

NOTES

ORIGEN STUDIES AND PIERRE NAUTIN'S *ORIGÈNE*

Pierre Nautin's *Origène*¹ is a milestone in the ongoing "revival"² of Origen studies. To explain why requires a brief sketch of the major moments in the history of Origen research.³

I

Born about 185 of Christian parents (his father was martyred around 201), Origen spent most of his early life in Alexandria, until tension with his bishop Demetrios forced him to leave Alexandria and accept the patronage of the bishops of Jerusalem and of Caesarea Maritima, where he spent most of the final seventeen (and most productive) years of his life. He died around age 69, some time after June 251, after having been imprisoned and tortured under Decius.

Like Philo, some two hundred years before, Origen never managed a fully satisfying synthesis between his (in this case Christian incarnational) faith and the constant Platonizing tendencies of his thought, nor does he seem even to be much concerned about such a synthesis. This helps explain why he has been admired by both Athanasius and the adoptionists, Reformers and Catholics, rationalists and mystics alike. Many in his own day saw him as the referee of orthodoxy. This is part of the very favorable picture drawn by Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* 6), also dramatically confirmed by the recently discovered Toura papyrus text *Dialogue with Heraclides*.⁴

But many others, even in his own day, seriously doubted his orthodoxy; for the tensions which precipitated his final departure from Alexandria in 232 seem to have been caused largely by conservative reactions to his attempts (*Comm. Pss. 1-25, Stromata, De resurrectione*, the first books of the *Comm. Gen.*) to nuance the popular, physically literal misunderstanding of creation and resurrection with a more spiritual interpretation. As N. reconstructs it, Origen wrote the *De principiis* in 229-30 largely in an attempt to meet these objections with a systematic presentation of his

¹ P. Nautin, *Origène: Sa vie et son oeuvre* (Christianisme antique 1; Paris: Beauchesne, 1977) 474 pp.; appendixes; indexes of works cited, proper names, manuscripts.

² Cf. H. Musurillo, "The Recent Revival of Origen Studies," *TS* 24 (1963) 250-63.

³ For much of the detail of this sketch, and for many of the implicit and explicit judgments contained therein, I have relied extensively on H. Crouzel, *Bibliographie critique d'Origène* (*Instrumenta patristica* 8; The Hague: Nijhoff, 1971 [see n. 22 below]). This is somewhat complemented by R. Farina, *Bibliographia Origeniana 1960-1970* (*Biblioteca del "Salesianum"* 77; Turin: Società Editrice Internazionale, 1971).

⁴ J. Scherer, ed., *Entretien d'Origène avec Héraclide et les évêques ses collègues, sur le Père, le Fils, et l'âme* (Cairo: Publications de la Société Fouad Ier de Papyrologie, Textes et documents 9, 1949); published also in SC 67 (Paris: Cerf, 1960).

exegetical and hermeneutical principles, and above all by carefully distinguishing between what is clearly revealed and handed on and what is not and thus subject to speculative elucidation. But the storm continued to rage; so, after a brief stay in Athens, Origen settled in the theologically more receptive climate of Caesarea in Palestine.

For some 150 years Origen's opponents were far outweighed by those who understood and admired him: Gregory Thaumaturgus, Athanasius, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, Eusebius, Didymus, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Hilary, and the early Jerome. But around 400 the balance shifted; the first great Origenist crisis came to a head in the disedifying controversy between Rufinus and Jerome, who, largely for ecclesio-political reasons, it seems, had by then publicly turned against Origen while continuing to use him as a major source for his own works. Thereafter the field was dominated by overenthusiastic Origenists who turned Origen's speculations into doctrine, and by the anxious guardians of orthodoxy who likewise misunderstood Origen's thought and intentions. This led ultimately to the largely misinformed blanket condemnations of Constantinople II (553; cf. DS 433—which many assumed erroneously to represent conciliar definition) and to the repeated strictures of later synods and councils. No longer was any influential figure sufficiently conversant with Origen to see him, as did the fourth-century Fathers, as "the stone which sharpens us all" and "the second master of the Church after the Apostle."⁵ This helps explain why only about one fourth of Origen's work, and much of that only in the Latin translations of Rufinus and Jerome, has survived.

