

## SOME REACTIONS TO DEVRESSE'S NEW STUDY OF THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA

FRANCIS A. SULLIVAN, S.J.

*Weston College*

A LITTLE more than a year ago, Fr. J. L. McKenzie<sup>1</sup> called the attention of the readers of this review to an interesting new approach to Theodore of Mopsuestia presented by Msgr. Robert Devreesse in his *Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste*.<sup>2</sup> It will be recalled that among the salient points in Devreesse's new study are the following: (1) Theodore, long judged the "father of Nestorianism" on the basis of fragments preserved mainly by Leontius of Byzantium and the Acts of the Fifth Council, can now, due to recent discoveries, be judged on the basis of complete texts. (2) Devreesse believes that the study of these newly discovered texts must lead to a reversal of traditional opinion concerning Theodore's Christology. His judgment is that Theodore's authentic Christology is basically sound; that, in effect, he taught the Chalcedonian doctrine of two natures and one person in Christ. (3) It is Devreesse's opinion that the extracts of the writings of Theodore on which his posthumous condemnation was based, when compared with their parallels in the complete texts, show conclusively that the Council of 553 based its decision on evidence that had been deliberately falsified.

It is inevitable that a work involving so radical a departure from the traditional view will excite wide interest, and this not only among professional patrologists. Theodore has long claimed the attention of Scripture scholars as the foremost exponent of the Antiochene exegesis. Dogmatic theologians and historians of dogma will certainly be interested in the new light thrown on the development of the doctrine of the Incarnation in the school of Antioch before the outbreak of the conflict between Nestorius and Cyril of Alexandria. And finally, those interested in questions concerning the infallibility of the teaching Church will find something to excite their attention in what seems to amount to the reversal of a decision of an ecumenical council. In

<sup>1</sup> J. L. McKenzie, S.J., "A New Study of Theodore of Mopsuestia," *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES*, X (1949), 394-408.

<sup>2</sup> *Studi e Testi*, CXXI (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1948).

view of this widespread interest, it seems worthwhile to consider some of the reactions which Devreesse's new work has aroused, both on the question of Theodore's Christology, and on that of the reliability of the extracts on which the decision of the Fifth Council was based.

#### I. THEODORE'S CHRISTOLOGY

Fr. McKenzie pointed out the fact that Devreesse's opinion as to the fundamental orthodoxy of Theodore's Christology was shared to a large extent by E. Amann. Hence it will not be out of place here to mention some articles which refer specifically to Amann's opinion, but which would undoubtedly apply to that proposed by Devreesse just as well. It will be recalled that this new view of Theodore's Christology is based largely on the work known as the *Catechetical Homilies*, which was printed for the first time in 1932.<sup>3</sup> Amann proposed the view that the Christology of these homilies was basically sound in an article written in 1934.<sup>4</sup> Naturally the touch-stone of orthodoxy for one suspected of Nestorianism will be his treatment of the "communication of idioms." Amann is satisfied that these homilies, while their terminology is still imperfect, do show "un essai," "une esquisse," of the doctrine of the "communication of idioms."<sup>5</sup> He concludes that, "... given a few slight corrections, these *Catecheses* could have been pronounced before an audience of Western doctors and bishops, without producing in the listeners anything but great admiration for the piety and the learning of their author."<sup>6</sup>

It was soon manifested, however, that Amann's favorable opinion of the Christology of the homilies was not shared by all scholars, for in the following year M. Jugie expressed quite a different view.<sup>7</sup> Referring specifically to Amann's article of the previous year, Jugie remarks: "M. Amann puts less stress than we do on the heterodox character of Theodore's formulas."<sup>8</sup> That this is a bit of understatement

<sup>3</sup> A. Mingana, *Woodbrooke Studies*, V and VI (Cambridge, 1932-33).

<sup>4</sup> E. Amann, "La Doctrine christologique de Théodore de Mopsueste (à propos d'une publication récente)," *Revue des sciences religieuses*, XIV (1934), 161-90.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 174, n. 1; p. 181, n. 3.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 190.

<sup>7</sup> M. Jugie, A.A., "Le *Liber ad baptizandos* de Théodore de Mopsueste," *Echos d'orient*, XXXIV (1935), 257-71.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 262, n. 4.

is clear from the fact that Jugie sees in the newly published homilies “. . . nothing really new, but only an ample confirmation of what one already knew from other sources, namely, that Theodore is the true father of the doctrine condemned by the Church under the name of Nestorianism. The Bishop of Mopsuestia really sees in Jesus Christ two distinct personalities . . . two distinct beings: *the one is not the other.*”<sup>9</sup>

A conclusion similar to that of Jugie was reached by W. de Vries, who, in discussing the “Nestorianism” of Theodore’s sacramental theology, mentioned the sharply divergent views expressed by Amann and Jugie.<sup>10</sup> He says: “In our opinion, the verdict must be given unreservedly to Jugie, and Amann’s attempt to clear Theodore of the charge of heresy must be considered a failure.”<sup>11</sup> Referring specifically to Amann’s defense of Theodore’s Christology on the basis of an orthodox approach to the “communication of idioms,” de Vries states emphatically: “What was later on called the *communicatio idiomatum*, was in reality denied by Theodore in its true sense, and admitted only as a manner of speaking. . . . Theodore can admit no true *communicatio idiomatum*, because he does not distinguish between person and nature.”<sup>12</sup> He goes on to defend the thesis that, while Theodore wished to be orthodox and to remain faithful to the traditional formulas, still his real, inner thought is dominated by a rationalistic tendency which shies away from mystery, and empties traditional formulas of their true content. This rationalism has led him to his fundamental error: the denial of the basic fact of Christianity, namely, that God has in truth become man. And de Vries will show that this basic error has invaded not only Theodore’s Christology, but his theology of redemption and of the sacraments as well. Yet throughout there is a conflict between his rationalism and his loyalty to tradition: one will find expressions that seem perfectly orthodox, yet a closer examination of the way in which Theodore evidently understands them reveals a rationalistic sense, minimizing the mystery.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 259.

<sup>10</sup> W. de Vries, S.J., “Der ‘Nestorianismus’ Theodors von Mopsuestia in seiner Sakramentenlehre,” *Orientalia christiana periodica*, VII (1941), 91–148.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 92.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 94.

If de Vries' analysis is correct, it would also offer an explanation of the sharply divergent views of Theodore's Christology which we have outlined. Those who are satisfied with his orthodoxy probably tend to interpret the more disquieting passages in the light of his traditional expressions. Those who still see in him the father of Nestorianism will put more stress on these ill-sounding explanations, as coming closer to the personal thought which underlies the apparently orthodox formula.

Since de Vries' article was written, there have appeared the two most thorough treatments of the Mopsuestian which we now possess: the article "Théodore de Mopsueste," by E. Amann in the *DTC*,<sup>13</sup> and Devreesse's *Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste*. There is no need of my discussing in detail the content of these studies, since Fr. McKenzie has done this amply in his note of last year. Suffice it to say that, while Amann and Devreesse are willing to admit deficiencies, lacunae, and exaggerations in Theodore's Christology, they are convinced of his basic orthodoxy, and would definitely reject the traditional judgment that he was the father of the heresy condemned as Nestorianism.

Having seen the adverse reactions caused by Amann's first presentation of this thesis, we are not surprised to find that not all the reviewers of Devreesse's *Essai* were convinced by his statement of the case for Theodore's orthodoxy. J. Daniélou offers a fairly mild protest: having admitted that Devreesse has perhaps cleared Theodore of the charge of outright heresy, he asks: "But is it true for all that, that Theodore's work does not betray dangerous tendencies?"<sup>14</sup> J. Lebon presents a somewhat more vigorous objection in his review of the *Essai*. He admits that one should no longer base his judgment on fragments, but on the complete works now available. But after outlining the salient points of Theodore's Christology found in these texts, Lebon asks:

"Are not the grounds really there on which theologians have always based their charge against the bishop of Mopsuestia—namely, of dividing Christ and of not proposing him truly as God made man? If one pretends to acquit him of this charge, he will have to show that the correct interpretation of these formulas

<sup>13</sup> *DTC*, XV, 1, 235-79.

