

radical, Eunomians, to whom nothing was mysterious, but does not apply to earlier Arians. Eusebius of Caesarea uses the same argument, and so does the Second Creed (the „Blasphemy“) of Sirmium of 357. Again, Dr. Person (here going astray with a large number of distinguished scholars, including Harnack and Kattenbusch) fails to distinguish between the baptismal creed and the rule of faith, which was a much more fluid and variable phenomenon than the bare, summarizing baptismal creed (pp. 81, 148). Nor does he realize (p. 101) how fragile is the evidence that Origen applied the term *homoousios* to the Son.

His treatment of the Council of Ephesus is much briefer and sketchier than his account of the Council of Nicaea. Indeed, the work might have been improved had he omitted this chapter and filled out the others. He has no difficulty in showing how unfair, hasty and unsubstantiated were the accusations which this Council made against Nestorius and in concluding that Cyril and Nestorius represented, not an orthodox and an heretical viewpoint, but two different ways of interpreting the Bible. And his general conclusions about Scripture and tradition, as far as any conclusions can be drawn from the far from abundant evidence about Nicaea, are sound. The ancients placed Scripture first and tradition second as sources, but were ready to interpret Scripture by tradition, and the two acted on each other in what Person calls a „Dialogic“ (? dialectical) way. This is, in short, a useful book for the student of patristic literature.

But it could have been a better book than it is, because its presentation is marred by a number of careless and unnecessary faults. Dr. Person, to his credit, quotes the original Greek of his sources freely; I counted no less than thirty mistakes in the Greek. Less excusably, I counted at least 35 mistakes in the English text. It is also possible to detect some curious spellings or expressions: „concensus“ on p. 37 (this is not an American mode of spelling but a mistake); „Syrian-speaking“ (? Syriac-speaking) on p. 49; „publically“ (a *vox nihili* for „publicly“) p. 136; „data“ as a singular noun on pp. 142 and 158; „Pneumatomacher“ (German-Greek?) on p. 190. Note 160 on p. 127 is displaced and inapplicable. A long sentence on p. 111, beginning „With important bishops...“ is quite obscure, for the reader cannot determine to whom „they“ (the subject) refers. Another sentence of baffling obscurity occurs on p. 160, n. 1. The clause on p. 56 „With the problem of transportation being what it was“ is deplorably clumsy, and the expression on p. 174 (Eusebius) „was not terribly pleased about accepting the *homoousios*“ made your reviewer think that he was reading a student's essay.

Manchester

R. P. C. Hanson

Lorenzo Perrone - *La Chiesa di Palestina e le Controversie Christologiche: Testi e ricerche di Scienze religiose*, Brescia/Paideia editrice, 1980, pp. 335, Price 12.000 lire, stiff paper cover.

From the early years of the fifth century down to the Arab invasions, Palestine played a peculiar role in the ecclesiastical and doctrinal controversies of the Roman east. While Egypt was staunchly anti-Chalcedonian and most of Syria became so, Palestine at first sight presents the historian with a picture of baffling inconsistency. Immediately after the Council of Chalcedon in 451 feeling against the Definition equalled that prevailing in Alexandria. The Patriarch Juvenal was forced to flee and for two years his place was taken by the monk Theodosius. Thereafter, however a gradual change took place. While many prominent monks remained anti-Chalcedonian, the bishops followed the lead of the Patriarchs Martyrius (478-486) and Sallustius (486-494) and moved towards a mediating position between the Chalcedonians and their opponents. In the first decades of the sixth century, however, Palestine opted firmly for Chalcedon and was responsible with the clergy and monks of Syria II, for initiating the downfall of Severus of Antioch in 518. In Justinian's reign Palestine, though loyal to Chalcedon, became the centre for a revival of Origenism as well as the home of one of the great theologians of the east, Leontius of Jerusalem, who converted the Two-Natures concept of Chalcedon into a dynamic mystical theology capable of withstanding the argu-

ments in favour of Monophysitism. How and why did these developments take place?

