

tekstów starochrześcijańskich 1901-2004 (opr. W. Stawiszyński, Kraków 2005, s. 338-358). Autor zamieścił też podstawowy skorowidz. Obszerny zapewne byłoby trudno sporządzić, ponieważ w tekstach kaznodziejskich, a nie np. w etyczno-filozoficznych, idee (Bóg, człowiek, cnota, grzech itp.) często powracają. Układ monografii jest logiczny i przemyślany, na dobrym poziomie naukowym.

Prezentowaną publikację należy uznać za cenny wkład w badania i popularyzację dzieł św. Jana Chryzostoma w aspekcie egzegezy biblijnej. Autor tomu 7 Biblii Ojców przybliżył osobę Złotoustego, który odegrał doniosłą rolę w historii Kościoła, będąc zaliczony do jego doktorów, duchowych filarów Wschodu. Autor monografii prezentuje tę wybitną postać, przedstawiając Jana jako wielkiego erudyty, teologa i świetnego egzegetę, znawcę tekstu natchnionego, który dokonał systematycznego wykładu Pisma Świętego w ok. 700 homiliach. Książka stanowi cenne źródło wiedzy nie tylko dla teologów, historyków, filozofów i filologów, ale także dla każdego współczesnego człowieka. Napisana zwięźle i jasno pozwala szybko zrozumieć zagadnienie. Może być też impulsem do dalszych badań nad ogromną spuścizną literacką wybitnego Antiocheńczyka.

**Giulio Maspero, *Rethinking the Filioque with the Greek Fathers*,
William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan
2023, pp. 326**

Marta Przystychowska – badacz niezależny, Hiszpania

Giulio Maspero is (aptly!) considered one of the most renowned scholars in Patristics. He himself admitted that the book on the Filioque is a result of ten years' work and the grand scale of research behind this publication is clearly noticeable. The great value of this book is that it is based on the sources, mostly translated by the Author himself.

In my opinion, the problem of the book is its methodology. As Giulio Maspero claims, this book is a narrative, not "an aseptic and historicist reconstruction": "the dogmatic reconstruction sketched here does not aim to be the solution of a conceptual problem, as if it were a mathematical equation, but aspires to trace a series of relationships, which make visible a dogmatic path as a growing immersion of the fathers in that Trinitarian

mystery that the encounter with Christ has revealed” (Chapter Five VII). To be clear: I do recognize the value of the context and even of personal experience in theology (though not so much in the history of theology). The problem is that research defined in such a way is subjective and difficult to share. The Author perceives his experience (“desire, passion, and concerns”) as crucial and important, but it may hinder the comprehension of the text by the reader. The Author tells things related to each other – related in his own judgment, but not necessarily according to the reader. So, in this book on patristic pneumatology there is no clear distinction between inner procession (ἐκπορεύεσθαι) and economy (προϊέναι); although Maspero of course knows it very well, but he deliberately chose to focus “on the relational correspondence between economy and immanence”. In the title, the topic was narrowed to the Greek Fathers, which did not hamper the Author from discussing the Syriac Fathers as well as Augustine. Actually, the *Filioque* itself is only mentioned and the book ends up being about the deity of the Holy Spirit in general – the effect sanctioned by the “relational” methodology.

The book by Maspero seems to be crude iron that the reader has to work into steel himself. The narrative approach to the Fathers of the Church is what is called – a narrative, spun like a tale during long winter evenings; it may be fascinating and absorbing, but at the end of the day it leaves the reader with no explanation of the problem.

Maspero juxtaposes the Syriac and Greek Trinitarian theology which look up into Mystery with “the Latin tradition, which, from the ninth century onward, has been somewhat dialectical”. As if apophaticism and dialectics necessarily excluded each other. The best example that this is not so is Gregory of Nyssa, considered the father of negative theology, who in his *Contra Eunomium* led the Trinitarian discussion according to the highest philosophical and dialectical standards of his times. Facing such alternatives, my theological master father Jacek Salij used to teach us that if somebody asks a Catholic whether he wants a beer or vodka, the true Catholic will always say: both!

