

G.-M. de Durand, OP (Hrsg.): *Cyrille d'Alexandrie: Deux Dialogues Christologiques*. Texte Critique, Traduction et Notes (= Sources Chrétiennes, No. 97); Paris (Les Editions du Cerf) 1964. 556 S., kart. fr. 45.-.

Except for the publication of Greek fragments or translations into Syriac, this is the first serious attempt to edit any of the writings of Cyril of Alexandria since the monumental work of Eduard Schwartz in his *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*. Prior to Schwartz's edition, which only included writings of Cyril extant in the conciliar acts (letters, polemical and dogmatic writings against Nestorius, *et al.*), the most recent full scale work was done by P. E. Pusey in the nineteenth century. His seven-volume edition included the *Commentary on the Minor Prophets* (2 vols.), the *Commentary on John* (3 vols.), and a number of dogmatic writings and fragments. This edition has recently appeared in photographic reprint under the auspices of *Culture et Civilisation* in Belgium. The present volume, edited by a Dominican of the *L'Institut d'Études Médiévales* in Montreal, is a new edition of two Christological texts including notes and the first French translation of these works. The one, *Dialogus de Incarnatione Unigeniti* (DI), is an early work coming at the beginning of the controversy with Nestorius (or before this according to Durand); the other, *Quod Unus Christus sit* (QUX), is a mature and comprehensive treatise written late in Cyril's life.

The texts and translation are preceded by a lengthy historical, literary, philological and theological introduction (pp. 8-185). D begins with a brief, but thorough and well documented, biographical sketch (7-34) in which Cyril's strengths as well as his manifest limitations become clear. Cyril was a stubborn, immovable, and often narrowminded churchman and thinker and a captive of the Alexandrian theological tradition; he was a heir to many of the unpleasant traits of his uncle and predecessor, Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria. But he was also a remarkably religious and spiritual man whose writings often reach sublime heights. He is totally dominated by the mystery of Christ and his thought orbits about a markedly Christological center which synthesizes everything in terms of Christ: theology, exegesis, piety.

The DI is closely related to another writing of Cyril, the *Recta Fide ad Theodosium* (RF). In fact these two writings are really different editions of the same work. In Chapter 2 (35-57) D sets out to clarify this relation. Traditionally the RF was considered to be earlier (Pusey, Mahé), and the DI was thought to be a second edition of this work redone in dialogue form. RF is one of three works addressed to the imperial household in 430; the others were *Recta Fide ad Augustas*, and *Recta Fide ad Dominas*. Since the DI touches on questions of a "dualistic Christology", it seemed likely that it was published after the beginning of exchanges between Cyril and Nestorius. D proposes a new dating and order, suggesting that the DI was written before the controversy began, was held in reserve by Cyril, and then reworked into RF at the time Cyril wrote the works to the imperial household.

This view is based on literary and theological arguments. He first notes a number of differences between the RF and the other two writings to the imperial court. In these Cyril polemicizes against a union *κατ' ἀθανάτων*; he affirms the equivalence between *φύσις* and *ὑπόστασις* in Christology; he frequently criticizes *συνάφεια* as a term for the union. None of the questions appear in the RF. How does one, asks D, explain the difference in these writings if the RF comes from the same period and a similar situation?

D, then proceeds to compare RF with DI. A number of the so called "concrete" expressions are replaced by abstract expressions: for example "complete man" becomes "humanity like ours", "Word united to perfect man", becomes "humanity such as ours". But Cyril is not wholly consistent and Durand takes note of this (page 46). Cyril also seems to eliminate terms in the RF which would suggest a mixture or combination, thereby protecting himself as he criticizes Nestorius. The

term *theotokos*, only used infrequently in Cyril's earlier writings, is absent from DI, but it appears in RF four times.

On the literary side, D notes a number of compounds of *θρόσκειω* which are replaced in RF by other words less exaggerated and perhaps less vulgar (e. g. *ἀναθρόσκειν* becomes *ἀναφοιτᾶν*). This, however, could be explained by difference in the form of the two writings; one is a dialogue and the other is not. Further, a number of statements such as "some would say", *et al.* seem to suggest a carry over from the dialogue. But D correctly observes that this is very typical of Cyril's style. This same practise also occurs in Cyril's commentaries. D still feels the number of times this kind of construction appears here is excessive. This summary does not include all the arguments brought forth by Durand, but it indicates the tenor of his remarks.

The argument is appealing, though it is not fully convincing. The DI is a typical when compared with Cyril's other writings before 428. Prior to this time he wrote either exegetical writings or works on the Trinity. Why should he, as a working bishop, write a dialogue on Christology and not even publish it? D fails to give an explanation of the immediate situation which would have occasioned such a writing. Most of the writings of the fathers, except commentaries and other exegetical writings, were written for specific purposes. But the original purpose of the dialogue is not sufficiently clarified here. D has, however, shown the difficulty of the traditional dating and made a good case for the consideration of an earlier date.