Dr. Perrone attempts to answer these questions in his study of the Palestinian Church from 431–553, published under the auspices, of the Instituto per le Scienze religiose at Bologna. He writes as an historian, aiming at unravelling the political problems involving Christianity in Palestine that accompanies the doctrinal controversies. He sees Palestine as an excellent observation post whence to follow the evolution of the latter. The five sections into which he divides his study namely, Palestine between Ephesus and Chalcedon, the generation of „minimal Chalcedonianism“, the re-affirmation of Chalcedon, the development of „integral Chalcedonianism“, and theology and spirituality in Palestine between Chalcedon and the Fifth General Council in 553, faithfully reflect these aims.

Perrone follows the story as told by Zacharias Rhetor, Evagrius and, above all by Cyril of Scythopolis. In outline, it is relatively familiar but it is valuable to watch the situation unfold from the Palestinian point of view. Undoubtedly, the author's main contribution lies with his first chapter. Taking as his starting point the synod held at Jerusalem on 13 September 400 (the annual celebration of the dedication of the Church of the Resurrection on 13 September 335) he shows the main problems affecting the Church in Palestine in the next century and a half were already in embryo at that meeting. Origenism, the influence of the doctrines of Apollinaris of Laodicea and above all, the relations between the Christians and the other major religious communities, the Jews and Samaritans all formed part of the agenda. The Palestinian scene with its cosmopolitan influx of pilgrims, its ever-increasing numbers of monks, its developed liturgy and articulate theologians is excellently set. The author shows that on the whole, the Palestinians, while accepting the *Logos-Sarx* concept of the person of Christ and favouring its Alexandrian interpretation, were consistent in their opposition to Apollinarism. The student will be grateful in particular for the author's demonstration of this from a comparison of Hesychius of Jerusalem's exegesis of Leviticus 14,7 ff. (the two goats) compared with that of Cyril of Alexandria. Juvenal's support of Eutyches in 449 he points out also, was notably less warm than that afforded by Dioscorus, and was in part motivated by his fierce ambition to win for Jerusalem the status of a patriarchal see. A generation later, he might have been like the Patriarch Martyrius, a man of the *Henotikon*.

Jerusalem however, lacked the power on its own to sustain its pretensions. The author rightly points to the fact Christianity did not succeed in becoming the majority religion of Palestine before the fifth century, and correctly emphasises the role of the increasing number of monastic communities in bringing this about. Monasticism however, was far less of an indigenous growth in Palestine than it was in Egypt and Syria. Many of the Palestinian monastic leaders were immigrants and also men of intellectual stature. Thus, Euthymius the Chalcedonian leader, came from Melitene near the Armenian frontier while his opponent Peter the Iberian was from the royal house of the kingdom of Georgia. Whatever their theological leanings, they reflected a cosmopolitan outlook and they depended for their security on imperial patronage and troops. It is not surprising that we read of Saba's monastery petitioning Justinian c. 531 for a fort for protection against Saracen raiders (*Vita Sabae*, ch. 72) or that Photion, described as a „senior monk“ took the field in 564 against Samaritan insurgents (John of Nikiou, *Chron.* 95.17).

In what is intended primarily as a political and ecclesiastical survey this aspect of the religious history of Palestine needs stressing. The brittle nature of the Christian position, ever threatened by hostile forces explains much of the feverish activity and apparent inconsistency of the monastic leaders. More space too, might have been devoted to the internal life of the monasteries and to the personal influence exercised by some of the monks on the patriarch, notably by Sabas on the Patriarch Sallustius, in a Chalcedonian sense. Monastic history in Palestine is dominated by powerful personalities waging their private wars for or against Chalcedon. Here one would draw attention to Dervas Chitty's *The Desert a City*

(Oxford 1966). The author's handling of the complicated doctrinal issues (Ch. 5) fits in well with his survey of the general ecclesiastical history of Palestine, without displacing the acknowledged masters in this field, such as Halleux and Meyendorff.

