

Methode der christlichen Mystagogen ausgegangen ist. Es steht doch zu erwarten, daß eine sorgfältige Prüfung dieser von R. gar nicht berücksichtigten Probleme und Fragen zusätzliche charakteristische Akzente für die mystagogische Methode der vier behandelten Kirchenväter setzen würde.

R. ist sich durchaus der Tatsache bewußt, mit seiner Arbeit praktisch Neuland betreten zu haben (8). Er hat einen mutigen ersten Schritt getan, für den ihm Dank und Anerkennung gebührt. Er hat durch seine Arbeit unsere Kenntnis von der Tauftheologie der Väter des 4. Jh. und insbesondere von ihrer Mystagogie erheblich vermehrt. Er hat über diese Neuerkenntnisse im Bereich der Liturgiegeschichte und Patristik hinaus überzeugend die Notwendigkeit herausgestellt, auch heute die Initiationsriten – und wohl alle liturgischen Handlungen – mit Hilfe einer echten Mystagogie zu erklären und für das Leben des Christen fruchtbar zu machen. Dieses Verdienst des Autors soll durch die kritischen Überlegungen des Rezensenten nicht geschmälert werden, der statt einer Einzelanalyse des von R. gesammelten und vorgelegten mystagogischen Materials der vier Kirchenväter nur andeuten möchte, wieviel Arbeit noch zu tun bleibt, bis das von R. betretene Neuland ganz erschlossen sein wird.

Bonn-Bad Godesberg

Otto Nußbaum

Luigi I. Scipioni: Nestorio e il concilio di Epheso (= *Studia Patristica Mediolanensia* 1). Mailand (Vita e Pensiero) 1974. VII, 453 S., L 14.000.

Fr. Scipioni has followed up his earlier researches into the Treatise of Heraclides with a full-scale study of Nestorius which puts us still further in his debt. He rightly insists that the dogmatic issues cannot be separated from church-historical questions and his long and careful analysis of the course of events is one of the most valuable features of the book. Inevitably he devotes considerable attention to the christology of Cyril in which he can trace no significant development and which he regards as monophysite in tendency from start to finish. It seems however more probable that, without deserting his main position, he modified it in some important matters of detail both to avoid the charge of Apollinarianism and in the course of his rapprochement with John of Antioch. Scipioni's criticism of Cyril's letters to his outraged supporters after the Formula of Concord in 433 are not entirely justified. Cyril was certainly a theologian of moods who could speak with more than one voice. At times he could write in a manner which suggests that the confrontation with Nestorius need not have occurred. No doubt political and ecclesiastical considerations weighed heavily with him, but as indications of what he could find christologically admissible, this evidence should not be discounted.

In his account of the intellectual formation of Nestorius Scipioni lays great stress on his training in the monastic schools of Antioch. There is no evidence for a period spent in a great centre of secular learning or for an Antiochene Catechetical School such as existed at Alexandria under Origen. It is also chronologically unlikely that there was any direct relationship between Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius. His indebtedness to earlier Antiochene theologians should not be minimised; indeed there is little in his christology which cannot be paralleled in the writings of Theodore. He obviously belonged to the Verbum-homo tradition. He is certainly indebted to the Cappadocians but Scipioni's suggestion that in the earlier part of the Treatise he relies heavily on Irenaeus must be treated with considerable reserve. His knowledge of Stoic philosophy, a leading theme of Scipioni's earlier work, may have come either from the Cappadocians or through his monastic training at Antioch. Too little is known of monastic schools at Antioch to do more than guess at the extent of his knowledge of Stoicism and its influence on his christology. Nestorius never gives the impression of being an academic theologian.

Scipioni next examines the literary work of Nestorius before the outbreak of the Theotokos controversies. It represents a pastoral type of theology within the framework of the monastic spirituality current at Antioch. The Adam-Christ parallelism is a master theme and the accent falls on the imitation of Christ which

involves a realistic assessment of his humanity. Scipioni may well be right that the so-called anti-Pelagian Homilies and finds a number of baptismal echoes elsewhere though even at this period not every discussion of the spiritual life necessarily demands an implicit allusion to Baptism. The emphasis in these Homilies is soteriological and anthropological rather than directly christological. Technical questions of Christology are absent. The term 'nature' for example describes the created order and has no christological reference.

During this period the principal theological opponents of Nestorius seem to have been Arians who combined their usual belief in the created and mutable nature of the Logos with an Apollinarian type of Christology. If this is correct there is a striking, though temporary convergence between the polemical aims of Cyril and Nestorius before the outbreak of the Theotokos controversy. Cyril however, following Athanasius, starts from the inconsequences in the Arian doctrine of the Logos, Nestorius stresses the necessity for a full and complete humanity if an adequate doctrine of Redemption is to emerge. The differences between the Cyrilline and Nestorian doctrines of Redemption are well noted by Scipioni.