In 1486 Pico della Mirandola published his famous 900 conclusions, one of the more controversial of which was: "It is more reasonable to believe Origen saved than to believe him damned." He supported this statement with an impressively argued Latin dissertation which, with its (for that time) unusual awareness of historical context and its concern to bring both fact and reason to bear on theological conclusions, can still be read with profit, especially as an aid to understanding how Origen continued to be a sign of contradiction through the ages.⁶ Erasmus, whose Latin edition (Basel and Lyon, 1536, with the *Comm. Jn.* first appearing only in the 1557 Basel edition) helped make Origen generally accessible, was also strongly sympathetic to him. So also was Pierre Daniel Huet. His *Origeniana* (1668), written to introduce the first edition of Origen's

⁵ Gregory of Nazianzus, Didymus the Blind, and the early Jerome, as quoted by H. Crouzel, "Origen and Origenism," *NCE* 10 (1967) 773. This article is the best brief introduction to Origen in English.

⁶ Cf. H. Crouzel, *Une controverse sur Origène à la Renaissance: Jean Pic de la Mirandole et Pierre Garcia* (Paris: Vrin, 1977). For a French translation (with annotations) of Pico's dissertation: "Pic de la Mirandole et Origène," *BLE* 66 (1965) 81–106, 174–94, 272–88.

exegetical works in Greek, was the first critical study of Origen's life, teaching, and works. It stood alone as the basic work on Origen for some two centuries, being included by the Maurists Charles and Vincent Delarue in their critical edition of 1753-59, and by K. H. E. Lommatzsch (1831) and J.-P. Migne (1857) in their respective re-editions of Delarue. Delarue's edition (with Latin translations, introductions and notes) was the first complete critical edition of Origen's known work, and is even today not wholly supplanted by the Berlin Academy's *editio maior* (GCS), not only because of some notable omissions like the *Commentary on Romans*, but also because of the large amount of questionable or spurious material somewhat arbitrarily included by P. Koetschau in his 1913 (GCS 22) edition of the *De principiis*. The next "classic" study on Origen is E. R. Redepenning, *Origenes: Eine Darstellung seines Lebens und seiner Lehre* (2 vols.; Bonn, 1841-46; repr. Aalen: Scientia, 1966), whose critical allegiance to historical accuracy rather than dogmatic or ecclesiastical preoccupations (as he describes it) produced a picture strongly sympathetic to Origen, and conclusions remarkably like the growing modern critical consensus which gives the nod more to Rufinus than to Jerome in their famous dispute. C. Bigg's sympathetic essay of several decades later also retains its value as a general introduction, despite weaknesses in understanding the allegorical method.⁷

But in the same year (1886) the first volume of Harnack's *Dogmengeschichte*, putting Origen's thought in a framework of cosmological speculation, gave decisive impetus to an attitude which dominated critical scholarship for over half a century: viewing Origen more as a Greek philosopher than a Christian theologian.⁸ De Faye's classical three-volume presentation of this position⁹ accepted at face value Jerome's condemnation of Rufinus' translations, thus eliminating from consideration most of the homilies and all but fragmentary remains of the *De principiis* and *Commentary on Romans*. This facilitated the one-sided interpretations of scholars bred on comparative religion and far more alert to the evidences of Neoplatonism and Gnosticism than to those of genuine Christian faith or mysticism.¹⁰ Not insignificant support came from the

⁷ C. Bigg, *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1886; repr. 1913).

⁸ A. von Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* 1 (4th ed.; Tübingen: Mohr, 1909) 650-97.

⁹ E. de Faye, *Origène: Sa vie, son oeuvre, sa pensée* (3 vols.; Paris: Leroux, 1923-28).

¹⁰ Representative of this "school" are A. Miura-Stange, *Celsus und Origenes: Das Gemeinsame ihrer Weltanschauung, nach den acht Büchern des Origenes gegen Celsus* (Beihefte zur ZNW 4; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1926); Hal Koch, *Pronoia und Paideusis: Studien über Origenes und sein Verhältnis zum Platonismus* (Arbeiten für Kirchengeschichte 22; Berlin, 1932); H. von Campenhausen, *Die griechischen Kirchenväter* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1955; Engl. tr., New York, 1959); E. von Ivanka, *Plato christianus: Uebernahme und Umgestaltung des Platonismus durch die Väter* (Einsiedeln: Johannes, 1964).

