

che ci sono giunti. Il *Discorso* celebra il momento della presa di possesso della cella da parte del monaco (e la tradizione siro-orientale prevedeva per questo una liturgia specifica) che, terminato il periodo di noviziato nel cenobio, si apprestava a iniziare la sua vita di solitario. Le esortazioni ad "abitare la solitudine" rivolte al monaco riguardo a come dovrà abitare la sua cella, dice S. Chialà, sono in realtà una profonda descrizione della vita stessa del solitario; e la cella altro non è che il cuore stesso del monaco. Con questa chiave di lettura, il *Discorso* diviene una magnifica sintesi della vita spirituale monastica e fa capire l'autentico obiettivo, che può sembrare paradossale trattandosi di un solitario, a servizio del quale la "cella" diviene uno strumento: riacquistare la dimensione relazionale fondamentale perduta con il peccato. Diventare, cioè, di nuovo pienamente "uomo" secondo il progetto di Dio, ossia capace di relazioni sane e autentiche con Dio, con il prossimo e con le cose create. Abitare la cella, abitare la solitudine, abitare il proprio cuore sono il cammino non di una separazione che fugge ma una vera e propria azione terapeutica, non solo per il monaco stesso ma a favore di tutti, nel suo essere capace di vedere di nuovo il mondo con occhi nuovi e amare di nuovo l'altro.

L'ultima relazione del volume è di Francisco del Rio Sánchez che tratta di *Dadišo' del Qaṭar*, autore sul quale non si hanno quasi notizie, tranne ciò che ci tramanda il *Catalogo* di 'Abdišo'. Corretta la identificazione fatta, in base a un errore dell'Assemani, di Dadišo' del Qaṭar con Dadišo' di Izla e la definitiva chiarificazione di A. Scher, si sono potuti aggiungere comunque pochi dati a questa figura, che rimane nel suo complesso ancora sfumata nei suoi contorni biografici. Però ci è stata tramandata probabilmente «la parte più significativa e importante» delle sue opere (cfr. p. 142), di alcune delle quali si ha già l'edizione critica. Ciò permette di abbozzare un quadro degli insegnamenti di Dadišo', dei quali l'autore si sofferma soprattutto su quello indicato dal termine siriano *šelya* e sulle tre tappe del cammino spirituale, mostrando come Dadišo' sia stato soprattutto un autore che scriveva su argomenti monastici, scevro di qualunque polemica teologica. Conclude la relazione una utile bibliografia essenziale.

Il volume termina con un'appendice di Emidio Vergani, *Centri e luoghi di diffusione della Chiesa Siro-orientale*, che fornisce un utile quadro "visivo" (grazie a delle essenziali ma chiare mappe) dove collocare le vicende storiche e religiose della Chiesa dell'Est.

M. Pampaloni, S.J.

WYRWOLL, Nikolaus, *Politischer oder petrinischer Primat? Zwei Zeugnisse zur Primatsauffassung im 9. Jahrhundert*, Institut für Ökumenische Studien der Universität Freiburg Schweiz 2010, pp. 147, € 18,00.

If for the East the primacy passed over to Constantine's new capital, for the West it remained where Peter and Paul had suffered martyrdom (3), which is why W. discusses here the political and the apostolic conceptions of Peter's primacy. After 1453 Constantinople saw one land after another reclaim autocephaly, while Rome remained for most the capital of Christianity (3). Tensions between the two

capitals due to political *potestas* and spiritual *auctoritas* existed from the start (9). A small *Treatise* discovered c. 1900 in canon law manuscripts given to the Bulgarians after their conversion in the 9th cent. discusses can. 28 of Chalcedon by stressing Constantinople's rights over against Rome (9-10); inside the *Treatise*, a *Scholion*, i.e. a theological marginal comment, defends Rome's primacy. On the backdrop of Pope Nicholas I and Patriarch Photios (9) and the sudden arrival of the Slavs, W. studies the origin and influence of the *Treatise's* and *Scholion's* teaching (10). The texts have a German translation (11-17) and a version in Church Slavonic (133-138).

