



A Fragment of a Lost Work on Dioscorus

William H. P. Hatch

The Harvard Theological Review, Vol. 19, No. 4. (Oct., 1926), pp. 377-381.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0017-8160%28192610%2919%3A4%3C377%3AAFOALW%3E2.0.CO%3B2-C>

The Harvard Theological Review is currently published by Cambridge University Press and Harvard Divinity School.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/cup.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

A FRAGMENT OF A LOST WORK ON DIOSCORUS

WILLIAM H. P. HATCH

EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

THE present writer visited the Wâdi Naṭrún in February 1923, and at the monastery known as Abû Maḳâr he found the fragment which is here published.¹

It is in the Bohairic dialect, as one would naturally expect from the locality in which it was discovered, and it is written on a leaf of yellowish paper 24.5 cm. in length and 16.5 cm. in width. The writing is arranged in a single column and there are twenty lines on each page. The letters incline slightly to the left and the ink is brown. Initials Φ and Ξ, and -ς, which is the only mark of punctuation used, are ornamented with red. ΙΗϸ, ΠΧϸ, and Οϸ are the only abbreviations employed. On palaeographical grounds the fragment may be assigned to the early part of the fourteenth century.

ΜΟΥ†² ΕΡΟϸ -| Ε†ϸΥΝΑΓΩΓΗ -| ΝΤΕ ΠϸΑΤΑΝΑϸ -|
ΕΤΑϸΙ ΕΒΟΥΝ -| ΕΠΙΜΑ ΕΤΕΜΜΑΥ -| ΑϸΝΑΥ
ΕΖΑΝΜΗϸ -| ΝΖΟΥΟ ΕΜΑϸϸ -| ΕΘΒΕ ΦΑΙ ΑϸΧΟϸ -|
ΧΕ ΟΥ ΜΜΕΤΗΑΕ -| ΕΤΕ ΠΙΝΑΖ† ΕΤϸΟΥΤΩΝ -|
ΕΡΗΑΕ ΜΜΟϸ³ -| ΑΥΧΟϸ ΝΑϸ ΜΠΑΙΡΗ† -| ΧΕ ΞΕΝ
ΠϸΟΒΝΙ ΜΠΟΥΡΟ -| ΑΥΘΟΥ† ΝΝΙΜΗϸ -| ΕΦΩΝΖ
ΜΠΙΝΑΖ† -| ϸΑΤΟΤϸ ΑϸΧΟϸ ΝΩΟΥ -| ΧΕ ΕΩΠ
ΑΥϸΑΝΘΟΥ† -| ΝΝΑΙΜΗϸ ΕΤΟΥ -| ΕΘΒΕ ΙΗϸ
ΠΧϸ -| †ΝΑΖΕΜϸΙ ΑΝΟϸ -| ΝΤΑϸΑΧΙ ΝΞΗΤϸ -| ΜΦΗ
ΕΤΑ ΠΧϸ -| ϸΑΧΙ ΜΜΟϸ ΝΡΩΙ -| ΑΛΛΑ ϸΕΜΠΩ
ΝΗ -| ΝΤΑΕΡΟΜΟΛΟΓΙΝ -| ΞΕΝ ΠΙΝΑΖ† ΕΤϸΟΥΤΩΝ -|

¹ This fragment has been printed and discussed briefly in the *Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, VI, pp. 108 ff.

² The word was probably ΑΥΜΟΥ†, the syllable ΑΥ being at the end of the last line on the preceding page.

³ ΜΜΟϸ probably refers to the interrogative pronoun ΟΥ above.