GCS *editio maior*, whose editors (P. Koetschau, E. Klostermann, E. Preuschen, W. A. Baehrens, and M. Rauer), more philologists than theologians, reflect the then (1899–1935) reigning assumptions of the Harnack school in their introductions, notes, and indexes, as becomes glaringly obvious in comparison with the theologically more perceptive supporting materials of the *Sources chrétiennes* editions.

Authors like G. Bardy seemed merely to be shouting into the wind until Völker¹¹ decisively restored an awareness of Origen's Christian spirituality and mysticism. He insisted that all texts on a given subject, Latin as well as Greek, need to be considered when studying Origen's thought, and that the Latin texts, when thus used with care, are also reliable sources. This method, refined by such scholars as Daniélou, de Lubac, Hanson (with reservations), Crouzel, Gruber, Harl, and Gögler, gradually won out.¹²

To speak, as Musurillo could fifteen years ago, of "the two camps of Origen studies today" ("The Recent Revival" 252), would now be an anachronism. But Völker's ground-breaking work was itself not without flaw. Among others, Lieske showed that in Völker Origen's idea of mystical union was excessively restricted to the level of personal piety and religious experience and falsely isolated from any theological conception of the ontological reality of being taken up into union with Christ.¹³

By now, the modern "rehabilitation" of Origen was underway. After World War II, led especially by French scholars like Daniélou and de

¹¹ W. Völker, *Das Vollkommenheitsideal des Origenes* (BHT 7; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1931).

¹² J. Daniélou, *Origène* (Paris: La Table Ronde, 1948); Engl. tr., *Origen* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1955); H. de Lubac, *Histoire et esprit: L'Intelligence de l'écriture d'après Origène* (Théologie 16; Paris: Aubier, 1950); *Exégèse médiévale: Les quatre sens de l'écriture* (4 vols.; 1/1–2, Théologie 41 [1959]; 2/1, Théologie 42 [1961]; 2/2 Théologie 59 [1964]; Paris: Aubier). R. P. C. Hanson, *Origen's Doctrine of Tradition* (London: SPCK, 1954); *Allegory and Event: A Study of the Sources of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture* (London: SCM, 1959); G. Gruber, *ZΩH: Wesen, Stufen und Mitteilung des wahren Lebens bei Origenes* (Münchener theologische Studien 23; Munich: Hueber, 1962); M. Harl, *Origène et la fonction révélatrice du Verbe incarné* (Patristica Sorbonensia 2; Paris: Seuil, 1958); R. Gögler, *Zur Theologie des biblischen Wortes bei Origenes* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1963). For other works of these (and many other) authors on Origen, see Crouzel, *Bibliographie critique*. For Crouzel himself, see the special paragraph on him below.

¹³ A. Lieske, *Die Theologie der Logos-Mystik bei Origenes* (Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie 22; Münster: Aschendorff, 1938). One should also note in this connection the brilliant work of H. Urs von Balthasar, "Le mystèrion d'Origène," *RSR* 26 (1936) 513–62; 27 (1937) 38–64; reprinted as *Parole et mystère chez Origène* (Paris: Cerf, 1957). The same extraordinary gifts of perception enabled him, by internal criticism alone, to distinguish accurately—as confirmed by M.-J. Rondeau, "Le commentaire sur les Psaumes d'Evagre le Pontique," *Orientalia christiana periodica* 26 (1960) 307–48—between genuine and spurious material in the Psalm fragments attributed to Origen; cf. "Die Hiera des Evagrius," *ZKT* 63 (1939) 86–106, 181–206.

Lubac (who was particularly responsible for providing modern scholarship with the key to understanding Origen's exegesis), scholars increasingly saw in Origen not just a Greek philosopher in Christian clothing, but the central key figure in the early development of Christian theology. Much of the credit for this consensus is due to the scholars who have produced the nineteen volumes on Origen in the *Sources chrétiennes* series.¹⁴ Their introductions and notes provide the needed theological complement to those of the GCS editions of the Berlin Academy.