All in all, in focussing attention on Palestine and bringing together and explaining many of the political as well as the doctrinal factors that took Palestine out of the Monophysite sphere, the author has rendered real service to scholarship. A regional study of the Christological controversy such as his, has long been needed. Valuable too, are his insights into the characters of the successive patriarchs of Jerusalem in a situation where personality counted. His fair-minded and well-written study will remain a standard work on Palestine in the century when its religious leaders exercised no little influence on the development of Christian orthodoxy in the Byzantine empire.

Glasgow

W.H.C. Frend

Rudolf Lorenz, *Arius judaizans? Untersuchungen zur dogmenschichtlichen Einordnung des Arius (= Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte, Band 31)*, Göttingen (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht) 1980. 227 S., kt. DM 78,-.

Nachdem die in den letzten beiden Jahrzehnten neu belebte Erforschung der Ursprünge des Arianismus¹ im wesentlichen außerhalb Deutschlands vor sich ging, meldet sich mit diesem Buch die deutsche protestantische Patristik hierzu zu Wort, und zwar in einer Weise, die der gespannten Aufmerksamkeit aller Interessierten von vornherein sicher sein kann.

Das Buch setzt ein mit einem ausführlichen forschungsgeschichtlichen Überblick (Kap. I: Die Erforschung der Ursprünge des Arianismus), welcher über die Anfänge der Dogmengeschichtsschreibung in der Aufklärung noch hinausgehend immer wieder auch auf die antike Polemik und auf die Nennung von Traditionen durch die streitenden Parteien von einst zurückgreift, an die diese anknüpft. Folgt sodann (in Kap. II) eine äußerst hilfreiche synoptische Darbietung der wichtigsten Ariussezzerpte bei Alexander und Athanasius von Alexandrien mit anschließenden (einleuchtenden) Erwägungen zur Abfassungszeit der Thalia; wie ja überhaupt die Feststellung, „daß für die Auslegung der Fragmente des Arius, abgesehen von den großen Schlagwörtern des arianischen Streites, nicht so viel geschehen“ sei, „wie man es bei einem so häufig behandelten Thema annehmen sollte“, als Begründung für die erneute monographische Befassung mit dem Gegenstand dient (s. Vorwort, S. 7). Auf dieser Grundlage wird (in Kap. III) eine „vorläufige Bestimmung des theologischen Ansatzes bei Arius“ versucht, welche der Verf. in den folgenden Kapiteln zu bewähren bestrebt ist, indem er minutiös den bislang namhaft gemachten – und das ist in der Tat gleichbedeutend mit: fast allen denkbaren – Traditionen in ihrem vermeintlichen oder wirklichen Einfluß auf Arius nachgeht: so „im Vergleich arianischer Sätze mit der origenistischen“ – wohlbemerkt: nicht nur der origenischen, sondern beispielsweise auch der von Dionysius von Alexandrien repräsentierten² – „Logos- und Trinitätslehre“ (Kap. IV), in der Näherbe-

¹ Vgl. hierzu u. a. meinen Artikel „Arianismus“, TRE 3, 692–719, mit weiterer Literatur.

² Da das Manuskript nach Auskunft des Vorwortes Ende 1977 abgeschlossen war, konnte auf die abweichende Ansicht W. A. Bienerts (Dionysius von Alexandrien. Zur Frage des Origenismus im 3. Jahrhundert [= PTS 21], Berlin 1978) zwar noch hingewiesen (S. 94, A. 222), die Diskussion mit B. aber nicht mehr aufgenommen werden. Ich bin freilich zutiefst skeptisch, ob die *communis opinio* vom „Origenismus“ des Dionysius nach dieser – ganz gewiß verdienstvollen! – Untersuchung als „widerlegt“ zu betrachten ist (gegen W. A. Bienert, *Das vornicaenische ὁμοούσιος* als Ausdruck der Rechtgläubigkeit, in dieser Zeitschr., Jhg. 90, 1979, S. 170, A. 82), kann dies hier jedoch nicht vertiefen.