ΝΤΑΧΟΣ ΜΠΑΙΡΗ† -| ΧΕ ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΙΗΣ -| ΕΜΜΑΝΟΥΗΛ
 ΠΕΝΝΟΥ† -| ΜΠΕΡΦΩΡΧ ΕΝΕΖ -| ΉΕΝ ΝΕΡΖΒΗΟΥΙ⁴
 ΤΗΡΟΥ -| ΑΛΛΑ ΟΥΟΣ⁵ ΝΟΥΩΤ -| ΟΥΦΥΣΙΣ ΝΟΥΩΤ -|
 ΟΥΟΝ ΝΤΑϞ ΜΜΑΥ -| ΝΟΥΣΟΒΝΙ⁶ ΝΟΥΩΤ -| ΟΥΟΖ
 ΧΕ Α ΤΜΕΤΝΟΥ† -| ΖΩΤΠ ΕΤΜΕΤΡΩΜΙ -| ΜΦΡΗ†
 Ν††ΥΧΗ -| ΕΣΖΩΤΠ Ε†CΑΡΞ -| ΦΑΙ ΠΕ ΠΑΟΥΩΝΖ -|
 ΝΕΜ ΤΑΜΟΛΟΓΙΑ (*sic*) -| ΑΝΟΚ ΠΙΕΛΛΑΧΙΣΤΟΣ -|
 ΔΙΟΣΚΟΡΟΣ ΠΙΖΗΚΙ -|

He was summoned to the synagogue of Satan. When he came in to that place, he saw many more multitudes. On account of this he said, "What deficiency (is there) which the orthodox faith lacks?" They said to him thus: "In the counsel of the king the multitudes have been assembled to pervert the faith." At once he said to them, "If these numerous multitudes have been assembled concerning Jesus Christ, I will sit down and speak in it that which Christ has spoken to my mouth. But I ought to confess the orthodox faith and say thus: Lord Jesus, Emmanuel, our God, has never been divided in all his works; but (he is) one only Lord, one only nature; he has one only will; and the deity has united with the humanity as the soul unites with the flesh. This is my declaration and my confession, — I the least, Dioscorus, the poor."

Dioscorus succeeded Cyril in the see of Alexandria on the death of the latter in 444. The Christological question was then agitating the Church, and Dioscorus soon became involved in the controversy. His force of character and his ecclesiastical position made him the foremost champion of the Monophysite view of the person of Christ and one of the most uncompromising opponents of Nestorianism. By appointment of the Emperor Theodosius II he presided at the so-called Robber Synod of Ephesus in 449, which deposed the leading representatives of the Nestorian view and assured the triumph of Monophysitism.

The ascendancy of the Alexandrian party, however, was shortlived. In 451 at the behest of the Emperor Marcian an

⁴ By ΖΒΗΟΥΙ are meant the so-called *operationes* (*divinae, humanae, et mixtae*) in Christ.

⁵ ΟC may possibly be an error for ΜΕΤΟC, 'lordship.'

⁶ CΟΒΝΙ probably means 'will' here rather than 'counsel.'

ecumenical council assembled in Chalcedon, which not only nullified the acts of the Robber Synod, but also condemned Dioscorus and deposed him from his see. He went into exile at Gangra in Paphlagonia, where he died in 454. In spite of his condemnation and deposition Dioscorus had many followers in Egypt who rejected the decision of the council of Chalcedon and held fast to the position of the former patriarch concerning the person of Christ. On account of this theological difference they broke definitely with the life and traditions of Greek Christianity and continued to be Monophysites.

Both before and during his exile Dioscorus wrote letters dealing with the doctrinal questions of his time, and several fragments of them have been preserved. Most of these fragments are extant only in Syriac, but two of them have survived in Greek. Dioscorus seems also to have been the author of six anathemas directed against the council of Chalcedon.⁷

Soon after the death of Dioscorus, and possibly to some extent before it, his followers wrote in his defense. Most of this literature has perished, but enough has been preserved to indicate something of its character. Apart from a few Coptic fragments two products of this literary activity have survived — the Panegyric of Macarius of Tkōou and the History of Dioscorus.

The Panegyric of Macarius of Tkōou, attributed in the manuscript containing it to Dioscorus, is generally recognized to be the work of someone else and to have practically no historical value. It is extant as a whole only in the Bohairic dialect, but some Sahidic fragments show that it existed also in the language of Upper Egypt. It was composed in Sahidic probably not very long before or after the year 500, but the author's name and the place of composition are unknown.⁸

⁷ On the writings of Dioscorus, see Lebon, *Le Monophysisme sévérien*, pp. 84 ff. In addition to the fragments of letters discussed by Lebon see also the "Encyclical Letter of the Archbishop Dioscorus to the Bishops," preserved in Additional MS. 14530 in the British Museum, and translated by Perry in *The Second Synod of Ephesus*, pp. 373 ff.

