

des 5. Jh. erscheint diese Usurpation als vornehmlich religiös bestimmte Auseinandersetzung, in deren Verlauf die stadtrömische Aristokratie unter Nicomachus Flavianus ihre letzte Chance sah, „die freie Ausübung ihrer Kulte wieder durchzusetzen“ (S. 134). Theodosius aber, so heißt es weiter, hielt damals die Zeit für gekommen, das Heidentum energisch zu bekämpfen, was durch die Verschärfung der Heidendgesetzgebung besonders deutlich geworden sei. Es kann kein Zweifel sein, daß die religiöse Komponente für einzelne heidnische Senatoren eine wichtige Rolle spielte, aber andererseits ist J. Szidat recht zu geben, der betont, daß die Erhebung des Eugenius „sich weder in ihrem Verlauf als eine vornehmlich religiös bestimmte Auseinandersetzung darstellt, noch in ihrer Wirkung, die sie auf die weitere Entwicklung des Heidentums hatte, ein Wendepunkt ist“.<sup>4</sup> Dies wurde sie erst unter dem Eindruck der Barbareneinfälle des 5. Jh., vor allem der Eroberung Roms durch Alarich, sowohl für den Heiden Zosimus wie für den Christen Rufin.

Diese wenigen Beispiele dürften genügen für den Nachweis, wie wenig es selbst heute möglich ist, das reichhaltige Material auf einen einheitlichen Nenner zu bringen. Gerade weil auf Theodosius zahlreiche Lobreden existieren, wogegen lediglich bei Zosimus (auf Eunapius zurückgehend) eine negative Charakteristik erscheint, fällt es schwer, zu einem historisch abgesicherten Urteil zu gelangen. Um so begrüßenswerter ist es, daß Lippold, aus dessen Feder auch der umfangreiche RE Artikel über Theodosius stammt<sup>5</sup>, ein Buch geschrieben hat, das sowohl als Arbeitsinstrument für Fachkollegen und Studenten, aber auch als einführende Darstellung für weitere Kreise seinen Zweck voll erfüllt. Die zur 1. Auflage hinzugekommenen 14 Abbildungen (mit Abbildungsverzeichnis), die beiden Karten über das Imperium Romanum um 390 bzw. über Konstantinopel um 400 n. Chr., die knapp gehaltenen, in der 2. Auflage vermehrten Anmerkungen, eine Zeittafel sowie eine nach Quellen und Literatur getrennte Bibliographie erhöhen den Wert des Ganzen.<sup>6</sup> Man wünschte sich mehr Bücher dieser Art über herausragende Gestalten der römischen Geschichte.

Wendelstein

Richard Klein

Les Homélie's Festales d'Hésychius de Jérusalem by Michel Aubineau. 2 volumes 1978 and 1980. I *Les Homélie's I-XV*; II *Les Homélie's XVI-XXI et Tables de deux Volumes*. LXXV+1008 pp. No. 59 in the series *Subsidia Hagiographica*. Société des Bollandistes 24 Boulevard Saint-Michel, B-1040, Brussels.

This fine work, the outcome of six years of labour, brings together in Greek text with accompanying French translation and rich documentation, the known surviving sermons for feast days in the ancient Jerusalem calendar by Hesy-chius, priest and leading preacher of the church there during the first half of the 5th century. The slender information we have on Hesy-chius' life and career is summarised on pages XIII-XX of the Introduction to volume I. He was remembered as a brilliant preacher and expositor (a handful of lengthy works of exegesis, notably a commentary on Leviticus in Latin translation - *P. G.* 93, 787-1180 - and one on Isaiah - ed. M. Faulhaber - along with Psalm commentaries, survive and are in need of modern edition and translation) and, less clearly, as an opponent of Theodore of Mopsuestia in his *Ecclesiastical History*, a fragment of which had the honour of quotation at the Fifth General Council (553) - *A.C.O.* 4, 1 p. 90. This last (a piece of polemic) does not leave one with much regret at the loss of the rest, it must be admitted. His doctrinal sympathies lay with Cyril of Ale-

<sup>4</sup> J. Szidat: Die Usurpation des Eugenius, *Historia* XXVIII 1979 508.

<sup>5</sup> Theodosius I. RE Suppl. XIII 837-961 (1973).

