

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

The Journal of Theological Studies

JANUARY, 1929

ARTICLE

EDUARD SCHWARTZ

AND THE *ACTA CONCILIORUM OECUMENICORUM*

ON August 22, 1928, Eduard Schwartz, professor first at Göttingen, then at Strasburg, and since the war at Munich, attained his seventieth birthday: and in celebration of that occasion his friends and admirers, instead of the more usual *Festschrift*, have appealed for contributions to a fund to be used for the assistance and furtherance of the great work to which twenty years of his life have already been given and which will claim whatever of life and strength—may it still be his in large measure—remains over for him. Perhaps the moment is therefore appropriate for bringing his work, even if briefly and summarily, before the notice of English readers.

Our own University tradition in this country has always built our theological studies, biblical and patristic, on the basis of our classical. If this is not so exclusively the case to-day as it used to be, when for instance Ramsay could reckon Lightfoot with Mommsen as one of the two masters who had taught him most, it remains true that it is far more common in England than in Germany to pass on from classics to theology. To confine myself to living examples in Oxford, Dr Lock, Dr Ottley, Prof. Webb, and Dr N. P. Williams all began their careers by winning fellowships in Classics.

But there are exceptions, and distinguished exceptions, to the ordinary rule in Germany. One such was Friedrich Blass: another is Eduard Schwartz. I am not competent to speak of the classical side of Schwartz's work: suffice it to say that the name of von Wilamowitz occurs among the signatories to the appeal. I will confine myself to the writings in which the energies of his later life have found vent in the sphere of theological study.

His monumental edition of the *Church History* of Eusebius appeared in the Berlin series of ante-Nicene Greek Fathers between 1903 and 1909 (vol. i, books i-v, 1903; vol. ii, books vi-x, and the *Martyrs of Palestine*, 1908; vol. iii, index, etc., 1909). Mommsen provided,

opposite the Greek text, an edition of the version of Rufinus : Schwartz constructed his apparatus for the Greek out of seven MSS, three at Paris (ABD), two at Florence (TE), one at Venice (M), and one at Moscow (R), with the help of the two very early versions, the Latin and the Syriac—it is one of Schwartz's special merits that he is a good Syriac scholar. In the supplementary volume he discussed, with a fullness and force which leave little room for criticism, the general principles to be followed in the selection of readings, and decided that the family to which preference is ordinarily to be given is that of BDM.

In few ancient books is the problem of text so difficult and so complicated as in the *Church History* of Eusebius. Some twenty-five or thirty years ago a group of Oxford scholars set before themselves the task of preparing for the Clarendon Press a new edition of the old work of Burton, which had been reprinted with an introduction by Dr William Bright, the reprint itself being just then exhausted. The work was so divided that those of us who lived in Oxford (Dr Brightman, myself, and for a time Mr H. N. Bate) undertook the side of typography, punctuation, marginal references, and general arrangement, while Dr Headlam and Mr Claude Jenkins in London were responsible for changes in the text and the preparation of a modest apparatus. We did not contemplate a final text, but a manual edition for scholarly readers, and I think we then hoped—though this part of our labours never reached concrete form—to follow up the text with a subject-matter commentary. At an early stage we procured a new collation of the Venice MS, M, and I remember that we gained an impression of its very special value. After some progress (slow progress, it must be admitted, for we were all busy men with other claims upon our time), it was decided, on the proposition of Dr Headlam, that the undertaking should be put into the hands of the youngest, and at that time the least occupied with other literary ventures, among us, Mr Jenkins. But Mr Jenkins is now Lambeth Librarian and Professor of Church History at King's College, London, and about the last scholar to be described as a man of leisure : and all (I think) that has appeared from his pen about the *Church History* is a note in this JOURNAL (Jan. 1909, pp. 277-279), which I cite here because he crossed swords with Dr Schwartz on the question of a reading in *H. E.* i 2, where Schwartz had followed the Paris MS A and Jenkins championed the reading (or what is practically the reading) of M, τοῦ πατρὸς ὑπαρχον, against all the other MSS : and I do not doubt that Jenkins was right.

That only means that, with a work like the *Church History*, no pioneer (and the edition of Schwartz is the first critical edition worthy of the name) can expect to be right in every detail : it does not detract from the sum total of our gratitude. And yet I am not sure that the

further labours of which I am going on to speak do not shew him on an even higher plane of achievement.