The QUX is dated toward the end of Cyril's life (58-80). D. takes this writing as a kind of personal theological statement of Cyril against the Christology of the "school" of Antioch. For example, in a number of places Cyril seems to be refuting statements of Antiochene theologians such as Diodore and Theodore (59 ff.). But D. thinks it was written prior to the *Contra Diodorum et Theodorum*, and dates it in 435-36 at the latest. With the dates of the two writings established he turns to the main thesis of his introduction: if the DI is Cyril's earliest Christological writing, and the QUX his latest, we should, on the basis of these works be able to determine what is constant and what flexible in Cyril's thought (80). An interesting question. How does it work out?

D. deals with this question by a lengthy discussion of Cyril's theology in the introduction (81-150) and by extensive notes accompanying the texts. In his view the proper starting point for Cyril is the *mystery* of Christ. "Adore the mystery in silence." Though the element of mystery permeates Cyril's thought, he does not refuse to pursue the problems raised by reflection on the person of Christ. In fact, says D., one can discern "two movements" in Cyril's writings: the drive to analyze, explain and articulate the mystery; and the refusal to say anything which would wrench the mystery out of its proper context and reduce it to human language and thought. These two movements are balanced by a deep and rich current of soteriology which informs all of Cyril's writings and thought. To interpret his Christology, then, we must see it within the economy of salvation and not as an isolated problem concerning the "doctrine of Christ". For Cyril the economy almost always means the theory of "recapitulation" for he inevitably links redemption with the fallen creation and sees redemption as re-creation. At the same time he is almost wholly oblivious of eschatology and does not complement his concern for the first creation with an equal concern for the consumation of all things. Eschatology plays only a peripheral role in his thinking.

In a closer analysis of DI Durand shows more clearly how the "two movements" of Cyril's thought actually work out in his writings. Here Cyril discusses a number of ancient heresies which have, in his opinion, offered abortive solutions to the Christological problem: docetism, Apollinarism, dualistic Christology, *et al.* These solutions, says Cyril, do not give adequate expression to the mystery, for they do not do justice to the biblical data. Cyril shows a positive disinterest in "solving" the Christological problem or formulating a consistent Christology. He simply

refuses to discuss the "how" and remains content with reflecting on the Biblical statements about Christ and interpreting these soteriologically.

Though questions of a „dualistic Christology“ appear in DI, it becomes apparent when one turns to QUX that Cyril is much more interested in this question in the later writings. In the DI the „dualistic Christology“ was only one of several questions under discussion; in the QUX it occupies his full attention. Comparing this work with the earlier, D notes a number of important clarifications in terminology. In the DI the terms used for the union are still flexible and imprecise; for example he freely uses *σύμβασις* and *συνδρομή* (121), but in the QUX he relies exclusively on one term (*ζῆνσις*). For the history of Christology this is a significant observation, for it minimizes the terminological differences between late fourth and early fifth century fathers – a factor historians have tended to emphasize rather than minimize.

In conclusion D discusses what he calls the general character of Cyril's theology. Cyril had the capacity of posing new problems, but he frequently resorts to old axioms to deal with them. He was not really capable of reacting in a fresh and original way to new circumstances. In part this confirms the opinion of Liébaert (*Doctrine Christologique*) who argued that Cyril never really went beyond Athanasius; but D has shown that within his original frame of reference Cyril did refine, clarify, and extend his position. Though D has much to say about Cyril's exegesis, he does not integrate these concerns into the judgment of Cyril as a theologian. If exegesis is part of theology, it may well be that Cyril's originality as well as his ability to develop and go beyond his predecessors may be found here.

The texts of the two writings are based on the same Greek manuscripts used by Pusey in the nineteenth century. But D has supplemented these manuscripts by a number of Syriac and Armenian translations (Pusey had access to only one Syriac manuscript). D also uses a number of fragments from the *catenae* and *florilegia*, though Pusey did much of this work already in his edition. In establishing the text of DI, D has greater confidence in the fourteenth century Florentian manuscript (*Mediceus Laurentianus* Plut. V cod. 35; B) than in the 11th century Munich manuscript (*Monacensis graecus* 398). Pusey was more inclined to favor the latter. In the case of QUX D uses the versions extensively, translating them in the apparatus.

The notes go far beyond anything Pusey attempted, and are far superior to any of the notes we have on Cyril's writings. They are thorough but not excessively long, to the point, and immensely helpful in interpreting the text in light of Cyril's other works. Perhaps the greatest value of the notes lies in D's obvious interest in the Biblical background of Cyril's thought. These two writings are littered with biblical citations and at times the QUX reads like a commentary on a series of selected Biblical texts. D has collected numerous parallels from Cyril's commentaries as well as from the exegetical writings of Antiochene theologians. This is one of the most attractive features of this volume. The translation itself reads well, and, though not excessively literal, accurately reproduces Cyril's Greek.

