

## Secondary Publication



Riedlberger, Peter

### **Collatio Carthaginensis anni 411: Gesta Collationis Carthaginensis. Augustinus, Breviculus collationis. Augustinus, Ad Donatistas post collationem / Clemens Weidmann: Berlin/Boston, 2018**

Date of secondary publication: 16.02.2024

Version of Record (Published Version), Review

Persistent identifier: urn:nbn:de:bvb:473-irb-934605

#### **Primary publication**

Riedlberger, Peter (2020): „Collatio Carthaginensis anni 411: Gesta Collationis Carthaginensis. Augustinus, Breviculus collationis. Augustinus, Ad Donatistas post collationem / Clemens Weidmann: Berlin/Boston, 2018“. In: Plekos : Periodicum online zur Erforschung der Kommunikationsstrukturen in der Spätantike, Vol 22, pp. 315-324, München, URL: <http://www.plekos.uni-muenchen.de/2020/r-weidmann.pdf>.

#### **Legal Notice**

This work is protected by copyright and/or the indication of a licence. You are free to use this work in any way permitted by the copyright and/or the licence that applies to your usage. For other uses, you must obtain permission from the rights-holders.

This document is made available under a Creative Commons license.



The license information is available online:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>

Clemens Weidmann (ed.): *Collatio Carthagenensis anni 411. Gesta Collationis Carthagenensis. Augustinus, Breviculus collationis. Augustinus, Ad Donatistas post collationem*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter 2018 (*Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* 104). VI, 418 p. € 109.95. ISBN: 978-3-11-046967-7.

This<sup>1</sup> volume contains critical editions of three texts connected to the great conference between Catholics and Donatists of AD 411, although scarcely a word in the description just given should be used out without quotes: it was not a ‘conference,’ but rather a show-trial, as it was clear from the outset which side was going to prevail. It is problematic to call one side ‘Catholic,’ as at the very core of the dispute lay the question which of the two communities rightly deserved the much-coveted qualification as ‘Catholic,’ while ‘Donatists’ is the pejorative appellation used by the winning camp for the one that succumbed. Yet to avoid ambiguity, let us cling to the traditional labels while remembering that we thus take the viewpoint of the victorious side.

By 411, the origin of the Donatist schism lay more than one hundred years back. Born out of the question how much forbearance clerics deserved who had not proved themselves steadfast during the Tetrarchic persecution, this seemingly time-dependent issue had lasting consequences: as the rigorists (‘Donatists’) did not acknowledge the clerical ordinations of the other side, a reconciliation proved impossible, although there were few doctrinal issues (apart from the question of rebaptism which need not concern us here). Various emperors tried different approaches, from favoring one side to violent persecution of the other; but only Honorius was successful in dismantling the Donatist Church, although remnants of Donatism apparently survived into the sixth century.

Before Honorius unleashed the full force of legislation against the Donatists, targeting even laymen (which was, the hated Manichaeans excepted, quite unusual), he stage-managed a whimsical spectacle: by way of a *collatio*, ‘conference,’ to be publicly held at Carthage, delegates of both sides were to advance their respective arguments, and in the end, a state judge was to decide

1 This review is part of a project that has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under grant agreement No. 677638.

which group was the real ‘Catholics.’ But this was no fair conference: already in the convocation letter, Honorius branded Donatism unequivocally as *error* (and indirectly even as *superstitio*), and in actual fact, there was never the least doubt who would remain victorious. The Donatists did not dare to boycott the event, as they would have lost by default and still fallen victim to all those legal sanctions; by attending the mock conference, they could at least publicly advance their case, if in vain.

Although the *collatio* was a setup, authorities nevertheless put a lot of effort in keeping up appearances. The whole event was minuted; this was nothing out of the ordinary, of course, but the employed procedure of stenographing was highly unusual. Both sides had a team of speedwriters, and at the end of the sessions of the *collatio*, these stenographers gathered, compared their notes and agreed on a final text, which in turn had to be approved by the recorded speakers. Nobody would be able to doubt the veracity of the resulting protocol, proving once and for all that the prevailing side was, indeed, the Catholic one.