First I should like to recall attention to the remarkable series of studies entitled 'Athanasiana', which appeared in the Proceedings of the Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen between the years 1904 and 1908. I leave aside any consideration of the rather acrimonious controversy between Schwartz and Harnack over the genuineness of the letter purporting to be sent from a synod at Antioch to Alexander of Constantinople, not long before the Council of Nicaea, and preserved in one of the great Syriac collections of canon law. What most interested myself was naturally that element in Schwartz's enquiries which had to do with Latin documents. And his second paper consists of over 30 pages of detailed description and searching analysis of one of the principal documents which have supplied material for my own edition of *Canons*, Verona bibl. capit. lx [58], a MS written perhaps about A.D. 700, which I first saw in 1890 and last in 1922. It is unique for the number of documents it contains—a few of them original, but for the most part translated from the Greek—for which it is the only authority, and for this uniqueness it has acquired among recent scholars a special name as the 'Collection of Theodosius the deacon'. As we have it, the collection is a veritable hotchpotch: the nucleus which has given it its importance is Alexandrine, but there are also Western elements in it, an African element (it is our only source of knowledge of the Carthaginian council of 421) and a European element, probably Roman, to which are due some Greek councils in the Isidorian version, others in that of Dionysius Exiguus, not earlier therefore than the sixth century. To Schwartz and myself, looking at the matter from different angles, the primary interest of the collection is not quite the same: what matters most to him is the light thrown on the history of the doctrinal controversies of the fourth century, what perhaps matters more to me is the literary and historical problem of the collection itself. Theodosius the deacon was not the writer of the Verona MS: the subscription as we have it at the end of the MS is obviously not original, for it is full of small mistakes: Theodosius himself belongs therefore to an earlier stage. But Theodosius in that subscription tells us that his own work in turn was a compilation 'de mendosis exemplaribus'. The problem of disentanglement of the stages thus implied is difficult, perhaps impossible: but some light is thrown on it by the palaeography of the MS. There are abbreviations which must go back behind the actual MS, for they are too singular not to demand a special source. *CHR̄O* for *Christo*, *AM̄* for *autem*, are idiosyncrasies which are alien in time and place from the Italy of A.D. 700. I am confident that they are African, and therefore at least

earlier than the Mohammedan invasion. I have at the back of my mind a distinct impression that I once came across mention of a Theodosius archdeacon of Carthage in the sixth century, but I cannot place the reference. If my impression is correct, that Theodosius might well be the original author of the Verona collection. Did he work on material brought from Alexandria to Carthage in connexion with the appeal which the Africans made to the East at the time of the dispute with Rome in A.D. 419? I cannot answer that question quite confidently.

But the main purpose of this note is to call attention to the great undertaking which was initiated twenty years ago, under the auspices of a Strasburg committee and the editorship of Eduard Schwartz, the *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*. As planned, the work was to have included the General Councils, with related documents, down to A.D. 553: and in fact the only part published before the war (in 1914) was concerned with the last of these Councils.¹ But the war put a stop for the time to the labours of scholars in all countries concerned in it. Strasburg ceased to be part of Germany: Schwartz himself suffered the loss of the son who was to have assisted him in carrying on his work. It almost seemed as if the continuation of the *Acta* might have to be postponed to other times, though in view of Schwartz's age that would have meant a transference to other hands.

Fortunately that calamity was averted. German scholars and publishers rallied in support of Schwartz with the same volcanic energy that Germans have shewn, during the period of reconstruction since the war, in so many other departments of life. Nor was help wanting from outside: in more than one of his prefaces Schwartz gives graceful expression to his thanks for the munificence of Pius XI, and he is now able to set before himself the ideal of completing the two first and most important sections of the scheme, the Acts of Ephesus and those of Chalcedon. And the phrase 'Acts' he understands in a very liberal sense: much of the dogmatic writing of Cyril, and some of that of Theodoret, is included in the old Greek and Latin collections that deal with the Council of Ephesus, and all of it finds place in the successive *fasciculi* that have poured from the press with almost bewildering rapidity in the course of the last five years. The tome of five volumes on the earlier council is now so near completion that one's hopes are high that the not less important tome concerning Chalcedon may be

¹ *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum* Tom. III: Concilium Vniuersale Constantinopolitanum sub Iustiniano habitum: vol. ii Iohannis Maxentii libelli. Collectio codicis Nouariensis xxx. Collectio codicis Parisini 1682. Procli Tomus ad Armenios. Iohannis papae II epistula ad Viros Illustres.

issued under the same editorship and with the same masterly scope. There are few things to which I should look forward more eagerly than an adequate presentation of the recension of the Acts of Chalcedon by the sixth-century Roman deacon Rusticus.