There are six Excursus. 1. Sources for Cyril's expressions and ideas. D mentions Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Athanasius, Didymus. However, it is doubtful whether Didymus had any significant influence on Cyril. As the recent edition of Didymus' *Commentary on Zachariah* (*Sur Zacharie*, ed. Louis Doutreleau, „Sources Chrétiennes“, No. 84, III Vols; Paris, 1962) shows, Cyril studiously avoids Didymus, almost in the same fashion as Origen seems to avoid Clement. Perhaps it would have been useful to explore the relation between Cyril and Irenaeus, especially because of Cyril's fondness for the idea of „recapitulation“. 2. The Armenian version of RF 3. On the treatise *Adversus nolentes confiteri sanctam Virginem esse Deiparam*. 4. Use of the term *φύσις*. This is actually an index of this term in these two writings. 5. Cyril's style. D relies on the earlier work of Vaccari and the remarks of F. L. Cross at the Byzantine Congress, 1948. D's own examples tend to confirm their conclusions: use of rare and archaic forms, Attic for Hellenistic spellings (*σμιχρο* – for *μικρο* –), many terms from ancient poets, and a high percentage of compound words. D thinks Cyril is almost always clear and intelligible if

not always pleasing to read. 6. The Bible in the dialogues. D is primarily interested in which books are cited, how cited (from memory; O. T. passages in N. T. form, e. g. Hab. 1:5 according to Acts 13:41), etc. He observes that N.T. citations predominate, even though Cyril is quite willing to read the O.T. Christologically. This could be important, for it suggests that when it comes to a serious discussion with an Antiochene opponent, Cyril turns to the N.T. where there will be less possibility of difference of opinion on exegetical matters. D also observes that John is cited more frequently in DI and Hebrews in QUX. Is this because the respective commentaries were written about the same time as the dialogues?

Finally he appends a table of congruence between the Migne-Aubert edition and the present text, a Scriptural index, index of some Greek words, and an index of persons and things. The Scriptural index is quite complete, but the index of persons and things is almost useless. Why, for example, list 16 references to M. Richard and overlook Grillmeier; or why give 7 references for F. Loofs and omit Hefele and Anastasius of Sinai?

In conclusion, D has not only given us a fine edition of two important works of Cyril, but he has gone a long way in helping scholars interpret Cyril's thought. This is more than a critical edition; it is also a short monograph on Cyril's Christology. In it we see something of the richness of Cyril's theology as well as its profoundly Biblical orientation. This last point is worth emphasizing, for the relation between Cyril's theology and his exegesis has been surprisingly neglected by scholars. D has done a great service to patristic studies by making these texts available and shedding fresh light on their interpretation. Hopefully, Cyril's thought will appear a bit different when it is ground through the mills of future historians.

Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

Robert L. Wilken

Mittelalter

Theodor Wolpers: Die englische Heiligenlegende des Mittelalters. Eine Formgeschichte des Legendenerzählens von der spätantiken lateinischen Tradition bis zur Mitte des 16. Jahrhunderts (= Buchreihe der Anglia 10). Tübingen (M. Niemeyer) 1964. XV, 470 S., 6 Abb., 8 Tafeln, geb. DM 51.--

C'est surtout le sous-titre qui caractérise le but qu'a poursuivi M. Wolpers: *Eine Formgeschichte des Legendenerzählens* et au terme de son effort, l'auteur nous explique lui-même une dernière fois sous quel angle précis il a entrepris son enquête: „Es war das Anliegen der geschichtlichen Untersuchung, die beharrenden und die sich wandelnden Strukturen und Formen des Erzählens in den englischen Heiligenlegenden vom frühen bis zum späten Mittelalter und in einigen repräsentativen lateinischen Viten zu erfassen und aus den Faktoren der jeweiligen Darbietungssituation, insbesondere aus den zentralen Erbauungstendenzen, zu erklären“ (p. 409).

Pour mieux montrer la nouveauté de ses recherches, M. W. retrace avec beaucoup d'érudition l'histoire des „études hagiographiques durant les cinquante dernières années: travaux du P. Delehaye et de savants allemands comme L. Zopf, H. Günther, J. G. Herder, O. Katann, G. Müller, A. Jolles. Les préoccupations historiques et littéraires évoluent avec le temps; pour bien des raisons, on comprend pourquoi le P. Delehaye s'est surtout intéressé à la valeur historique des textes hagiographiques; mais il n'ignorait pas l'importance des genres littéraires. De plus – et ceci mérite d'être rappelé –, parlant du *choix des textes à publier* dans les *Acta Sanctorum*, il écrivait: „A ne considérer que le côté historique, bien des suppressions se justifieraient aisément. L'intérêt littéraire réclame au contraire la multiplication des textes, et l'on ne peut nier que les volumes des *Acta* où l'on s'est le plus largement