

lenisierten Römer wenig. Obwohl in der Abartigkeit seines Wesens den Frauen kaum zugetan, haben Frauen sein Schicksal bestimmt, während er mit einem philosophischen play-boy umherzog, dessen plötzlicher Tod durch Ertrinken ihn tief erschütterte. Wenn auch kein zielstrebigster Monarch, so doch ein interessanter Mensch. – Perowne hat in seinem Buch *Leben und Zeit Hadrians* sachlich und in den Tatsachen auch zutreffend erzählt. Aber seine Darstellung erhebt sich nirgends zur eindrucksvollen Historie. Selbst seine Hauptfigur, der er gern eine besondere Bedeutung zumessen will, wird nicht scharf genug konturiert. Die Urteile bleiben unscharf. Und wie hätten gerade der gewiß ganz unheroische Hadrian und seine engere Umwelt (Plotina, Sabine, Antinous) zur Darstellung einer Geistes- und Sittengeschichte in einer sinkenden Zeit dienen können, in der allerdings die morbiden Züge hätten deutlicher werden müssen, als es die Konzeption des Verf. vermochte.

Berlin

Karl Kupisch

Die 50 geistlichen Homilien des Makarios, herausgegeben und erläutert von Hermann Dörries, Erich Klostermann † und Matthias Kröger (= *Patristische Texte und Studien* 4). Berlin (de Gruyter) 1964. LXVIII, 341 S., geb. DM 72,-

The Macarian Homilies have been the subject of special interest in the present century because of two developments in particular. In 1920 Villecourt demonstrated beyond all reasonable doubt that this masterpiece of fourth century ascetical theology, which remains today prescribed reading in Orthodox monasteries, is the ultimate source of the propositions condemned as Messalian in Timothy of Constantinople and John of Damascus. Then in 1941 Dörries (Symeon von Mesopotamien, TU 55/1) showed that the transmission of the Messalian texts was far more complicated than had previously been thought. Not only are there the seven homilies, appended to the Normal Collection of fifty, which Marriott first printed in 1917 from cod. Bodl. Baroccianus 213, (of which one homily is largely an excerpt from the Lausiaca History). There is also the Arabic tradition studied by Strothmann (1934), and above all the rich collection of Macarian material contained in Vat. gr. 694 s. XIII (= B) and Vat. gr. 710 s. XIV (= A), of which Dörries provided a summary in German translation with occasional, tantalising excerpts from the Greek text. Since then the question of the character of the transmission has been made even more complicated by the discovery of yet a third type of Macarian tradition. The new material therein contained was well edited by Klostermann and Berthold in 1961 (TU 72). All three types of collection overlap with one another. Blocks of the same material appear in quite different settings in each, and it is not easy to discern a pattern to explain the divergent order in which the pieces occur. Evidently there were separate recensions which drew, each in its own way, on the literary remains of the great Messalian master, Symeon of Mesopotamia.

The Normal Collection (H) was apparently the product of an orthodox editor who exercised considerable care in arranging and selecting his material. Kröger's introduction suggests that he may have worked in the tenth or eleventh century about the time of Symeon the New Theologian.

The volume here under review is certainly an excellent work. The critical text is Kröger's work; the commentary is contributed by Dörries. Kröger has been able considerably to enlarge the manuscript base. The ed. princeps of 1559 used Paris. gr. 1157 s. XIII. In 1850 Floss made some use of Berol. gr. 16 s. XIII/XIV (= F), a manuscript lost since 1945 but fortunately collated by Dörries in 1926. The Oxford manuscript (Baroccianus 213, s. XIV/XV = D), known since 1721, was used by A. J. Mason for his English translation (1921), but Mason did not publish the text that his version presupposed. D turns out to give the same type of text as Paris. gr. 1157 but to offer an older and superior form of it; accordingly, Paris. gr. 1157 is not cited in the apparatus at all. Besides these manuscripts and two other Paris codices which have parts of the collection, Kröger has used two 12th century manuscripts from Halki and Moscow, both originally on Mount Athos, and two others still on the holy mountain – Panteleimon 128 s. XVI (Z) and Lavra H 61 s. XIV (G). The full readings of G became available (thanks to K. Aland) only when the book was already in proof. A collation of G is therefore given in the introduction, and there are inevitable risks that this information will be undeservedly neglected. A perusal



suggests that in a few places G's readings have very reasonable claims to remedy lacunae and to amend corruptions in the rest of the tradition, e. g. p. 252,28 where G restores words that have fallen out by homoioteleuton, and incidentally provides additional evidence of the brilliant insight of Klostermann who had already detected the lacuna and made an uncommonly good guess at what it must have contained. Likewise p. 92,35 μήτε + ἔκπεινοι GB, probably rightly since the word is part of Symeon's vocabulary, p. 95,49 PG 34, 928 C.