One of the more important events of this period was Scherer's publication of the extensive Greek fragments of the *Commentary on Romans* found at Toura.¹⁵ This affords proof—thus strengthening the hand of those who insisted that the Latin translations be given their due—that Rufinus' much maligned Latin translation, except for occasional incomprehension of Origen and some updating of Trinitarian terminology, is actually a fairly accurate summary of Origen's thought.

After Musurillo's review (1963) the following accomplishments stand out: the continuing dialogue among Origen scholars, the clear emergence of Henri Crouzel as the "patriarch" of Origen studies, the impressive break-through by Mme. Harl and her students on the structure and literary background of the *De principiis*, and an impressive succession of articles and monographs on various aspects of Origen's thought.

Beyond the quadrennial meetings of the Oxford Patristic Conference, Origen scholars have begun to hold their own international conference every four years. The first meeting took place at Montserrat from Sept. 18–21, 1973. The congress volume *Origeniana*¹⁶ arranged twenty-two papers into three parts: (1) concerning the *De principiis*, with essays by Harl, Dorival, Le Boulluec, Alexandre, Godin, Rist, and Crouzel; (2) concerning the other works of Origen, with essays by Girod, Lomiento, Deniau, Junod, Dorival, and Birdsall; (3) influences on Origen, with essays by de Lange, Bostock, Balas, Elorduy, Walter, Rius-Camps, Daly, Trevijano Etcheverría, and Armantage. Shortly before, the Daniélou

¹⁴ From 1944–77 the following have contributed: L. Doutreleau, P. Fortier, H. de Lubac, O. Rousseau, J. Scherer, A. Jaubert, H. Crouzel, F. Fournier, P. Périchon, M. Borret, C. Blanc, R. Girod, E. Junod, P. Nautin. Two Italian translations, because of the high quality of their extensive introductions and notes, have also contributed to this consensus: M. Simonetti, *I principi di Origene* (Classici delle Religioni, Sezione 4^a; Turin: Unione Tipografica, 1968); E. Corsini, *Commento al Vangelo di Giovanni* (Classici della Filosofia; Turin: Unione Tipografica, 1968). This is the only complete modern-language translation of the eight surviving books of this work.

¹⁵ J. Scherer, *Le Commentaire d'Origène sur Rom. III, 5–V, 7, d'après les extraits du Papyrus n° 88748 du musée du Caire et les fragments de la Philocalie et du Vaticanus graecus 762: Essai de reconstitution du texte et de la pensée des tomes V et VI du Commentaire sur l'Épître aux Romains* (Institut français d'archéologie orientale 27; Cairo: Bibliothèque d'étude, 1957).

¹⁶ H. Crouzel, G. Lomiento, J. Rius-Camps, eds., *Origeniana* (Quaderni di "Vetera christianorum" 12; Bari: Istituto di Letteratura Cristiana Antica, 1975).

Festschrift¹⁷ had appeared with another impressive group of articles by Barthélemy, Crouzel, R. M. Grant, Hanson, Harl, Kettler, Menard, Nautin, Richard, Rordorf, Studer, Leroux, and Leroy. The Festschrift for Cardinal Pellegrino¹⁸ also included articles on Origen by Harl, Méhat, R. M. Grant, Crouzel, and Früchtel. Taken together, the essays in these collections provide a fairly good picture of the contemporary state of Origen studies. More recently, the second international Origen congress took place in Bari from Sept. 20–23, 1977, with seventy scholars in attendance, forty-five of them presenting papers or reports. The contributions concentrated mainly on Origen's thought. Nothing startlingly new appeared, and the field gave signs of being, relative to the past, in a phase of consensus and consolidation. According to arrangements just completed, the proceedings will appear as *Origeniana secunda* (Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo).