Chapter 1 discusses the sources. While A. Pavlov, who first published the *Treatise* and the *Scholion* in 1897 (18), held Methodius for its translator, for M. Jugie, Methodius was the author and translator of the *Scholion* (19). F. Grivec considered the *Scholion* to be the work of Greek monks in Rome which Methodius corrected and translated (20), N. Rutkovskij suggested Gelasius I (d. 496) composed the *Scholion* in Latin towards the end of the 5th cent., whereas the Czech philologist M. Weingart rejected any connection with the Apostles of the Slavs on linguistic grounds (21). In 1935 Grivec asserted that Anastasius Bibliothecarius (d. c. 878) had helped Cyril in its composition (21). In 1941 Grivec called Cyril and Methodius the authors of the *Scholion*, but in his 1960 study of both saints the *Scholion* is not even mentioned (22). V. Troicki believed the *Scholion* to have been translated in Bulgaria after Anastasius Bibliothecarius composed it in Rome (22), an explanation I. Žužek rejected. The *Scholion* is cited by Jugie as the chief witness for the Roman primacy (23); whereas the *Treatise* claims that, as the capital of the empire, Constantinople enjoys a primacy over *all* bishops, including Rome's (25f).

Chapter 2 analyzes the *Treatise* by discussing Chalcedon's can.s 9, 17 and 28 and Rome (27). A cleric should appeal to his bishop against another cleric, says can. 9, to the provincial synod against his bishop, and to his exarch or to the archbishop of Constantinople against a metropolitan. Can. 17 specifies that a bishop who for thirty years was in peaceful possession of a diocese should be left in peace; should, however, the metropolitan hurt the bishop's rights, the latter can lodge a complaint with Constantinople. This does not apply only for the dioceses of Constantinople, for Leo I repeatedly writes that the rights of Alexandria and Antioch should not be impaired (28). Constantinople's head thus received an appeals right no other patriarch ever received, justified in can. 17 by the city's political rank. Even the Western theory of the three Petrine seats refers to three capitals (29). Can. 28 does not appear except in the beginning 7th cent., in the *Nomocanon with 14 Titles*, but the very comment of the *Treatise* on can. 28 shows its continued influence (32). W. next turns to the second part of the *Treatise*, which contains six imperial Laws on the pre-eminence of Constantinople. They are contained in the *Codex*, which Justinian published in 533, thereby abrogating the three in force thus far, the *Gregorianus*, the *Hermogenianus*, and the *Theodosianus* (33). The oldest known Collection of Church Regulations is John Scholasticus' *Synagoge canonum in 50 titles*, on the model of an earlier anonymous collection with 60 titles (33f.), followed, a few decades later, by the *Syntagma in 14 Titles* together with the "*Collectio tripar-*

tita" (34). In these collections of Church law State laws appear as an appendix. At the beginning of the 7th cent. Enantiophanes again reordered these collections in fourteen chapters, bringing conciliar decrees, patristic canons and the corresponding civil laws together, thereby enhancing the value of civil legislation (34). At the end of the century the *Quinisext* in 692 specified in can. 2 which canons are still in vigour. The *Nomocanon in 14 Titles*, known for centuries as the "Nomocanon of Photios", enjoys great prestige until this day (34). A politically interpreted primacy implies some of Rome's rights pass over to Constantinople (34f.). For example, the *Treatise* discusses who should exercise jurisdiction over Illyria. Although formerly under Old Rome, it was divided in 379 between Old and New Rome. Eastern Illyria became an independent prefecture with seat in Thessalonica, through which popes sought to exercise their rights over that area, even if the patriarch of Constantinople time and again interfered in it with the support of the Theodosian Codex (35). Only with iconoclasm in 732 was Illyria definitively transferred to the patriarch of Constantinople (36). Yet the *Scholion* describes the bishops of Illyria as still under the pope (36f.). Though the *Treatise* calls Rome "Mother" and "head" (37f.), can. 36 of the *Quinisext* claims equal rights for New Rome (38) and the *Treatise* subordinates the Roman bishop to it (39). In the Acts of Chalcedon Constantinople is called "the New Rome" (42).