<sup>14</sup> *Recherches de science religieuse*, XXXVI (1949), 620-22.

does not involve such a division, and one cannot help regretting that Msgr. Devreesse did not believe it necessary to apply himself further in this respect."<sup>15</sup>

An even more critical view of Devreesse's thesis is taken by I. Ortiz de Urbina, who reviews the *Essai* in *Orientalia christiana periodica*.<sup>16</sup> Fr. Ortiz insists that the reason why one does not find the "Nestorianism" traditionally attributed to Theodore in Devreesse's synthesis of this doctrine, is that the Monsignor's study is incomplete, and has not taken into account all the material which is critically certain, and in particular, the fragments cited by Cyril of Alexandria. In Ortiz's opinion, these are enough to warrant a Nestorian interpretation even of the ambiguous expressions which are found in the works treated by Devreesse. Hence he concludes that Devreesse's defense of Theodore's orthodoxy is without sufficient foundation.

It will be remarked that Ortiz de Urbina lays great stress on the fragments cited by St. Cyril, as an authentic and decisive source for a judgment of Theodore's orthodoxy. Several recent studies by Marcel Richard, however, cast serious doubts on the reliability of these fragments.<sup>17</sup> M. Richard does not question the veracity of Cyril, but rather of those who composed an early florilegium of Theodorian texts. It is on such a florilegium, and not on the complete works, that Richard believes Cyril's opinion of the Mopsuestian to have been based. Richard presents evidence to show that the compilers of this early florilegium were the avowed enemies of Theodore at Antioch, who themselves were Apollinarists, and who were not above manipulating texts to suit their own purposes. It is such corrupted texts, Richard claims, which Cyril handed on in his work *Contra Diodorum et Theodorum*. In view of this serious charge, it is clear that one can no longer presume the certain authenticity of a text of Theodore merely on the basis of its citation by Cyril of Alexandria. It is of course possible that Richard's reconstruction of events may be eventually disproved.

<sup>15</sup> *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, XLIV (1949), 604.

<sup>16</sup> *Orientalia christiana periodica*, XV (1949), 440-43.

<sup>17</sup> Marcel Richard, "La Tradition des fragments du traité *Περί τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως* de Théodore de Mopsueste," *Muséon*, LVI (1943), 55-75; also: "Les Traités de Cyrille d'Alexandrie contre Diodore et Théodore et les fragments dogmatiques de Diodore de Tarse," *Mélanges Félix Grat* (Paris, 1946), pp. 99-116.

But until this is done, the reliability of the extracts cited by Cyril must remain open to some doubt.

In the opinion of the present writer, it is precisely this doubt which has been cast on the reliability of the fragments of Theodore handed on by Cyril of Alexandria and Leontius of Byzantium, which stands in the way of a definitive solution of the problem of Theodore's Christology. It is true that we now possess four complete texts, independent of these fragments. But it is very significant that among these complete texts we have three exegetical commentaries and one collection of catechetical homilies, but none of the strictly theological treatises in which Theodore exposed his complete doctrine on the Incarnation. For these treatises, the *De Incarnatione* and the *Contra Apollinarem*, we must rely on extracts. It was indeed a sad loss when a manuscript containing a complete Syriac text of the *De Incarnatione*, discovered in this century, was destroyed by vandals in 1922. The chances are that this manuscript might have solved the question of Theodore's Christology. As matters stand, however, one must either confine himself to the exegetical and catechetical works, or he must attempt a solution to the question of the reliability of the extracts which have come down to us of the strictly theological treatises. The sharp difference seen in the judgments passed on the *Catechetical Homilies* by Amann and Devreesse on the one hand, and by Jugie and de Vries on the other, is perhaps an indication that a satisfactory and definitive solution has not been found in such works alone.

## II. THE CONDEMNED EXTRACTS

Hence we approach the thorny question of the authenticity of the extracts quoted by Cyril and Leontius. Now it seems clear, on the basis of Richard's studies, that all of these collections of extracts used by the enemies of Theodore are not independent of each other, but are based on some early florilegium. A large number of these extracts are preserved in the Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople, and also in the papal document known as the *Constitutum Vigilii*. From this it will appear that to prove that the extracts used by the council and by Vigilius can be proved falsified, is to cast equal suspicion on all this literature of extracts from which the conciliar *capitula* were drawn. Now it will be recalled that one of the salient points

made by Devreesse in his *Essai* is precisely this: that in the light of comparisons which can now be made with authentic texts, these conciliar extracts show omission, interpolation, truncation, alteration, in almost every instance. As Fr. McKenzie remarks: this is more than enough to cast doubt on the reliability of the other extracts.

There are, then, several reasons which justify a careful scrutiny of the data upon which Devreesse has founded this judgment on the conciliar extracts. The first is, as we have suggested above, that the reliability of the extracts used by the council will be an important indication as to the trust which one may place in the collections preserved by Leontius and Cyril—collections which present texts from the strictly theological works of Theodore, and hence are vital to a consideration of his Christology. For, a comparison of the conciliar version with parallel texts as quoted in the Greek by Leontius indicates that those who immediately drew up the capitula for Vigilius and the council were faithful to the texts as they found them in the Leontian collection. If there was corruption of Theodore's original words, it apparently was already present in the florilegia. Hence Devreesse's conclusion as to the interpolations and alterations to be found in the condemned extracts, will, by obvious implication, cast serious doubt on the reliability of all the texts handed on by Leontius and Cyril.

The second reason calling for a closer study of Devreesse's conclusion in this matter is that it is vital to his treatment of the condemnation of Theodore by the ecumenical council. For if Theodore was not really guilty as charged, a grave injustice has been done to him, and a serious mistake has been made in a decision of a universal synod—a decision to which Pope Vigilius eventually gave his approbation. The explanation offered by Devreesse lies in the contention that the judgment of the council was based on falsified evidence. It will then be important to review his proof of this contention.

The third and most immediate reason for examining the data for Devreesse's conclusions in this matter, is that Fr. Ortiz, after a study of the same evidence, comes to a conclusion which is so different from that reached by the former as to produce something of a shock. In summing up his discussion of the fifty-five extracts used both by Vigilius and the council, Devreesse had stated: "Where we have been

able to compare these fragments with the text from which they were detached, and with their authentic parallels, we have found them in each case mutilated, truncated, cut from their context or diverted from their meaning. . . ."<sup>18</sup> Yet Ortiz, studying these same fifty-five extracts, concludes that of the twenty-nine texts for which he finds a certain parallel, no less than twenty-two are thereby proved certainly authentic, while in only five cases does he see evidence of unfriendly manipulation. He adds: "This state of affairs in no way authorizes one to say *en bloc* that these texts are 'false or dubious.'"<sup>19</sup> Since Fr. Ortiz made this statement in the course of a brief review of Msgr. Devreesse's book, he did not present all the evidence on which he based his judgment. What we propose to do here is to examine the texts concerning which these two scholars have come to so contrasting conclusions, in the hope that thus some further light may be shed on the subject.

First of all, to lessen somewhat the apparently irreconcilable contradiction between the two statements, we should note that Devreesse himself, when discussing the individual texts, seems to allow a textual confirmation of eight of the extracts, although he notes that in several of these cases the lack of context is equivalent to corruption. Secondly, of the twenty-two texts which Ortiz considers proved authentic by comparison with certain parallels, there are nine (26, 28, 29, 44-49) which he seems to have compared with texts found in other anti-Theodorian collections, as that of Leontius, of Cyril, and of a Monophysite collection preserved in Syriac. In Devreesse's opinion, these are not independent witnesses, but are simply other elements in the anti-Theodorian tradition. Richard's studies seem to warrant at least a strong suspicion that this is the case. Hence it seems safer to count these nine texts among those for which no certainly independent parallel has been found.

With these preliminary concessions made, we can now sum up the remaining differences of opinion. In the fifty-five extracts, Devreesse sees a certain parallel in nineteen cases; of these he admits six as substantially identical with the parallel (15, 16, 25, 35, 38, 53); two are textually sound, but have a crippling lack of context (14, 41); eleven show textual corruption (20, 22, 27, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 42, 43, 52).

<sup>18</sup> *Essai*, p. 254.

<sup>19</sup> *Orient. chr. per.*, XV (1949), 443.