One of the most obvious events in recent Origen studies has been the emergence of Henri Crouzel as the "patriarch" of Origen studies (six books, two SC text editions, forty articles, twelve chronicles or review-articles). His study of Origen's theological anthropology in 1956¹⁹ was followed in 1961 by an extensive study of Origen's theory of knowledge²⁰ (bringing to completion the pioneering work of Völker and Lieske), and almost immediately thereafter, in 1962, by an analysis of Origen's relationship to philosophy,²¹ which with its appended essay "Origène est-il un systématique?" offered an overwhelming mass of proof that Origen was neither a systematician, as this term is commonly understood, nor in the first instance a philosopher, but primarily a theologian and committed man of the Church. Among these contributions are the superb survey articles on Origen in the *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche, Sacramentum mundi*, and the *New Catholic Encyclopedia*. In 1973 he was the moving force behind the first Origen congress at Montserrat; but that which perhaps most of all gives him pre-eminence in service to the community of scholarship is his awesome critical bibliography of Origen.²²

¹⁷ J. Fontaine and C. Kannengiesser, eds., *Epektasis: Mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1972).

¹⁸ T. Alimonti et al., eds., *Forma futuri: Studi in onore del Cardinale Michele Pellegrino* (Turin: Bottega d'Erasmus, 1975).

¹⁹ H. Crouzel, *Théologie de l'image de Dieu chez Origène* (Théologie 34; Paris: Aubier, 1956).

²⁰ H. Crouzel, *Origène et la "connaissance mystique"* (Museum Lessianum, section théologique 56; Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1961).

²¹ H. Crouzel, *Origène et la philosophie* (Théologie 52; Paris: Aubier, 1962).

²² H. Crouzel, *Bibliographie critique d'Origène* (Instrumenta patristica 8; The Hague: Nijhoff, 1971). This exhaustive annotated bibliography, stretching from the second century to 1969, and supplied with an analytical index as well as author index, is arranged chronologically. It allows the nonspecialist to acquire some control over an otherwise hopelessly complicated field. Since 1967, Crouzel has published annually in the *BLE*, under the title "Chronique Origénienne," a review of the new Origen books of the previous year.

But Crouzel has not stood entirely alone; one must also point out the remarkable break-through by M. Harl and her students on the structure and literary genre of the *De principiis*. Harl, building on the earlier, somewhat neglected work of Steidle,²³ finds that the work consists of a preface and three "cycles": first, I,1—II,3: general presentation; second, II,4—IV,3: detailed discussion of particular questions; third, IV,4: brief recapitulation plus supplementary developments. In each of the three cycles the same basic body of material is treated: God, Son, Spirit—beings endowed with reason—the world. In the context of contemporary philosophical tracts, it comes after "logic" and "ethics" and within the area called "physics," which was the place where the philosopher would speak of God. While producing a wholly Christian work, Origen nevertheless seemed to follow the customary arrangement of a treatise in the area of physics. This helps explain why the *De principiis* is not a complete exposition of Christian doctrine (ecclesiology, prayer, and sacraments, among others, are missing). G. Dorival then finds parallels to the form of the *De principiis* (repetition by way of refutation and research) in a tradition of treatises on physics which had been common since Aristotle. A. Le Boulluec, finding that Origen reflects only a stereotyped image of Gnosticism, concludes that he was primarily addressing believing Christians, using Gnosticism only as a foil to help them to understand their faith more deeply. These presentations were the high-point of the 1973 Montserrat congress. They appear as the opening entries in the Congress volume *Origeniana*.²⁴ The Origen fraternity seems to have accepted these conclusions and thus achieved, for the first time in history, something approaching consensus concerning the nature of the *De principiis* (hence my disappointment that Nautin did not immediately discuss the relationship of his conclusions to these).

II

The last three decades have seen a veritable stream of articles and monographs on Origen.²⁵ The one increasingly obvious gap, the lack of a critical study of all known sources on Origen's life and work, is what

²³ B. Steidle, "Neue Untersuchungen zu Origenes," *ZNW* 40 (1941) 236–43.

²⁴ See n. 18 above. These findings are also summarized in *Origène, Traité des principes (Peri Archon)*, introd. et trad. M. Harl, G. Dorival, A. le Boulluec (Études augustinienes; Paris, 1976). For a discussion of what is needed in a new edition of the *De principiis*, see E. Junod, "Entre deux éditions de *De principiis* d'Origène," *BLE* 78 (1977) 207–20.

²⁵ Among the recent works which seem to be particularly valuable are J. A. Alcain, *Cautiverio y redención del hombre en Origenes* (Bilbao: Universidad de Deusto 1974); W. Gessel, *Die Theologie des Gebetes nach "De oratione" von Origenes* (Munich: Schönningh, 1975), cf. review by Crouzel in *BLE* 77 (1976) 128–32; H. J. Vogt, *Das Kirchenverständnis des Origenes* (Bonner Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte 4; Cologne: Böhlau, 1974).

