Zusammenhang mit Origenes, wie ihn R. Lorenz (Arius judaizans? 1979) für die Arianer dargestellt hat, nicht ausreichend diskutiert. Apollinaris erfährt eine behutsame Deutung, die sich von A. Grillmeier (Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche I, 1979) m.E. mit Recht unterscheidet. An Kyrill wird gezeigt, daß ein rechtgläubiger Theologe die anthropologische Analogie benutzen kann, weil er sich ihrer Begrenztheit bewußt ist und somit die „Christusparadoxie" letztlich bewahrt. Als weiteres Ergebnis wird deutlich, daß rechtgläubige Christologie weniger von einem bestimmten anthropologischen Modell – sei es mehr platonisch oder mehr aristotelisch ausgerichtet – abhängig ist, sondern von seinem Stellenwert als Erläuterung zu Joh 1,14.

Die Kurzübersicht über das besprochene Material läßt erkennen, welches Ausmaß an Detailkenntnissen vorausgesetzt werden muß. Im allgemeinen wird man dem Vf. bescheinigen können, daß er sich ausreichend informiert hat. Ein Lapsus wie die Unkenntnis, daß ep. 8 des Basilius von der Forschung einhellig dem Evagrius zugeschrieben wird (vgl. S. 102f.), fällt nicht ins Gewicht. Anspruchsvoller noch ist die Arbeitsmethode. Jeder Text, der sich zur Begründung seines Christusverständnisses auf ein anthropologisches Modell beruft und es zur Illustration heranzieht, wird übersetzt; seine Begrifflichkeit wird von den Anfängen griechischer Philosophie bis hin zum Neuplatonismus verfolgt, um die im Text gemeinte Anthropologie philosophisch einzuordnen. Abschließend wird der Ausgangstext im Zusammenhang interpretiert und gewertet, natürlich im Hinblick auf seinen Abstand oder seine Nähe zum Dogma von Chalkedon. Hier findet sich viel Interessantes zusammengestellt, meist auch Zutreffendes, zuweilen aber pauschal und historisch zu wenig sensitiv beurteilt. Denn die dogmengeschichtliche Überschau gelingt nur unter der Voraussetzung, daß die Bischöfe in Chalkedon eine Glaubenswahrheit über die Einheit des Christus aus zwei Naturen formulieren wollten, wobei ihnen auch noch zugestanden werden muß, daß sie vom Personbegriff eigentlich nichts wußten.

Der Ertrag – ein durchaus lesenswerter und orientierender – ist also letztlich die dogmatische Analyse einer Denkfigur mit Hilfe historischen Stoffes. Nicht sichtbar wird, welches die Zentren der christologischen Ausführungen bei den herangezogenen Autoren sind. So fehlt im Sach- und Begriffsregister nicht zufällig „Adam"; für Kyrill aber dürfte die Adamthematik nicht fehlen. Dogmatisch und nicht theologiegeschichtlich gedacht ist z.B. diese Analyse zu Kyrill: „Die Passionstheologie stellt, so scheint es, eine Zerreißprobe für das rechte Verständnis der Natureneinheit dar. Kyrill ist nämlich eingezwängt zwischen zwei theologischen Kernsätzen, einmal muß er die Leidlosigkeit des Göttlichen und Geistigen, zum andern jedoch die Einheit der Person Christi und des Menschen wahren" (S. 403). Der zweite Kernsatz ist eine theologiegeschichtliche Ungenauigkeit; denn Kyrill sprach nicht von Person, schon gar nicht von der Person des Menschen, von dem die Person Christi unterschieden sei, und „Einheit der Person" ist keine bei Kyrill belegbare Begrifflichkeit. Für die altkirchliche Christologie sollte die Arbeit nicht konsultiert werden, sondern als Untersuchung zu einem einzelnen Problem, das in der Geschichte des Dogmas von Chalkedon im 6. und 7. Jh. mehr ins Zentrum rückte.

Sehr unpraktisch sind die Querverweise ausgezeichnet. Eine Übersicht über die besprochenen Haupttexte fehlt.

Göttingen *Ekkehard Mühlenberg*

Henri Crouzel: Origène, editions Lethielleux, Paris 1985, 349p., 115francs.