The ‘official’ minutes are not extant, but we do have three texts derived from it, all of which are part of Weidmann’s edition. First, there is the *Breviculus collationis*. This ‘abstract of the *collatio*’ was authored by Augustine only months after the event, as he believed the full transactions to be too lengthy, so reading them might be tedious for many. Editorially, scholars have had to rely on the *editio princeps* of 1506, as no other manuscript was known. This changed in 1997, as a paper manuscript of around 1500 was found in Prague. Weidmann’s edition is the first to use it, but unfortunately, the Prague manuscript’s contribution turned out to be insignificant. Several observations suggest that it was created somehow together with the *editio princeps*, with the two being siblings, and the *editio princeps* generally being superior. Thus, only rarely does the Prague manuscript help improve the text. Second, there is the *Ad Donatistas post collationem*.<sup>2</sup> This Augustinian work was also authored

2 Here I stick to Weidmann’s title, although the situation is confused. The manuscript from which our whole tradition is derived has *Contra partem Donati post gesta*, which Weidmann rejects, as *post gesta* being an otherwise un-Augustinian combination. His *Ad Donatistas post collationem* goes back to Erasmus, who phrased it based on a passage in the *Retractationes* (*librum etiam scripsi [...] ad ipsos Donatistas post conlationem*). Weidmann (p. 312) claims that both *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* and *Augustinus-Lexikon* use *Contra Donatistas*, based on the title cited in the *Retractationes* (*Post conlationem contra Donatistas liber unus*); this title is, according to Weidmann, secondary, although I find his argument, pointing to one other wrong title there, weak; this

shortly after the original collation; the difference is that the *Breviculus* is intended as a (largely) neutral abstract of the transactions, while in *Ad Donatistas post collationem*, Augustine is engaged and refutes later Donatist allegations (such as a purported corruption of the judge). Editing *Ad Donatistas post collationem* appears to entail a lot more work, as there are over a dozen manuscripts extant. But a close examination shows that all of them derive from the oldest one extant, a splendid sixth century manuscript now kept at Paris. None of the other witnesses can contribute more than conjectures devoid of a manuscript pedigree.

Third and by far most importantly, there are the *Gesta collationis Carthaginensis* themselves. Extant in a single manuscript (ignoring two later direct copies of it), they present an extraordinary challenge to any editor: on the one hand, we know of the great pains taken during its creation to produce an authentic record of what was actually spoken. This apparently even included the reproduction of mistakes.<sup>3</sup> Thus, any oddity *might* go back to the original

other title could be corrupted (although additional research into the authenticity of titles in the *Retractationes*, and in the literality of apparent title citations, would be most welcome). In truth, things are even more complicated, as ThLL has *Post collationem adversus Donatistas*, abbreviated as *adv. Don.*, while AL has *Contra Donatistas liber unus*, abbreviated as *c. Don.* – hence, neither of these two reference works sticks to the evidence! Weidmann does not say so, but the version he prefers is employed by several other standard works (M. Schanz/C. Hosius: *Geschichte der römischen Literatur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian. Teil 4. Die römische Literatur von Constantin bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk Justinians. Hälfte 2. Die Literatur des fünften und sechsten Jahrhunderts.* München 1920 [Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 8,4,2], 429; E. Dekkers/E. Gaar: *Clavis Patrum Latinorum.* Steenbrugge<sup>3</sup>1995; the volumes of *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Werke des Heiligen Augustinus*). Actually, the agreement regarding both *contra* and *post* between the oldest manuscript and the (in all likelihood) completely independently transmitted title of the *Retractationes* suggests to me that their common ground (including *contra*) should not be questioned.