Pierre Nautin aims to fill with his *Origène*. Chap. 1 (pp. 19–29) presents his approach to the major source, Eusebius' biography of Origen in *Hist. eccl.* 6. Most essential is his careful distinction between Eusebius' written sources (Origen's own works and letters in the archives and libraries of Jerusalem and Caesarea) and his oral sources, which are particularly prone to hagiographical embellishment (he is, of course, writing in Caesarea some 120 years after Origen's early life in Alexandria). Happily, Eusebius marked these oral sources with such phrases as "it is reported" or "the story is told that." But for the first forty-eight years of Origen's life, Eusebius seems to have been blessed with access to an autobiographical account, probably the letter Origen sent from Athens to the bishop of Jerusalem in 233 to defend himself against Demetrios, the bishop of Alexandria. Eusebius reveals his use of this account by such phrases as "as he himself writes" or "as he himself says in his own words." For the period after 233, however, Eusebius apparently had no such detailed source.

N. next points out the need for a highly critical attitude towards Eusebius' interpretations and attempts at chronology. In his interpretations and assumptions he falls far below contemporary critical standards (e.g., identifying persons who happen to bear the same name, and making assumptions about Origen's education in Alexandria from the way he educated Theodore [Gregory?] in Alexandria forty years later). One must also keep in mind that, although honest, one of his main purposes is to defend a controversial figure who was in some quarters suspect of heresy. What results is more an apology than a disinterested biography. The modern historian, with access to far more information and methodological refinement, can also see that Eusebius' attempts at chronology frequently miss the mark. But, despite these limitations, Eusebius remained a straightforward, almost naive, relatively transparent historian. The patient scholar can glean enough information from him to rescue much of Origen's biography from ungrounded affirmations and uncritical hagiography.

Chap. 2 (pp. 31–98) is a paragraph-by-paragraph analysis of the twenty-eight chapters (1–8, 15–19, 23–28, 30–33, 36–39) of *Hist. eccl.* 6 which deal with Origen. Chap. 3 (99–153) does the same with Pamphilus' and Eusebius' *Apology for Origen* (Pamphilus wrote Bks. 1–5, Eusebius wrote Bk. 6 and published the work), which has survived only in fragments. N. begins with an analysis of Photius' remarks on the *De principiis* in codex 117 and 118 of his *Library*, in which he (apparently embarrassed that Pamphilus defends it) passes over Origen's teaching in silence. N. then analyzes the condemned fifteen articles of Origen's teaching listed in codex 117 and which Photius apparently took from the no-longer-extant Book 2 of Pamphilus' *Apology*. This enables him to reconstruct the

origins of these fifteen articles and how they occasioned the *Apology*.²⁶ Chap. 4 (pp. 155–82) treats the handful of Origen's letters which have come down to us in whole or in part (three are intact or substantially reconstructed; three others exist only in fragments). Chap. 5 (pp. 183–224) treats the remaining biographical sources: (1) the *Panegyric of Theodore* (usually identified with Gregory Thaumaturgus, due to one of Eusebius' hasty assumptions), which gives us precious insights into Origen's life-style in Caesarea; (2) the hostile remarks of Porphyry from the third book of his treatise *Against the Christians* (ca. 270) which Eusebius quotes in *Hist. eccl.* 6, 19, 10 (Porphyry is not a trustworthy witness, but N. finds little reason to doubt either his claim that, as a young man of seventeen or eighteen, he had some intellectual contact with Origen, or his statement that Origen, as well as his student and later bishop of Alexandria Heraclas, had indeed studied under Ammonius Saccus in Alexandria); (3) the secondhand remarks (a) of Epiphanius of Salamis, who is himself dependent on a weak recollection of the *Apology* of Pamphilus and Eusebius, (b) of Jerome, who is dependent on Epiphanius (for the ungrounded idea that Origen died at Tyre) and on Eusebius and his own conjectures, and (c) of Palladius, who, working from Eusebius, simply invents a somewhat tasteless novel.