What I personally consider related to the topic are historical issues that are missing in the book. There are some minor mistakes, such as that Macedonius died in 360 (in reality, he lived and was still active AFTER the Council of Constantinople in 359/360, Sozomen, HE IV 26, 1; Socrates Scholasticus, HE II 45, 1–5); but what strikes me is a lack of research on the Homoiousians and Pneumatomachians. There is a great number of studies on the former group starting with the great triad: Jaako Gummerus

(*Die homousianische Partei bis zum Tode des Konstantius*, Leipzig 1900), Jeffery N. Steenson (*Basil of Ancyra and the Course of Nicene Orthodoxy*, Oxford 1983, D. Phil. diss.) and Winrich Alfried Löhr (*Die Entstehung der homöischen und homöusianischen Kirchenpartien*, Witterschlick – Bonn 1986). They already established that the Homoiousians played a crucial role in recognizing the Anomean danger, that they did not perceive the relationship between the Father and the Son in the subordinationist way, and that they prepared the basic Trinitarian argumentation developed later on by the Cappadocians. Some of the Homoiousian arguments were repeated almost literally by Gregory of Nyssa in his *Contra Eunomium*. The Homoiousian pneumatology still waits to be discovered. It also remains to be established whether the Cappadocians took the φύσις-theology from the Homoiousians or from Athanasius (which the Author takes for granted).

The case of the Pneumatomachians is not as obvious as it seems at first glance. The entire section 74 of Epiphanius' *Panarion* does not mention any "Pneumatomachian" by name; the only writing Epiphanius quotes in that section is an excerpt from his own writing *Ancoratus*. Moreover, he does not refer to any specific statement of the heretics, but develops his own theology of the Holy Spirit, built on an exegesis of the Scripture. It seems that it was Basil of Caesarea who around 372 invented the noun ὁ πνευματομάχος. He used it in the Arian/Eunomian context and only when the conflict between him and Eustathius of Sebastea started, he called him "the leader of the Pneumatomachian heresy" (πρωτοστάτης τῆς τῶν Πνευματομάχων αἰρέσεως) (Basil, *Epistulae* 263, 3), but it might have been a slander only. I am convinced that Basil shared with Eustathius Homoiousian ideas as well as ascetical ones and his charges might have had a political background. The cause of the conflict seems to be a fight for power, specifically for jurisdiction and the right to ordain bishops in Armenia (M. Przyszychowska, *Administrative issues as the cause of the conflict between Basil the Great and Eustathius of Sebastea*, in: *Patrologie und Ökumene. Theresia Hainthaler zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. P. Knauer – A. Riedl – D.W. Winkler, Freiburg – Basel – Wien 2022, p. 494-504). So, it seems that there was no "Pneumatomachian" group in Asia Minor, it was just another epithet for Arians and Anomoeans.

I am sure the scope of the book was to enter into dialogue with the Orthodox as building bridges is what Giulio Maspero likes the most (and does masterfully!). I wonder what the Orthodox would say about the book. I have this image from the introduction lodged in my memory: "What would happen if those two Jerusalem monks of the early ninth century could

have a beer with the young man in London who, at the beginning of the third millennium, wrote ‘Drop the Filioque’ on a pizza box before waiting for the Pope to ride past”. I find it an act of bravery to put the expression most hated by the Orthodox in the title of a book which is supposed to look for the way to restore communion. I read it as a recognition of Catholic heritage, recognition that constitutes the first indispensable step to enter into respectful and fruitful dialogue despite differences between the denominations. Similarly, I took a liberty to express some critical remarks convinced that I can differ with Giulio Maspero with respect and friendship (and beer and vodka) because our shared objective is to get to know the Fathers of the Church better.