3 This is unusual as any neat copy of minutes is smoothed, at least up to a certain degree. But the transmitted text of the *Gesta* includes many oral features that might be considered ‘mistakes’ (cf. Weidmann, 22–23). The most stunning observation pertains to the repeated self-corrections of one specific person, Petilianus (25); examples are *tantum de ... temporis* or *quis igitur in ... hominum* [the suspension points here representing faltering speech, not an ellipsis], i.e., Petilianus started to formulate a prepositional attribute, just in time noticed the colloquiality of it, and quickly substituted the genitive required in standard Latin; as this occurs predominantly with him, this must go back to the minutes themselves and should not be understood as transmission mistakes. This also means that other speakers were either less prone to such

minutes. On the other hand, given our flimsy transmission line, mistakes might also easily have crept in later. Deciding what to correct and what to keep constitutes a prohibitively difficult task.

A further complication arises due to the fact that we do not possess the *Gesta* in an ‘official’ edition; the version we have starts with a preface by a certain *memorialis* by the name of Marcellus who, according to his own statement, created the table of contents following the preface (and prefixed to the edition proper). But there cannot be any doubt that between the original neat copy and Marcellus’ edition, more modifications took place (perhaps carried out by Marcellus, perhaps earlier by others). For example, speakers of the winning side are introduced as <name> *episcopus ecclesiae Catholicae*, the others as <name> *episcopus*; it cannot have been like this during the conference itself, when precisely the qualification of *Catholicus* was at stake. It is obvious that there is no way to go back before Marcellus’ edition; attempting to reconstruct earlier stages would be based on pure speculation.

Thanks to a clearly laid out method which is painstakingly followed, Weidmann succeeds in giving the best possible edition of this text. First off, he clearly points out which kinds of oddities are recurring, but might easily be explained through an oral origin. One such example (23) is the lack of a pronominal accusative in an *accusativus cum infinitivo*; while mandatory in school Latin, it could apparently be left out in speech. Earlier editors felt obliged to add many *se, eum* etc.; but there is no imaginable reason why a scribe should carelessly omit these words when copying an *accusativus cum infinitivo* but not otherwise. This is a strong argument that any such peculiarity should go back to the original minutes. Discussing this and similar cases covers several pages in Weidmann’s introduction, and invariably his conclusions convince (18–26). Equally important are Weidmann’s observations about scribal mistakes we have to account for. For example, there are numerous cases of missing syllables (cf. 10: *separi* instead of *separari*; *obmutit* instead of *obmutuit*), a type of mistake that rather points to scribal neglect than to mumbling speakers! Certainly a scribal problem is present in the cases of mistaken division of words (we shall encounter a few examples later). Things are less easy with variations between *b/v* or missing or present *h*; but then again, such mistakes are incredibly common in any kind of manuscript, and

colloquialisms or, more probably, removed suchlike oddities when they had the opportunity to re-check their statements before countersigning them.

they seem to be equally present in non-oral parts of the *Gesta* (i.e. cited documents) as well. So it is certainly best to correct them all, as there is very little chance that we can thus distinguish between pronunciation habits of different speakers. Possibly the most important preliminary observation of Weidmann is concerned with the two correctors, P<sup>1</sup> and P<sup>2</sup>. In short, his result is that P<sup>1</sup> corrected using the antigraph of the *Gesta* manuscript; he was a contemporary of its scribe, or perhaps even identical with him. Accordingly, his versions deserve utmost attention. P<sup>2</sup> is a much later corrector who is intelligent, no doubt, but is conjecturing, and accordingly his text does not merit more trust than any conjecture by any other later scholar. Earlier editions happily used P<sup>2</sup>'s corrections; we shall see below how far Weidmann could advance by simply ignoring them and finding a solution for himself.

Weidmann suggests numerous ingenious corrections all of which thoroughly convince this reviewer. Some examples may suffice:

1.12: [...] *petimus* [...], *ut is, qui me acciri edictis* [...] *inquietavit, petita ut voluit proponat, cur* [...]

This is the version of P1 and Lancel, which is strange Latin, although perhaps still understandable. However, a little modification by Weidmann keeping in line with his findings (i.e., wrong word divisions can always be expected) smooths out all difficulties: [...] *petimus* [...], *ut is, qui me acciri edictis* [...] *inquietavit, petit aut voluit, proponat, cur* [...]