Ortiz de Urbina, on the other hand, sees an independent parallel in twenty cases (if one does not count the nine which were mentioned above); of these, no less than thirteen are claimed as genuine (13–17, 25, 33–36, 41, 52, 53); two more have insignificant variants which do not affect the sense (42, 43); and only five (20, 22, 27, 30, 31) are admitted as apparently corrupted. There is still enough contradiction here to warrant further study. The only satisfactory way to handle it seems to be to present the evidence in each case where they have reached a different verdict. At the same time the writer will present his personal evaluation of the evidence, which, let it be said, in general confirms the opinion of Ortiz against that of Devreesse. In brief, this writer proposes: (1) that there are twenty-one capitula for which an authentic parallel can be found; (2) that of these twenty-one fragments, no less than seventeen are shown to be substantially confirmed as to the text, although a serious lack of context must be admitted in several cases; (3) that in three of the other four cases, which show substantial textual variants from the parallel, the grounds for asserting that these differences must be due to a deliberate corruption of the text by the anti-Theodorian compilers are not as unquestionable as might at first seem. Before going into the evidence, we should first mention that, while the text of the extracts is found in the Acts of the Fifth Council<sup>20</sup> and in the *Constitutum Vigilii*, confusion may result from the fact that the numbering is not uniform in both sources. It is preferable to follow Ortiz in referring to the texts as found in the *Constitutum*, since this has received a critical edition which is generally available.<sup>21</sup>

The first twelve extracts are from Theodore's treatise *Contra Apollinarem*. There are no independent parallels to any of these texts, and Devreesse dismisses them with the remark that as they are presented, they do not seem to him to correspond to the authentic thought of Theodore.<sup>22</sup> Ortiz comments, quite justly, that this is not a sufficient reason for rejecting their authenticity.<sup>23</sup> One might add the observa-

<sup>20</sup> Mansi, IX, 203–221.

<sup>21</sup> *Vigilii Constitutum de tribus capitulis*, ed. O. Günther, *Collectio Avellana (CSEL)*, XXXV, 1, 230–320; the extracts are on pp. 237–85).

<sup>22</sup> *Essai*, p. 247. He discusses the extracts, in numerical order, on pp. 246–54.

<sup>23</sup> *Orient. chr. per.*, XV (1949), 442, where all of Ortiz's remarks concerning individual extracts will be found.

tion that these extracts are all drawn from a polemic, theological treatise. We have no complete text of any comparable work of Theodore. To say that they do not seem to correspond with the thought found in his purely exegetical and catechetical works is not to exclude the possibility that they are genuine. Hence they should rightly be numbered among the texts for which we simply have no independent parallel.

Of Cap. 13, Devreesse says that he has not found it elsewhere. Ortiz, on the other hand, numbers it among those proved authentic by comparison with other certain texts, but he does not indicate where the other text in this case is to be found. The writer must confess that he can shed no light on this question, as he has been able to find no text to substantiate a claim for the authenticity of Cap. 13. The next fragment on which there is a difference of opinion is Cap. 17, a passage from Theodore's Commentary on the Acts, which Ortiz numbers among those proved authentic by other sources. Devreesse seems to dismiss it as though there were no parallel to be found, but in a footnote he refers to another page of his *Essai* (39, n. 1), where he mentioned the fact that Vosté had seen a parallel to this text in a commentary on the Acts by the ninth-century Nestorian exegete Isho'dad of Merw.<sup>24</sup> That Devreesse does not put much faith in the reliability of such a parallel is obvious, both from his previous treatment of Vosté's suggestions along this line,<sup>25</sup> and from the objections which he raises on this occasion. But the fact remains that Vosté has found, in the writings of an exegete whom he calls "a faithful abbreviator of Theodore of Mopsuestia,"<sup>26</sup> a Syriac text which substantially confirms the Latin text of Vigilius. In fact the correspondence is so exact that Vosté describes the Syriac as "a translation which corresponds word for word with the Latin text."<sup>27</sup> In view of this striking parallel, there can hardly be any doubt that the passage of Isho'dad and the conciliar extract both represent a genuine text of Theodore. One cannot imagine that the Nestorian exegete, for whom the Mopsuestian was "The Interpreter" par excellence, would have drawn upon an anti-

<sup>24</sup> J. M. Vosté, O.P., "Le Gannat Bussame," *Revue biblique*, XXXVII (1928), 398-9.

<sup>25</sup> R. Devreesse, "Par quelles voies nous sont parvenus les commentaires de Théodore de Mopsueste?" *Revue biblique*, XXXIX (1930), 362-77.

<sup>26</sup> J. M. Vosté, O.P., "L'Oeuvre exégétique de Théodore de Mopsueste au IIe Concile de Constantinople," *Revue biblique*, XXXVIII (1929), 383.

<sup>27</sup> Vosté, "Le Gannat Bussame," p. 398.

Theodorian florilegium for an isolated passage of his Commentary on the Acts. Devreesse, however, objects that the treatment of I Cor. 10:2 given in the parallel extracts does not correspond to what remains of Theodore's commentary on I Corinthians. So vague a difficulty, which seems to demand a rigid consistency of treatment, and to exclude the possibility of a change of view, is hardly a sufficient reason for rejecting the evidence of two parallel and independent texts. Devreesse's second objection to a confirmation of Cap. 17 is that the Syriac extract omits the last few lines of the Vigilant text. Is not this equivalent to saying that the two extracts simply do not have the same "explicit"—a fact which would tend to confirm their independence from any common florilegium? Ortiz does not say explicitly that the text of Isho'dad discovered by Vosté is the authentic parallel on which he bases his certitude of the genuinity of Cap. 17. However, it seems most likely that this is the case. The evidence for genuinity on the basis of "word-for-word" correspondence found in an independent source must be admitted to outweigh the objections offered by Devreesse. At least the major portion of Cap. 17, which is substantiated by the text of Isho'dad, should be admitted as proven to be authentic.

The next Capitulum to be discussed is 20, a passage from Theodore's Commentary on the Psalms. For Devreesse, this is a clear case of deliberate and malicious corruption of an innocent text into flagrant Nestorianism. The anti-Theodorian version, which is also found in Greek, preserved by Leontius, differs in a vital point from an ancient Latin version discovered in an eighth-century manuscript of Bobbio. Devreesse prints the three versions side by side.<sup>28</sup> We here present the part showing the variant reading.

*Leontius of Byz.*  
p. 46, ll. 23-30

Πῶς οὐ πρόδηλον ὅτι ἕτερον μὲν ἡμᾶς ἢ θεὸς γραφὴν διδάσκει σαφῶς εἶναι τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον, ἕτερον δὲ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, πολλήν τε αὐτῶν οὖσαν δεικνύειν ἡμῖν τὴν διαφορὰν;

*Ms. of Bobbio*  
p. 46, ll. 25-33

Manifestum ergo est quod aliam divinae scripturae nos doceant Dei Verbi esse substantiam et aliam hominis suscepti naturam, multaque inter utrasque esse distinctionem:

*Vig. Cap. 20*  
p. 46, ll. 20-30

Quomodo non manifestum, quod alterum quidem nos divina scriptura docet evidenter esse Deum Verbum, alterum vero hominem et multam eorum esse ostendit nobis differentiam?

<sup>28</sup> R. Devreesse, *Le Commentaire de Théodore de Mopsueste sur les psaumes (I-LXXX)* (Studi e Testi, XCIII; Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1939), pp. 46-7.

On the basis of the ancient Latin version (probably of the fifth century), Devreesse, followed in this point by Fr. Vaccari,<sup>29</sup> considers the sixth-century text of Leontius to be fraudulent. Ortiz also admits that this text has apparently been tampered with, although he does express some misgivings about Devreesse's unquestioning faith in the correctness of the Latin version.

However, Jugie has an observation concerning this case which weakens considerably the assumption that the difference between the two traditions here can only be explained by corruption in the anti-Theodorian fragment. Jugie says on this point:

Authenticitatem hujus fragmenti a Leontio Byzantino laudati nulla adest specialis ratio in dubium vocandi. Congruit enim cum multis aliis ejusdem Theodori locis. . . . Verum, nostro judicio, mutatione tenetur non Leontius, sed latinus interpretator, cujus aures catholicae verba Theodori haeresim redolentia tolerare non potuerunt; unde stylo catholico omnia lectori proposuit.<sup>30</sup>

Jugie seems to make a solid point. It is well known that ancient translators often did not feel any scruple, but rather thought it laudable, to improve the orthodoxy of a text which seemed to them reprehensible. That this has taken place in the present instance is a possibility which cannot be ignored. Unless one can prove that the unknown fifth-century translator gave a scrupulously faithful translation of the original Greek, it does not seem just to charge malicious falsification on the grounds that Leontius' Greek text differs from the Latin version. In the light of this doubt, we would reduce the verdict of "certainly corrupt" to a moderate "non constat."

