

Auch wenn möglicherweise der Umfang des Bds. in der korrigierten Fassung nicht verändert werden sollte, ist nicht ganz nachvollziehbar, warum die Chance einer ‚Aktualisierung‘ kaum genutzt wurde – zumal sich der Seitenumbruch bereits verschoben hat. Dessen ungeachtet bietet J. eine detailreiche und die weitere Forschung anregende Übersicht und Diskussion literarischer Spuren eines Bereichs der frühesten Kirchengeschichte, der noch immer schwer fassbar ist.

J. ARNOLD

GRILLMEIER, ALOIS, *Fragmente zur Christologie*. Studien zum altkirchlichen Christusbild, herausgegeben von *Theresia Hainthaler*. Freiburg im Breisgau [u. a.]: Herder 1997. XII/484 S., ISBN 3-451-26411-0.

The name ‚Grillmeier‘ has become almost synonymous with his great work on the Christology of the early centuries of the Church, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, which grew from an article originally published in the three-volume commemorative work he edited with H. Bacht, published on the 1500th anniversary of the Council of Chalcedon, into a series of large volumes, still incomplete on his death in 1998. Despite the size and scope of this his major work, Alois Grillmeier published a great deal else. Some of this – articles and lectures – was collected together in a volume, *Mit ihm und in ihm*, published in 1975, and a further selection is to be found in the volume under review, published to commemorate the sixtieth anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood – just a year before his death. Most of the pieces collected here are, as the title suggests, ‚fragments‘ of the research that went into the great monument to his scholarship. The most important of these is an important article on the term *κυριακός άνθρωπος* applied to Christ. With characteristic care and learning, Grillmeier traces the different contexts in which the term is used, demonstrating how widespread its use in fact is, not in the least confined to ‚Antiochene‘ Christologies, and the different ways in which the adjective *κυριακός* has come to be attached to the substantive: as a way of representing the genitive *τοῦ κυρίου*, and as a way of expressing a Christology of glorification, both a biblical Christology of exaltation and a way of understanding the implications for Christ’s human nature of the hypostatic union. Another detailed paper concerns the different linguistic models that both might be called ‚God-man‘: the *θεός-ἄνθρωπος* model and the *θεός-ἄνῆρ* model. Yet another paper concerns Leontios of Byzantium and his use of Porphyry and Nemesios of Emesa, which, though ‚durchgesehen‘, makes no reference to Andrew Smith’s critical edition of the *Symmikta Zetemata* nor to Morani’s indispensable edition of Nemesios, which had already appeared when the original article was published. There are a number of articles that relate to the question of Origenism: an article on Mark the Monk’s attack on Origenist Christology in his *opus* 11, and on Shenoute and Dioskoros’ encounter with what is presumed to be fifth-century Origenism. Grillmeier’s analysis of what an Origenist Christology might entail was characteristically careful, but there still seem to me many problems about what Evagrius’ Christology might amount to, especially if one is sceptical about reading back into his thought the condemned propositions of 553. Nor is it clear to me that Shenoute’s ‚Jesus prayer‘ is obviously anti-Origenist: Origen’s own position is not stable, as Grillmeier notes, and Evagrius’ understanding of pure prayer seems to me just as likely to be a foundation for such a prayer as the ‚Jesus prayer‘, as something to which the practice of the Jesus prayer was opposed. (There is also need for more explicit clarity over what one means by the ‚Jesus prayer‘, which is, nonetheless, a prayer *to* Jesus, despite the contrast Grillmeier draws.) Alongside this engagement with Egyptian Christology, there is a paper on the place of baptism in the theology of the Syrian Philoxenos of Mabbug. A very interesting paper on Manichaean denial of communion from the Eucharistic chalice adds further detail to Grillmeier’s original and convincing discussion of Pope Leo’s understanding of the Manichaean threat, and there is a brief note on Eutyches’ possible visit to Jerusalem and encounter with Hesychios there. In addition to these Christological studies, there are what are called ‚Christological perspectives‘. These are mostly short notes concerned with particular points: whether the human is revealed or concealed in Christ, which is tantalizingly brief and very suggestive; reflections on the issue of the ‚Hellenization‘ of the Gospel, exploring this issue briefly as background to the first Council of Nicaea; re-

