

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]

RECENT WORK ON EUTHALIUS.

SOME five or six years ago it was whispered among the few scholars who cared for so remote a subject, that the mysterious Euthalius, Bishop of Sulci, had turned up as a historical personage of the seventh century. More could not then be said, as the publication of the document which fixed his date was reserved for the Introduction to the Writings of the New Testament which was promised by Dr Hermann Freiherr von Soden and of which the first instalment is now in our hands.

In order to estimate the bearing of the new discovery on the Euthalian problem, and to appreciate von Soden's handling of it, it is necessary to summarize the results arrived at in my *Euthaliana* (1895), and to note a further contribution made to the subject by Professor E. von Dobschütz.

In my preface I spoke of the subsidiary matter found in many MSS of the Acts and Epistles as 'descended ultimately from an Edition of these books put out in ancient times by a modest scholar who has not revealed his own personality, but to whom tradition has ascribed the name of Euthalius'. Working with Zacagni's edition of the Euthalian apparatus, and supplementing it by some later discoveries and by occasional reference to MSS, I endeavoured to bring some order into the chaos of materials, to discriminate between earlier and later stages of its accumulation, and so to pave the way for some future editor. I discerned two distinct periods in the early growth of the apparatus:

1. Between 323 and 396: Prologues to the Pauline Epistles, to the Acts and to the Catholic Epistles, followed by full tables of quotations and chapter summaries, and a text written colometrically, or in sense-lines.

2. In 396: the dated *Martyrium Pauli*, compiled out of the Prologue to the Pauline Epistles; the insertion of stichometrical calculations, and of colophons such as that which is preserved in Codex H.

The former of these editions I ascribed to Euthalius, who had hitherto enjoyed the credit of the whole of what I have just enumerated; the latter, with less confidence, to Evagrius whose name is found in connexion with portions of it. A large part of Zacagni's material still remained as the addition of subsequent compilers.

The general position thus reached was accepted with a few modifications in detail both in an elaborate review in the *Guardian* (June 17, 1896), and by von Dobschütz in his article on Euthalius in Hauck's *Realencyclopädie* (vol. v, 1898). The latter writer pointed to a forthcoming study of the evidence afforded by the Syriac versions, which presently appeared under the title 'Euthaliusstudien' in the *Zeitschrift*

für Kirchengeschichte (xix 2). In this article he took the precaution to write the name of Euthalius in inverted commas, thus indicating a readiness to abandon that designation of the original editor, if need should be. His most important point was the proof that the Prologues and some other portions of the apparatus were translated into Syriac in connexion with the Philoxenian version in 508. This result, which might have been only of interest to Syriac scholars, has now become an important element in the discussion of the Euthalian problem. It is unfortunate that this article has been ignored by subsequent writers on the subject both in England and in Germany.

In the same year, 1898, I had occasion in Dom Butler's Introduction to the *Lausiac History of Palladius* (p. 103 f), to call attention to a kind of colophon connecting the Armenian translation of the Life of Evagrius with the works of Evagrius which follow it. I need only repeat here the first lines: 'I have written and set out according to my power three books in ordered and easy and convenient discourses.' These words are almost identical with the beginning of the rendering of the 'Evagrian' colophon in the Armenian biblical manuscripts. After investigating the matter I was obliged to say: 'I can offer no further light upon the coincidence by which a colophon at the close of a life of Evagrius corresponds so closely with a biblical colophon which contains the name of Evagrius. We seem further than ever from an explanation when we note that in the Armenian Bible MSS the latter colophon does not contain the name of Evagrius at all.' I added the following note in regard to the Greek colophon in Codex H: 'I have been inclined to think that εϒΑΓΡΙϒ, not εϒΑΓΡΙΟϒ, originally stood in Codex H, and that afterwards εϒΘΑΛΙΟϒ ΕΠΙϒΟΠ . . . was written over it.' I venture to note these details here, as they may easily escape the observation of students of the Euthalian question. On the latter point a word or two more may be said. Dr Zahn, in an article to be mentioned presently, calls attention to the unusual form of the sentences, Εὐάγριος ἔγραψα καὶ ἐξεθέμην κτλ., and Εὐάγριος διεῖλον καὶ ἐστίχισα κτλ., observing (1) that both are found elsewhere without the proper name Εὐάγριος, and (2) that ἐγὼ Εὐάγριος is the form which would naturally be expected. I think therefore that the possibility that the proper name first came in as a heading in the genitive case deserves consideration; and I would note (1) that the line in which the presumed εϒΑΓΡΙϒ stands, seems at first to have contained no more than this one word, and (2) that the symbol ϒ occurs in three other places in the fragments of Codex H (see Omont's edition, p. 12¹).

¹ M. Omont suggested the possibility that the ligature may be due to the hand of the reviser who inked over the fading letters of the codex. In the case of θρονϒ (p. 34) this may well be so, but in the other two cases it is less probable.