Cap. 22 is another case in which Devreesse sees clear proof of corruption. He says of this text: "One will observe that it gives an unfaithful and intentionally misleading citation of a passage which has been preserved in its integrity."<sup>31</sup> In proof of this contention he refers to his edition of the *Commentary on the Psalms*, where he prints Cap. 22 in juxtaposition with a passage of the commentary on Psalm 15.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>29</sup> R. Vaccari, S.J., "In margine al commento di Teodoro Mopsuesteno ai Salmi," *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, I (Studi e Testi CXXI; Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1946), pp. 179-80.

<sup>30</sup> M. Jugie, A.A., *Theologia dogmatica christianorum orientalium*, V (Paris, 1935), 102, n. 1.

<sup>31</sup> *Essai*, p. 248.      <sup>32</sup> *Le Commentaire . . . sur les Psaumes*, pp. 99-100.

The passages show considerable differences, which lead Devreesse to the conclusion that the extract of Vigilius "falsifies the literal tenor and thought of the author."<sup>33</sup> Ortiz de Urbina admits that the text has apparently been tampered with.

However, it is clear that Devreesse's whole case here rests on the assumption that Cap. 22 really is a falsified version of the passage of

*Comm. in Joël. II*  
(PG, LXVI, 232 b-c)

οὕτως ὁ μακάριος λέγει  
Δαυῖδ περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ, ὅτι  
Οὐκ ἐγκατελείφθη ἡ ψυχὴ  
αὐτοῦ εἰς ἕδην, οὐδὲ ἡ  
σὰρξ αὐτοῦ εἶδε διαφθο-  
ράν· ὅπερ οὐκ ἐπὶ τῶν  
πραγμάτων νοεῖσθαι δυνα-  
τὸν, μεταφορικῶς δὲ ἦτοι  
ὑπερβολικῶς λέγει, ὅτι ἐξ-  
ἤρθη κυδῶνος ἢ διαφθορᾶς·

ἢ δὲ τοῦ πράγματος ἀλή-  
θεια τῶν εἰρημένων ὑπὸ  
τοῦ Δεσπότης δεικνύεται  
Χριστοῦ . . . διόπερ ἐχρή-  
σατο τῇ φωνῇ καὶ ὁ μακά-  
ριος Πέτρος, ὡς ἂν

τότε μὲν κατὰ τινα αἰτίαν  
μεταφορικῶς εἰρημένῃ,  
νῦν δὲ ἀληθῆ τὴν ἐκβασιν  
ἐπ' αὐτῶν λαβοῦσα τῶν  
πραγμάτων·

*Vig. Cap. 22*  
(Günther, p. 256)

Tale est et, quod non  
derelicta est anima eius in  
inferno nec caro eius uidit  
corruptionem; nam pro-  
pheta quidem supra  
modum ipsum ponit circa  
populum, prouidentiam di-  
cens, uolens dicere, quo-  
niam inextemptabiles eos  
ab omnibus conseruauit  
malis.

quoniam autem hoc uerum  
et ex ipsis rebus euentum  
accepit in domino Christo,  
sequentissime de eo lo-  
quens beatus Petrus utitur  
uoce ostendens, quoniam  
quod de populo supra

modum dictum est ex qua-  
dam ratione utente uoce  
propheta, hoc uerum euen-  
tum in ipsis rebus accepit  
nunc in domino Christo.

*Comm. in Zach. IX*  
(PG, LXVI, 557 a-b)

Τοιοῦτόν ἐστι τὸ, "Οὐκ ἐγ-  
κατελείφθη ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ  
εἰς ἕδου, οὐδὲ ἡ σὰρξ αὐ-  
τοῦ εἶδε διαφθοράν," ὅπερ  
ὑπερβολικῶς εἰρημένον παρὰ  
τοῦ μακαρίου Δαυῖδ ἐπὶ τοῦ  
λαοῦ τῶν Ἰσραηλιτῶν,

ἐπ' αὐτῆς τῆς τῶν πραγμά-  
των ἀληθείας ὤπται γενοῦς  
ἐπὶ τοῦ Δεσπότης Χριστοῦ.  
"Ὅθεν δὴ καὶ τῇ φωνῇ δι-  
καίως ὁ μακάριος ἐχρήσατο  
Πέτρος . . .  
(ὅπερ ὑπερβολικῶς εἰρημέ-  
νον παρὰ τοῦ μακαρίου Δαυῖδ  
ἐπὶ τοῦ λαοῦ τῶν Ἰσραηλι-  
τῶν, ἐπ' αὐτῆς τῆς τῶν πραγ-  
μάτων ἀληθείας ὤπται γεγο-  
νός ἐπὶ τοῦ Δεσπότης Χριστοῦ.)

the *Commentary on the Psalms* with which he has compared it. His reason for so assuming seems to be merely that both passages deal with the use of Psalm 15:10 by St. Peter in his Pentecost address (Acts 2:27). As a matter of fact, the Acts of the Fifth Council indicate that Cap. 22 was taken from "the beginning of Theodore's commentary on the twelve prophets," a phrase which Günther<sup>34</sup> interprets to mean

<sup>33</sup> *Essai*, p. 248, n. 3.

<sup>34</sup> *CSEL*, XXXV, 1, 256 note.

a lost introduction to the commentary, the rest of which has been preserved in the original Greek.<sup>35</sup> Now while we do not find the text of Cap. 22 in this work, it is remarkable that in at least two different places, in the course of commenting on one of the prophets, Theodore introduces the use of Ps. 15:10 by St. Peter, as an example of what he calls "hyperbolic" prophecy. And a still more remarkable fact is that when these two texts are compared with Cap. 22, they show an identity of thought and a similarity of expression which can hardly be explained except by allowing the genuinity of the Vigilian extract. See page 191.

It will be observed that all three passages begin with an expression which indicates that what follows is an illustration of some general principle. From the context of the two passages from the commentary on the prophets, we see that in each case Theodore has introduced this example to illustrate his theory of "hyperbolic" prophecy. What would be more likely than that in an introduction to the commentary, the author had discussed the principles of his exegesis, and had once again used this example? In any case it must be admitted that Cap. 22 contains nothing that is not proved consonant with Theodore's exegesis of this passage as found in two certainly genuine texts.

Devreesse, however, found a contradiction between Cap. 22 and the passage from the *Commentary on the Psalms* with which he compared it.<sup>36</sup> If there is a real contradiction there, it is reduced to a contradiction between Theodore writing on the psalms and Theodore writing on the prophets. However, the difference is easily explained by the development of Theodore's theories of prophecy in the interval between the writing of the commentary on the psalms and the writing of that on the prophets. There can be no reflection on the authenticity of Cap. 22. The parallels found in the two Greek texts show beyond doubt that this extract of 553, far from falsifying the thought of Theodore, is a faithful mirror of his more mature exegesis of Psalm 15:10.

The next *capitulum* in which Msgr. Devreesse finds evidence of corruption is no. 27, an extract from the *Commentary on St. John*, for

<sup>35</sup> PG, LXVI, 123-632.

<sup>36</sup> *Essai*, p. 248, n. 3.

which there is a parallel in the Syriac version of that work.<sup>37</sup> A comparison shows two omissions in the Syriac version:

*Cap. 27. Günther, p. 261,*  
(lines 11–17)

Per omnia enim ista monstrabatur dignitas Christi, quod inseparate ei angeli aderant et omnibus circa eum ministrabant: sicut enim a peccantibus separantur, sic et per meritum honoratis subueniunt. propter quod bene dominus ait, quod 'maius uidebitis, quod et caelum aperietur omnibus per me et omnes angeli semper mecum erunt, nunc quidem ascendentes, nunc uero descendentes sicut ad domesticum dei et amicum.'

*Syriac: Vosté, p. 38,*  
(lines 25–30)

Per quae omnia Christi dignitas monstrabatur, quod sine intermissione ei angeli aderant, in omnibus, quae circa eum contingebant, ministrantes. Quapropter recte dicit, maiora istis illos esse visuros; angeli nempe semper ei praesto forent ascendentes et descendentes, seu diligentissime ministrantes in iis quae apud eum contingunt.

