Hughes re-examines Tertullian's treatises on dress (*On the Pallium*, *On the Apparel of Women* 1 and 2, and *On the Veiling of Virgins*), contending that far from being frivolous, Tertullian's interest in bodily adornment is deeply connected to his understanding of the salvation of the flesh. She further argues that Tertullian's treatises on women's dress must be read in light of the strict moral hierarchy that he establishes between male and female flesh, conceiving the flesh of the Christian woman as historically and ontologically inferior than that of the Christian man, who has been remade in the image of Christ, deeply imbued with the shame of Eve's sin. Approaching these treatises from an explicitly feminist perspective, Daniel-Hughes attempts to retrieve the voices of the women addressed by Tertullian, asking, "what did women in Tertullian's community do, indeed what could they do, with the semiotic burden that he, like so many church fathers, invested in their corporeal performances?" (12).

Chapter One begins with a survey of Imperial sources, both literary and material, which are put to use to illustrate the function of external dress and behaviour as an extension of the individual's moral virtue in Roman discourse. Drawing on recent research in Classics and Fashion Theory, Daniel-Hughes demonstrates how dress and adornment were employed to re-enforce gendered conceptions of morality. A proper matron's restrictive dress, including the *vittae*, *palla*, and *stola*, announced her modesty (*pudicitia*) and sexual exclusivity, while the toga-clad man demonstrated his control (*imperium*) over himself and others via his mastery of the proper folds and draping of his costume. Excessive or ostentatious clothing worn by both women and men were invoked as evidence of Oriental influence that introduced a threateningly effeminate luxury to Rome.

Chapter Two examines Tertullian's short oration *On the Pallium* as an instance of refashioning masculinity in opposition to Roman conceptions of manliness symbolized by the toga. Daniel-Hughes demonstrates how Tertullian recasts the semiotics of the *pallium* as the appropriately simple dress of the Christian man who does not seek political glory. In this speech, Tertullian reverses the established gendered connotations of the *pallium* and the toga, associating the latter with luxury and incontinence, while imbuing the *pallium* with discipline and virility. On Daniel-Hughes's reading, *On the Pallium* reflects "Tertullian's reconfigured masculinity [which] encompassed virtues, like patience and even submission, which were once conceived of in Roman gender ideology as feminized" (60). In spite of its absorption of "feminine" traits, Daniel-Hughes shows that Tertullian's construction of masculinity persists in its assertion of male privilege and female subordination.

Tertullian's two treatises *On the Apparel of Women* are the primary focus in Chapter Three, which Daniel-Hughes opens by quoting Tertullian's inflammatory accusation, "Don't you know that you are an Eve? Don't you know that you are the devil's gateway?" (63). She begins by attempting to reconcile this misogynist charge with Tertullian's "seeming commitment to the salvation of women and men alike," drawing on a selective reading of *On the Resurrection of the Dead*, *On the Flesh of Christ*, *On the Soul*, and *Against Marcion* to argue that Tertullian "suggested that a qualitative difference pertains to male and female fleshly bodies and souls that reflects and thus supports a gender economy figured in a hierarchical mode" (67). Daniel-Hughes reads the distinction between male and female flesh as actively informing Tertullian's understanding of the incarnation, in which men's flesh is remade in the sinless image of Christ, while women's flesh, conceived primarily as the locus of birth (and, therefore, the cause of death) persists in bearing the burden of shame. She reasons:

"A man's freedom results from the fact that no humility is incumbent upon Christ, after whom he is modeled. Christ's death unmoored the stain of sin from the flesh, his virginal flesh promises the very glory of heaven itself. What garb, indeed, could improve on that (Cor. 14.3-4)? [sic.] Yet a woman's flesh is not made in the image of Christ. Women have, like Mary, absorbed shame in their flesh—the price paid to preserve Christ's purity and his redemptive power. Their fleshly bodies stand, it seems, on the other side of the redemptive equation from Christ and men's own, as a testimony to the necessity of salvation" (72).

Daniel-Hughes proceeds to read the treatises *On the Apparel of Women* according to this gendered hierarchy, where men's flesh is symbolically charged with glory, women's with shame. Tertullian, she argues, insists "that women's moral decrepitude is revealed on their fleshly bodies" (73). Cosmetics, jewellery, and costly clothing is wasted, "tantamount to decorating something that is dead and dying" (76). According to Daniel-Hughes, Tertullian promotes modest dress as "the recitation of a woman's shame through its constraint" (82).

Concluding that "it is hard to imagine such hyperbole would persuade a female audience," Daniel-Hughes suggests that Christian women likely attached alternative meanings to their own adornment (82-83). Surveying sartorial artefacts and portrait busts, Daniel-Hughes concludes that "women enjoyed fashioning themselves as an assertion of their wealth and status" (83). Although maintaining that "there are countless reasons why [women] would don handsome clothing and ornamentation, and indeed, too, why they would not see such practices as incommensurate with their religious life" (90), Daniel-Hughes articulates only pleasure and the assertion of wealth and status. Given the strongly ascetic ethic attributed to second-century Christianity in many of our extant sources, Daniel-Hughes's claim that the women's adornment was not "incommensurate with their religious life" would be more

persuasive if buttressed by supporting evidence from early Christian texts or demonstrably Christian material culture.

