

gründeten Angabe von Mitsakis, *Language*, S. 8, § 5, das Wort sei paroxytonisch, nicht unbesehen folgen, denn an der einzigen anderen Stelle, wo es noch bei Romanos vorkommt (und es ist nach dem Ausweis der Lexika sonst nirgends belegt), Nr. 53,17,3 (G.), ist die Betonung als Proparoxytonon zumindest mit dem metrischen Schema von G. besser vereinbar. Vielleicht aber kann man hier tatsächlich eine Akzentschwankung bei Romanos annehmen, zumal ein Blick in P. Kretschmer / E. Locker, *Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache*, Göttingen<sup>2</sup> 1963, S. 419 zeigt, daß der Akzentgebrauch bei den zahlreichen Kompositionen mit -*λαλος* ohne erkennbare Regel zwischen den beiden genannten Möglichkeiten schwankt.

Die Anmerkungen des Kommentars, vor allem zur Herkunft theologischer Vorstellungen, zu literarischen Anspielungen, Bildern und Symbolen, zu stilistischen, grammatikalischen, lexikalischen und metrischen Fragen, sind reichhaltig; die Einleitungen zu den Hymnen geben hervorragenden Aufschluß zu theologischen, historischen, literarischen, textkritischen und metrischen Problemen.

Im Zusammenhang mit der zeitlichen Einordnung eines Hymnus werden gelegentlich auch weiter ausgreifende historische Themen behandelt; so fragt G. in der Einleitung zu Nr. 51 in Anknüpfung an die Thematik des Hymnus nach der Verbreitung endzeitlicher Erwartungen im Zeitalter Justinians (283–286). Die Einleitung zu Nr. 54 würdigt diesen Hymnus als älteste erhaltene Reaktion auf den Nikaufstand. Geistesgeschichtlich von Interesse ist die Frage nach Romanos' Vorstellung vom „Satan“ (333 f.).

Grundsätzliche Ausführungen zu dem wohl von mehreren Autoren verfaßten griechischen „Ephräm“, zu dem Romanos zahlreiche Parallelen aufweist, finden sich auf S. 218–220.

Die Zwischenbilanz aus dem bisher von G. vorliegenden oeuvre, dessen vorläufig letzter Band hier zu besprechen war, kann nach Ansicht des Rezensenten nur lauten: Einer der größten religiösen Dichter der Weltliteratur hat einen Editor und Interpreten gefunden, der seiner würdig ist.

München

Franz Tinnefeld

Wolfgang A. Bienert: *Dionysius von Alexandria. Zur Frage des Origenismus im 3. Jahrhundert* (= *Patristische Texte und Studien* 21) Berlin (De Gruyter) 1978. XII, 252 S., DM 88,—.

Dionysius the Great of Alexandria was 'no great theologian', we are told (p. 221); but his theological power should not be underrated; and if he is rightly described as 'a bishop devoted to the practice and teaching of the Church', he was also a wise and charitable pastor whose influence on his people, and on other Christians, seems to have been wholly beneficent. We would like to know more of him; and the evidence that is available has been collected and reexamined by Dr. Bienert with admirably precise and careful scholarship.

The book is constructed in four main sections with numerous subdivisions, followed by a brief concluding section, a fairly extensive bibliography, and a good set of indexes covering biblical and patristic references, modern authors, and finally names, subjects and concepts drawn from antiquity.

It has been customary, following Eusebius, to describe Dionysius as an Origenist; but to judge whether this view is correct we need, and find in the Introduction, a careful discussion of the meaning to be attached to the terms 'Origenism' and 'anti-Origenism'. It becomes clear that Origen's influence can be traced in several distinct theological idioms and procedures, some of which were already attracting criticism in the century which followed his death; but there is no good evidence that theologians of this period can be classified as self-confessed 'Origenists' or 'anti-Origenists' in the manner that became customary from the late fourth century. Dr. Bienert describes Origen's teaching as 'a theological achievement sui generis combining elements of Platonic-Stoic philosophy with Philonic exegesis of the Bible and Christian tradition, where contradictions are held together in a dialectical tension in the interests of comprehensive theological in-

struction which offers guidance but never compels' (p. 8). He also draws attention to Origen's disinterest in elegant writing. One of his principal findings is that Dionysius is, in important respects, either opposed to Origen or uninfluenced by him, even though he came to establish friendly relations with theologians who revered his memory.

