
The monograph under review, written as a doctorate in 1999 and later revised and supplemented, offers a searching analysis of the form and function of rhetoric in the Pascal-Pentecost cycle of the 12th century homilist Cyril of Turov, together with an examination of the Byzantine sources. Lunde scrutinizes eight festal homilies for the period from Palm Sunday to the Sunday before Pentecost, using the edition by Igor’ Erëmin [TODL 11-13,15 (1955-1958), reprinted as Literaturnoe nasledie Kirilla Turovskogo: Archeologičeskij obzor I izdanie tekstov in 1989]. All Slavonic fragments are accompanied by English translations, predominantly drawn from Simon Franklin’s *Sermon and Rhetoric of Kievan Rus’* [1991, reviewed by Francis Thomson in *Slavica Gandensia* 19], with minor alterations (e.g. p. 266, note 11) and critical remarks (e.g. p. 180, note 37). The study is positioned along the line that marks a shift in focus from philological and historical commentary towards the literary analysis of Cyril’s sermons. Lunde’s approach is clearly indebted to various developments in modern literary criticism, from structural linguistics to discourse analysis and communication theory. Questions of dating, attribution, and textual criticism are consciously left aside.

The *Introduction* (pp. 13-29) is partially dedicated to the scarce data concerning Cyril’s life, and Lunde should be credited for not trying to fill in the gap left by the sources, confining herself to the presentation of existing theories, from Simon Franklin’s statement that Cyril *probably existed* to the more detailed elaborations on the hagiographic *topoi* in his synaxarium vita. The problem of the ascription of texts to Cyril is dealt with succinctly, just as the dominant themes in previous scholarship. In her first chapter, *Rhetoric and Homiletics* (pp. 30-71), Lunde explores the various functions of rhetoric within the context of homiletics and hymnography. A general introduction to Christian preaching deals with the ambiguous Christian attitude towards rhetoric, the importance of typological interpretation and allegory, the implications of apophaticism for Christian rhetoric, and, especially, with the central role of *antithesis* in Christian discourse. In *Epideictic Rhetoric and Christian Homiletics* (pp. 72-84), the author creates a theoretical framework, starting with Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*, wherein she elaborates on the central aspects of epideictic and its relevance for homiletics.

Lunde’s study of *Tradition and Originality: Kirill’s Sources and Byzantine Homiletics* (pp. 85-121) is revealing. The author points to some problematic aspects of previous source-critical investigations, presenting a short overview of this major issue in scholarship since Michail Kačenovskij’s review in *Vestnik Evropy* of Konstantin Kalajdovič’s *editio princeps* [1821]. Lunde reassesses the findings of such scholars as Suchomlinov, Vinogradov, and Thomson, criticizing the criteria used for the identification of sources. She insists on the identification of the *tradition* wherein Cyril worked, rather than of isolated instances of verbal correspondence, and stresses the importance of the examination of *differences*, considering the search for similarities an obstacle to the study of Cyril’s possible originality. This allows her to label some of the earlier ascriptions as misleading, and to point out considerable dissimilarities, especially in rhetorical organization, focus, and meaning, between Cyril’s sermons and previously signalled sources. Central is Lunde’s conviction that the sermons by Cyril of Turov – often associated with John Chrysostom’s work – must be seen in the light of the *post-Chrysostomian* tradition of the so called ‘dramatic homilies’, represented by such homilists as Severian of Gabala, Proclus of Constantinople, Basil of Seleucia, Leontius of Constantinople, Andrew of Crete, and others. Some of their sermons appear to have entered the Slav lands as *pseudo-Chrysostomia*. It is clear that the setting of Cyril’s sermons within this new literary context raises the question of the extent to which these homilists’ works were known in Kievan Rus’. The preliminary exposition, for each of the eight homilies, of Slavonic
translations of Greek sermons for the same feast-days and with the same traditional elements, particularly from the before-mentioned tradition, then makes up a logical and valuable addition to the original premise of Lunde’s work (pp. 107-118).

The short chapter on *Kirill’s Metadiscursive Reflections* (pp. 122-131) functions as a link between the two parts of the monograph. The second part is devoted to concrete analyses of Cyril’s sermons, approached each time from a different angle, separately dealing with some of his main rhetorical strategies. Lunde’s functionalist approach constantly highlights the close connection between theology, the rhetorical development of meaning, and comprehension. The study of the Aspects of Amplification (pp.132-160) deals with rhythmical organization, repetition, variation and parallelism. *Speech and Dialogue* (pp. 161-218) draws the attention to the occurrences of direct speech in the Turovian homilist’s work (a phenomenon becoming increasingly important in Byzantine homiletics from the 4th century onwards), while the chapter Quotation (pp. 219-239) is not so much a systematical analysis of all biblical quotations, as an examination of the function of quotations from a rhetorical viewpoint. In *The Preacher and his Audience* (pp. 240-253), the interaction with the congregation is discussed, stressing the centrality of performance in the context of the Eucharist. The way the liturgical setting affects the homiletic work in terms of rhetorical focus is further elaborated upon in *The Rhetoric of Paradox* (pp. 254-271), i.e. how the central Christian paradox of Christ’s death and resurrection – the ultimate theme of the cycle as a whole – is rhetorically developed.

A useful Index of names and subjects is added (pp. 293-301). The splitting up of bibliographical references, possibly due to the later additions, in References (pp. 118-121) and Works Cited (pp. 275-292), is somewhat confusing.

A minor remark concerns the transcription of proper names: when using anglicized forms such as Andrew of Crete, Clement of Alexandria, John the Exarch etc., why then not Cyril of Turov, Clement of Ochrid, Theodosius of the Caves instead of the transliterations Kirill, Klim, Feodosij? Some smaller errors should be noted: ‘multiplicity’ (p. 5, repeated on p. 211); ‘Eremin choses as…’ (p. 19 note 30); ‘Gouden Horn’ for ‘Hoorn’ (p. 63 note 124); “… where not, I have notes this” (p. 108); ‘предступлением’ for ‘предступлением’ (p. 154); ‘полупьщи’ for ‘полупьщи’ (p. 213). “отроцы скоро течаху” is translated “young men ran softly”, for ‘swiftly’? (p. 216); ‘с мюроносицами’ has not been translated (p. 247).

Altogether, the innovative approach and the new insights offered make this study a valuable contribution to the scholarship on Cyril of Turov. It is to be hoped that Lunde’s invitation to further comparative examination of the Slavonic homiletic corpus will not remain unanswered.
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