Henri Crouzel must be acknowledged as the foremost scholar in the study of Origen alive today. He has literally devoted a life-time to the study of Origen, as his many works on that subject testify. Unlike his predecessor in writing a general book on Origen, devoted not to one aspect of this great man, but to a comprehensive account of him, Jean Daniélou, Crouzel has not, or not often, been tempted into other fields of scholarship. He is the Origenist *par excellence*. His painstaking and outstandingly useful *Bibliographie critique d'Origène* and its sequel form a monument of scholarship for

which many succeeding generations will be grateful. With Manlio Simonetti he has produced a magisterial edition of that most difficult and exacting of Origen's works, the *Peri Archon*, with French translation and notes, which will not be superseded for a very long time. When therefore an expert as well informed as he produces a book on Origen, and simply Origen, this is an important event for students of the history of doctrine in the early Church.

The book is of almost three hundred and fifty pages. It is divided into four parts, the first dealing with Origen's life, the second with his exegesis of Scripture, the third with his spirituality, the fourth with his theology. It is written in a style which is firm and flowing, with one welcome flash of humour, when the author describes the system of Valentinus as *Les Malheurs de Sophie* (282). As a thorough exposition of Origen's career, thought and achievement, there has been nothing like it since Eugène de Faye's *Origène, sa Vie, son Oeuvre, sa Pensée* written over fifty years ago, and it is much better than de Faye's book (useful thought that was) because it is written by somebody who is a complete master of the subtle and treacherous subject with which he is dealing. M. Crouzel, as is quite proper in such a work, only mentions other authors when the thinks it necessary. He takes issue with much (though not all) of the chronology suggested recently for Origen's life by P. Nautin, and always with good reason. He deals competently with the difficult question of ‚Origen the pagan' (30–31). He makes an interesting suggestion that Origen's first visit to Palestinian Caesarea should be placed early in his career, and not at the time of the crisis of his affairs in Alexandria (36–37). He disentangles in a most enlightening way the complicated subject of Origen's concept of a ‚double creation': the first creation is of souls with bodies of an etherial, non-fleshly nature; the second (described in Genesis 3 as the giving of coats of skins) is the conferment on the original material of that body (material as formless substratum needing a form) of a terrestrial quality, after the (pre-mundane) Fall. Neither of these ‚creations' corresponds to the birth of souls into this world in an incarnate form with fleshly bodies (132f.) (Methodius entirely misunderstood Origen). He rightly scouts the idea that Origen believed in metempsychosis (135, 220). His chapter on Origen's anthropology (123–138) is positively brilliant and must be held almost to settle this complex subject. His account of Origen's ideas on the resurrection body (319–330) is another piece of careful and lucid exposition. And his treatment of the much-discussed point of Origen's doctrine of *apocatastasis* is fair and judicious (331–342), though he does not deal with the question (raised by not a few students of Origen) whether Origen believed in an eternal recurrence, so that everything started again after the *apocatastasis* (I do not think that he did). In short, this is a fine book written by an expert, and it will long remain a standard work which no scholar can afford to ignore.

M. Crouzel is very anxious to vindicate Origen's orthodoxy. Now, in one sense this is a perfectly understandable aim and one not irrelevant to this book. Origen was attacked at the turn of the IVth to the Vth centuries (to pass over earlier criticisms of him) by the venomous Jerome and the hypocritical Theophilus of Alexandria. And in the middle of the VIth century his views were damned as heretical by a General Council directed at Constantinople by the Emperor Justinian. Crouzel has no difficulty in showing that these attacks were unfair, that the accusations made against him were based on flimsy grounds, and that the doctrines attributed to him and condemned were not his. By the standards of the *third* century Origen certainly was not heretical, and in the third century, though some of his teaching raised opposition, nobody seriously thought that he was an heretic (cap. 9). But Crouzel all through the book wishes to go further. He wants to argue that Origen's views were orthodox, his teachings sound and his methods allowable by the standards of *any* century, by the standards, indeed, of the contemporary Roman Catholic Church. He believes that only the most innocuous criticism of Origen, that he was a little too much influenced by Platonism, that he was rather too ready to use allegory, is justified. All else is misunderstanding or prejudice.