1.48: [...] *quia non opus est multifariae obdilationem causam peragere*

The underlined part must be wrong. Earlier editors opted for *multifaria dilatione*, which gives a perfect sense but which is more intrusive than necessary (why should any scribe add *ob* out of nowhere, for example?). Weidmann's elegant solution *multifarie ob dilationem* is so gentle an intervention that it is, strictly speaking, not even an emendation.

2.51: [...] *constat, praesertim cum personae ab utraque parte videantur esse firmata et amen. Si* [...]

This is the clearly corrupt version of P. Without further ado, earlier editors took over P<sup>2</sup>'s correction, which is *firmatae. Et tamen si* [...] Weidmann corrects convincingly to *firmatae. Tamen si* [...] which is not only less intrusive, but indeed yields a smoother result.

3.32: *Donatum huius caecitatis episcopus*

Obviously, *episcopus* must be corrected to *episcopum*. P<sup>2</sup> and all earlier editors jumped to the easiest solution of modifying *caecitatis* to *civitatis* but according to the observations about typical mistakes in P, this is rash. Weidmann instead writes *huiusce civitatis*,

accounting thus for *cae-* and explaining the corruption as a further case of an omitted syllable (“vi”).

3.99: *Quamvis ipsa catholica, quae nunc pro praescriptione partis adversae quasi in fronte quodamarite adversum nos temperari cognoscitur, medium esse debet [...]*

“Although the label ‘Catholic’ itself—which now, because of the prejudgment of the adverse side, is now *quodamarite* employed [*temperari*] against us almost upfront—must remain unattributed [...]” Even ignoring the corrupted word, the phrase appears peculiar. P<sup>2</sup>, followed by earlier editors, corrects to *quadam rite*. Weidmann’s solution is ingenious: *quodam ariete*, “like some battering ram.” Perhaps surprisingly, *arietem temperare* is a phrase twice attested in Christian authors and can also be found in Jerome’s Bible translation in a similar version.

Weidmann further detected an abbreviation which was more than once misunderstood by the earlier editors: *a* with an additional slash for *adiexit* (a verbal form which is found numerous times in the acts). Earlier editors sometimes understood this as *ad*. Further, there are two cases where the manuscript has *alius* where *adiexit* belongs; instead of simply adding *adiexit*, Weidmann convincingly argues that this must be a wrongly expanded abbreviation, so he replaces *alius* by *adiexit*.

This is just a minuscule sample to illustrate the kind of textual advances this edition brings with it. Apart from Weidmann’s convincing corrections, I especially liked his frequent use of *fortasse melius* in the apparatus, marking out alternate textual versions that also appear quite good. Any serious user of a critical text is often faced with the question why an editor preferred his version to another one in the apparatus; such a marker indicates that the decision was a close thing.

There is little room for criticism although I must note two things. First, the way proper nouns are handled is inconsistent. Weidmann (28–30) apparently thinks that varying spellings such as, say, *Tebestinus* and *Tevestinus* might go back to the preferences of individual speakers and/or stenographers which would mean that one is not entitled to regularize them. This argument would be valid if Weidmann is consistent, which is not the case. While any *Carthaginensis* is removed to the benefit of *Carthaginensis* and *Hippo* wins over *Ippo*, (e.g.) *Hermianensis* and *Ermianensis* happily co-exist. The criterion is what Weidmann (29) considers “gut bekannte und bestens bezeugte Orte,” but is, e.g., Theveste not quite famous? If one browses through his list (29–30) of non-standardized place names, one encounters many pairs whose difference match exactly what Weidmann lists as typical scribal mistakes of our *codex*

*unicus* (10), such as missing *h*, *b/v* variations (for these, see the examples above), *i/e* variations (*Novasinnensis* versus *Novasennensis*), missing syllables (*Tamamallensis* versus *Tamallensis*). I think I would have preferred to see them all standardized, with an index of variant spellings. As an alternative, one might keep all the manuscript spellings; but it is certainly not a good idea to make some place names uniform while keeping others unstandardized.

