Григорий И. БЕНЕВИЧ, Дмитрий С. БИРЮКОВ, Аркадий М. ШУФРИН (сост.), Прп. Максим Исповедник: полемика с оригенизмом и моноэнергизмом (Санкт-Петербург: Изд-во СПбГУ, 2007) 564 с. (Византийская философия. Т. 1; Smaragdus Philocalias).

Gregory BENEVICH, Dmitri BIRYUKOV, Arkadi CHOFRINE (comp.), St. Maximus the Confessor: His Polemics against Origenism and Monoenergism (St. Petersburg, Russia: UP, 2007) (Byzantine Philosophy T. 1; Smaragdus Philocalias) 564 p.

The monograph focuses on the two major contributions made by Maximus the Confessor to the theological tradition, namely, his refutations of Origenism and monoenergism, respectively. These aspects of Maximus' thought have been so far treated separately. This is the first attempt to look at them as being in the same context.

The monograph has two parts which correspond, respectively, to the two stages first distinguished in Maximus's life by H. U. von Balthasar. The first part deals with the later stage: from the publication of the monoenergist Pact of Union in 633, which prompted Maximus's entering the arena of Church politics and public theological debate, up to his martyrdom and repose in 662. Its first section consists of an article by Grigory Benevich and Arkadi Choufrine, which, in dialogue with recent Maximus scholarship, traces, stage by stage, the development of Maximus's polemic against monoenergism and monotheletism.

According to a widespread interpretation, the reason for Maximus's rejection of these Christological trends was their monophysitic implications: since he believed that both will and energy are manifestations of nature, the assertion of one will or energy in Christ would imply that Christ had no human nature distinguishable from the divine. Indeed, later Maximus does draw a parallel between his opponents and monophysites. However, as the authors argue, he did not, except for a period from 643 to 657, reject unitary formulae as such. This rejection, moreover, was somewhat contrary to his own concept of deification developed before 633, according to which the energy and will of deified humanity are one with those of God.

Benevich and Choufrine argue that a major issue at stake in Maximus' Christological polemic was the correct interpretation of Areopagite's expression "theandric energy." Maximus's view was *not* that the two constituents implied by it were *not* united in any real way (as a too literal reading of the Tome of Leo might suggest), but that they were united in *two* ways (rather than only in the one proposed by his

opponents). For Maximus there were thus two “*theandric*” energies in Christ, one of them being manifested in His miracles and the other in His voluntary passions; rather than just two *natural* energies (one purely human and one purely divine), as has been assumed so far. To make this point, the authors go through all the relevant texts either composed by Maximus or documenting his disputes with his opponents and interrogators.

In addition to this major theme Benevich and Choufrine give attention to the development of Maximus’s alliance with Rome as a possible reason for his shift, in 643, to a more rigid theological language. Maximus’s ecclesiology, expressed, in particular, in his attributing ecumenical authority to the first Lateran Council and rejecting, in the end, communion with all the local Churches of his time, is also discussed.

Finally, the authors bring to light the suppression of Maximus’s memory by the Fathers of the 6th Ecumenical Council and sketch the story of his rehabilitation by the later tradition. In an appendix they analyze the unique ecclesiological situation created by the betrayal of the Orthodox case by pope Vitalian, and the ways this fact has been glossed over in Roman Catholic scholarship.

The second section of the monograph’s first part contains a Russian translation of seven texts documenting trials, interrogations, and the exile of Maximus and his disciples. The translation published in the beginning of the 20th century by an outstanding Russian scholar, M. I. Muretov, has been emended and annotated on the basis of the recent edition and annotation of the same texts by P. Allen and B. Neil; one of these texts, extant only in Latin, has been translated into Russian for the first time.

The second part of the monograph, beginning with a short introductory article by Arkadi Choufrine as its first section, focuses on the work representative of the earlier part of Maximus’s life, namely, on the seventh chapter of his so-called *Ambigua*. Besides being a polemical treatise, this work, like the others from the same period, is rich in philosophical content and constitutes the part of Maximus’s heritage that exercised, despite its complexity, the deepest and most lasting influence on the Byzantine theological tradition as a whole.

The second section of the second part begins with a new Russian interpretative translation and a parallel Greek text of this treatise. The same section includes the commentaries (scholia) on it by Arkadi Choufrine, analyzing the structure and logic of Maximus’s argument, the background of the theoretical and dogmatic concepts he uses, and

the peculiarities of his language and style. It is considerably more detailed than the other extant commentaries on the same treatise, namely, those by D. Stăniloae and Cl. Moreschini.

The last, third, section of the second part contains an annotated Russian translation of the still not outdated parts of the two studies on Maximus's refutation of Origenism by P. Sherwood. These studies originally broke the ground for the fuller philosophical analysis of the treatise which is the focus of the second part.

The monograph includes bibliographies of Maximus's works and of the secondary sources used, and indexes of modern authors, figures of antiquity, and toponyms, as well as a thematic index to the scholia.

G. Benevich, A. Choufrine