

Nikolaus Wyrwoll, *Politischer oder petrinischer Primat? Zwei Zeugnisse zur Primatsauffassung im 9. Jahrhundert*. Freiburg (Schweiz): Institut für Ökumenische Studien der Universität Freiburg, 2010. 147 S. ISBN 978-2-9700643-7-4.

*Habent sua fata libelli!* Whether the phrase belongs to Horace or Terentianus Maurus, the fact remains: There are those who, following the maxim, put their book in a drawer and let their ideas grow like fermented dough, and there are others, who do the same, only to find out, perhaps much to their surprise, that their ideas remain as valid as ever before, hardly in need of any change. Is this the lesson to draw from W.'s work?

The work is slender but dense. It is the publication of W.'s doctoral thesis at the Pontifical Gregorian University about half a century ago (6), which he nonetheless presents without any substantial changes. The book is divided into seven chapters, plus a version of the Treatise in Church Slavonic as an Appendix (133-138) and the Scholion in that Treatise, found around 1900 among manuscripts given to the Bulgarians on the occasion of their conversion to Christianity in the ninth century; the Scholion was simply attached to the Treatise. The Greek original of both as well as a German translation are found on pages 11-17. Put together they could hardly present a sharper contrast on the primacy, the Treatise taking Constantinople's side against Rome, and the Scholion defending the Roman idea of the primacy.

Who wrote the Treatise? Who wrote the Scholion? The first chapter gives a brief survey of the *status quaestionis*, which, according to the Preface, has known no development ever since W.'s dissertation was written (6). The first to publish the Treatise, in 1897, was A. Pavlov, who found only the Greek text of the Treatise in a manuscript containing John Scholasticus' canonical *Collection in Fifty Titles*, not, however, that of the Scholion, which he discovered translated in Church Slavonic in two manuscripts of the *Kormčaja Kniga*, the chief code of Russian canon law (18). M. Jugie, the first scholar in the West to discuss the *Scholion* in detail, argued that St Methodius, the Apostle of the Slavs, was possibly not only its translator but also its author, for its Graecisms would suggest that Methodius first wrote it in Greek (19). F. Grivec gave the Methodius connection a different slant, suggesting that it was Greek monks in Rome who actually composed it, Methodius only corrected and translated it (20). Later on, in 1935, Grivec believed that Anastasius Bibliothecarius had helped Cyril to compose it and went a step farther in 1941, calling both brothers its authors, with yet an anticlimax in 1960 when he does not even mention the Scholion in his study, *Konstantin und Method: Lehrer der Slaven* (Wiesbaden 1960) (22). The first chapter ends by pointing out the importance of the Treatise, for which the bishop of Constantinople, with the council of Chalcedon (451), already enjoyed the right to judge all bishops including Rome's. Since Rome owed its primacy to its status as imperial capital, this primacy devolves now to Constantinople, which is now the first city in political importance (25-26).

And yet, so argues chapter 2, the reaction to Chalcedon has concentrated so exclusively on canon 28 as to make us forget the insidious charge of canons 9 and 17 which prepare it. These canons, as well as canon 28, are commented in the first part of the Treatise, and are discussed in the first part of chapter 2 (27). In virtue of these canons the archbishop of Constantinople (it was still not customary to call him patriarch in the mid-fifth century) received unprecedented appeal rights, far exceeding that of any other patriarch; moreover, no limits are set to the precincts from which he could receive appeals, except the insistence, on the part of Emperor Leo I, that the rights of

Alexandria and Antioch remain unimpaired (28-29). From this W. concludes that P. Joannou's interpretation that this was true only of the Pontus, Thrace and Asia cannot be right (29). Here, however, one misses, in W., a hermeneutic of the Councils. Had not canon 2 of Constantinople I already said that every bishop should mind his business and restrict his actions to his own diocese? In our times, did not the title *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* unleash a storm of protests just because it does express in the title that the addressees are the Catholic Eastern Churches? Rather than drawing such portentous conclusions, the Orthodox canonist P. L'Huillier faults "the intrinsic obscurity of the redaction" of canon 9 (*The Church of the Ancient Councils*, Crestwood NY 1996, 231). With regards to canon 17, L'Huillier points out that Zonaras rejected the idea, defended by Aristenus, that the archbishop of Constantinople could judge any metropolitan, affirming instead that he had competence only over those under his territorial jurisdiction (*ibid.*, 253-254). The second part of the second chapter of W.'s work reports six imperial laws that speak of the primacy of Constantinople (33). There emerges from this a picture of the clash of competences, illustrated by what is said about Illyria. Originally divided in 379 into Eastern and Western Illyria, Eastern Illyria was still under papal jurisdiction in 733, when Emperor Leo VI during the iconoclastic crisis removed this huge territory from under the pope's jurisdiction to that of the archbishop of Constantinople (36). In spite of this, the Scholion describes these bishops of Eastern Illyria as still being under the jurisdiction of the popes (36-37).