<sup>6</sup> Als störende Druckfehler seien vermerkt: S. 165 Barbarisch (statt barbarisch), S. 192 A 272 Dauta O. (statt Daur a. O.), 193 A 282 in Sophonicam (statt Sophoniam), S. 193 A 290 Le pretre (statt Le prêtre), 203 f. Constantinus II. (Kaiser v. 337 bis 361) statt Constantius II.

xandria, whom he may well have met at Jerusalem in 438. Père Aubineau rejects the testimony of Pelagius *In def. iii cap 2* (cited p. LXXV) that Hesychius wrote against Leo's *Tome* and the Council of Chalcedon. Clearly this report conflicts with the esteem in which Hesychius was held by the rigorously pro-Chalcedonian Cyril of Scythopolis (see pages XV and LXXV). Perhaps one might see in Pelagius' statement the memory of some indiscreet initial support by Hesychius for Theodosius, the fierce opponent of Chalcedon, who temporarily ousted Juvenal from Jerusalem after a violent campaign. However that may be, Hesychius' interest for us here does not lie in his church-political associations or in any doctrinal 'points' that may be extracted from these sermons. Section VI of the Introduction to vol. I (*Quelques aperçus sur la théologie d'Hésychius*) neatly summarises all that needs to be said. Rather we have here a magnificent preacher, clearly in demand on great occasions because he was able to grace them with discourses couched in ornate and thrilling language. These sermons are not at all pieces of controversial divinity; indeed they deliberately avoid contentious issues. When they polemicize, it is against conventional enemies like the Jews, about whom all Hesychius' hearers would be agreed that they had persecuted the prophets, denied the Christ and so on. They are sermons composed in the grand manner, full of rhetorical gestures: repetitions leading to climaxes, pieces of imaginary dialogue between sacred personages, elaborated internal rhyming schemes, neologisms or at least unusual words and (*ni fallor*) carefully designed prose rhythms. Perhaps the nearest equivalent to them in the post-classical world would be something not literary but musical: set-pieces by Vivaldi or Handel, for example, in which individuality of sentiment yields to the demands of the great public occasion. Not that they are hackneyed or common-place in thought or expression (far from it) but they are very similar in manner – again like the big choral fugues of Handel. The reviewer had to read them in the worst possible way, *seriatim*; but they should, of course, be savoured individually.

The similarity of manner is one, but only one, clue used by Père Aubineau in the establishment of Hesychius' authentic corpus. The work here has been done convincingly and Père Aubineau's arguments for the genuineness of the first 16 homelies, the doubtful character of no 17 and the spuriousness of the last 4 seem solid. Each homily is given a careful introductory assessment in which its claim to genuineness is looked at, its content and construction examined and its original setting deduced. In these individual introductions there is much to admire in Père Aubineau's wide learning and above all in the sympathetic analysis he gives of each piece to display its finer points. Hesychius could not have found a more diligent or loving first editor, as Père Aubineau is of most of his pieces printed here.

The *spuria* are interesting too. The two pieces on Longinus the Centurion at the crucifixion (nos. XIX and XX) show an early stage in the development of the legend and throw some light on the piety of the periods to which they belong. The second, curiously, incorporates a feature well-known in ghost-stories viz, the spirit unquiet because it lacks a proper burial – in this case the headless ghost of Longinus demands the deposition of the head with the rest of the body. No. XXI, on St Luke, has interesting points of contact (explored by Père Aubineau) with Proclus' *Hom. XV* and with the antimarcionite prologue to Luke.

Liturgists, specialists in late Greek rhetoric and in the transmission of manuscripts will, it goes without saying, find much of importance for them here. What these pieces give the non-specialist Church historian is, as it were, a window upon the Church of Jerusalem assembled for high celebrations. They can look in upon, and listen to, the Church of Jerusalem at prayer in a particularly interesting period. They will find little here that directly enlarges our knowledge of Church-political events or doctrinal developments, but much that brings them close to the ancient mentality. The sermons on Saint Mary, for example (nos 5 f.) say nothing about the Council of Ephesus (431) but bring vividly before the reader how much hung upon her title, theotokos.

