

## Historische Theologie

GRILLMEIER, ALOIS, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*. Band 2/2: *Die Kirche von Konstantinopel im 6. Jahrhundert*. Unter Mitarbeit von *Theresia Hainthaler*. Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder 1989. XXV/588 S.

The volumes with which Fr Grillmeier is extending the first volume of his „Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche“ (originally an extended essay in vol. 1 of „Das Konzil von Chalkedon“) from the Council of Chalcedon to the reception (if one can call it that) of the decisions of the 7th Ecumenical Council in the West at the Council of Frankfurt in 794 do not so much fill a gap as open up a whole new field of theological inquiry. Hitherto the period after Chalcedon has been terra incognita into which forays have been made in the form of monographs and scattered articles. If many of these have been works of lasting value, others have given currency to misconceptions that few were in a position to refute. What Gr. provides in these volumes is a general picture of the whole *orbis christologicus* after Chalcedon, which will enable investigators in any particular area to gain (and keep) their bearings and ordinary historical theologians to enter a territory too long largely reserved for philological specialists. It is a work of awesome erudition. Volume 2 (in 5 parts) is to cover the period from Chalcedon to the death of Gregory the Great; volume 3 the rest of the period to 794. The first part of volume 2 surveyed the reception of Chalcedon up to the accession of the Emperor Justin I in 518, from which point on the triumph of Chalcedon seemed assured (in the Empire, at least). The rest of the parts of volume 2 are arranged geographically, covering the situation in Constantinople (the part-volume under review), in Antioch and Jerusalem and their hinterlands (2/3), Alexandria and its hinterland (2/4), and the West (2/5). There is bound to be overlap, but that might be no bad thing, as the situation often looked different from different perspectives: that, indeed, was part of the problem. – These volumes are, as Gr. makes clear, an exercise in *Dogmengeschichte*. The political history of the period, even the religious history, is taken for granted, though Gr. alludes to it from time to time and is clearly well-informed. Doubts as to whether it is still possible to write pure *Dogmengeschichte* crumble before the magnitude of Gr.'s achievement. This kind of careful and lucid analysis will make it possible to work out a true general picture, which has too often, in the past, simply pushed theology to the sidelines in favour of more readily accessible criteria.

This volume is dominated by Severus of Antioch and the problems he posed to the defenders of Chalcedon. Although he was Patriarch of Antioch from 511–18, and his shadow will certainly fall long over the next part-volume, he was in the capital in the years immediately preceding that and during the period of the conversations held by the Emperor Justinian between the Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians in the first half of the 530's. The first 200 pages of this book constitute a virtual monograph on Severus, his controversy with the Chalcedonians who endeavoured to claim Cyril's authority for Chalcedon, and his controversy within Monophysite circles with Julian of Halicarnassus (Gr. tends to avoid the term ‚monophysite‘, rightly in my opinion, preferring ‚miaphysite‘ – perhaps better than the term percolating from Oxford: ‚henophysite‘ – or, when its meaning is clear, ‚non-Chalcedonian‘). What is new in these pages is mainly in the detail – drawn from the work of Orientalists – as the main lines of interpretation are those established long ago by Lebon and Draguet. – The 150 pages on Leontius of Byzantium are a different matter. Gr. adopts the now almost universally accepted distinction between Leontius of Byzantium, Leontius of Jerusalem and the author of *De Sectis* (all identified, or rather confused, with one another by Loofs). Leontius of Byzantium emerges as a strict Chalcedonian (streng-chalcedonisch). But that is not all. Gr. has read and absorbed his fellow Jesuit, B. E. Daley's, thesis on Leontius and his few but important articles. Leontius of Byzantium is no longer the theologian of the *enhypostasia*: ἐνυπόστατος is rendered ‚real‘, in opposition to ἀνυπόστατος (‚unreal‘). Leontius is a strict Chalcedonian: there are two distinct natures in Christ, and over the nature of the union Leontius is puzzling and contradictory. Gone, too, is Leontius the Origenist Christologist: D. B. Evans' surprisingly popular thesis is dec-