The third chapter probes into the background of the Treatise's idea of papal primacy. The Treatise was sent to the Bulgarians for a special purpose: to drive home the point how important the emperor is for their newfound faith, namely as the head of God's kingdom on earth (43-44). On the one hand, no personality cult followed because the real head was Christ (47-48), on the other, the emperors thought of themselves as being *vicarius Christi* (49-50). Not only was the emperor considered to be infallible (51), but he was the one who judged the patriarch in case of error, and to order him to start a process all over again (54). That the emperor had the duty to promote Orthodoxy may be gathered from the mission of Sts Cyril and Methodius (57-58); indeed, a Church without an emperor would be inconceivable, according to Patriarch Antonius IV's well-known reply to Grand Duke Vassilij I in 1393 (62-63). The whole idea was blurred by Constantinople's mixing up the temporal with the spiritual power, so that primacy became in end effect administrative more than anything else (65-67). The patriarch himself was caught up in a dilemma to derive his power where the highest political power is, with no proofs furnished to support the claim why he should have these particular spiritual powers (72). The contemporary tensions between Constantinople and Moscow are only a new edition of Constantinople's hegemony claims in the Middle Ages (74).

We now turn in chapter 4 to see what the Scholion has to say on canon 28 (75). Contrary to the accepted wisdom insinuated by Leo I that it was Anatolius, the new archbishop of Constantinople after Flavius' violent death, who prepared canon 28, it was in fact canons 9, 12 and 17 who did, says the Treatise (79). The Scholion counters that not political power but Christ's injunction to Peter to graze his sheep sealed Rome's destiny (81-82). Pilgrims flocked to Rome not because it was the capital but because Peter and his successors had their seat there (82). The Scholion offers some pertinent reflections on the interpretation of the transferral of the primacy from Rome to Constantinople by pointing out that, though the imperial residence moved first to Milan and in 402 to Ravenna, the seat of the primacy remained in Rome (87). Decisive

for the recognition of a council's ecumenicity was the pope's approval of the emperor's convoking it (106). Probably in response to Photius' placing, on the basis of canon 28, Constantinople before Rome in enumerating the ecclesial *taxis*, the Scholion reiterates that the papal programme came first on the agenda of Chalcedon (110-112).

The arguments of the Scholion in favour of the Roman primacy are passed in review in chapter 5. While considering it to be a masterpiece in its own right (116), W. admits that its arguments are not equally strong. Two points serve as coordinates: Christ's 'Feed my sheep' as the strongest argument, and Pope Leo I as the most valid witness (117). Its achievements are twofold: through the Scholion, as well as the copiers of the *Kormčaja Kniga* the Bulgarian Church became aware of the Petrine principle, through which the political principle is definitely abandoned (117-118).

Chapter 6 takes up again the question of authorship of the Scholion. Whereas Catholic scholars favour "St Cyril or St Methodius as either author or translator" (this reviewer finds the wording ambiguous) on the basis of their familiarity with the Roman conception due to their Rome visit and their mastery of Greek and Church Slavonic (119), this does not convince Troicki. The *Nomocanon in Fourteen Titles*, which Constantinople had given to the Bulgarians and to which according to Troicki the Treatise was attached, was unknown in Rome. Troicki advances instead the authorship of Anastasius Bibliothecarius (120). Having been elected bishop of Moravia, W. counters, he would be expected to demonstrate his orthodoxy by responding to Nicholas I's appeal to defend the primacy in the teeth of Photius' attacks (121). In favour of such a thesis W. adduces the fact that Cyril had discussed the primacy with Anastasius Bibliothecarius (121). However, the validity of the arguments of the Scholion, as W. rightly points out, does not depend on the authorship, even if the author were to remain anonymous (122).

In the last chapter, the idea of the primacy of both the Treatise and the Scholion are compared. The Treatise simply assumes that the primacy has already been transferred to Constantinople so that Rome has nothing more left than a few privileges. Rome naturally could not agree, seeing its right to intervene grounded in its apostolic origin (124). On the other hand, for Constantinople, though it now claimed primacy over the whole Church, this primacy was simply a question of administration (125). But while Constantinople wanted to extend its primacy over the whole world, the patriarchates of Alexandria and Antioch were founded precisely because Rome felt it could not run the show everywhere directly. Constantinople, too, eventually came around to claiming an apostolic origin, by building up the feast of St Andrew (127), first after Photius, then in 1759, in an even more solemn way, by Patriarch Seraphim. The Conclusion rounds up the conclusions by saying that not only Rome but also Constantinople indulged in progressive centralization (130).

