

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:



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<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]

(9) The participial construction was purely 'translatese' and does not appear to have been adopted in the colloquial or the literary language. There are no examples of it in the New Testament except in Old Testament quotations (Blass *Gramm. d. neut. Gr.* § 74, 4). On the other hand the New Testament has several examples of the verb with dat. of the cognate noun: in Lc. and Acts ἐπιθυμία ἐπιθύμησα, ἀπειλή ἀπειλ., παραγγελία παρηγγ., ἀναθέματι ἀνεθεμ., in Jo. χαρᾶ χαίρει, in James προσευχῇ προσηύξατο (ibid. § 38, 3).

H. ST. J. THACKERAY.

THE DATE OF THE DEATH OF NESTORIUS: SCHENUTE, ZACHARIAS, EVAGRIUS.

THE recovery of the work of Nestorius cited by Ebed Jesu under the title 'the Book of Heraclides' shews conclusively that Nestorius survived the Council of Chalcedon.¹ There is no doubt that Schenute survived Nestorius. Schenute cannot, therefore, have died on July 7, 451; and Dr Leipoldt's confident assertion² 'Schenutes Todesjahr ist und bleibt 451' must be revised in the light of the new evidence. If it is certain that he died on July 7 (the day of his commemoration) the earliest year would be the year 452—a date which on other grounds some scholars have preferred. But there are references in Schenute's writings which imply that Nestorius had been long dead, and if Schenute 'must have died in 451 or in 466', as Dr Leipoldt says before deciding for the earlier date, we must now without hesitation choose 466 as the year of his death. Part of the evidence on which Dr Leipoldt depends, in coming to his own conclusion that Schenute died in 451, is the statement of Evagrius³ that Nestorius had already departed this life at the time of the Council of Chalcedon. This statement Dr Leipoldt misrepresents in claiming the authority of Evagrius for the view that Nestorius had been already *a long time* dead (*dass Nestorios im Jahre 451 längst nicht mehr unter den Lebenden weilte*). But his argument has drawn my attention to the fact that I have myself much more seriously misrepresented the evidence of Evagrius on this point: whereas he has only overstated this evidence, I regret that I have

¹ See my *Nestorius and his teaching* p. 34 f.

² J. Leipoldt *Schenute von Atripe* Texte u. Unters. xxv, n. F. x i p. 46.

³ Evagrius *H. E.* ii 2.

inadvertently mis-stated it altogether.¹ I desire at once to correct the error, and, as Evagrius was clearly mistaken, to examine briefly how his mistake arose.

Evagrius, in his account of the Council of Chalcedon, quotes the statement of the historian Zacharias Rhetor (who wrote some fifty years after the Council) that Nestorius was sent for from his place of exile (ἐκ τῆς ὑπερορίας μετάπεμπτον γενέσθαι ? summoned to the Council or recalled from exile). He describes this statement as 'prejudiced' (ἐμπαθῶς . . . φησί), in accordance with his general estimate of Zacharias (a strong monophysite), and rejects it on the ground that the Council anathematized Nestorius. But he also goes on to cite evidence which in his opinion shews that Nestorius was already dead. This evidence he finds in a letter of Eustathius, bishop of Berytus, one of the bishops who had been consenting parties to the proceedings of Dioscorus at the Council of Ephesus of 449, and were therefore deposed at Chalcedon, and again reinstated on the ground that they had acted at Ephesus under constraint. A fragment of a letter of this Eustathius in defence of Leo's *Letter to Flavian* is extant ;² but of the letter quoted by Evagrius nothing is known but what he tells us, viz. that it was written about the proceedings of the Council of Chalcedon to two persons of the name of John, one a bishop and the other a presbyter. The passage he cites is as follows : ἵπαντήσαντες δὲ πάλιν οἱ ζητοῦντες Νεστορίου τὰ λείψανα τῆς συνόδου κατεβῶων· Οἱ ἅγιοι διὰ τί ἀναθεματίζονται ; ὡς ἀγανακτήσαντα τὸν βασιλέα τοῖς δορυφόροις ἐπιτρέψαι μακρὰν αὐτοὺς ἀπελάσαι.

This apparently refers to some incident in the course of the Council when the Emperor was present (? at the sixth session) and means 'and those who were going to fetch the remains of Nestorius came again and cried out against the Council, saying, Why are holy men anathematized? so that the Emperor was indignant and ordered his guards to drive them off to a distance'. And the comment which Evagrius adds—'How then Nestorius was summoned (or recalled) when he had already departed this life (τῶν ἐντεῦθεν μεταστᾶς), I cannot tell'—shews that he understood it to mean that Nestorius was already dead.

This appears to be the only evidence Evagrius had to shew that Nestorius was then dead. It is all the evidence he adduces here, and earlier in his History (bk i ch. vii) he has said that he found no information in the historians as to the fortunes of Nestorius after his banishment, though he knew that one who wrote an account of his death said that his tongue was eaten by worms. His authority for this report may have been the same passage of Zacharias from which he drew the statement already mentioned. Books iii-vi of the extant Syriac

¹ *Nestorius and his teaching* p. 34.