The significance of the title Theotokos as a scandalon oikoumenikon is somewhat minimised in the following chapter. Scipioni considers the root objection of Nestorius to the title to be the support which it might give to the doctrine of the Logos treptos. But evidence for this view seems to be lacking and the usual explanation that it involved the ascription of human birth to the wrong nature and a misuse of the principle of the communicatio idiomatum is much to be preferred. While Cyril's doctrine of the twofold generation of the Logos gave the term its theological justification, for Nestorius it set at risk the full reality of the humanity which was vital alike for Christology and Redemption. While this is certainly true of the Arian doctrine of the mutability of the Logos, it was also endangered in his opinion by the Cyrilline idea of a Logos-centre, Logos preponderant Person. While the title was the occasion rather than the root cause of the controversy, it marked the point at which Cyril and not the Arians became the controversial target of Nestorius. Small-scale though the immediate problem was, it marked the opening of the wider confrontation between the Verbum-caro and Verbum-homo traditions in Christology.

Scipioni now addresses himself to the specific problems of the Treatise of Heraclides. Here he defends the unity of the work against the theory of dual authorship advanced by Professor Abramowski. While fully accepting the existence of minor interpellations he regards the opening Dialogue as a product of the earlier part of the exile of Nestorius evoked by the writings of Cyril after the rapprochement of 433, particularly the two christological dialogues edited by de Durand in the series Sources Chretiennes. Its looser and somewhat untidy structure is explained as a direct and conscious dependence upon Irenaeus. Both suggestions are very doubtful. The latter part of the Treatise shows that Nestorius could provide a better and more direct reply to Cyril than the Dialogue supplies and it is difficult to see what Nestorius gained by adopting the rather discursive literary technique of the second century Father. While there is considerable overlap between the two halves of the Treatise there remain significant differences in presentation, emphasis and terminology which cannot be dismissed as easily as Scipioni appears to do. The oblique approach and looser construction of the Dialogue together with significant differences in points of detail still make the theory of dual authorship the most economical explanation of the problem. If Scipioni would elaborate his theory of the relation between the Dialogue and the later christological writings of Cyril in greater detail and Abramowski expand her short article which identifies Philoxenus of Mabbug with the Sophronius of the Dialogue we should be closer to a resolution of the problem. In my opinion Scipioni would have the harder task of the two.

The discussion of the second half of the Treatise and the presentation of the issues which divided the two protagonists is one of the best parts of the book. Its

tighter construction and more objective, even timeless character are well stressed. While the publication of the Tome of Leo must have given considerable encouragement to the lonely exile, it seems unlikely that this was the sole or even the principal motive for this Apologia. The possibility of a review of his case in a new and more favourable climate of opinion may have had even greater importance. But in any case, as Scipioni himself points out, at this stage Nestorius had already committed his cause to the ultimate judgment of God. A thorough and objective account both of the historical events leading to his downfall and of the issues which divided him from Cyril would put the record straight and be his best legacy to his remaining followers and to posterity.

Scipioni's presentation of the two rival christologies is fair and judicious. The whole controversy represents the confrontation between the *Verbum-caro* and *Verbum-homo* traditions. It is a debate about things and not merely an affair of words. The main thrust of Cyril's christology is monophysite and this is accentuated both by his failure to distinguish between *phusis*, *hupostasis* and *prosopon* and by his adoption of the Apollinarian formula 'one incarnate *phusis* of God the Logos' in the mistaken belief that it was athanasian in origin. The ultimate subject of the incarnate Lord is God the Logos who appropriated to himself (a genuinely athanasian idea) the attributes of humanity. This led inevitably to an undervaluation of the humanity and its reduction to an adjectival or participial status. The formula 'out of two natures' was essential to Cyril, even though he could accept the compromise formula 'of two natures' for the sake of peace with the Antiochenes, and admit, whether diplomatically or by conviction, that the two natures could be discerned by abstraction alone. Scipioni rightly doubts whether Cyril could have accepted the 'in two natures' of the Chalcedonian Definition and the distinction drawn between *phusis* on the one hand and *hupostasis* and *prosopon* on the other would at least have come strangely to him. Both in its intuition and its vocabulary Cyril's christology was heavily oversimplified.

For Nestorius the problem of Christology was raised in a more acute form by his firm dyophysitism. This was an integral part of the theological tradition which he had inherited, imposed by his realistic interpretation of the Synoptic Gospels and supported by his doctrine of Redemption and the pattern of spirituality to which it gave rise. He was therefore led to adopt a more complicated metaphysical and christological framework than that of Cyril. In terminology he seems to have identified *ousia* and *phusis* on the one hand and *hupostasis* and *prosopon* on the other. The immediate source of his framework seems to derive from the Cappadocians, its ultimate origin (if Scipioni is correct) was Stoicism.