Chapter 3 elucidates the background of the primacy in the *Treatise*. If it was sent to the Bulgarians, the point was to explain the emperor's significance for the Church (44). A balanced approach to the problem is Hugo Rahner's, who rejects the term "Caesaropapism" as being too Western, as does W. The emperor justified his right to intervene not as pope but as head of God's Kingdom on earth (46). Emperors appealed to several NT passages such as Rom 13:1, 1 Tim 2:2 and 1 Pt 2:13f., 17, but no emperor worship followed, for the real emperor is Christ (47f.). The emperor's standing was recognized so long as he wielded power in East and West; only when the Germans conquered the West did the emperor's position in the West wane, though not in the East, where the idea of the emperor as the highest ecclesial authority was upheld (48f.). As emerges from Emperor Leo III's declarations, he claimed for himself a teaching and jurisdictional primacy (49). The emperors were imbued with Constantine's idea of being *vicarius Christi*; Balsamon confirms this right especially when the canons are transgressed (50). The emperor was thought of as being infallible (51). In 328 Constantine had taken Arius back into the Church, simply because he accepted the council's creed (51). "Melkites" brings out the emperor's link to orthodoxy (52). The bishops of Syria II used the title "You are Peter" (Mt 16,18ff.) in a letter to Emperor Leo I (52). Even the *Book of Ceremonies*, produced in Constantinople in 959, uses for the emperor divine epithets (53). From the synod's list of three the emperor chose the patriarch, who sat one level below the emperor when they ate together and was judged by him if he fell into error (54); and though Chalcedon had assigned him the highest authority in ecclesial questions, the emperor could order him to start a process all over again. Metropolitans were appointed by the *synodos endemousa* and the patriarch, but the patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem were nominated by the

emperor. When Cyprus was recaptured by the Byzantines from the Saracens, it was John Tzimitzes who appointed its bishops (55). From Justinian's time until 741 the emperor confirmed the choice of the new pope and, until 1453, named the metropolitan for Russia (56). The emperor's universal jurisdiction entitled him to fix the boundaries of dioceses and patriarchates, as with the transferral of Illyria (56). Photius evokes this principle when he tells the pope it is up to the emperor to decide whether to return Bulgaria or not (56f.). The emperor's duty of propagating the faith is well illustrated by the contemporary Life of Sts Cyril and Methodius, which extols the emperor for his missionary success with the Chazars and with Ratislav of Moravia (57f.). At the end of his mission Cyril exclaims he is no longer the emperor's servant, but God's. Moreover, councils were convoked by the emperor; though W. does not point out that this was only a *Gewohnheitsrecht*, not anchored in any canon. When at Florence the question arose whether the pope can convoke a council, the answer was positive only if emperor and patriarch refused to come; but the anti-Photian synod of 869 rebuts the claim that no synod could be held without the presence of the ruler (58f.). Unlike F. Dvornik, who interpreted the fact that the emperor never voted in Synods as in the Senate as a sign of bishops' pre-eminence, W. explains that could mean he reserved his decision for later on. God's law and the Church tradition set limits, however, to the emperor's power; e.g. the emperor could not administer the sacraments (59f.). Still, Antonios IV of Constantinople wrote to Grand Duke Vassilij I, in 1393, that a Church without an emperor is inconceivable (62f.). A view similar to the Easterners' is found in the Donation of Constantine (64). Given the vacuum of authority in Rome, the pope increasingly assumed secular power, so that the Frankish archbishops complain that Nicholas I had become emperor of the whole world (65). Superficially, at the time of the *Treatise* the pope and the emperor had the same position: the pope governs a state with a claim to rule over all Christians; the emperor rules an empire with the claim to be the highest ruler of all Christians. However, A. Michel criticizes R. Glaber's report that Basilius II wanted to buy the papacy from John XIX in 1024 and not in 1044 as in the text (65f.). The *Treatise* simply declares that Rome no longer enjoys the primacy, which it assigns *tout court* to Constantinople (66). And yet, while the *Treatise* discusses at length some of the external rights of Constantinople it is silent on the duty to promote Church unity by "presiding in love" (66). However, as an analysis of the *Scholion* will show, the West's idea of the primacy was still largely enmeshed in administrative questions, and thus lost sight of what is essential (67). On account of their confusion of patriarchs' and a primates' rights Constantinople's canonists could denigrate Rome's position and privileges with a good conscience (67f.). The *Treatise* seems to reflect can. 17 of Chalcedon, emanated for a world where dogma and canons interpenetrate (68). W. next discusses the aspect of the primacy where the *Treatise* draws upon Photius' *Epanagoge* (68). Under Basil I two collections of law were composed: the *Epanagoge* and the *Procheiros nomos* (69f.). Photius compares the emperor with the body, the patriarch with the soul, whereby the highest jurisdiction goes to the patriarch, not the emperor (70). For the *Epanagoge* the patriarch is Christ's image and is put in charge by God,