This short work of W. is dense and insightful, because it conducts a discussion of the two principles on their own terms, on the basis of two documents at once contemporary and incorporating these two principles. A recent doctoral thesis defended in Rome (2013) on F. Dvornik's historical presuppositions of the primacy, A. Porpora's *I presupposti storici del primato del vescovo di Roma nell'opera di Frantisek Dvornik* (2013), was able to profit from W.'s work, the author's conclusion being that Dvornik's presuppositions are basically political. Nonetheless, while the two principles in their complementary and contradictory character manage to say much about the primacy, they leave much that is unsaid; one need only remember, on Orthodox side, what S. Bulgakov says on the spiritual nature of the primacy, and, on Catholic side, K. Rah-

ner's conception of the pastoral nature of the Roman see. Analogous works to W., conducted with the same thoroughness and eirenical spirit, are badly needed, especially if abetted by new or still insufficiently studied documents.

Rom

Edward G. Farrugia S.J.

Günther Schulz / Jürgen Ziemer, *Mit Wüstenvätern und Wüstenmüttern im Gespräch. Zugänge zur Welt des frühen Mönchtums in Ägypten*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010. 344 S. ISBN 978-3-525-67002-6.

Das Buch ist das Resultat langjähriger Auseinandersetzung der Autoren – G. Schulz ist emeritierter Professor für Kirchengeschichte an der Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität Münster, J. Ziemer ist emeritierter Professor für Praktische Theologie an der Universität Leipzig – mit den *Apophthegmata Patrum*, die sowohl im gemeinsamen Gespräch als auch im Rahmen universitärer Veranstaltungen erfolgte.

Aus der Überzeugung heraus, daß die spirituellen Traditionen, die hinter den Vätersprüchen stehen, für den modernen Menschen, zumal im protestantischen Kontext, zugleich fremd als auch überraschend nah (S. 15) seien, beschäftigen sich die Autoren in drei Teilen damit. Teil I (S. 19-130) bietet eine historische Einführung in das Wüstenmönchtum: „Kontext und Geschichte“ (S. 19-35), ein ausführliches Porträt des Antonius und dessen Lehre (S. 36-57), gefolgt von Porträts von 15 weiteren Wüstenvätern und Wüstenmüttern (S. 69-111); gleichsam überleitend zum II. Teil werden die *Apophthegmata Patrum* als theologische Texte beleuchtet (S. 112-130). Der II. Teil (S. 131-253) nähert sich den Traditionen systematisch, indem ausgehend von konkreten Sprüchen zentrale Themen erkundet werden, wie z.B. Freiheit, Schweigen, Demut, Achtsamkeit, Seelsorge oder Tod und Sterben. Diese werden immer auch mit Bezug auf die Fragen unserer Zeit vorgestellt. Teil III „Evangelische Spiritualität im Gespräch mit dem Wüstenmönchtum“ (S. 256-292) sucht nach Verbindungen zur reformatorischen Tradition und richtet aus der Perspektive der Wüstenväter auch Fragen an jene, wie z.B. „Wie viel Struktur braucht unser Glaube?“ (S. 269). Didaktische Hinweise zur Lektüre der *Apophthegmata Patrum*, die „exemplarische Auslegung einiger Haupttexte“ (S. 277-292) sowie „Statt eines Nachworts: Gespräch der Autoren“ (S. 293-298) schließen die eigentliche Darstellung. Es folgt ein Anhang (S. 299-328) mit einem Glossar, diversen längeren Erzählungen, mit der Beschreibung der Quellen- und Überlieferungsgeschichte (S. 310-324), einer Zeittafel sowie der schematischen Rekonstruktion der Generationsabfolgen der Wüstenväter und Wüstenmütter (S. 328).

Die Autoren haben sehr viel Bewunderung und Respekt für die *Apophthegmata Patrum*, in denen sie geglückte Sätze erkennen, solche nämlich die „leuchten wie Kristalle und die man nicht vergisst, wenn man sie einmal gehört hat“ (S. 298) ... „kleine Sprachkunstwerke“ (ebd.) seien sie. Aufgrund und in dieser positiven Grundhaltung haben es die Autoren sogar auf sich genommen, sich in die überaus komplizierte textkritische Problematik, die die *Apophthegmata Patrum* nach wie vor umgibt, einzuarbeiten (S. 310-324). Wir haben es mit zwei Theologen zu tun, die eine große Liebe zu diesen Texten verbindet. Und diese Liebe, d.h. wie die Autoren die *Apophthegmata Patrum* sehen, wird dann in diesem Buch vornehmlich nachgezeichnet. Über die Wüstenväter erfahren wir indes wenig, was über den schieren Wortlaut der *Apophthegmen* hinausgeht. Wer dieses Buch liest, liest im wesentlichen die *Apophthegmata Patrum* durch die Brille der Autoren. Dies könnte ein lohnenswertes Unterfangen sein, wenn dem Leser dazu relevante, inspirierende oder sonst nicht