ently buried in a footnote or two (though his work is conceded other merits). Gr. then discusses briefly other strict Chalcedonians – Hypatius of Ephesus, the Acoimete monks of Constantinople, and the monk Eustathius – before turning to the real creator of ‚Neo-Chalcedonianism‘, Leontius of Jerusalem. Gr.’s account of this Leontius is extremely compressed and not always easy to follow. He is presented as the real architect of an interpretation of Chalcedon in the light, and along the lines, of Cyril (so Gr. often prefers ‚neucyrrillianisch‘ to ‚neuchalcedonisch‘ – an issue to which he devotes an excursus [pp. 450–5] – though one might prefer Meyendorff’s ‚Cyrilline Chalcedonian‘ to either). The one hypostasis of the Incarnate Christ is the Second person of the Trinity: the Incarnation is, however, seen as a process, a process of deification, answering God’s embracing of humanity in the Incarnation. – The third part of the book (another 200 pages nearly) is devoted to the Emperor Justinian. This starts with the theopaschite controversy and the Scythian monks, moves on to the struggle with the Severans in the 530’s, the condemnation of Origen (only tangentially Christological, but part of the story), the Three Chapters controversy, the Fifth Ecumenical Council, and Justinian’s final leaning towards an ‚aphthartic‘ Christology (as Gr. insists it should be described, rather than the tendentious ‚aphthartodocetic‘). In the course of these pages much is covered: in his discussion of the Scythian monks he draws attention to Maxentius’ deeper reflection on the nature of *persona* and *subsistentia*; there is a long and valuable excursus on the *agnoetes*; there is a careful discussion of how far Justinian’s own position (at least at the time of the Fifth Ecumenical Council) can be regarded as ‚neo-Chalcedonian‘ in which Gr. argues that Justinian adopts some neo-Chalcedonian moves but fundamentally affirms Chalcedon. – The fourth and final part is much shorter: a brief survey of the Emperors after Justinian and a final section on Romanos Melodos, which is rather a *g esture* towards a dimension missing from this volume than anything more.

All this is a massive achievement and any criticism must be more in the way of reflections made possible by the riches revealed by Gr.’s erudition and clarity. There is, however, a certain unevenness in places. It is a huge work and Gr.’s thought evidently developed in the course of writing it: the closing pages, for instance, betray a much stronger sense of the contribution Byzantine historians have to make to his enterprise than his introductory pages (in particular, he seems to have discovered the work of Professor Averil Cameron as he wrote). A more general point concerns the nature of theology in this period. It is all ‚patristic theology‘ in the sense that it is a theology in which the ‚Fathers‘ are authorities. Gr. recognizes this, of course, but does not consider it very deeply. To get some sense of the contours of the ‚patristic‘ theology to which the 6th-century Fathers deferred involves detailed attention to the reading of the (4th-century) Fathers by the (6th-century) Fathers, something that has scarcely begun (C. J. A. Lash – now Archimandrite Efrem – made a start on Severus’ debt to Athanasius in an article cited by Gr.). But one often suspects that deeply held positions are deeply held out of loyalty not so much to the *terminology* of the ‚Fathers‘ as to their own deeply held convictions. Athanasius’ theology, for example, is shot through with a sense of the close inwardness of the Trinity (which Athanasius himself expressed on one occasion in the phrase  $\mu\iota\alpha\ \phi\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ ) to which corresponds a close inwardness between the Word and the flesh assumed. This double close inwardness (often expressed by the term  $\tau\acute{\omicron}\delta\iota\omicron\varsigma$ , a usage still found in Severus, it seems) guarantees the reality of God’s involvement with humanity in redemption. It is this sense of close involvement, felt to be put at risk by the Chalcedonian language of two natures, that many were concerned to preserve: theopaschite language could seem a touch-stone that it *was* preserved (as Justinian himself perhaps realized). There is still perhaps a tendency in Gr. towards linguistic categorization that bypasses what it was that fed the fierce loyalties of the 6th-century controversies. Another aspect of the ‚reception‘ of the Fathers by the Fathers concerns ‚die mystische Gestalt des Pseudo-Denys‘ that Gr. detects between the theology of Cyril and that of Severus. In support of this Gr. attests nothing more than the notorious phrase about a ‚new theandric energy‘ from the 4th letter, but later he draws attention to other Dionysian echoes in Leontius of Jerusalem that leave one wondering about the extent of Dionysian influence in Miaphysite and neo-Chalcedonian circles. Of course the reception of Denys is not strictly reception of the Fathers,

rather it is an attempt to create an impression of ‚reception‘: but that may shed even more light on the process of reception than any examples of true reception (‚Denys‘ was, in some sense, what some 6th-century Fathers *wanted* to receive from the patristic and apostolic past).

But such reflections are only possible because of the way Gr. has made it possible to gain some sense of the broad canvas of the *orbis christologicus* of (in this part-volume) the Imperial capital. His further volumes will be awaited with eager anticipation.

A. LOUTH

RISSE, GÜNTER, „*Gott ist Christus, der Sohn der Maria*“. Eine Studie zum Christusbild im Koran (Begegnung 2). Bonn: Borengaesser 1989. 273 S.