On the evidence of the Syriac version, Devreesse labels the last phrase of Cap. 27 "an interpolation whose import one sees immediately." Ortiz grants that this text does indicate apparent corruption. But here again some questions may be raised as to the certitude of the conclusion which Devreesse has drawn. He has made several assumptions which bear examining. First, he must assume that the Syriac version is a scrupulously faithful translation of the original Greek text—so exact that a variation from it is positive proof of interpolation in the Vigilant text. Secondly, he must assume that the Latin version of Cap. 27 and the Syriac version were made from the identical edition of Theodore's original commentary. And yet Devreesse himself says, on pp. 302–3 of his *Essai*, that the variations between the Syriac version and the Greek fragments which he has gathered suggest the hypothesis that there were two editions of the original work. If Devreesse calmly admits divergencies between the Syriac version and the Greek fragments, it hardly seems consistent to charge interpolation in the Latin version which shows a few phrases not found in the Syriac. The third assumption made by Devreesse is that the phrase "sicut ad domesticum dei et amicum" introduces a sinister idea that is

<sup>37</sup> J. M. Vosté, O.P., *Theodori Mopsuesteni Commentarius in Evangelium Johannis Apostoli* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum, Scriptores Syri, Series IV, T. III; Louvain, 1940), p. 38.

foreign to Theodore's true thought. Yet the fragment which preserves the original Greek of the commentary on the immediately preceding verse shows the phrase *περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ . . . ὡς οἰκειωμένου παρὰ πάντας Θεῶν*.<sup>38</sup> It is true that the modern noun "domestic," or "domesticque," has a servile connotation. But one should not reproach a sixth-century translator who was intent upon a strictly literal version, for translating the Greek *οἰκεῖος* by "domesticus." Hence, while the phrase "sicut ad domesticum dei et amicum" has no equivalent in the Syriac version, the grounds for describing it as an interpolation introducing a thought foreign to Theodore, are something less than conclusive.

Of Cap. 30, Devreesse simply remarks that Marcel Richard "has sufficiently demonstrated how this text has been deliberately corrupted, cut from its context, truncated by a theologian who knew what he was doing."<sup>39</sup> And here again Ortiz de Urbina agrees that there is evidence of corruption. It is clear that in order to test the certitude of this case we must examine the proofs offered by M. Richard.<sup>40</sup> The facts which he presents are these: Cap. 30 represents a fragment of Theodore's *De Incarnatione*, also preserved in Greek by Leontius (fragment VI).<sup>41</sup> Cap. 30 and Leontius fragment VI have the same *explicit*. The evidence of two independent Syriac versions of this same passage of the *De Incarnatione* shows that whoever excerpted the fragments given by Leontius as VI and VII, left out a passage which came between these two extracts, and would have shed considerable light on the thought of Theodore. This fact seems to justify Richard's first conclusion: that the compiler of these extracts was not above cutting out just the portions which served his purpose, omitting others which would give a more honest presentation of the author's full thought. This would justify the charge that Cap. 30, representing Leontius VI, is "coupé de sa suite,"—not, of course, that the immediate compilers of the *capitula* should be blamed for it, as they undoubtedly used the extracts as they found them presented by Leontius.

However, another and even more serious charge is made by Richard

<sup>38</sup> *Essai*, p. 318, ll. 13-14.

<sup>39</sup> *Essai*, p. 249.

<sup>40</sup> M. Richard, *art. cit.*, *Muséon*, LVI (1943), 64-66.

<sup>41</sup> Günther prints Leontius frag. VI beneath Cap. 30 (*CSEL*, XXXV, 1, 264).



on the evidence of the Syriac texts. It happens that two different Syriac mss. contain the passage which parallels Leontius VI and VII. One of these gives a Syriac version that is faithful to the Greek of Leontius.<sup>42</sup> Richard ascribes the texts of this ms. to a Monophysite florilegium—hence another witness to the anti-Theodorian tradition, and suspect in Richard’s eyes. On the other hand, the second Syriac ms.<sup>43</sup> shows a text which differs in important details from that of Leontius, and it is on this basis that Richard charges corruption in the Leontian text. He juxtaposes the Greek of Leontius with his own Greek retroversion of the Syriac text. The following section shows the important variation:

*Leontius VI (Günther p. 264)*

ὅταν μὲν γὰρ τὰς φύσεις διακρίνωμεν,  
τελείαν τὴν φύσιν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου φαμέν  
καὶ τέλειον τὸ πρόσωπον (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀ-  
πρόσωπον ἔστιν ὑπόστασιν εἰπεῖν), τελείαν  
δὲ καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου φύσιν καὶ τὸ  
πρόσωπον ὁμοίως· ὅταν μὲντοι ἐπὶ τὴν  
συνάφειαν ἀπιδώμεν, ἓν πρόσωπον τότε  
φαμέν.

*Syriac (Richard’s version)*

ὅταν γὰρ τὰς φύσεις διακρίνωμεν, νοοῦμεν  
τὴν θεῶν φύσιν ἐν ὑποστάσει ἰδίᾳ, καὶ  
τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν·  
ὅταν μὲντοι ἐπὶ τὴν συνάφειαν ἀπιδώμεν,  
ἓν πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν φαμέν.

Richard comments: “If one of these two texts represents the original thought of Theodore, as there is good reason for thinking it does, the other has been intentionally modified by a theologian well aware of what he was doing.”<sup>44</sup> But to draw from this premise a certain conclusion that it is the text of Leontius that has been “intentionally modified,” Richard must establish with certainty either that the Syriac text is a faithful version of the original Greek, or that the extract of Leontius is demonstrably corrupted. He offers arguments to prove both of these contentions. We must consider the degree of certitude which his arguments attain.

Richard’s main argument for the reliability of *cod.* 14669 as a witness to the original text of Theodore is the report of the eighth-century Joseph Hazzaya that a certain “Koumi” translated the *De*

<sup>42</sup> *Cod. Brit. Mus. Addit.* 12156, ed. E. Lagarde, *Analecta Syriaca* (Leipzig, 1858), pp. 100–108.

<sup>43</sup> *Cod. Brit. Mus. Addit.* 14669, ed. E. Sachau, *Theodori Mopsuesteni fragmenta syriaca* (Leipzig, 1869).

<sup>44</sup> Richard, *art. cit.*, p. 66.

*Incarnatione* into Syriac, at the same time interpolating into it the formula "one hypostasis" in Christ where Theodore had spoken of "two hypostases." Since we do find the term "one hypostasis" in the fragments of *cod.* 14669, Richard concludes that this must be part of Koumi's translation. And since this Koumi was a disciple of Theodore's ardent defender, Ibas of Edessa, Richard is confident that he would not have changed anything in the works of Theodore, and hence that the name "Koumi" as translator is sufficient to guarantee the fidelity of the translation. While he accepts the statement of Hazzaya that Koumi did the translation, he finds several historical weaknesses in the charge that Koumi tampered with the work. Hence the complaint is attributed to Joseph's rigid Nestorianism, which found Koumi's translation too close to orthodoxy. Richard further argues that such an interpolation as Hazzaya speaks of would never have succeeded in the region of Edessa, where Theodore was held in high repute.

Now all of this gives some probability to the conclusion that *cod.* 14669 represents a faithful version of the original text of the *De Incarnatione*. But one may be permitted to retain some doubt as to the adequacy of such evidence to produce an absolutely certain conclusion. On the other hand, Richard also presents evidence to show that the text of Leontius is not trustworthy. Despite the statement of Leontius that he procured a copy of the *De Incarnatione*, Richard shows considerable evidence to indicate that Leontius, as well as Cyril of Alexandria before him, found their passages of Theodore's works not in an original text, but in a florilegium of extracts culled by persons unknown, who were probably of the anti-Theodorian faction at Antioch. But Richard's main argument for the unreliability of these texts is that "wherever they can be compared with another branch of the tradition, one finds that the texts of the florilegia present a text that is more or less altered."<sup>45</sup> Now it is unfortunate that Richard appeals, in proof of this statement, to an article of R. Devreesse written in 1930. In this article Msgr. Devreesse had compared five extracts of the anti-Theodorian tradition with what he then believed to be their authentic parallels, and had come to the con-

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 69.