Further, I am skeptical of the way some documents are handled, although I must stress that Weidmann's edition also brings huge progress in this respect when compared to earlier editions. Thus for good reason, he rejects intrusive additions by earlier editors. For example, the edict between sessions two and three ends with *Proponatur. Post consulatum Varanis viri clarissimi VI Kalendas Iulias*. Baluzius and Lancel added a *Datum Carthagini* before *post consulatum*, which is haphazard: it is far more likely that the stated day refers to the posting (*propositum*) than to the sending (*datum*) of the text, but actually we do not know, so any addition is unwarranted. The same is true for the indication of place (*Carthagini*), especially since we have numerous texts in the Theodosian Code whose subscriptions do not indicate a place name. Finally, it is (given comparable texts) unlikely that *proponatur* and *post consulatum* [...] belong in the same phrase, but by haphazardly adding text, one destroys any such possibility. My guess is that before *post* one has to imagine a *propositum* which was left out because this goes without saying after *proponatur*. While accordingly Weidmann deserves praise for not taking this over, he unfortunately does add *Et alia manu* (for which there is no manuscript authority) before *proponatur*. Naturally, we can expect this to have been written by another hand (namely the judge Marcellinus's), and in several cases within the acts of the 411 conference we do find this indication. But on the other hand, there are many other documents where the scribe did not bother to indicate the change of handwriting (e.g., Nov. Iust. 13, Nov. Iust. 69). Adding *Et alia manu* might create an artificial consistency ("whereas in the Justinianic Novels, a change of handwriting is omitted, it is invariably present in the documents embedded in the acts of 411").

In another document (3,220), the earlier editors wrought havoc. The transmitted subscription is *Dat. die XVII Kl. Maiarum Carthagin., domino nostro Constantino Aug. ter. cons.* Rossi added *et Maximino III*, while Lancel added *et Licinio III*. Weidmann (17) rightly discards these additions, believing that the change must have happened "wohl in den ca. hundert Jahren zwischen der Entstehung des Dokuments und der Konferenz von Karthago"; further he



points to Aug. ep. 88,2, where the same document is cited, again with just Constantine as consul. In actual fact, we know a lot more about what happened in that year 313.<sup>4</sup> After Maximinus was eliminated by 30 April 313, he ceased to be indicated. The *cons.* (not *cons.*) in the document possibly suggests that his name was struck out. But this certainly happened already in 313, not later. Weidmann follows Baluzius by expanding *dat.* to *datum*, which is probably a reference to the way we modern scholars refer to these indications (see above how I wrote *propositum* and *datum* without further ado). In actual fact, I am not sure whether anybody systematically researched whether the neuter or the feminine is more often attested. For example, P.Oxy. 10,1271 has a written-out *datum* while CIL III 13640 has a fully spelled *data*. With texts transmitted in documents, this is methodologically more difficult, as we can never be sure if an earlier scribe expanded a *dat.* to his personal liking. However that may be, if we *insist* on expanding these abbreviations in the acts of 411, *data* would have been a better choice, as this is transmitted spelled-out in 1,4 l. 50, 3,29 l. 48, 3,174 l. 25, while there is not one single *datum* attested.

Further: Honorius' letter is cited twice in the acts of 411. In the first instance (1,4 l. 50), Weidmann has [...] *Et divina manu: 'Vale, Marcelline, carissime nobis.' Data pridie Idus Octobres Ravennae*, suggesting by the placement of the single quote that the imperial handwriting just refers to the greetings (not to the date), while the single quote is moved in the second instance (3,29 l. 48): *Et divina manu: 'Vale, Marcelline, carissime nobis. Data pridie Idus Octobres Ravennae.'* Apparently, the emperor himself now adds the date (which I believe is wrong).