The existence of at least two other recensions of the material makes the critical apparatus slightly uncomfortable to use. There is so much information about the parallel texts which the editor has not been able to include. The reader must remind himself continually that the editor's purpose is to print the recension H, not to try and get behind the tenth century Redactor and to ask what the original Messalian documents may have said before he expurgated them. This purpose is entirely right. Nevertheless, the parallel tradition in the other recensions can correct errors and omissions which appear in all the manuscripts of H and were probably there in their archetype. Five striking instances are mentioned on p. XLI, and the observant reader will notice other places where the help of B is invoked. Yet the recension preserved by B, now supported by A and by Atheniensis 423 s. XIII (described by Darrouzès in *Muséon* 67, 1954, 297-309) is so independent of H, even where its material runs parallel, that Kröger was surely right to judge that, unless B is supporting a variant within the H tradition, only relatively few of its variants can be recorded.

A striking example of the results of this decision can be seen on p. 206. Immediately before the question H 26,2, whether natural appetite is uprooted with sin when the Holy Spirit comes, cod. A has the question 'Had Adam a pure nature?' with the answer, 'Just as the prophoric word comes out without passion, or as saliva and the tongue are moved without passion, so before the Fall Adam's intercourse with Eve was without passion.' This last sentence is cited by John of Damascus as an objectionable Messalian proposition. But it was not admitted to the original recension of H, and therefore is not recorded in this book in either commentary or critical apparatus.

The B recension, however, is occasionally mentioned in Dörries' commentary (pp. 135, 177-178, 283).

The text printed is easy to read and in good order. There is no occasion for intruding an obelus, hardly even for an emendation on the part of the editor. A minor transposition suggested by Klostermann at p. 11, 233 looks plausible, but is not promoted from apparatus to text. The author of the homilies certainly believed that a good thing deserved to be said more than once, and because of his repetitions it is easy to find parallels for his diction. On these grounds, at p. 314, 48 probably ἀτιμίας is to be preferred to Kröger's ἀμαρτίας, in view of the parallel phrase, p. 303, 72. At p. 147, 191 the text reads ὁ οὖν ποιῶν τὰ θελήματα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ τὰ θελήματα τῆς καρδίας ποιεῖ, ἐπειδὴ συμπλέκεται καὶ συγνέκεται τῇ ψυχῇ. The confusion between καρδίας and κακίας is common in the manuscripts (see the apparatus for p. 49, 51 and 165, 187) and the sense here demands the latter. The curious use of πελάζεται in the sense of πλάζεται, 'roams', is consistent throughout (p. 66, 48; 85, 23; 195, 27), so that the strong temptation to emend must presumably be resisted. At p. 231, 8-9 there is a curiosity; the text reads πλησθέντων ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς τῶν γνωρισμάτων αὐτῆς θηρίων δεινῶν, καὶ ἔρπετῶν πνεύματων πονηρίας ἐν αὐτῇ καταλυόντων. It would be natural to transpose the comma to fall before θηρίων, and to regard the preceding genitive absolute as a quotation from some unidentified apocalypse describing the desolation of Jerusalem (which is the context of the remark). In that case, πλησθέντων may be a corruption, as A. J. Mason suggested, of either λησθέντων or ἐπιλησθέντων.