Latin collections bearing on the Council of Ephesus came first. In 1922 and 1923 there appeared vol. iv, the second part of the *Collectio Casinensis* as it is called, which Schwartz in fifteen pages of preface, closely packed with matter, vindicates for the authorship of the same Rusticus; the documents (numbered 77-312) here published were rendered by Rusticus direct from the Greek, for the most part from the *Tragoedia* of Count Irenaeus, the friend of Nestorius. Being largely of Nestorian origin, it is not perhaps surprising that a large proportion of them have only come down to us through this version of Rusticus.

Next followed, in 1924 and 1925, still in Latin, the five *fasciculi* which between them make up volume v. Three of them contain what Schwartz labels the *Collectio Palatina*—because it is contained in a single MS, Vat. Pal. 234, of the ninth century—rather than with the seventeenth-century editors ‘the collection of Marius Mercator’. He shews in fact (his preface will be found prefixed to the third *fasciculus*) that all that belongs to Mercator is comprised within the first *fasciculus*, and that the whole of the second and third *fasciculi* go back only to a sixth-century collector, not improbably a Scythian monk of the type of Dionysius Exiguus, who shared Mercator’s admiration for St Augustine and so was the more willing to incorporate Mercator’s contributions in his own collection.

The fourth and fifth *fasciculi* of this volume are quite independent of the other three, and are a sort of miscellaneous supplement of several briefer Latin collections of Ephesine or quasi-Ephesine material, equipped with their own separate preface.¹ J. Sichard in 1528 published at Basle a collection entitled *Antidotum contra diuersas . . . hereses*; R. Winter, also at Basle, in 1542, a small volume of *Synodicae constitutiones*; and these are the main constituent parts of the two *fasciculi* respectively, with this difference, that for Sichard’s collection Schwartz is able to base his text of the material on two MSS, while for Winter’s volume he has to depend on the printed text with such improvements as his own sagacity can dictate.

Last of the Latin documents so far published by Schwartz came the *Collectio Veronensis*, numbered as vol. ii, of which the preface is dated in March A.D. 1926. The collection derives its name from a single MS of the tenth century, preserved in the Chapter Library at Verona under

¹ This preface is prefixed to the fifth *fasciculus*, but covers the fourth and fifth alike, although the title-page of the fourth would appear to indicate (erroneously, as far as I can see) that it still forms part of the Palatine collection.

the press-mark lvii [55]; but though no MS but this contains the whole of the material, there are throughout other authorities, sometimes collateral, sometimes more closely related, which serve to check the tradition of the Verona MS. Nevertheless the volume is rightly named from this unique MS, since it contains a definite *corpus* representing a single point of view: *Synodus Ephesena cum epistulis suis in hoc corpore continetur . . . explicit sancta synodus Ephesena cum epistolis ad se pertinentibus*. Schwartz shews that the collector drew much of his matter direct from the papal archives, and that a Roman *animus* dominates the collection from end to end: Cyril's action, whether in condemning Nestorius or in making peace with John of Antioch, had at each stage the support of the Roman see.

The second, fourth, and fifth volumes of Ephesine Acta are thus published, and only the third volume is wanting to complete the series of Latin versions. Most of them, like the collection of Verona, belong to the sixth century rather than to the fifth; some are products of the movement under Justinian to qualify the acceptance of Chalcedon by a fresh emphasis on the Council of Ephesus and the theology of St. Cyril; Rusticus on the other hand is a defender of the pure Chalcedonian tradition, and balances Cyrilline documents by others from Isidore and Theodoret. The controversy over the Three Chapters shews us the churches of Africa and of north-eastern Italy developing, on the ground of their loyalty to Chalcedon, a violent opposition to the Ephesine policy of the emperor and the popes, Justinian, Vigilius and Pelagius.

But though the mass of Latin material is the larger, if only because you may have three or four versions of one document, much too is preserved in the original Greek, and the last two years have witnessed the successive publication of six parts of the *Acta Graeca* which will apparently, with one more part to follow, between them make up volume i. The foundation of the whole matter so far published is the collection of cod. Vat. 830, the most recent but also the most complete of our leading Greek MSS.

It is not easy to present in a few sentences a clear conspectus of the Greek material or of Schwartz's classification and interpretation of it; partly because the seventh part and its preface are still to follow, partly because, even if we set aside the prefaces to the second, third, and fifth parts as relatively negligible, there still remain three of importance (those, that is, to the first, fourth, and sixth parts) the *data* of which have to be woven together in order that a complete picture of the Greek matter, as handled by Schwartz, may be presented to the reader.