⁸ Cf. Haase, *Patriarch Dioskur I. von Alexandria* (in *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen*, VI), pp. 162 ff. For the Coptic text of the Panegyric, with an introduction and a French translation, see Amélineau, *Monuments pour servir à l'histoire de*

Besides the Panegyric there has been preserved in Syriac a History of Dioscorus, which possesses genuine historical worth. It was written in Greek by one Theopistus, a deacon and a faithful disciple of Dioscorus. He accompanied his master to the council of Chalcedon and later went with him into exile. He composed the History in the Pentapolis about the year 455. It was used as a source by the author of the Panegyric; in the first half of the sixth century it was translated into Syriac and at an early date into Sahidic.⁹

In addition to the Panegyric and the History a number of Sahidic fragments relating to Dioscorus have escaped destruction and oblivion.¹⁰ Most of these correspond to passages in one or the other of the above-mentioned works, but three of the fragments find no parallel in either of them. One of these three seems to be from a history,¹¹ whereas the rhetorical style of the other two points rather in the direction of a panegyric.¹² The writings of which they once formed part belonged to the great body of Monophysite literature.

The fragment published in the present article is from a work of the same class as those mentioned above. It was probably a history of Dioscorus composed by some follower or partisan of the former patriarch of Alexandria. It is impossible to determine its date with precision, but either one of two conjectures is reasonable. It may have been written not very long after the death of Dioscorus, which occurred in 454. In that case it would belong to the same general category as Theopistus's History, and it may have been dependent on the latter. On the other hand, the work from which the present fragment comes may have owed its origin to the revival of Monophysitism which took place under the influence of Severus of Antioch.

l'Égypte chrétienne aux IV^e et V^e siècles (in *Mémoires publiés par les membres de la mission archéologique française au Caire*, IV. 1), pp. XV ff. and 92 ff.

⁹ Cf. Haase, pp. 145 ff. For the Syriac text, with an introduction and a French translation, see Nau, *Journal asiatique*, X^{me} Série, I, pp. 5 ff. and 241 ff.

¹⁰ Cf. Zoëga, *Catalogus Codicum Copticorum*, pp. 280 f.; Amélineau, *op. cit.*, IV. 2, pp. 790 ff.; Krall in *Mittheilungen aus der Sammlung der Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer*, IV, pp. 63 ff.; Crum in *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, XXV, pp. 267 ff.; and Winstedt, *ibid.*, XXVIII, pp. 137 ff.

¹¹ Cf. Zoëga, pp. 280 f. (No. CLXV).

¹² Cf. Crum, pp. 274 f. (Cairo, No. 8084); and Winstedt, pp. 140 and 142.

If so, it must have been written somewhere between the beginning of the sixth century and the year 536, when Severus and several of his confrères were condemned. In that period there was a lively interest among Monophysites in the earlier exponents of their views, and it was a time of great literary activity among them. Severus himself wrote many theological treatises, sermons, letters, and hymns. There is, however, no indication as to who was the author of the work in question, or where he lived, and conjecture is futile.

What the writer of the fragment calls "the synagogue of Satan" is the council of Chalcedon, which he naturally detested above all other ecclesiastical assemblies. "The king" in whose counsel the multitudes had been assembled "to pervert the faith" was the Emperor Marcian, who first summoned the bishops of the Empire to meet at Nicaea and later bade them come to Chalcedon, where he could himself attend their meetings.

Of greater interest than anything else in the fragment is Dioscorus's confession of faith: "Lord Jesus, Emmanuel, our God, has never been divided in all his works; but (he is) one only Lord, one only nature; he has one only will; and the deity has united with the humanity as the soul unites with the flesh." It is possible that we have here a translation into Coptic of words actually used by Dioscorus in formulating his christological position and cherished by his disciples as an authentic saying of their master. More probably, however, the confession of faith was ascribed to him by some later Monophysite writer. In either case the Monophysite doctrine of the person of Christ could hardly be better expressed.