I list here a few comments. (1) in *Homily I* 2, 18 f. I think it is quite likely right to see an expression of the belief that the resurrected Christ appeared first to his mother (so Aubineau pp. 13 ff.) but I should like to have seen the evidence for that (allegedly quite widespread) belief set out with more than a reference to texts from authors from John Chrysostom to Severus of Antioch collected in an article which is hard to get hold of. (2) In *Homily VI* 3, 14 f. I query the text and translation: ὡσπερ ὑπάρχων πρὸς οὐ, ὡς πρὸς δὴν πάσιως κτίσεως / ,comme pricipie et fin de toute création'. The relatives οὐ and ὄν stand oddly without finite verbs. I suggest: ὡσπερ ὑπάρχων πρὸ σου, ὡς προὐν πάσης κτίσεως / ,as being before thee, as pre-existing all creation'. (3) In *Homily VII* 6, 26 f., the phrase ὁ ἀπαλειφῶν πᾶσιν ἐγκλήματα / ,celui qui efface pour tous les imputations de dettes' looks suspiciously like a doublet of the same phrase in line 24. I suggest it be deleted. (4) In *Homily VIII* 3, 14 f. we read: ἐκείνη περὶ τὸν ἄερα βρίθει (ὡς βοήθει), αὐτὴ Φθάνει τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τοὺς ἄνω πρηροφορεῖ, αὐτὴ τοῖς ἄνω παρίσταται / ,(le son) est retenu dans l' air par son poids; (le parfum) atteint le ciel et comble ceux d'en haut, il demeure en présence de ceux d'en haut'. I like the clever conjecture βρίθει, but something seems to be amiss with the clause καὶ – πληροφορεῖ where a further pair of contrasts is desiderated. I suggest ἐκείνη τοὺς κάτω πληροφορεῖ and translate the passage: ,the sound hangs heavy in the atmosphere, the perfume reaches heaven; the sound satisfies those below, the perfume attends those aloft'. (5) In *Homily IX* 7, 7 the use of πρὸς with the accusative to mean ,by' is in line with the same (rather unusual) application in *VI* 6, 1. (6) In *Homily IX* 24, 9 I suggest 'Ἐξεστὶ <τοῖς> ἐπὶ γῆς οὖσαν (7) I find the first paragraph of *Homily X* (preserved only in Photius' *Bibliotheca* cod. 275) extremely obscure. The two short paragraphs constituting the remnants of this sermon on Saints James and David would not have been worth printing, had it not been for the interesting notes they have evoked from the editor, who points out that December 25th on which the feast was celebrated (the Jerusalem Church kept no feast of the Nativity that day) has links with Jewish celebrations of Jacob the patriarch, along with king David, on the same date (pp. 359 f.). (8) in *Homily XVI* 1, 1 the translation appears to follow the apparatus and not the text printed. I should translate: ,Exultations (σικυτήματα) are all great and most glorious of all (those) of inspired prophets'. The anti-Origenism in this same Homily (10) could perhaps be linked with certain questions posed to Cyril of Alexandria in *De dogmatum solutione* (a text I have edited for O.E.C.T.). In 14, 2 f. I suggest for καὶ τί (which I do not understand) καίτοι. Linking with the previous sentence I translate: ,Nevertheless the Devil could not slander him, though thirsting, though eager and needing (to do so)'. In 22, 10 I do not understand what the snakes hissing out of Salome's flanks are. Is she supposed to be a snakedancer? Or are these snake-shaped bangles (see LSJ s. v. δράκων IV 2)? (9) *Homily XVIII*, 6, 6 ff. I find puzzling with its talk of names possessing names – rather like a celebrated passage of Lewis Carroll. I think the text must be at fault with a lacuna I cannot plausibly fill. (10) In *Homily XX* 22, 3 f. read βασιλεῖ and Ω.

There are a number of small points on which one would like to question the author further. For example, what evidence has he for the statement that Proclus' famous *Homily I*, preached in the presence of Nestorius, was quoted as a document at the Council of Ephesus (431) – see p. 146? Nor (*ibid.*) can I persuade myself that the (alleged) *Homily IV* of Cyril of Alexandria (*A.C.O.* 1, 1, 2 pp. 102–104) is by Cyril. It is a wretched piece, giving the impression that either the preacher or the short-hand writer who took it down was drunk; if the heading in the mss. be correct it cannot be by Cyril; finally it is most unusual (to say the least) for Cyril to refer to the BVM as God's ,temple', a title reserved habitually by him for Christ's humanity.