In the first place, then, there are three main collections to be distinguished. Of the primary collection V, late as it is, there are later copies at Rome which may be neglected, and an epitome represented by

several copies in different libraries, none of them older than the thirteenth century but descending from a very early archetype. Next comes the collection named S after its earliest representative, a twelfth-century MS of Ségurier's, now Paris Coislin gr. 32: a sister MS of rather later date, supposed to be lost but now re-discovered at Leningrad, D, was the source of Commelin's *editio princeps* of the Ephesine Acts, Heidelberg, 1591. Third and last is a collection of which our knowledge is due to a fortunate discovery, some twenty years ago, by Albert Ehrhard: contained in a unique twelfth-century MS of the Library of the Society of Christian Archaeology at Athens, it is entitled A in the apparatus, and was fully described by Schwartz in a separate publication of the Bavarian Academy.

But no one of the three principal collections is homogeneous: in S the first 92 documents, in A the first 136, form the original collection, and the documents which follow, S 93-145, A 137-177, are derived from another common source, and that source is V,¹ from which both have borrowed, at some stage in their history, the documents wanting to their original *corpus*. But the source was not V in quite its present form: for whereas V consists as it stands of 172 documents, the additions in S and A are extracted from the first 164 documents only of V, and show no contact with V 165-172. Thus analysis of the relation of the three collections to one another establishes the nuclei of the three respectively as V 1-164, S 1-92, A 1-136.

Now we find that this nucleus in each falls naturally into three successive parts, documents preceding the Council, acts of the Council, documents following the Council. The common documents of the first section appear to go back to a very early pro-Cyrrilline (perhaps Alexandrine) compilation: and this compilation, both in respect of the absence of alien accretions and of the retention of the correct chronological order of the documents, appears to be best preserved—it is interesting to note this—in the Latin collections. Similarly of the Acts themselves the common nucleus appears to be a selection of the portions and documents most necessary to present the case from the Cyrrilline point of view: and here again the Latins, with S among the Greek authorities, are our best guides. To the Acts proper are appended in all the main collections a series of sermons addressed by Cyril and others to the bishops in synod. Lastly come a few documents posterior to the Council, documents, that is, concerned with the restoration of peace in 433 between Cyril and John of Antioch.

These three divisions of pre-Ephesine, Ephesine, and post-Ephesine

¹ By V, here and in subsequent references, I mean of course not necessarily the existing late representative of the collection, but the collection itself in the successive stages of its growth.

matter correspond to about the first three-fourths of the documents in V. But two considerable additions follow on this main Cyrilline *corpus* to complete the collection as we now have it in V. The pieces numbered 140-164 not only stand outside the chronological arrangement so far in substance adopted, but more than half of them are derived from the *Tragoedia* of Count Irenaeus, and Schwartz holds that the historical reasons for inserting these would not have overborne the dogmatic reasons for excluding them at any time nearer the events than the seventh century.

These last documents are printed as a distinct section constituting the fifth part of the Greek Acts of vol. i. Similarly the remaining pieces in V, 165-172, are again treated separately as part vi: though so few in number, their bulk is considerable, for they are theological treatises rather than occasional documents, all of them with a single exception Cyrilline, and the first of them, the work in five books against Nestorius, known to us through no other channel. This final appendix of eight pieces Schwartz holds to have been incorporated into the collection V at some date not earlier than the ninth century. His argument, as I understand it, is as follows. The latter part of both the collections S and A was borrowed from V at a time when V ended at 164—and had therefore not received its last supplement, 165-172—and both append, to the matter borrowed from V, as a sort of *finale* a letter written by the patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople to pope Leo III in A.D. 811. Such a letter would only appear in such a position if it was something quite recent or even contemporary. S and A, as we have them now, were therefore completed from V not long before A.D. 811, and at that date V still lacked 165-172.

A description of an imperfect work must needs be, in many respects, even more imperfect than the work described. It is my hope to contribute at an early date to the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, at the request of the editor, Dr. A. Heisenberg, a fuller review of the *Acta* with more attention to textual detail. But enough has been here said perhaps to give some idea of the advance made in this new undertaking on the last edition of importance, the Roman edition of 1608, and some idea of the urgency of the need of supporting Schwartz in his herculean labours.

C. H. TURNER.

[The paper above published was intended for the October, 1928, number of the JOURNAL, but it took me some time to write, and through a misunderstanding, for which I was primarily responsible, was not completed early enough to appear in that number. C.H.T.]