Chapter Three ends with the speculation that Tertullian's criticism of extravagant female dress indicates an attempt to maintain power over a large and potentially threatening subset of his community consisting of wealthy women. This possibility is further explored in Chapter Four, which turns its attention to *On the Veiling of Virgins*. Daniel-Hughes rightly points out that the treatise hangs on the interpretation of scripture, namely, on the meaning of γυνή in 1 Corinthians 11. Tertullian aims to discredit his opponent's claim that virgins are not "women" according to the definition of the apostle Paul and, thus, continent women are not required to veil themselves in the Christian assembly. Daniel-Hughes is more successful in retrieving the voices of these unveilers than she was those of the ostentatious dressers, as she makes use of the *Gospel of Mary Magdalene*, the *Acts of Thecla*, and the *Martyrdom of Perpetua and Felicitas* to argue that Tertullian's opponents understood their sexual continence to mitigate against the femininity of their flesh. She helpfully explains how Tertullian puts Stoic materialist theory of vision to use, arguing that male gaze upon the unveiled head of a virgin is a form of penetration, so that "every public exposure is the experience of sexual violation to a good virgin" (111, citing *On the Veiling of Virgins*, 1). Likewise, Tertullian describes the experience of being seen as active, rather than passive, constituting a threat to the continence of the virgins' brothers in Christ. By urging virgins to remain veiled, Daniel-Hughes contends that Tertullian attempts to limit the possible significations of their flesh, so that it continues to be regarded by the community as embodying shame and requiring constraint and submission.

Carly Daniel-Hughes contributes a provocative monograph that will be of interest to scholars of gender in early Christian and Roman imperial contexts. Throughout her study, however, Daniel-Hughes's reading of Tertullian minimizes the occasional and rhetorical contexts of Tertullian's writings that have been emphasized by scholars such as Geoffrey Dunn.¹ Tertullian's claims are presented as revealing his fixed position on a given issue, rather than as occasional arguments intended to persuade an audience. For example, Daniel-Hughes takes Tertullian's claim in *On the Military Crown* that "the Christian man is as free as even Christ is" as indicative of a consistent theological system in which men (and men only) have already undergone the transformation of their flesh. Daniel-Hughes does not engage with the immediate context of the citation, the practice of donning laurel crowns signalling submission to military commanders, a practice that Tertullian's

1. Geoffrey D. Dunn, "Rhetoric and Tertullian's *De Virginibus Velandis*," *Vigilae Christianae* 59/1 (2005): 1-30.

Alexandrian contemporary, Clement, also condemns while making use of different arguments.²

Daniel-Hughes is to be commended for foregrounding the ways in which Tertullian constructs gender and employs those constructions in his rhetoric. As a result of her decision to read Tertullian's treatises through the lens of gender, however, Daniel-Hughes minimizes other factors that impinge upon Tertullian's argumentation in these texts. Thus, *On the Apparel of Women* is read primarily as the attempt by a man to control the practice of women, rather than, for example, as a proponent of asceticism railing against the temptations of artifice and luxury, despite the prominence of this theme in the work.³ Similarly, *On the Veiling of Virgins* is interpreted as the complaint of a misogynist rather than of a (Montanist?) rigorist interpreter of Paul. Further, Daniel-Hughes does not pose the question of whether some women may have agreed with Tertullian.⁴ The net result is that a reader unfamiliar with Tertullian's treatises would come away with a rather unbalanced impression of their contents.

Daniel-Hughes argues persuasively that Tertullian conceived of women's bodies as "perilous indicators of destruction and demise" more strongly associated with sin and death than those of men (116); whether the soteriological implications of that distinction are as extreme as she contends is left to the reader to determine. Still, Daniel-Hughes's monograph is a valuable contribution to the growing literature on the role of dress and adornment in the construction of early Christian identity.

2. *Paed.* II.8. Although Daniel-Hughes's decision to limit her study to the works of Tertullian is understandable, a comparison with Clement, who treats similar issues in *Paedagogus* II.8, 10–13, III.1–3 and *Quis dives salvetur?*, would have provided a fuller picture of this debate in late second-century Christianity.

3. See especially 2.9, where Tertullian refers to men who have "sealed themselves up to eunuchhood for the sake of the kingdom of God" and other mortifications of the flesh, including abstinence from wine and meat. I am also reminded of the famous quip of the Pythagorean Theano, who responded to a compliment on the beauty of her arms with the retort, "but they are not meant for public viewing." Plutarch, *Conjug. praec.* 142 D.

4. ". . . it is difficult to imagine a woman would comply with the advice offered in them or that she would willingly perform her shame and degradation" (72). This comment ignores Christian ascetics of both genders who have "performed their shame and degradation" in myriad ways over the centuries.