clusion that the extracts had been deliberately falsified.<sup>46</sup> I said unfortunate, because of the five examples there produced by Devreesse, in no less than three cases he had juxtaposed an extract with a passage to which it did not correspond. In reality, comparison with the correct passage tends rather to confirm the text of the extract. Thus, in 1930, Devreesse compared Conciliar fragment 62 with a passage from the Greek *Catena Barbari*, and found that they did not fully correspond. But Devreesse himself now recognizes that there is also a fragment of the *Catena Nicephori* which exactly corresponds to the offending section of Cap. 62. Hence, in his *Essai*, he now correctly juxtaposes the conciliar fragment with both of the Greek fragments, each of which confirms a section of the Latin text.<sup>47</sup> Again, in 1930, Devreesse rejected Vig. Cap. 35 because it did not correspond with a passage preserved by Facundus. The publication of the *Catechetical Homilies* a few years later provided the proof that Cap. 35 was in fact a passage from the *Homilies* (as the Council had indicated), and that it was a faithful rendition of the text. Devreesse admits this also in his *Essai*.<sup>48</sup> Another text preserved by Facundus indicated to Devreesse a proof of falsification in Vig. Cap. 52. But this extract also has a confirmatory parallel in an authentic Greek text. Msgr. Devreesse apparently was not aware of this fact when he wrote his *Essai*, as he there still juxtaposed Vig. Cap. 52 with a section of Facundus to which it does not correspond.<sup>49</sup> The other two examples of supposed corruption of the anti-Theodorian extracts are the cases of Vig. Cap. 20 and 33–34. We have already discussed the case for corruption in Cap. 20. For the others we can refer to their treatment below,<sup>50</sup> remarking only that Devreesse's objection to Cap. 33 and 34 is rather against the Latin translator than against the underlying Greek text, and hence does not affect the question of the reliability of the texts of Leontius.

This rather long digression has been necessary in order to test the value of the argument offered by M. Richard to prove that in Cap. 30 it was the text of Leontius, rather than that of Koumi, which was

<sup>46</sup> Devreesse, "Par quelles voies etc.," *Revue biblique* XXXIX (1930), 362–77.

<sup>47</sup> *Essai*, p. 23, n. 4.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 251.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 253–4. For a more detailed discussion of Cap. 52, *vide infra*, pp. 205–b.

<sup>50</sup> *Vide infra*, pp. 198–200.

unfaithful to the original. For Richard appealed to Devreesse's article of 1930 for proof of his contention that the text of Leontius is not to be trusted, on the grounds that "wherever these texts can be compared with the other traditions they are found to be more or less altered." To this we must reply, "Non constat." It is true that Richard himself presents, as confirmation of Devreesse's thesis, an example of divergence between a text of Cyril of Alexandria and that of the Syriac version.<sup>51</sup> The textual divergence is slight; one must have abundant faith in the literal accuracy of the Syriac translator if one is to charge corruption of the Cyrillian text on such grounds. Richard can with justice point out the arbitrary manner in which the extract has been lifted from its context. This, however, is still a long way from proving the general thesis that comparison with authentic texts shows alteration and corruption in the anti-Theodorian florilegia.

To sum up, therefore: Devreesse considers that Richard has sufficiently demonstrated Vig. Cap. 30 to be deliberately corrupted. Richard bases his charge on divergencies between Cap. 30 and the Syriac text of "Koumi." If this Syriac text could be proved certainly faithful to the original, one must conclude to manipulation in the text of Leontius. Since the proof of this is not absolutely conclusive, Richard adds the argument that other texts of Leontius have been proven corrupted when compared with authentic parallels. His main authority for this statement is an article by Devreesse, which, as we have seen, needs considerable revision. Hence we conclude that while the divergent Syriac text does cast doubt on the anti-Theodorian tradition, still we believe that Richard has not conclusively proved that the text of Leontius is unfaithful to the original Greek text.

With regard to Cap. 33 and 34, Devreesse's complaint is, as we have already remarked, rather against the translator than against the fidelity of the underlying Greek text. These two fragments are taken from the same section of Theodore's *Commentary on St. John*. While both of them have a parallel in the Syriac version of the commentary, one of them (33) also appears in a Greek fragment which is printed

<sup>51</sup> Richard, "La Tradition etc.," pp. 70-71. He compares the fragment: "Hoc vero," quoted by the Fifth Council from Cyril's *Contra Theodorum* (Mansi, IX, 239-40), with the corresponding text of *Catechetical Homily III*, 6 (Tonneau, p. 61, ll. 4-12).

by Devreesse in the *Appendix* to his *Essai* (p. 318). The texts are as follows:

<i>Vig. Cap. 33-34</i> (Günther, pp. 266-7)	<i>Greek Fragment 16</i> ( <i>Essai</i> , p. 318)	<i>Syriac (Lat. transl.)</i> (Vosté, p. 37)
<i>Rabbi, tu es filius dei, tu es rex Israel: hoc est, 'tu es ille, qui de longe praedicatus es Christus'; haec enim scilicet de Christo sperabant sicut domestico constituto praeter omnes deo.</i>	Ῥαββί, σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, σὺ εἶ ὁ Βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. Ταῦτα δηλοῦσι περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ προσεδέκων ὡς οικειώμενον παρὰ πάντας Θεῶν,	<i>Rabbi, tu es Filius Dei, tu es rex Israel; id est, tu es Messias, qui iamdudum est nuntiatus. Messias profecto ab illis expectabatur tamquam Dei prae omnibus familiaris, ...</i>

Certus quidem et ipse erat filium dei non secundum deitatis dicens nativitatem sed secundum quod domesticus deo erat, per quod filii dei per virtutem domestici deo constituti homines interim vocabantur.

Manifeste vero etiam Nathanael non dicebat eum *Filium Dei* generatione divina, sed familiaritate; quatenus homines, virtute sua accedentes ad Deum, filii Dei vocabantur.

Devreesse sees a deliberate falsification of Theodore's thought here in the use of the term "domesticus," which, he says, adds "quelque chose de servile que ne comporte pas le grec." Evidently he would prefer that the translator had used the word "familiaris" instead of "domesticus," to translate the Greek *οικειωμένον*. There can be little doubt but that some form of the term *οικείωσις* would also be found in the original Greek of Cap. 34. Theodore's use of this term to express the notion of the familiarity of the "homo assumptus" with God is well attested not only by the Greek fragment here quoted, but also by another passage of his writings which has been preserved in the original Greek.<sup>52</sup>

Fr. Ortiz does not see any difficulty in a translation of *οικειώμενος* by "domesticus," and he remarks that in any case Vigilius would most likely have quoted the Greek text of Theodore. Hence he numbers Cap. 33 and 34 among the texts which are proven authentic by comparison with certain parallels. One might add the following observations to his remarks. First, it is clear that Devreesse's objections to these *capitula* apply only to the Latin translation: it is explicitly the "translators of 553" whom he accuses of twisting Theodore's meaning.

<sup>52</sup> *Theodori Mops. Commentarius in Zachariam Prophetam*, Cap. I (PG, LXVI, 504 a-b).

Immediately one sees that this alleged falsification could hardly have influenced the decision of the Fathers of the Fifth Council, who were almost exclusively Eastern bishops, and would not have read their extracts of Theodore in a Latin translation. Fr. Ortiz suggests that Vigilius too would have cited the original Greek. About this one may be allowed to retain some doubt. Familiarity with Greek was not too common an accomplishment for Romans of the sixth century. Günther seems to assume that the parchment volume which Vigilius received from Benignus of Heraclea contained a Latin version of the extracts, rather than the original Greek.<sup>53</sup> If we admit, then, that Vigilius had to judge Theodore by this Latin translation alone, Devreesse would have a point in objecting to a translation that would use "domesticus" where "familiaris" is desired—if it were true that the Latin word "domesticus" had only the meaning of the modern noun "domestic" or "domestique." As a matter of fact, however, standard lexicons show that the word "domesticus" in ancient usage had all the breadth of meaning that was had by its Greek counterpart *οικέϊος*. And that Vigilius himself, whom Devreesse supposes to have been deceived by the term, did not in fact read into it any such servile meaning, is clearly proved by his own paraphrase of the *capitulum*, where he says: "sicut alii sancti homines filii dei dicuntur, homines tamen sunt, sic et Christus per *familiaritatem* quam ad deum habet, a Nathanahēle, cum quo loquebatur, deus sit nominatus" (italics mine).<sup>54</sup> For Vigilius himself, then, "domesticus deo" and "familiaris deo" would seem to be synonymous. This considerably weakens Devreesse's objections to Cap. 33 and 34. Instead of suggesting a sinister motive for the choice of the word "domesticus," one might rather ascribe it to the translator's intention to give a rendition of the Greek which would be as exact and literal as possible. Wherever we can compare this translation with the Greek from which it was drawn, we find that such indeed is the character of the work. Hence we conclude, with Ortiz, that Cap. 33 and 34 are rather confirmed than shown false by their authentic parallels.