Bereits 1989 erschien die Dissertation von G. Riße über das Christusbild im Koran in der neuen Reihe „Begegnung. Kontextuell-dialogische Studien zur Theologie der Kulturen und Religionen“, hrsg. vom Bonner Fundamentaltheologen H. Waldenfels SJ, unter dessen Betreuung auch diese Arbeit entstand. Flüssig geschrieben, klar und komprimiert bietet das Werk eine Fülle von Material, insbesondere auch an arabischer Literatur, die dem gewöhnlichen Leser schwer zugänglich ist. Die Arbeit ist in drei Hauptteile gegliedert: Eine Darstellung des Christentums in Arabien in vorislamischer Zeit (35–96), eine Erarbeitung des orientalischen Christusbildes (97–148) und auf diesen Vorarbeiten aufbauend sodann „Das Christusbild Muhammads“ (152–212). Hinführung (1–34) und Rück- und Ausblick (218–228) rahmen das Exposé ein, dem im Anhang Tabellen zur Chronologie der Suren und eine Konkordanz der Suren, ein reichhaltiges Literaturverzeichnis und ein Personen- und Sachregister in Auswahl beigegeben sind. – Ein instruktives Schaubild (220) zeigt die Grundthese von R.s Untersuchung „in den zentralen christologischen Texten des Koran den Einfluß des monophysitischen Christusbildes zu sehen“ (22 und 219) (statt „monophysitisch“ sollte man jedoch aus ökumenischen Gründen besser „miaphysitisch“ oder „antichalcedonisch“ sagen, was auch sachgemäß ist, denn die Ausrichtung der damit bezeichneten Christologie ist von der Mia-Physis-Formel und der Opposition zum Konzil von Chalcedon bestimmt; es wird dabei aber keine einfache [„Mono“-]Natur in Christus unterstellt). Ephraem wirke über Philoxenus von Mabbug auf Muhammad ein, ein zweiter Strom komme von Julian von Halikarnaß, der von Cyrill von Alexandrien beeinflusst war und im Streit mit Severus von Antiochien stand. Damit dürfte eine These von Cl. Schedl, wonach der entscheidende Einfluß auf die Christologie des Koran auf die Nestorianer zurückgehe, obsolet sein.

Das Buch ist lesbar geschrieben, auch für ein breiteres Publikum, dem wohl auch längere Auszüge dienen, wie etwa von Bornkamm (36–37); hier ist für weitere Lit. (zu Arabia in Gal 1, 17) etwa auf H. D. Betz, Galatians (Philadelphia 1979) 73 f. (mit Lit.), deutsche Ausgabe (München 1988) 147 f. zu verweisen, auch wenn der Auszug aus Bornkamm instruktiv und markant ist. Wir beschränken uns in unseren Anmerkungen auf die ersten beiden Hauptteile. Zum vorislamischen Christentum in Arabien wären die Arbeiten von I. Shahid: Byzantium and the Arabs in the Fourth Century (Washington 1984), Rome and the Arabs (Washington 1984) zu berücksichtigen. Die Geschichte von Mavia (50 f.), einer Sarazenenfürstin, ist erstmals von Rufin (den R. nicht erwähnt) erzählt worden, und von ihm sind die anderen Berichte bei Sozomenos, Sokrates (und auch Theodoret, den R. nicht anführt) abhängig (dazu F. Thelamon, Païens et chrétiens au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle. L'apport de l'„Histoire ecclésiastique“ de Rufin d'Aquilée [Paris 1981] 124–147; ferner Shahid). Es fehlen die sog. Parebole-Bischöfe (Aspebetos-Petrus: Thelamon, 139), um das Bild der Christianisierung bei den Arabern unter byzantin. Herrschaft voller zu gewinnen. Vgl. dazu jetzt die Darstellung nach den Quellen bei R. Solzbacher, Mönche, Pilger, Sarazenen = MThA 3 (Altenberge 1989) 171–184. – Bei der Darstellung des Wirkens von Jakob Baradaï und Theodor von Arabien (55–58) ist zu berücksichtigen E. Honigmann, Évêques et évêchés, (Louvain 1951), bes. 158–164. 168–177, aber auch die Documenta ad origines monophysitarum illustrandas, ed. Chabot = CSCO 103 (Louvain 1933). – Zu schreiben ist Wallace-Hadrill (statt: Wallace-Kadriel) auf p. 39, Anm. 13 und p. 265. Im Zitat (129) von G. L. Müller,