Chap. 6 (pp. 225–60) offers a provisional reconstruction of the list of Origen's works which Eusebius inserted into the third book of his *Life of Pamphilus*. The sources for this reconstruction are the biographical details in Eusebius' *Historia ecclesiastica* and Jerome's *De uiris illustribus* and *Letter 33*. The "nouvelles observations" (p. 241) which N. can bring to bear justify his attempt to improve on the older lists of E. Preuschen (1893) and E. Klostermann (1897). The result is a nineteen-page list (242–260) of the works of Origen known to Eusebius, accompanied by brief descriptions and the essential modern bibliographical and technical information related to them. Since the two-volume tract *Peri pascha* (recent Toura papyrus discovery) is not included, unless it is meant to be included under the eight paschal homilies, it is quite possible that not all of Origen's work was known to Eusebius.

The following three chapters discuss three works whose over-all place and significance in Origen's work are frequently the subject of some confusion. Chap. 7 (pp. 261–92) puts in context the three different Psalm

²⁶ This chapter complements the valuable work of A. Guillaumont, who found in the newly available S₂ text of the *Kephalaia Gnostica* of Evagrius of Pontus, which he edited for PO 28/1 (1958), the apparent source of the Christological doctrine (anathematisms 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13) in the fifteen anti-Origenist anathematisms of Constantinople II (553). Cf. A. Guillaumont, *Les 'Képhalaia Gnostica' d'Evagre le Pontique et l'histoire de l'origénisme chez les grecs et chez les syriens* (Patristica Sorbonensia 5; Paris: Seuil, 1962); "Evagre et les anathématismes antiorigénistes de 553" (Studia patristica 3; TU 78; Berlin: Akademie, 1961) 219–26.

commentaries. The first, covering Pss 1-25, from A.D. 222-25 (erroneously described by Eusebius as "excerpta"), was probably Origen's first major writing venture after his extensive work on the *Hexapla*. The second is a massive commentary covering Pss 1-72 and 103, done at Caesarea in 246 and 247. The third is the *Excerpta in psalterium* from the year 249, a work which reflects Origen's custom of quickly "finishing" an unfinished commentary by treating only selected passages of the remaining portion. Chap. 8 (pp. 293-302) discusses the ten-volume *Stromata*, which, following Clement's example, Origen wrote in Alexandria, apparently just after the first Psalm commentary and before the *De resurrectione*. From Jerome's description, the subjects treated therein covered the length and breadth of theology. Only fragments have survived (carefully listed on p. 295), to which N. adds the account of Origen's treatment of the resurrection which Jerome includes in his *Contra Iohannem Hierosolymitanum* 25-26 (pp. 298-300). Chap. 9 (pp. 303-61), a detailed discussion of the *Hexapla*, is an unusually fruitful piece of detective work. Among the conclusions proposed with varying degrees of certitude or probability are: that Origen's purpose was not polemic but primarily to get as close as possible to the *original* Hebrew text, and that he used the comparative textual methods of the Alexandrian grammarians to do so; that Origen originally worked from a Jewish *Vorlage* with four columns: Hebrew, transliteration in Greek letters, Aquila, Symmachus; that Origen's first step was to drop the Hebrew column and add the LXX and Theodotion; that Origen carried this out as his first major work (but for his own private use) in Alexandria around 220; that Origen's work did *not* have a Hebrew column, and that all witnesses to a Hebrew column go back to a misinterpretation of Epiphanius which Jerome uncritically followed; that Jerome, despite his contrary claim, never actually saw Origen's original copies; that the work was never fully copied, and probably never left the library at Caesarea; that the terms *tetrapla* and *hexapla*, as first used by Eusebius, referred to the number of translations, not to the number of columns, and that Epiphanius is the one primarily responsible for the confusion on this point; that the word *hexapla* refers to a second synopsis of Origen which had six translations, compiled after he had discovered two additional translations around 245. N. also mentions his fascinating thesis, which he hopes to demonstrate in a future work, that Jerome's Vulgate is a translation not from the Hebrew but from a Palestinian copy of the hexaplaric version of the LXX (pp. 357-58).