The next extract to be considered, Cap. 36, is taken from *Catechetical*

<sup>53</sup> CSEL, XXXV, 1, p. lxxi. Cf. *Vig. Constitutum* 28 (Günther, p. 236, ll. 20 ff.).

<sup>54</sup> CSEL, XXXV, 1, 267, ll. 11-14.

*Homilies*, XIV, 25, where Theodore is addressing the newly-baptized:

*Vig. Cap. 36*  
(Günther, p. 268)

Renatus alter factus est pro altero, non  
aim pars Adam mutabilis et peccatis  
circumfusi sed Christi, qui omnino in-  
culpabilis per resurrectionem factus  
est.

*Syriac (French translation,*  
Tonneau, p. 455, lines 11–15)

Tu es né et devenu complètement  
autre; tu n'es plus dès lors partie de  
(cet) Adam, qui est changeant,—parce  
que accablé de péchés et malheureux,—  
mais (tu es partie) du Christ, qui fut  
absolument exempt (de l'atteinte) du  
péché par la résurrection,

The Syriac version continues (lines 15–18):

n'en ayant même fait aucun depuis le commencement, parce qu'il  
convenait que cela aussi fût aussi en lui à titre primordial; mais par  
la résurrection, c'est complètement qu'il reçoit la nature immuable.

Comparing the Latin extract with the Syriac text, Devreesse remarks: "... with what care has it not been amputated from its immediate context and modified to the extent of altering it?" Ortiz, on the other hand, replies that a lack of context does not prove a deliberate mutilation, and that, in reading the Syriac text, he does not find the "alterations" of which Msgr. Devreesse speaks. As one who is not familiar with Syriac, the present writer can offer no direct judgment on this latter observation. However, it is clear that Devreesse's charge of "alteration" must be based on the difference between the reading: "inculpabilis per resurrectionem factus est," of the Vigilian extract, and the Syriac parallel, which Devreesse himself translates: "sine peccato fuit per resurrectionem." Now it should be remembered that the Latin extract and the Syriac text are both versions of an original Greek text. The difference between these two translations could be explained on the hypothesis that the Greek showed something like: *ἀναμάρτητος διὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐγένετο*. The Greek verb here could be taken to mean either "factus est" or "fuit," depending on the context. As a matter of fact, the context in the present case indicates that the author meant "factus est." For it is clear that in this passage Theodore is expressing his personal doctrine on the sinlessness of Christ. The lines which follow upon the extract (quoted above), show that he taught that while Christ, before the resurrection, was indeed without sin, yet with the resurrection he *received* an "im-

mutability" which seems close to the idea of impeccability. That Theodore actually did hold *impeccantia* in Christ during his mortal life, and *impeccabilitas* only after the resurrection, is attested by E. Amann.<sup>56</sup> Hence the phrase "per resurrectionem" seems to lack its full significance unless the verb expressed the notion of "becoming," which would parallel the phrase at the end of the passage: "by the resurrection he *received* immutability." We conclude from the context, therefore, that the Latin extract is probably more faithful to the original meaning of the text where it reads "factus est" instead of "fuit."

The difference between "inculpabilis" and "sine peccato" might also be explained by an original reading like *ἀναμάρτητος*. It is true that we would rather expect "impeccabilis." But we should perhaps not be too quick to judge a sixth-century translator, who in all likelihood had only this short passage before him, out of its context, for choosing the word "inculpabilis." It is, after all, the exact equivalent of *ἀναμάρτητος* in its more common meaning. It is only from the context that one could understand the precise sense in which the word was to be taken. And this leads one to the observation that the way in which this extract has been cut from its context does cast suspicion on the intentions of the excerptor. From the following lines it would have been clear that Theodore did at least teach the actual sinlessness of Christ during his lifetime. Without this clarification the words "inculpabilis per resurrectionem factus est" would easily suggest a sinister connotation which they did not originally possess.

Of Cap. 37 Devreesse remarks only that it offers some resemblances with phrases scattered through Homilies VII and VIII; Ortiz numbers it among those for which no parallel is to be found. However, we have found a passage in Homily V, 5, which shows a striking resemblance to the extract of Vigilius. Theodore is speaking of the relations between the Word and the Temple—i.e., the "homo assumptus." The close parallel between the Latin and the literal translation which Tonneau gives of the Syriac text seems to justify the conclusion that we have found the source of Cap. 37, and the Vigilian text is thereby confirmed. See page 203.

Devreesse acknowledges the confirmation of Cap. 38 by a passage of Homily VIII ("il recouvre à peu près un développement de l'homélie

<sup>56</sup> E. Amann, *art.* "Théodore de Mopsueste," *DTC*, XV, 1, 262-3.



*Vig. Cap. 37*  
(Günther, p. 268)

Ut multam quidem eius faceret diligentiam, omnia autem illius propria faceret et toleraret per omnes eo ducto passiones, per quas eum secundum suam virtutem perfectum fecit, nec a mortuo secundum suae naturae legem recedens sed sua praesentia et operatione et gratia liberans quidem eum de morte et malis, quae inde sunt, resuscitans autem eum de mortuis et ad meliorem finem perducens.

*Catechetical Homily V, 5*  
(Tonneau, p. 107, ll. 9–17)

Et tout ce qui (appartient) à la nature de l'homme il le prit sur soi: étant éprouvé en toutes ses facultés, il le perfectionna de sa puissance;—au point que, même quand il reçut la mort selon la loi (*νόμος*) de sa nature, il ne s'en éloigna pas; mais étant avec lui, par l'opération de la grâce, il l'arracha à la mort et à la corruption du tombeau, le ressuscita d'entre les morts et lui accorda cet honneur sublime qu'il lui avait promis avant de subir la mort, quand il disait: *Détruisez ce temple et en trois jours je le redresserai*; (Jo. 2:19) ce qu'il accomplit.

VIII”), but he quotes J. M. Vosté to the effect that “the extract is poorly rendered and the last part of it is practically unintelligible.” Through some oversight, Fr. Ortiz numbers Cap. 38 among extracts for which no parallel text can be found. Devreesse did not give the precise place in Homily VIII to which he referred, but a comparison with a section of Homily VIII, 9, will show that the parallel is indeed quite certain.

*Vig. Cap. 38*  
(Günther, p. 269)

Deinde ostendens, cuius gratia passus est, diminutionem infert: *quatenus citra deum pro omnibus gustaret mortem*, quia, diuina natura ita uolente, separata illa ipse per se pro omnium utilitate gustauit mortem; et ostendens, quod deitas separata quidem erat illo, qui passus est, secundum mortis experimentum, quia nec possibile erat illam mortis experimentum accipere, non tamen illo, qui passus est, afuerat secundum diligentiam.

*Catechetical Homily VIII, 9*  
(Tonneau, p. 199, ll. 6–12)

Et, afin de nous enseigner pourquoi il supporta d'être abaissé pour un peu de temps, il dit: *En dehors de Dieu, pour tous il goûta la mort*, parce que la nature divine voulut ceci: que pour le profit de tous, il goûtât la mort. Et, afin d'indiquer que la divinité est distincte de celui qui pâtissait dans l'épreuve de la mort,—puisqu'elle ne pouvait pas goûter l'épreuve de la mort,—sans s'éloigner de lui par sa providence, mais étant toute proche, elle opérât ce qui est nécessaire et convient à la nature de celui qu'elle avait assumé.

With all due reverence to the late Fr. Vosté, one must question his assertion: "Ultima verba citati textus Concilii nullum prae se ferunt sensum . . ." <sup>56</sup> Keeping in mind Theodore's exegesis of his peculiar reading of the text of Heb. 2:9 (*χωρὶς Θεοῦ*—"citra Deum"), <sup>57</sup> one may rather say that the antithesis which is brought out in the Latin extract: "separata quidem . . . secundum mortis experimentum; non tamen afuerat . . . secundum diligentiam," in fact brings out Theodore's thought even more clearly than the Syriac text, which does not present this antithesis as sharply, at least judging by the translations.