It is time to turn to the commentary. Dörries draws deeply on his rich mine of erudition. The notes take the form of providing (a) the relevant citations from Timothy of Constantinople or John of Damascus; (b) cross-references to other places in H where similar ideas and language occur; (c) parallels in gnostic and apocryphal literature or in other ascetic writers such as Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Evagrius, and Diadochus of Photice. The gnostic and apocryphal parallels are seldom very illuminating, but the presence of a parallel in Tatian (H 14, 6 p. 125) is noteworthy, in view of the Mesopotamian background of the original author. Attention should also be called to the immense and



most instructive notes on Christology and Pneumatology, pp. 283–285, on the Church, p. 268, on Baptism, p. 135, on the Devil, pp. 270 + 134, and the numerous annotations on the central Macarian thesis that the Devil remains deep in the soul even after baptism. From the patient study of the notes there is so much to be learnt that it would appear ungrateful to ask for more, or to wish that the information had been presented in a slightly different form. There are, however, a few gaps. Diadochus of Photice is cited perhaps a dozen times, but not on 17,5 (cf. 16,3) where the parallel to Cent. 80 is too close to be accident; perhaps Tatian, Or 13, p. 14, 18 Schwartz also deserves mention here. The note on p. 64,8 sends the reader off to Type III, ed. Klostermann-Berthold (Kl.-B.), p. 41, 21; the same text will be more speedily found in H 23,2. H 4, 11–12 speaks of the depth of divine wisdom transcending all creaturely terms; the affinity with Kl.-B. p. 110, 20ff. is close enough to deserve record. H 15, 39 might have a cross-reference to 26,6, and 15,23 could be added to the note on 3,5 (p. 24, 29). But no one could know better than Dörries how much more detail could be added. It must have been hard to know when to stop in giving the cross-references to other passages in H.

H 26, 24 (p. 216, 317) on giving a drug to a dragon', looks like an allusion to Bel and the Dragon 27.

Two themes, though prominent in H and of great interest for the history of Messalian ethics, receive short treatment. One is the reiterated doctrine that the help of divine grace is indispensable but kept to the minimum and often withdrawn to test the soul. (cf. Diad. Photice, cent. 85.) The index s. v. ὑποστέλλω guides the reader to H 26,7 where there is the very true but brief note that ‚Sich-entziehen der Gnade ist ein häufiges Thema Symeons z. B. H 8,5'. Here is a place where Dörries could have disclosed more. The other theme on which the commentator is reticent is that of not judging others. Symeon taught that the perfect saint passes judgement on no one, not even on malefactors and harlots. The note on H 8,6 modestly refers to H 15,8 and 27,6, but not to H 5,6; 7,4; 18,8 and 37,3. Moreover, it is surprising to have no signpost to either the Liber Graduum or Marcus Eremita. Both Liber Graduum (8, 5 and 30, 2) and Marcus Eremita (PG 65, 1071 ff.) concur that an absolute refusal to reprehend evil doers is a mark of high sanctity. Diadochus of Photice was not so convinced, cent. 62 and 91. The point is of special interest because it draws attention to the fact that the relationship between the Macarian homilies and the Liber Graduum does not make its way into the commentary. At H 8,3 (p. 79,37), where the mystical ecstasy is such that the saint seems a fool to others, a comparison with Lib. Gr. 16,7 and 27,5 could be illuminating.

A few other details may be noted. The translation of κωδικέλλους as ‚Ehrenstellen' (p. 274) may be queried. The word means the imperial diplomas conferring honours, not the positions thereby conferred.

Timothy of Constantinople ascribed to the Messalians the opinion that the Lord's body was full of demons which he expelled. Dörries (p. 102) notes that this proposition cannot be reconciled with H 11, 9 (no sinless body in the world until the Lord). Perhaps a closer parallel, however, is H 26, 15: The Lord put on a body καταλιπὼν πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ ἐξουσίαν, and in the temptations the devil attacked his body from the outside, for within he was God. H 6,5 (79) is another probable source.

Dörries denies that Symeon ever says ὅτι φύσει τὰ κακά, which stands among the Messalian propositions in John of Damascus. That Symeon was anti-Manichee is evident from H 16, 1 and 46, 3. But no one could derive from his works a cheerful estimate of the natural order apart from grace, and there is a phrase in H 26, 22 (p. 215, 290), σύνεσσι κακία τῇ φύσει, which might have been exploited by a malevolent inquisitor anxious to please authority by unearthing hidden heresy among the Messalians. H 15, 21 condemns as erroneous those who say that evil is not ‚born and bred' in man.