The second main section (pp. 23–70) sets out the sources and testimonies for Dionysius' writings. Eusebius, Athanasius and Basil preserve clearly authentic material; but the later tradition is obscured by the possibility of another Alexandrian Dionysius and by confusion with 'the Areopagite'. The rather complex discussion can be summarized by indicating the modifications now required in Feltoe's edition (Cambridge, 1904), which is described as 'still indispensable'. Beginning with Greek texts: in section A (the Letters), a short piece on pp. 63–4 is shown to be associated with 'the Areopagite' and should be discounted. In section B, some doubt still attaches to Holl's fragments 367, 368 and 392, all regarded by Feltoe as dubious; Dr. Bienert would keep the first two but excise the last, from p. 126. In section E, the Exegetica, the profile of Dionysius' Commentary on Ecclesiastes has altered considerably; Dr. Bienert would excise at least pp. 210.10–211.12 and 227.4–14; on the other hand there are two brief fragments to be added, which he prints on his p. 57; and Feltoe's piece 1 on p. 250 should perhaps be assigned to this work. A fragment on the Song of Songs, printed with some doubt by Feltoe on pp. 228–9, is condemned; while the fragments on St. Luke derived from Nicetas are a mixed bag, as Feltoe already discerned. Dr. Bienert upholds those derived from Codex Vaticanus 1611, printed by Feltoe on pp. 231–241.2 and 245.8–248.2, discarding the rest. In section Z we are to reject items (III) and (IV) (pp. 252–3) and at least no. 7 of item (VIII), pp. 259–60.

From the versions, we now have the brief Latin fragment from the Bobbio Palimpsest, printed by Bienert on p. 64, which illustrates Dionysius' subordinationist phase. The Syriac versions add little of significance, but important material survives in the Armenian version of Timothy Aelurus, notably three fragments of letters to Stephen I and Sixtus II of Rome (to which we can add a possible fragment of the last-mentioned letter, see p. 69) and extensive remains of a letter on the Three Days between Christ's death and resurrection, possibly addressed to the same Basilides who received a letter dealing with the same topic printed by Feltoe on pp. 94 ff., especially 94–102.

The third main section considers the Alexandrian church in relation to Origen and the career of Dionysius before he became Bishop. Dr. Bienert argues that the decisive part in Origen's expulsion from Alexandria was played by Heraclas, not Demetrius; indeed, accepting Jerome's date of 233, not 231, it must have been one of Heraclas' first acts as Bishop; and if we can believe that Demetrius died at the age of 105, Heraclas may well have been *de facto* in control of church policy for some years previously. The case is, then, that since Dionysius became head of the catechetical school under Heraclas, and later succeeded him as Bishop, he must have enjoyed Heraclas' confidence, and so presumably approved, or at least accepted, his decision in regard to Origen. There follows a survey of Dionysius' writings assignable to this period, which brings to light some notable theological divergences; in particular Dionysius is seen to have denied the pre-existence of human souls (p. 116) and opposed the belief that paradise is 'above the universe'. In his exegesis of scripture Dionysius seeks to preserve the literal sense, using harmonistic methods, rather than welcoming obscurities as a stimulus to allegorical treatment; and his careful rhetorical style, contrasting with Origen's unadorned writing, may also be due to Heraclas' influence; though I myself think we should also consider his early training as a pagan of good family.

The fourth and last section (pp. 134–221) considers Dionysius' career as Bishop. Two subjects may be selected for comment. In the first place, Dr. Bienert proposes a new chronology for the Easter letters, abandoning the generally-accepted scheme based on Eusebius – see p. 143 – which is followed by Feltoe. His main contention is that two of the ostensibly later letters, that to Hierax and the so-called 'Pestbrief', should be assigned to the same period as the letter of Fabius of Antioch, and therefore to the years 250–2. The plague therefore developed in Alexandria late in 249; it spread more generally through the Empire in 252 – which seems an unexpectedly slow propagation; but

there is no need to postulate a recurrence of it in the 260's to be described in the two letters just mentioned.