These assumptions cannot be allowed to pass without comment. Crouzel, for instance, is ready to defend Origen's method of allegorizing Scripture as only a rather extreme example of discovering the ‚spiritual sense' beneath the literal text which has

always (he argues) been part of Catholic exegesis; in this he is an unrepentant and indeed uncritical disciple of de Lubac (116–118). Crouzel, indeed, sees Scriptural doctrine in Origen at places where Origen most flagrantly departs from Scripture: to say that Origen's trichotomous anthropology is Scriptural because Paul at 1 Thess. 5 : 23 refers to ‚body, soul and spirit' (123–130) is absurd. The anthropology of the N.T. is not trichotomous in anything like the sense which Origen reads into it (*vide* Bultmann *Theology of the New Testament*). Origen's anthropology in fact only touches the Bible at odd points. His use of allegory was not simply a pardonable exaggeration of the Church's indefeasible right to interpret the Bible (‚un fait de culture, non illegitime, mais cependant étranger' [115]). It was an intellectual disease which, rather than enabling him to sense the true nature of Scripture, distanced him regularly from the possibility of seriously understanding the text and enabled him to read into it whatever he liked. His use of allegory was not merely unhistorical. It was positively anti-historical. It enabled him to ignore the significance of history to a dangerous extent and it is not merely modern scholars who observe this. In his own day and all through Christian antiquity writers who themselves do not hesitate to use allegory complain of Origen's use of it. Indeed, in his defence of Origen's exegesis Crouzel reaches a point which can only be called ultra-Protestant (though no doubt unwittingly so): the reading of Scripture is a sacramental act (148); Origen's concept of the Word ‚inscripted' in the Bible parallel to his Incarnation (which only the extremest Protestants have ever maintained, and which in my view verges on blasphemy) is recorded without comment (176).

Perhaps it is possible to defend Origen against ‚aristocratisme' (158); he was certainly not a Gnostic. But the whole bent of his thought was profundly intellectual, and not enough appreciation of this is evident in Crouzel's book. He constantly distinguished between the educated and the ordinary Christian, though he admitted that the latter was as capable of salvation as the former. Yes, everything for Origen was symbolic (149), but is it satisfactory to excuse this by saying that everything for Origen was sacramental, including the Church, including Christ himself (110, 111) and that he never lost sight of the incarnate Logos (157, 257)? He accepted the necessity of believing in an historical calling of the Chosen People, and an historical Incarnation, certainly. But he put so great a weight on the interpretation of this history, on the parabolic or symbolic significance of it, that he in effect depreciates the historical. The fact that he constantly urges his hearer and students to transcend the historical, to progress beyond the incarnate Logos, is simply not brought out in this book. Origen spiritualizes the eucharist, not in the Zwinglian sense that he says that it is of purely symbolic significance, but in that he urges us to move beyond the matter of the sacrament to its *res*, in fact as far as possible to leave the matter behind. He intellectualises the Atonement; his main account of this doctrine, what de Faye called ‚dieu éducateur', is scarcely mentioned in this book. He spiritualises the ministry; there are some who are bishops who are not recognized by the Church, and some bishops recognized by the Church are not bishops; and so on. He spiritualizes the body of Christ. After the Ascension (as Crouzel admits 331) there is, in Origen's theology, no more a terrestrial body of Jesus. It has been completely etherialised and divinised. This is quite consistent with the rest of his doctrine. The intellectual (? spiritual, mystical) must nor merely convey, it must absorb the historical.

It is difficult to avoid agreeing with Bianchi and Giulia Gasparro that for Origen there was a link between existence in the human flesh and sin (see the latter's *Studi di anthropologia e di storia della Tradizione*, cap. V; Crouzel deals with the point 279–280). What does it mean to say (224) that Origen produces several terms in his Christology equivalent to *homoousios* applied to the Son? What did *homoousios* mean in 325 A.D.? And what did it mean in 381? Generalizations like these are too easy. Origen's doctrine of the Trinity was sophisticated, carefully thought-out and a great advance on anything that had gone before it, but many scholars will continue to hold that he believed in a graded, though not created, Trinity, even after reading Crouzel (see 262–263). The suggestion (358) that the personality and divinity of the Holy Spirit had always been recognized and cherished in the Church, but only happened to come into the limelight

in the year 360, is highly disputable. The achievement of orthodoxy was a process of trial and error, like all the achievements of human thought, and the error was by no means confined to a few heretics.