We must now pass on to speak of the discovery published in von Soden's *Die Schriften des N.T.* (I i 638), and of the use which the editor makes of it. Herr Wobbermin has found in an eleventh-century MS in the Laura on Mt. Athos a Confession entitled: *Εὐθαλίου ἐπισκόπου Σούλκης ὁμολογία περὶ τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως*. Internal evidence shews that it was written between 662 and 680. It contains a reference to Maximus the Confessor. The next piece in the MS is a letter from Athanasius to his 'son Maximus the philosopher'. Von Soden has no hesitation in identifying this Athanasius with the Athanasius mentioned in the Euthalian prologues to the Acts and Catholic Epistles. Thus Euthalius and his prologues are brought down into the seventh century, and all the 'Penelope labours' of former scholars are dismissed at once.

Another interesting discovery is announced on p. 646. Von der Goltz has found the Greek text of a document hitherto known only in the Armenian translation, which finds a place in Armenian Bibles in connexion with the Euthalian apparatus. It is called in Armenian the Prayer of Euthalius. In the Greek it is headed: *πρὸς ἑμαντόν*. Accordingly we know at last the meaning of the puzzling statement, *καὶ τὸ πρὸς ἑμαντόν, στιχοὶ κζ*, which occurs in a stichometrical list in certain of the Euthalian MSS.

Von Soden gives free play to his imagination, and writes a fanciful life of Euthalius, grounded upon these new discoveries. Two vigorous protests have already been entered against this offhand treatment of a most complicated problem. Mr F. C. Conybeare, who has the credit of first bringing the Armenian evidence to bear upon the subject, insists¹ that it has been proved that the Prologues are earlier than the *Martyrium Pauli*, which is an abbreviated statement drawn out of one of them in A. D. 396. He further asserts on the ground of Armenian Chronicles and other evidence, that the Euthalian apparatus was already attributed by the Armenians to Euthalius before 700 A. D.; and he claims that 'both the language and internal dating of the Armenian compel us to set the translation back in the fifth century'. His view is that the fourth-century Euthalius was decorated with the title 'Bishop of Sulci' only at a late period when his namesake of the seventh century had come into a certain prominence.

An exhaustive examination of the theory of von Soden is made by Dr Zahn in the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift* xv 4, 5. He begins by pointing out that a quotation from the newly discovered Confession of Euthalius was printed by F. H. Reusch in 1889, with the heading: *Εὐθάλιος ἐπίσκοπος Σούλκης ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως οὕτως λέγει*. After discussing the orthography of the Sardinian See at some

¹ *Zeitschrift f. d. N.T. Wissenschaft* v 1904.

length, he calls attention to the fact that the Letter of Athanasius to Maximus the Philosopher is a genuine letter of the great Athanasius of the year 370 or 371, and so disposes of von Soden's supposition that it was written by a seventh-century Athanasius to Maximus the Confessor. He points out the immense difference in style between the Confession newly discovered, and both the 'Prayer of Euthalius' and the Euthalian Prologues: and he inclines to identify on the ground of style the author of the Prayer with the author of the Prologues. With much learning he reviews the whole situation of the Euthalian problem. He accepts and reinforces the view that the first stage of the Euthalian apparatus must be placed some time before 396, the date of the *Martyrium Pauli*. He thinks it most probable that the original edition, though put out anonymously, was the work of a writer named Euthalius, and that his name was preserved by a true tradition which at length found a place in the titles of the Prologues: and he is confident that the description 'Bishop of Sulci' was an erroneous insertion of a still later period. His two articles are full of illustrative matter, and worthy of his great reputation for the accumulation and masterly handling of a bewildering mass of details¹.

The latest sketch of the Euthalian question which has been given to English students is to be found in Mr Turner's article on 'Patristic Commentaries' in the supplementary volume of Dr Hastings's *Bible Dictionary*. It would seem as though the new material published by von Soden reached the writer too late for proper digestion, and had to be hurriedly combined at the last moment with results which had been attained independently of it. Von Dobschütz's work on the Syriac versions has here also escaped recognition, though a true instinct had led Mr Turner to suggest that some fresh light might have been obtained by a systematic examination of Syriac MSS.

A proper edition of the Euthalian apparatus is now more urgently needed than ever; it is essential as a preliminary to the classification of the cursive MSS of the Acts and Epistles. For the present, and until some new facts are brought to light, we may reasonably continue to assign the origination of this apparatus to a fourth-century Euthalius, and we may be allowed to doubt whether Euthalius, the seventh-century Bishop of Sulci, ever put his hand to such work at all.

J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON.

¹ It is only surprising that he does not strengthen his position by a reference to von Dobschütz's proof that the Prologues were rendered into Syriac in 508; for, as a matter of fact, he gives a reference in a footnote to the article in which this is brought out.