N. brings his work to a close with two chapters which summarize and synthesize the detailed analyses that have gone before. Chap. 10, "Chronologie" (pp. 363-412), puts everything that can be known or reasonably surmised about Origen's life and work into one consecutive sequence, and

concludes with a four-page summary table (409–12). Chap. 11 (pp. 413–41) fleshes out this skeleton with a biographical sketch of Origen.

It is when one reads through these chapters (which one might well do before delving into the detailed analyses of the earlier chapters) that one becomes aware how much new information, clarity, and insight about Origen and his milieu this book provides. Even Origen specialists will find it an invaluable aid; for nowhere else have all the pieces been brought together, let alone brought together by an experienced scholar with a rigorous concern to seek out the earliest and most reliable sources of information. However, it is probably improper to speak of the book as definitive, at least not in the absolute sense of the word; for much of the evidence is too fragmentary to allow for more than conjectural conclusions. Indeed, one sometimes gets the impression that N. is concluding beyond the evidence, that he is using hypothetical conclusions as the grounds for further conclusions. But closer examination always leads back to the detailed analyses of the earlier chapters and to a realization that one's dissatisfaction is more with the tenuous nature of the available information than with N.'s treatment. And although different scholars will doubtless disagree with some of N.'s provisional conclusions, the over-all picture he draws is likely to go without serious challenge.

All in all, N.'s *Origène* provides what might be called definitive support for the Völker, Daniélou, de Lubac, Hanson, Harl, and Cruzel line of interpretation, over against that of the Harnack, de Faye, Hal Koch approach. No respectable scholar can any longer make the claim that Origen was primarily a Greek philosopher rather than a Christian theologian. Further, N.'s general evenhandedness enhances the value of his conclusions, for he accepts uncritically neither the praises of Origen's supporters nor the reproaches of his enemies. This also enables him to free Origen's personality from its centuries-old weight of polemical condemnation, hagiographical adulation, misinformation, and misunderstanding. The basic traits of a genuinely human person with its disappointments, mistakes, indiscretions and failures, as well as with its remarkable achievements, are laid clearly open to view. In effect, N. has made possible a scholarly biography of the most important theological figure between Paul and Augustine.

But, superbly produced as this book is (it really is worth the ca. 200 fr.—\$45 purchase price), no human work is perfect. While gratefully acknowledging that N. has indeed fulfilled the *unum necessarium*—a clear presentation and solid analysis of the sources, usually quoted in full—and in full sympathy with the fact that extensive attention to the secondary literature would have extended the book beyond reasonable limits, one still cannot help wishing that N. had provided more in this regard. For example, how does he see his conclusions on the date and

purpose of the *De principiis* fitting in with the recent work of Harl, Dorival, Le Boulluec, and Cruzel on this point? Does the context provided by N. (e.g., his dating of the *De principiis* some ten years earlier than Harl) imply serious differences? Similarly, the force of his conclusion that there is no solid reason for attributing the *Panegyric of Theodore* to Gregory Thaumaturgus runs directly against Cruzel's assumption. Is a debate likely to arise on this point? One could make an impressive list of such instances, for almost all who have written or said anything on Origen's life and works will probably find some of their conclusions and assumptions being swept aside by those of N. Another area around which discussion is likely to arise is chronology. Outside of the synopses which eventually became the *Hexapla*, N. has Origen producing his first works from around 222, when he was about thirty-seven, and the *De principiis* in 230, when he was about forty-five. In this context the term "early" in relation to these works can hardly be used to suggest immaturity.

In sum, the book is a landmark both in Origen studies and in patristic methodology. It sets standards that few indeed will be able to meet; for the specialized skills of text critic, historian, philosopher, and theologian are all brought to bear on the carefully weighed conclusions that N. synthesizes in his final two chapters. As knowledge expands and as patristic methodology matures and becomes more rigorous, scholars will be able to add their refinements and corrections; but for most, Nautin's work will have something of the quality once ascribed to Origen himself: "the stone which sharpens us all." One can look forward with anticipation to the next volumes in the "Christianisme antique" series, which promise to contain the first edition of Origen's treatise on the Passover (from the Toura papyri) and studies on the School of Alexandria, Origen's teachers, and the genesis of his doctrine.

Boston College

ROBERT J. DALY, S.J.