The sequence of documents within the acts of 411 has continued to baffle editors. There are three sessions (the text breaks off in the middle of the third one). Ignoring the preface by the later editor Marcellus and his likewise secondary table of contents, the acts set in with the first session. Between the first and the second session, there is an edict by Marcellinus ordering the publication of minutes. This edict has no number in P, but is counted as 1,224 in Marcellus' table of contents; but then again, it appears after the in-

4 R.S. Bagnall/A. Cameron/S.R. Schwartz/K.A. Worp: Consuls of the Later Roman Empire. Atlanta 1987 (Philological Monographs of the American Philological Association 36), 160–161.

incipit of the second session (*incipiunt gesta secundae cognitionis cum edicto* is immediately preceding it). Hence, either the table of contents or the incipit must be wrong. Editors including Weidmann (16) have claimed that this edict orders the publication of the acts of the first *and* the second session; Baluzius (followed by Lancel) moved it therefore after the second session, while Weidmann keeps it at its transmitted position, as this location is confirmed by Marcellus' table of contents, and for good reason he wants to edit Marcellus' version (not some reconstructed Urtext). Weidmann, nevertheless, believes that at the end of the *second* session is "die ursprünglich richtige Position des Edikts." In truth, there is not the slightest hint that this edict orders the publication of both sessions; it simply publishes *quae interim gesta sunt* (apparently the editors miss a separate publication edict for the acts of the first session; but this is a weak argument). Given its location in the text, it clearly orders only publication of the second session which immediately follows, as an attachment, so to speak. This arrangement is repeated with the edict between the second and the third session. Its date is past the conference proper, and its contents presuppose the final decision against the Donatists. Nevertheless, it functions also as publication edict for the third session, and this time the sequence is explicitly stated: *sicut gestorum series subiecta* [!] *demonstrat* (still, Baluzius inexplicably moved this edict to the very end of our text; this time, not even Lancel followed him). The long and the short of this is that the two publication edicts not only must not be moved, they are actually transmitted at the exact position where one would expect them.

In the edict 1,17, a *dicit* is supplemented, which should have been there, as it is an edict, after all. But then again, could its lack not be understood as testimony of the painstakingly exact way documents are rendered, even if they include clear mistakes? What I mean: if it was already lacking in the text Marcellus had at hand, I doubt very much that he would have dared to include it (and possibly commit the crime of *falsum*, for changing the exact wording of an official document). The edict 1,224, also by Marcellinus, has *dicit*, while the numberless edict between sessions 2 and 3, again by Marcellinus, has *dixit*. Both forms are encountered elsewhere in edicts (plus *edicit* and *edixit*) so it was rash by earlier editors to change the first *dicit* without further ado to *dixit*. This also means that if one insists on adding *dicit* to 1,17, it must be clear that this is just *exempli gratia*: *dixit* is an alternative with the same likelihood.

To sum up, this is a splendid edition which is superior to Lancel's in a great number of places; from now on, the only edition of the 411 acts to take into consideration is Weidmann's (although any user will remain most grateful to consult the annotation Lancel added to his edition with translation). What impressed me most about Weidmann's edition is how the seemingly unsolvable problem of which oddities to keep as oral influence and which to remove as scribal mistakes could, to a surprisingly large extent, be overcome by keeping to a strictly defined and adhered-to methodology. Another strongpoint is Weidmann's tenacity at devising his own solutions instead of simply taking over earlier ideas, even if they looked, on the face of it, quite good: everything is rechecked again, and this second glance often led to superior corrections. My pedantry regarding place names and diplomatic features should not detract from my enthusiasm about this edition; somebody who is working on these subjects will need to rely heavily on the apparatus at any rate.

---

Peter Riedlberger, Otto-Friedrich-Universität Bamberg  
Institut für Geschichtswissenschaften und Europäische Ethnologie  
peter.riedlberger@uni-bamberg.de

**www.plekos.de**

Empfohlene Zitierweise

Peter Riedlberger: Rezension zu: Clemens Weidmann (ed.): *Collatio Carthaginensis anni 411. Gesta Collationis Carthaginensis. Augustinus, Breviculus collationis. Augustinus, Ad Donatistas post collationem*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter 2018 (*Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* 104). In: *Plekos* 22, 2020, 315–324 (URL: <http://www.plekos.uni-muenchen.de/2020/r-weidmann.pdf>).

---