Devreesse links Cap. 42 and 43 together with the rather severe judgment that they are "unfaithful renditions" of their respective passages. Perhaps he has not taken into sufficient account the fact that he is comparing two independent translations of an original Greek text into two languages as widely different as Latin and Syriac. He complains, at any rate, that Cap. 42 "does not correspond word for word with the Syriac." Yet both Vosté and Ortiz de Urbina, who also read the Syriac, assert that the verbal differences do not seriously affect the sense. <sup>58</sup> A comparison of the Latin with Tonneau's French translation of the Syriac seems to support this verdict. <sup>59</sup>

But in the case of Cap. 43, while Ortiz again does not admit differences which affect the sense of the passage, Vosté supports Devreesse's charge of "unfaithful rendition," to the extent that he sees "two doctrinal differences" between the Latin and the Syriac. <sup>60</sup> He indicates these differences by insertions in the text of Cap. 43:

[*Syriace*. Et bene post illa dixit beatus Paulus]: *Deo autem gratias, qui nobis dedit victoriam per Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum* (I Cor. XV, 57), istorum causam fuisse nobis dicens Deum, qui contra omnes adversarios nobis dedit victoriam, sive mortis, sive peccati, sive cuiuscumque hinc nascendi mali, qui Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum pro nobis hominem sumens [*Syr.* hominem induit], et ipsum per resurrectionem de mortuis ad meliorem transtulit finem [*Syr.* trans-

<sup>56</sup> J. M. Vosté, O.P., "Theodori Mopsuesteni 'Liber ad baptizandos,'" *Orientalia christiana periodica*, IX (1943), 217.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Theodore's exegesis of Heb. 2:9 in what remains of his commentary on that epistle (*PG*, LXVI, 956-7).

<sup>58</sup> Vosté, *art. cit.*, p. 218: "differentias . . . revera leves quoad sensum." Ortiz de Urbina, *loc. cit.*: "le insignificanti varianti non incidono sul senso."

<sup>59</sup> Tonneau, *op. cit.*, p. 127, l. 18—p. 129, l. 1.

<sup>60</sup> Vosté, "Theod. Mops. 'Liber ad baptizandos,'" p. 219. Cf. Tonneau, *op. cit.*, p. 129, l. 23—p. 131, l. 3.

tulit ad vitam novam], et in dextera sua sedere fecit, et nobis [Syr. *addit*: per gratiam suam] ad eum donavit communionem.

Now surely Vosté did not see a doctrinal difference between "hominem sumens" and "hominem induit," as these phrases are undoubtedly used by Theodore as synonymous throughout his writings. The difference between "ad meliorem finem"—clearly referring to the life after death—and "ad novam vitam," does not suggest any important doctrinal implications. The omission of the phrase "per gratiam suam" seems more serious, but it must be admitted that in the context it would be easily understood that the communion given to men with Christ in the fruits of the resurrection would be a gift of grace. Hence we could concur with Fr. Ortiz, who sees here only "insignificant variants which do not affect the sense," and consider Cap. 43 substantially confirmed by its authentic parallel.

The last case to be considered is that of Cap. 52 and 53. Devreesse juxtaposes these two fragments with a passage of Theodore preserved in Latin by Facundus in his *Pro defensione trium capitulorum*.<sup>61</sup> Actually, Cap. 53 corresponds with the version of Facundus, but Cap. 52 is quite different from the lines of Facundus with which Devreesse compares it. From this he concludes that Facundus has "demonstrated the dishonesty of the enemies of Theodore." However, Devreesse himself discovered a Greek fragment which is clearly the original of the passage cited by Facundus.<sup>62</sup> And the remarkable fact is that this Greek fragment, which happens to go one sentence beyond the passage of Facundus, gives, in that one sentence, what is clearly the correct parallel for Cap. 52. Ortiz has pointed out this fact, which must have escaped the notice of Devreesse. The texts are as follows:

*Vig. Cap. 52*  
(Gunther, pp. 278-9)

Bene intulit: *namque ego homo sum*, ut dicat 'nihil mirandum, si hoc potes, cum sis homo accipiens a deo: quoniam et ego, cum hoc sim, accipio oboedientes semel habens iubendi potestatem propter datoris indulgentiam.'

*Greek fragment*  
(D., *Essai*, p. 36, n. 8)

καλῶς ἐπήγαγε τὸ Καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπός εἰμι, ἀπὸ τοῦ Οὐδὲν θαυμαστόν, εἰ τοῦτο δύνη ἄνθρωπος ὢν, λαβὼν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐπεὶ ἀγὰρ τοῦτο ὢν λαμβάνω ὑπηκόους ὑπερέχων τῷ (Κl. ἄπερ ἔχων τοῦ cod.) κελεύειν ὡς βούλομαι.

<sup>61</sup> *PL*, LXVII, 596 b.

<sup>62</sup> A passage of *Cod. Vindob.* 154 (ed. Klostermann-Benz, *Zur Überlieferung der Matthäuserklärung des Origenes* [Texte und Untersuchungen, XLVII, 2; 1931], p. 19) which is quoted by Devreesse in his *Essai*, p. 36, n. 8.

It will be observed that the Latin tends to support the ms. reading against the proposed emendation; "semel habens iubendi" would be a literal rendition of ἀπερ ἔχων τοῦ κελεύειν. As this phrase occurs almost at the very end of the Greek fragment, the difficulty may well be explained by the loss of the few final words which would be the equivalent of "potestatem propter datoris indulgentiam." We agree, therefore, with Ortiz, who considers Cap. 52 proved authentic on the basis of its "almost complete identity" with this Greek fragment. Cap. 53, which was previously confirmed by the Latin of Facundus, is also substantiated by the parallel passage in the Greek.

As this study is already too long, we shall conclude briefly, noting the following points: (1) Not all scholars are convinced by the case for the orthodoxy of Theodore's Christology. Amann's article of 1934 met strong reaction on the part of Jugie and de Vries; several reviewers of Devreesse's *Essai* (Lebon and Ortiz de Urbina in particular), expressed grave doubts concerning the validity of this thesis. (2) Devreesse's explanation of Theodore's condemnation on the basis of deliberately falsified evidence—his statement that wherever these extracts of 553 can be compared with their authentic parallels they are found to be corrupted—is open to serious question. Ortiz de Urbina insists that the evidence in no way justifies Devreesse's sweeping conclusion. And our own investigation has led us to the following results: (a) Of the 55 extracts under consideration, twenty-one can be compared with independent parallels. (b) Of these twenty-one, no less than seventeen<sup>63</sup> are substantially confirmed by the comparison, although in several cases one must admit a serious lack of context.<sup>64</sup> (c) In three of the four cases where substantial textual variants occur,<sup>65</sup> the hypothesis of corruption in the Vigilian extract is by no means the only likely explanation. In only one case does the evidence for corruption seem to prevail.<sup>66</sup> The general effect of this study, then, has been to confirm the doubts which Fr. Ortiz has raised as to the security of the foundation on which the conclusions of Msgr. Devreesse have been laid.

The writer does not mean to suggest that these fifty-five extracts

<sup>63</sup> Vig. Cap. 14-17, 22, 25, 33-38, 41-43, 52, 53.

<sup>64</sup> Vig. Cap. 33, 34, 36, 41, 52, 53. <sup>65</sup> Vig. Cap. 20, 27, 30.

<sup>66</sup> Vig. Cap. 31. Cf. Devreesse, *Essai*, pp. 249-50.

which met with papal and conciliar condemnation present a complete and thoroughly impartial picture of Theodore's Christological doctrine. The purpose of the compilers clearly was to amass evidence of heterodoxy; the fragmentary character of many of the extracts and the often complete lack of context show that they were looking only for what was objectionable. But on the other hand, it is one thing to compile fragmentary evidence, and it is another deliberately and maliciously to interpolate and falsify such texts so as to render them heretical. Msgr. Devresse believes that this has taken place, and that it can be proved in so many instances that one can no longer rely on the textual fidelity of any of the extracts collected by the enemies of Theodore. This would mean that in studying his Christology, one could not safely use the important fragments of the strictly theological treatises—the *De Incarnatione* and *Contra Apollinarem*—which have been preserved by Leontius and Cyril.

If, however, the criticism offered by Ortiz de Urbina and the present writer is found to be correct, then it appears that comparison of these anti-Theodorian extracts with their parallels in independent sources has *not* proved that the compilers dared to falsify the texts. In this case, we conclude that in judging Theodore's Christology, one may not safely ignore the passages of his theological works which Leontius and Cyril have preserved for us. At least until more incontrovertible evidence is found to prove that they have been corrupted, the presumption of innocence should remain in their favor.