The index of Greek words is no guide to Symeon's vocabulary. Only those words are included which happen to serve as pegs for hanging notes in the commentary. The selection is inevitably arbitrary. One cannot use this index to recall where, for example,



Symeon uses homousios (p. 176)\*, and where he recommends self-hatred (H 15, 51 and 26, 12). It remains to add that this fine volume has been splendidly produced by the printer and publisher. None of the trivial misprints in Greek words (p. 6, 116 app.; p. 30, 73 note; p. 268, 14 note; p. 322, 78) could possibly mislead anyone. The book deserves an enthusiastic salute.

Oxford

Henry Chadwick

L. A. van Buchem O.P.: *L'homélie Pseudo-Eusébiennne de Pentecôte. L'origine de la confirmation en Gaule Méridionale et l'interprétation de ce rite par Fauste de Riez*. Nijmegen (Drukkerij Gebr. Janssen N. V.) 1967 242 S., kart. fl. 16.90.

Im 1. Teil dieser ausgezeichneten Studie wird erstmals eine textkritische Edition einer „Homilia in Pentecosten“ geboten, als deren Verfasser in einigen Handschriften ein „Eusebius episcopus“ angegeben wird. Der Verf. bringt beachtenswerte Argumente, die es wahrscheinlich machen, daß Faustus von Reji († um 485) der Autor dieser Pfingsthomilie ist. Dabei befaßt er sich eingehend mit der Person des immer noch mysteriösen Eusebius Gallicanus (bzw. Emessenus). In einem Aufsatz in der *Revue bénéd.* 69 (1959) 198–215 hatte der Rezensent seinerzeit den Bischof Eusebius von Massilia (um 480) als mögliche Persönlichkeit vorgeschlagen, in dessen Auftrag, wie wir durch Gennadius wissen, der Priester Musäus von Massilia ein Sakramentar und Lektionar verfaßt und Homilien gesammelt hat. Jedenfalls bestände in diesem Fall Übereinstimmung mit dem in den Handschriften genannten Namen „Eusebius episcopus“.

Im 2. Kapitel wird vom Verf. diese Pfingst-Homilie, in der eingehend von der „confirmatio“ (Firmung) gehandelt wird, mit echten Schriften des Faustus verglichen, während im 3. Kapitel näher auf den Ritus der „confirmatio“ im Gallien des 5. Jh. eingegangen wird. Danach wurde gegen 425 im südöstlichen Gallien ein eigener Initiationsritus im Anschluß an die Taufe ausgebildet, der „confirmare neophytos“ genannt wurde und in einer 2. Salbung und Handauflegung bestand. Auf dem Konzil von Orange wurde i. J. 441 die 2. Salbung in Gallien wieder abgeschafft, so daß der Ritus der Firmung in der Folgezeit nur noch in einer Handauflegung und der Anrufung des Hl. Geistes bestanden hat. Er erhielt nun die substantivische Bezeichnung „confirmatio“.

Die Homilie ist der einzige Text aus Südgallien, der eine eingehende Erklärung der „confirmatio“ darstellt. Dabei wird das Wesen von Taufe und Firmung wie folgt formuliert: „In baptismo regeneremur ad vitam, post baptismum confirmamur ad pugnam“.

Die Studie stellt einen wesentlichen Beitrag zur Geschichte des Firmungsritus dar. Ob jedoch in allen behandelten Fragen, so in der Frage nach der Person des Eusebius Gallicanus, das letzte Wort gesprochen worden ist, muß erst die Zukunft lehren. Die Arbeit wird neben dem Patrologen und Liturgiegeschichtler auch der Dogmatiker mit Nutzen studieren.

Regensburg-Prüfening

Klaus Gamber

\* Timothy of Constantinople says that according to the Messalians the three hypostases of Father, Son, and Spirit are changed to one hypostasis. The charge of Sabellianism is not repeated in John of Damascus, and has no point of support in the Macarian homilies. Nevertheless, there is good evidence that there was some discussion of this topic among the Messalians. Cf. Marcus Eremita, de Baptismo, PG 65, 1008 D: In baptism do we receive the spirit of Christ or the Holy Spirit? Is the Spirit the Trinity?