flections on the development of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan creed; and on the Western understanding of Chalcedon in what appears to be a contribution to the conversations, still continuing, between the Oriental Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches, in which Grillmeier makes more than I think we can of Chalcedon's contribution to the notion of *hypostasis*. Grillmeier was, however, more than an academic theologian. One of these 'Christological perspectives' is a thoughtful and convincing response to Hans Küng's *Christ sein*, not simply as a matter of historical scholarship, but rather as a matter of present-day proclamation of the Christian Gospel. It is, however, in the final section that, it seems to me, we encounter the true heart of Cardinal Grillmeier's theology. For all his learning, for all his careful philological scholarship, it was not by chance that Grillmeier devoted his life to clarifying the Church's confession of Christ, for this lay at the heart of his own life. His study of the seven ages of the spiritual life in Augustine is an example of the best kind of spirituality, not in any way sentimental, but deeply concerned with understanding, both for his own sake and for those who turned to him, not just as a scholar but as a priest, the way in which God draws us to himself through the stages of human creaturely life. This is even more true of the final discussion of the 'theology of the heart', *theologia cordis*, where one of the most learned theologians of his generation wears his learning so lightly that we are scarcely conscious of it and introduces his readers to the place where *cor ad cor loquitur*, to quote the motto of his fellow-cardinal – where 'heart speaks to heart': the heart of God to the human heart, the heart of Christ broken for us, the heart of the Mother of God who 'pondered all these things', the heart in which, illumined by grace, we discover our solidarity with the whole of humanity. It is surely this theology of the heart that endures to eternity and is now the occupation of the great teacher who has gone before us. The volume has been edited by Theresia Hainthaler, who adds a detailed bibliography of Cardinal Grillmeier's work.

A. LOUTH

MORITZ, ARNE, *Explizite Komplikationen*. Der radikale Holismus des Nikolaus von Kues (Buchreihe der Cusanus-Gesellschaft; Band 14). Münster: Aschendorff 2006. 347 S., ISBN 3-402-03169-8.

Die Monografie von Arne Moritz (= M.) behandelt eine Thematik, die trotz ihrer zentralen Bedeutung im Werk des Cusanus in der Forschung wenig Interesse gefunden hat. M. weist auf die einzige Monografie zu diesem Thema, einer Dissertation aus dem Jahre 1896, sowie einige Aufsätze und zwei Lexikonartikel hin. Dem Autor drängt sich die Frage auf: Welche Bestimmungen und Verhältnisse sind bei denjenigen Gegenständen bedeutsam, die durch den Gebrauch der Terminologie *complicatio-explicatio* eine Rolle spielen. Seine Antwort ist die These vom radikalen Holismus des Cusanus.

Nach einleitenden Hinweisen zum Gebrauch kommentiert der Verf. im Kap. „Kommentare“ den unterschiedlichen Gebrauch der Terminologie von *complicatio* und *explicatio* in drei verschiedenen Texten. Anhand von „De docta ignorantia“ wird zunächst die ontologische Seite des Begriffspaars behandelt. In einem Brief an Rodrigo Sanchez de Arevalo vom 20. Januar 1442 geht es dann um den Konflikt Papst – Konzil. Dabei bewegen sich die ekklesiologischen Argumente parallel zu der ersten Kommentierung in „De docta ignorantia“. Die bei Nikolaus übliche Terminologie von *complicatio* und *explicatio* gilt nicht nur im Verhältnis von Kirche zu Christus, sondern auch im Verhältnis der sichtbaren Kirche zu deren Haupt Petrus und seinen Nachfolgern. In der Kommentierung von „Idiota de mente“ geht es um die von Nikolaus unter Verwendung der Terminologie von *complicatio* und *explicatio* entworfenen Theorie des Geistes (*mens*). Zusammenfassend lässt sich sagen: Der Kusaner versteht unter *explicatio* ein von einer *complicatio* verurachtetes abhängiges Sein (*ab-esse*). Dabei fügt die *explicatio* der ursächlichen *complicatio* nichts hinzu. D. h.: Die *explicatio* hat gegenüber der *complicatio* ein eingeschränktes Sein, ein *esse contractum*. *Explicatio* und *complicatio* sind jedoch nicht gegensätzlich, sondern sind zwei Modi ein und desselben Seins im Sinne der *coincidentia oppositorum*. Diese begriffliche Bedeutung verwendet Nikolaus von Kues ontologisch, ekklesiologisch-politisch und epistemologisch.