² Migne *P. G.* lxxxv 1803.

history under the name of *The Chronicle of Zachariah of Mitylene* are an epitome¹ of the work of the Zacharias (who wrote a history of the years 450-491) to which Evagrius refers, and in bk. iii ch. i, about the Council of Chalcedon, we read: 'This Marcian [the Emperor] favoured the doctrine of Nestorius, and was well disposed towards him; and so he sent by John the Tribune to recall Nestorius from his place of banishment in Oasis; and to recall also Dorotheus, the bishop who was with him. And it happened, while he was returning, that he set at naught the holy Virgin, the *Theotokos*, and said, "What is Mary? Why should she indeed be called the *Theotokos*?"' And the righteous judgement of God speedily overtook him, as had been the case formerly with Arius, who blasphemed against the Son of God. Accordingly he fell from his mule, and the tongue of this Nestorius was cut off, and his mouth was eaten by worms, and he died on the roadway. And his companion Dorotheus died also.' The author goes on to represent the Emperor as greatly grieved by the death of Nestorius and in doubt as to what he should do, but yet as persisting in summoning the Council. The statement that Nestorius died in this particular way may be due to misunderstanding of a remark of Schenute about him;² and the other details of the narrative have no *vraisemblance* to recommend them. Marcian was known to be opposed to the teaching of Eutyches, and Zacharias was a hot partisan of monophysitism, one of those who thought that the Council of Chalcedon did in fact support Nestorianism. The belief that Nestorius was actually summoned to the Council might easily be entertained by one who thought that it was the teaching of Nestorius that the Council affirmed. If this evidence stood alone, we might dismiss it at once. But now that we have Nestorius's own work before us, we see that Zacharias was at least right in believing that Nestorius was alive on the eve of the Council.

The letter of Eustathius of Berytus, however, seems to shew clearly that the report of his recent death was current at the time of the Council, and that some of his friends were starting for Egypt to bring back his remains³; and this is contemporary evidence. Can its origin

¹ See the translation by F. J. Hamilton & E. W. Brooks (Methuen & Co. 1899) *Introduction* p. 2.

² See *Nestorius and his teaching* p. 36 n. 1.

³ M. E. Revillout in his article 'Sénuti le prophète', *Revue de l'histoire des religions* viii p. 571 n. 1, translates the passage cited above 'là arrivèrent ceux qui suivent avec opiniâtreté le parti de Nestorius et ils se mirent à vociférer contre le concile', and says that without the comment which Evagrius adds *en guise de conclusion* it would be indecisive. I have quoted the words as they stand in the text of Valois and of Bidez and Parmentier, and the comment of Evagrius shews that he understood them as I have translated them. (M. Revillout's rendering would

be traced? The wish is often father to the thought, and I think we can assign the source of this rumour and the tale that Zacharias tells to the 'dream' which came to Macarius, the Egyptian bishop of Tkou, just before the Council met, while he was with Dioscorus at Constantinople, about to start for Chalcedon.¹ Afraid, as the party opposed to Nestorius obviously were, that he might be reinstated by the Council, it was clearly to their interest to have it believed that he was already dead. The narrative states that a eunuch who was devoted to Dioscorus came running to tell him that he had just heard that, four days before, the Emperor had sent to fetch Nestorius. Macarius replied that he already knew the fact, but that four nights before he had had a dream in which he found himself with Schenute in Egypt in the presence of Nestorius. 'We found the man whom they have just sent to fetch to the Council', the narrative runs, 'much weakened in body and incapable in mind of measuring himself with us . . . and I saw that Nestorius said to Schenute: Take this treasure and distribute it to the poor. The holy prophet said to him: Confess that the Virgin Mary is *Theotokos* and I will give it on your behalf. The impious Nestorius replied with his tongue that deserved to be cut off: The bishops (of Ephesus) could not persuade me to say that word, and who are you to make me say that a woman bore God as her child! That is what he said. Then Schenute replied to him: You are accursed, you and your money!—and he shook his hand over him. An angel then struck Nestorius, and he lay there three hours in great torment, and his tongue came out of his mouth. Mortification set in, and he died in a terrible way. When that took place, Schenute said to me: Go and inform the patriarch Dioscorus . . . —At that moment I awoke, and here we have letters coming now to confirm it all.' Such is the narrative, and while we allow for later embellishment of the details, we can hardly be wrong in drawing the inference from it that the report of the death of Nestorius, which was current at the time of the Council, originated with the party who wished him dead and eagerly seized on any evidence that came to their hand, whether by the 'dream' of Macarius at Constantinople or by letters from their partisans in Egypt. The letter of

require something like ζηλοῦντες for ζητοῦντες, and the sense he gives to Νεστορίου τὰ λείψανα is surely impossible. He also reads 'Leo' instead of 'John' as the name of the bishop and the presbyter to whom the letter was addressed.)

¹ The dream is narrated, as above, in the memorial oration which Dioscorus is said to have composed in exile at Gangra when news of the death of Macarius reached him. This oration is extant in Coptic (E. Amélineau *Monuments pour servir à l'histoire de l'Égypte chrétienne aux iv^e et v^e siècles* in the *Mémoires de la mission française du Caire* tom. iv). As to the question of its genuineness see Leipoldt *op. cit.* pp. 17 f, and the opinions of other scholars there cited. I quote from the French translation of M. Revillout *op. cit.* pp. 570 f.

Eustathius, accordingly, simply shews that the report spread by the enemies of Nestorius was believed by his friends at the moment, and that a casual reference to their belief at the time was accepted by Evagrius more than a hundred and forty years later as decisive evidence that Nestorius was dead at the time of the Council.

One point further remains. Evagrius had apparently handled the book of Nestorius himself which in its Syriac version is now again accessible. His reference to it (*H. E.* i 7) indicates that he dismissed it lightly as only a prolix repetition of the 'history' which he mentions. If it was the complete book as we have it, he would have found at the end of it evidence very much to his purpose. But it is easy to understand how the tedious doctrinal discussions with which it begins, and which continue all through it, may have deterred him from reading it to the end: he would not have thought it likely to contain anything of historical importance. It is, however, possible that the copy which he found was an early edition lacking the latter part which Nestorius added as a supplement¹ after he had read Leo's letter to Flavian and had heard of the proceedings at Chalcedon and the triumph there of the faith for which he had contended all his life.

J. F. BETHUNE-BAKER.

¹ *Nestorius and his teaching* p. 35.