Scipioni claims that both theologians started from the unity of Person, For Cyril this took precedence over a complete and unambiguous assertion of the humanity, for Nestorius room must be found within the unity for his own unqualified dyophysitism. While it might be maintained that this dyophysitism was his real starting point, he undoubtedly believed that he had provided an adequate bond of union between the natures. His denial of the charge of teaching a doctrine of Two Sons or a double personality in Christ is indignant and repeated. His adaptation of the Cappadocian formula of the doctrine of the Trinity for christological purposes is significant here and his conciliatory, if somewhat condescending, restatement of Cyril's theory of hypostatic unity in terms of his own doctrine of union in *prosopon* indicates that he has no doubts as to his own success. But the repudiation of the charges of his opponents depends upon the outcome of his own venture. The Cappadocian doctrine of three *hupostases* or *prosopa* rested securely on a prior unity in *ousia*, while for Nestorius the unity in *prosopon* had to include a duality of *ousia*, since for more than one reason the double solidarity of the incarnate Lord with the Father and with ourselves must be maintained. This placed the Cappadocian doctrine of the *hupostasis* or *prosopon* under considerable strain. His use of John 1, 14 is balanced by an even more frequent appeal to Philippians 2 and his recourse to the Nicene Faith is weakened by the fact that it made no at-

tempt to arbitrate between the two christological traditions. While admittedly Nestorius can often employ the formula 'One person, two natures', his further precisions cast some doubt on the question whether in its final form his christology really falls within Chalcedonian limits. The two natures are complete and 'self-sustaining'. Each has its own natural prosopon. On the basis of the equation of prosopon and hupostasis each can presumably be described as a hupostasis. Scipioni draws a careful distinction between two levels of understanding, the ontological and the logical, which he derives from Stoic logic. Nestorius never makes this distinction explicit anywhere in the Treatise. The unity in prosopon is there qualified by the existence of two natural prosopa related by a process of mutual giving and receiving. This reciprocity of the prosopa represents no doubt an extension of the Cappadocian doctrine of the perichoresis of the three Persons of the Trinity. Whether this provides a satisfactory clarification of the unity of Person is the real crux of the christology of Nestorius. If he is successful here, then he anticipated Chalcedon, if not, then Grillmeier's theory of an additive subject which he lacked the technical equipment to integrate into a unity of Person has more to commend it. Scipioni notes carefully enough the implied criticism of Cyril in the Chalcedonian Definition. In my opinion he misses the similar criticism of Nestorius contained in the assertion of 'one hypostasis and one prosopon'. If he had unswervingly held to the formula 'two natures, one prosopon' he could not have been faulted. His final precision made in the interests of his dyophysitism 'two natural prosopa, one prosopon of union derived from the mutuality and reciprocity of the two natural prosopa' carried him beyond the limits which the later Council could regard as acceptable. Scipioni's careful and complicated analysis does not completely defend him against this charge.

Cumbria

H. E. W. Turner

[Hydatius von Aquae Flaviae:] Hydace. Chronique. Tome I: Introduction, texte critique, traduction. Tome II: Commentaire et index. Par Alain Tranoy. (Sources Chrétiennes 218/9). Paris (du Cerf) 1974. 2 Bde., 179, 171 S., 3 Tafeln, 3 Karten, kart. FF 90,-.

Die kleine, als Quelle für die spanische Geschichte des 5. Jh. unschätzbare Chronik des Bischofs Hydatius von Chaves findet in dieser kommentierten Neuausgabe und Übersetzung eine inhaltliche Erschließung, die sie als Zeugnis einer notvollen geschichtlichen Umbruchsperiode auch über den engeren Kreis der Fachhistoriker hinaus verständlich macht. Ihre handschriftliche Basis bleibt die schon Th. Mommsen für seine Monumenta-Ausgabe¹ zur Verfügung stehende. Doch bemüht sich Tranoy, fußend auf einer kritischen Untersuchung von C. Courtois,² aber auch über diese hinausgehend, den in der Überlieferung teilweise verwischten chronologischen Aufbau des Werkes wiederzugewinnen (I 71-95), ohne dabei den Blick für den hypothetischen Charakter des Ergebnisses zu verlieren. Den wesentlichen Inhalt des von Hydatius aufgenommenen Stoffes sucht er in der Einführung unter den drei Themenkreisen „insania tyrannidis“, „debauchantibus barbaris“ und „lacrimabile tempus“ zusammenzufassen (I 18-49), so zugleich die Auswahlprinzipien des Chronisten herausstellend. Die sachliche Texterschließung übernimmt dann der Begleitkommentar, eine Verbindung von Materialsammlung und Einzelinterpretation, an den Tranoy gewiß den größten Teil der Arbeit verwandt hat. Mit ihm sich auseinanderzusetzen, heißt in Detaildiskussionen einzutreten, und darum seien auch hier, unter Beschränkung auf im engeren Sinn Kirchengeschichtliches, einige Einzelheiten herausgegriffen.

Tranoy glaubt, eine priszillianistische Annäherung an die suewischen Eroberer Gallaeciens feststellen zu können, die er darin angelegt sieht, daß der katholisch-

¹ *Chronica minora* II: MG auct. ant. 11 (1894, Nachdruck 1951), S. 1-36.

² *Auteurs et scribes. Remarques sur la chronique d'Hydace: Byzantion* 21 (1951) 23-54.