Some of the author's judgements will not be welcome to his colleagues elsewhere. I do not think that the learned editors of the Belgian *Corpus*, for example, will care to hear that texts published without accompanying translation into a modern language are still-born (p. 607). Nor is it true – though I fully concede that plenty

of Church historians do not know enough Greek and Latin to do their job properly and that they rely heavily on translations they are incompetent to verify. Père Aubineau is exceptionally generous in his acknowledgements to predecessors who have contributed to the subject. His criticisms of incompetence or inefficiency are correspondingly withering. Poor R. S. Pittman who had the misfortune to produce a feeble doctoral dissertation for the Catholic University of America (blessedly unpublished) is roundly rebuked (p. XXVII and elsewhere) though it would seem to me that the University is to be blamed rather for incompetent examination of the candidate. Richard and Datema get it in the neck (p. XXXIII note 5) for sheltering from criticism behind editions of the Greek text on its own. Somebody called Sever J. Voicu will feel extremely uncomfortable after reading p. 160 but can console himself with the fact that he has been immortalized; and Charles Pietri is (quite rightly) punished for a disastrous note in that meritorious but often messy work *Roma Christiana* (p. 465 note 1). Père Aubineau has earned the right to these little displays of temperament.

The note I must end on is one of gratitude to the editor who has so splendidly and selflessly served Hesychius. All but two of these sermons are marvellous pieces, able to speak to the modern reader in a direct and vivid way. (The exceptions would be: the Homily on James and David, for the reasons given above; and no. XIV on Saint Procopius, where Hesychius' style strikes me as pretentious and overblown – too much art expended on too little matter.) I have learned a lot from reading this book and I will freely confess that I have greatly enjoyed listening to Hesychius in the expert company of Père Aubineau.

Huddersfield

Lionel R. Wickham

## Mittelalter

Kirchengeschichte als Missionsgeschichte, hg. v. Heinzgünter Frohnes, Hans-Werner Gensichen und Georg Kretschmar. Band II/1: Die Kirche des früheren Mittelalters, hg. v. Knut Schäferdiek, München (Kaiser) 1978, 604 S., Ln.

Zu den in jüngster Zeit viel erörterten Problemen gehört die Frage nach dem theologischen Charakter der Disziplin Kirchengeschichte. Diese als Missionsgeschichte zu verstehen, kann eine profilierte Antwort auf jene Frage erbringen (vgl. die Rezension zu Bd. I: ZKG 86, 1975, S. 367–381). Doch das liegt nicht in der Zielsetzung dieses Werkes. Vielmehr wehrt Knut Schäferdiek als Herausgeber sich gegen eine derartige Programmatik als „eine untragbare Einengung dessen . . . , was als Kirchengeschichte anzusprechen ist“ (S. 8). Nun braucht eine besondere Akzentuierung noch keineswegs Einengung zu bedeuten. Immerhin erweist gerade der vorliegende Band II/1 des auf monumentale Ausmaße zusteuernenden Werkes die Berechtigung und Fruchtbarkeit des ganzen Unternehmens: „Er möchte eine markante Epoche der christlichen Ausbreitungsgeschichte in ihrem gesamtgeschichtlichen Kontext als Teilaspekt einer Wirkungsgeschichte des Christentums verständlich machen, die immer auch eine Geschichte des vielfältigen Handelns und Lebens der Kirche ist“ (ebd.). Vielleicht kommt dabei unter der Hand doch so etwas wie das Programm einer Wesensbestimmung heraus, aber darüber zu streiten, ist angesichts der signifikanten Verbesserung des Gesamteindrucks, die Band II/1 gegenüber Bd. I bietet, müßig. Im Vergleich zu anderen Versuchen, die Kirchengeschichte unter einem bestimmten Aspekt selektiv darzustellen (vgl. z. B. das neue Werk „Christentum und Gesellschaft“, hg. v. H. Gülzow und H. Lehmann) gewinnt das vorliegende Werk gerade durch Band II/1 ein eigenes Profil, weil das Thema Mission die Eigenart jener Umbruchepoche am Beginn der abendländischen Geschichte markiert.