Finally, Crouzel's note on Origen's style lacks one observation which has, as far as I know, never been made before, but which is quite important. It is not enough to say (quite correctly) that Origen does not like School rhetoric: he was wholly blind to poetry and to literary merit. He encounters some of the most striking and beautiful and effective examples of Hebrew literature, and especially of poetry. He transposes them painstakingly into arid allegory. A man who could read the text, ‚I am a worm and no man' and comment that as worms do not reproduce by sexual intercourse this must be a reference to the Virgin Birth of Jesus is scarcely competent to understand great literature. Ambrose uses allegory as freely as Origen; he ranges over the whole Bible, plucking texts indiscriminately here and there, but he does so with taste, with poetic appreciation. Origen plods through the Bible, blind to its merits, deaf to its music, like a scientist trying to distil chemical formulae from Shakespeare. Both Ambrose and Origen are often talking nonsense. But Ambrose at least gives us charming nonsense.

Cheshire *R. P. C. Hanson*

Samuel Vollenweider, Neuplatonische und christliche Theologie bei Synesios von Kyrene. (Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte, Band 35), Göttingen 1985, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 234 Seiten, kart. DM 48,–.

Die Begegnung zwischen Christentum und Platonismus ist eines der großen Themen der alten Kirchengeschichte und bleibt damit auch weiterhin ein umfangreiches Forschungsgebiet. Vor 10 Jahren untersuchte Bernhard Brons in seiner Abhandlung „Gott und die Seienden", (FKDG 28) das Verhältnis von neuplatonischer Metaphysik und christlicher Tradition bei Dionysius Areopagita. Die von der Theologischen Fakultät in Zürich angenommene Dissertation von Vollenweider (Referenten waren die Professoren Altendorf und Schindler) behandelt eine ähnliche Problemstellung, die jedoch etwa 100 Jahre vor Dionysius den unmittelbaren Einfluß von Plotin reflektiert. Das Grundschema der Arbeit ergibt sich deshalb direkt aus der tragenden Struktur seiner Philosophie, in der das Werden der Welt aus der Gottheit als Abstieg und ihre Rückbeziehung auf Gott als Aufstieg erscheint. In seiner Einleitung skizziert Vollenweider, wie die humanistisch-rhetorische Bildung, die Philosophie und die christliche Religion für Synesios eine innere Einheit bilden. Philosophiegeschichtlich ist er in die Bewegung des Neuplatonismus von Plotin zu Pophyrios und den späteren Platonikern einzuordnen. „Überall kreist Synesios irgendwie um die Idee eines göttlichen Abstiegs, dem der Aufstieg der Seele korrespondiert" (23). Vollenweider setzt sich zum Ziel, christliche Intentionen in dieser Konzeption aufzuspüren. Der vergleichende Blick auf eine ähnliche Problemlage bei den Kappadokiern, Marius Victorinus und Augustinus soll dabei zur Klärung dienen.

Der 1. Hauptteil (29–68) ist dem „Aufstieg zur Gottheit" gewidmet, wie er in den Hymnen in Erscheinung tritt, die als Inspiration und Opfer von Synesios verstanden werden. Eine besondere Rolle spielen die Motive des äußeren Rückzuges, der inneren Reinigung und des Schweigens, ebenso aber auch die von einem göttlichen Mittler gewirkte Erlösung, ein Aspekt, den Plotin nicht kennt und der erst von seinen Schülern zu Sprache gebracht wird. Auch die Motive der Unerkennbarkeit Gottes und des Rückfalls auf dem Wege zur Transzendenz treten in diesem Zusammenhang ebenso wie bei Gregor von Nazianz, Gregor von Nyssa, Johannes Chrysostomos und Augustinus in Erscheinung. Während für Plotin das Eine nur erkennbar ist im Über-sich-selbst-Hinausgehen des Geistes, vollzieht sich für Synesios im Sohn der gottgeschenkte Aufstieg.

Dies führt zum 2. Hauptteil des Buches über „die göttliche Trias" (69–129). Zuerst werden hier die triadischen Partien der Hymnen vorgeführt mit einem interessanten Exkurs über „Mutter heiliger Geist". Es folgt die Darstellung der Lehre Plotins von der Noogenese, die gekennzeichnet ist sowohl von dem positiven Aspekt der göttlichen