After discussing Dionysius' attitude to the Novatianist schism and his treatment of the Egyptian millenarians, Dr. Bienert deals with the controversy between the two Dionysii. The discussion is as careful and thorough as one would expect. *Inter alia* he comments on Dionysius' reference to the term  $\delta\mu\omicron\sigma\upsilon\sigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ , which he considers to be by then accepted by Greek-speaking circles in Rome (p. 216). He has expanded this thesis in a subsequent article in this journal (No. 90, 1979, pp. 151–75), which has been sharply criticized by Dr. Simonetti (*Vetera Christianorum* 17, 1980, pp. 85–98). In my book *Divine Substance* I argued that we have insufficient evidence to prove a Western origin for  $\delta\mu\omicron\sigma\upsilon\sigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$  as a theological term; and in the main I now have to agree with Dr. Simonetti. Nevertheless I can allow that Dr. Bienert has presented a more persuasive argument for his case than any that was available when I wrote my book.

In this careful study there are very few misprints; but one might correct the word  $\tau\epsilon\sigma\mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\upsilon\varsigma$  on p. 30; at p. 57 n. 39 read 227,4–14; and at p. 112 n. 32 restore the correct English spelling of 'Creationism'.

In conclusion, it seems to me that the author's negative thesis is amply justified. Dionysius was certainly not a disciple of Origen; he shows a very marked independence of exegetical method, of literary style, and of theological orientation. But it is not quite so clear what positive picture ought to emerge. The evidence that Dionysius was positively opposed to Origen seems markedly weaker and more inferential. Even if he endorsed Heraclas' decree of expulsion, we cannot tell whether he did so with indignation or with regret; and faced with Origen's many-sided genius it would be possible to take an independent line and pose many criticisms of detail while still recognizing a debt of gratitude to this controversial figure. We should not follow Eusebius blindly; but he may not be quite so misleading as Dr. Bienert makes out.

Haddenham, Ely

G. C. Stead

Thomas A. Kopecek: A History of Neo-Arianism I + II (Patristic Monograph Series No. 8) Cambridge/Mass. (Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, Ltd.) 1979. Zus. 553 Seiten, kart.

Die Geschichte des arianischen Streites im vierten nachchristlichen Jahrhundert wird nicht zum ersten Mal geschrieben. Wir kennen die kirchliche Geschichte, deren treibende Kräfte Kaiser und Hofbischöfe sind (vgl. E. Schwartz); wir kennen die dogmatische Geschichte, in der das Interesse eines religiösen Heilsgutes über eine kosmologisch orientierte Theologie logischer Stringenz den Sieg erringt (vgl. A. v. Harnack). Zwischen diesen Geschichtsdeutungen, die vorerst Maßstäbe setzten, trat der Beitrag von J. Gummerus (Leipzig 1900), „die homöusianische Partei“ in kirchengeschichtlicher Betrachtung heraushebend. Mit letzterem vergleichbar in Methode und Zielsetzung ist das anzuzeigende Buch. Denn K. legt eine Chronik der Neuarieraner vor, des Aetius und Eunomius. Er wählt die Form der Erzählung und schiebt Analysen der literarischen Dokumente an entsprechender Stelle ein. Auf diese Weise wird die Geschichte einer kirchlichen Bewegung sichtbar, die von zwei Theologen in den 50er Jahren des 4. Jhs. in Gang gebracht wurde und nach 30 Jahren schließlich als Sekte endete.

Aus bekannten Quellen hat K. zusammengetragen, was sich für die Geschichte des Aetius und seines Schülers Eunomius gewinnen läßt. Die Erzählung ist breit angelegt, so daß der geschichtliche Ablauf sehr plastisch wird. Besonderes Augenmerk richtet sich auf soziologische Zusammenhänge, die Verbindungen und Einflußkreise verständlicher machen könnten (vgl. S. 138–150). Der eigentliche Beitrag liegt in dem Gespräch für synodale Kirchenpolitik; man könnte fast von einer Synodalgeschichte im Unterschied zu einer Reichskirchengeschichte sprechen. Entstehung von kirchlichen Parteien und ihr Taktieren fügen sich zu einem eindrucksvollen Bild zusammen, so vor allem für die Zeit von 356–361 während der Regierungszeit Kaiser Konstantius'. In die synodalgeschichtliche Situation werden die literarischen Dokumente hingestellt, von ihr her