not by the emperor. No justification is given for the priority of the patriarch over the emperor; indeed, the *Epanagoge* exemplifies the independence of the spiritual from the political power (72). If the emperor's primacy was grounded in the idea of God's kingdom where the emperor directs both the spiritual and the temporal, the *Epanagoge* restricts his chores to the temporal (72). The argumentation limps: the patriarch's position is derived from the emperor's presence in the capital, but no proof is given why the patriarch should have these spiritual tasks, independent of the emperor (72). The only "justification" is that, where the highest political power is, there also exists separate from it the highest spiritual power. The Patriarch of Constantinople still enjoys an honorary primacy, but Moscow's claims are only a new edition of Constantinople's medieval hegemony claims (74).

Chapter 4 investigates what the *Scholion* says on can. 28, the highpoint of anti-Roman argumentation: the new capital has taken from the old capital its primacy (75). Not only Leo I disapproved, but several of those present refused to sign (76). The *Treatise* had claimed that not Anatolius' ambition, but can.s 9, 12 and 17 prepared can. 28 of Chalcedon (79). Symmachus (d. 514) says that, if the honour due to the emperor is comparable to a bishop's, there is a world of difference because one is concerned with worldly, the other with spiritual matters (80). But while the first part of the *Scholion* repeats papal teaching, in the second part a new element is introduced in the sense that the primacy is derived not from political power but from Christ's words, "Graze my sheep!" (81f.). If everyone came to Rome it was not because it was the capital, but because Peter and his successors resided there (82). Can. 9 of the council of Antioch (341) is used for Rome in analogy with a metropolitan's primacy over his bishops (82). A transferral of the Church primacy would have been conceivable only if a bishop of Rome went to live in Constantinople — or Anagni, Orvieto or Avignon (83). Although the East understands the Bible references to Peter as intending his faith rather than his person, the *Scholion* assumes that Peter's leadership was transferred to his successors (83). Leo I's homilies on Peter stress the identity between Peter and the bishop of Rome (84). This becomes decisive for the *Scholion's* idea of the primacy: Rome's bishops also had Peter's privileges (86). It next advances the argument that, though Milan and, as of 402, Ravenna were imperial residences, they did not attain primacy status (87). In 325 the Fathers did not want to move Jerusalem to first place, but to fourth, and became a "patriarchate" only at Chalcedon (451), though W. could have added that the title was still too new to be used. Already in Nicaea Jerusalem's bishop signs before Caesarea's metropolitan (94). Can. 7 of Nicaea I has received much attention in the East, but in the Syrian and Arabic traditions Jerusalem's place is not described as a patriarchate (95). Although Balsamon considers Jerusalem to be one of the patriarchates, he does not say whether this was already so by 325 (100). According to Damasus, in 382, the three patriarchates are the three Petrine sees of Rome, Alexandria and Antioch (100-101), a theory Leo the Great and Nicholas I repeat (101). The *Scholion* speaks of Jerusalem's historical, not contemporary, rank (102). As for popes and ecumenical councils, when Marcian invited Leo to attend the pope answered there was no precedent for that, though popes constantly sent

legates (103f.) and insisted that he would preside over the council through them (104). That this was not a primacy of honour follows from the fact that only the bishop of Rome never attended ecumenical councils (104f.). The decisive criterion for a council to be ecumenical, for W., is the agreement between pope and emperor (106). Thus, Nicaea II declassified Hieria on the grounds that a council cannot be ecumenical if the bishop of Rome did not participate. And Nicholas I wrote to Emperor Michael about the way Leo's letter was received (107). If the *Scholion* insists that the pope's programme came first on the agenda, as in Chalcedon (107f.), this is probably as an answer to Photius' letter to Boris in which Rome comes after Constantinople (109). Following can. 28 Photius mentions Constantinople first, then Rome, then Alexandria, then Antioch (110), the legates' names at Nicaea II appear after Tarasios' (111). Leo I's letters about Anatolios criticize his ambition (112f.), a theme which returns until 454 (114).

Chapter 5, analyzing the *Scholion's* arguments taken as a whole, advances historical arguments for the divine promise to Peter; for W., a masterpiece (cf. 116). But the arguments are not equally strong; can. 28 was not due to Anatolios' ambition (cf. 70f.); Ravenna and Milan did become metropolitans when their political importance arose (cf. 81ff.); and, according to many, Nicaea had already recognized Jerusalem as a patriarchate. The strongest argument is "Peter, do you love me?", and Leo I serves as authority all along. Through the *Scholion* Leo's thought was made known not only to the Bulgarian Church but also, thanks to the copiers of the *Kormčaja Kniga*, to the Slavic Churches (117). On the strength of the Petrine principle, the political principle is definitively abandoned (117f.).

Chapter 6 asks who wrote the *Scholion*; Catholic scholars point to Cyril or Methodius as either author or translator. Troicki rejects this because the *Nomocanon in 14 Titles*, in which the *Treatise* was found, was unknown in Rome (119); though he is right in saying that the *Nomocanon in 14 Titles* was unknown, the *Treatise* Photius sent to the Bulgarians was not. Troicki's arguments for Anastasius Bibliothecarius' authorship of the *Scholion* fail to convince (120). The way the case for the Petrine primacy is presented points to Cyril as author during his stay in Rome in 868. As bishop-elect of Moravia he was expected to show his orthodoxy, which he did in response to Nicholas' appeal to defend the primacy from Photius' attacks; besides, Cyril discussed matters with Anastasius Bibliothecarius (121). Should the author remain anonymous, his arguments retain their value (122).

Finally, *chapter 7* describes the *Scholion's* idea of the primacy, in sharp contrast to the *Treatise's*. The *Treatise* attributes Rome only privileges, the primacy now belongs to Constantinople (123). Whenever Rome's intervention went against the emperor, it was felt to lack a privilege to back it. Rome thought otherwise; its right to intervene derived from its apostolic primacy (124). Next the difference between the patriarchal and the apostolic offices are described (125). Constantinople's idea of the primacy was purely administrative (126). Rome, however, was not only the oldest patriarchate, but also the living centre of union of the whole Church (126). As Ratzinger wrote in 1963, the tragedy of the tensions between Rome and Constantinople is that the apostolic and the administrative functions got mixed up

(126f.). This opposition finds expression in the *Treatise* and the *Scholion*. The patriarchates of Alexandria and Antiochia were founded because Rome could not exercise its patriarchal-administrative rights everywhere. Constantinople, on the contrary — at least since Chalcedon — wanted to extend its administration over the whole world (127). As of the 18th century Constantinople celebrates St Andrew as its founder; which means, it, too, claimed an apostolic origin (127). With the fall of the empire came the fall of the “enormous patriarchate” of Constantinople, and there emerged a whole group of autonomous and autocephalous Churches (127). However, as can. 34 of the Apostles puts it, the bishops of a city must know who the head is (128). If Cyril and Methodius went to Rome, they meant to withdraw Moravia from the patriarchal particularism of Constantinople (128f.). To Bessarion's question Florence answered: a metropolitan's or patriarch's authority is limited to certain territories, whereas the authority of Peter extends immediately to all (129).

In *conclusion*, neither from the *Treatise* nor from the *Scholion* do autonomy and autocephaly follow. If the *Scholion* asserts Rome's leadership for all time, the *Treatise*, too, wants to promote visible unity (129). The kind of head necessary from the viewpoint of the *Treatise* had to be strong, since the emperor could exercise supervision over any patriarch. It is thus incorrect to claim Rome kept centralizing, for Constantinople did the same (129f.). An invisible union is useless, because unity must guarantee order. It is through the bitter experience with totalitarian states that a desire of union which does not come from the state but from the Church has become vocal and imperative (130). The Roman bishop is, in his apostolic succession, the guarantee of such a union, underlined by the *Scholion*: Rome's leadership will remain until the end of times. From the viewpoint of the leadership of the Church two conclusions have been drawn. Some want to tie unity to the political power of the Roman Empire, others want a completely independent Church (131). Where authority was too closely aligned to the State, it broke down with the State. Neither the *Treatise* nor the *Scholion* wanted this.

W.'s work merits to be read and discussed as when it was defended as a thesis at the *Gregoriana*, Rome, fifty years ago (6), because it strikingly illustrates the difference between the political and the apostolic primacy, so often invoked, so seldom defined.

E. G. Farrugia, S.J.

in: *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 77 (2011) 288–294