
A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies (old series)* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

The Journal
of
Theological Studies

APRIL, 1905

THE LAUSIAC HISTORY OF PALLADIUS.

HE who would adequately portray the meaning and character of the Christian life of the century that followed the conversion of Constantine—perhaps the most striking of all the centuries of Christian history—must find room in the foreground of his picture for full description of the great movement which we know by the name of monasticism. And when we talk of fourth-century monasticism, whether we are thinking of direct influence on the course of contemporary history or of the less immediate but ultimately not less real influence in distant countries, and especially in the Churches of the West, it is predominantly Egyptian monasticism that we mean. Yet it may be doubted if justice is really done to the subject whether in our manuals or in more ambitious works: nor are the reasons far to seek. If lack of sympathy with a movement that finds so little contact with modern tendencies and English ideals is partly accountable, it is probable that the comparative silence of some, at any rate, of our historians is more largely due to ignorance than to prejudice, and to ignorance that has hitherto been unavoidable. The inquirer, as he came to plunge into the study of monastic origins, found himself baffled at every turn by the intricacy of the literary problems that demanded solution, or daunted by widely spread suspicions of the authenticity and trustworthiness of the records. It is hardly too much to say that we owe it principally to the labours of an English monk, Dom Cuthbert Butler, a Benedictine of Downside, and till lately a resident at Cambridge, that these problems, or many of them, have been solved, and these suspicions laid finally at rest. In his two volumes on the *Lausiac History* of

Palladius[1] he has unravelled some of the most tortuous threads of this complex skein of documents with a sureness and precision such that the most hostile criticism can hardly hope to question or even to modify his results.

It is not quite easy for a critic who is himself wholly in the position of a learner, to decide how best to approach his task. But if he may assume the same defects of knowledge to be true of his readers that were certainly true of himself before he began the study of Dom Butler's volumes, it will probably not be unwise to introduce the present article with some slight general sketch of this department of Christian literature, before coming to close quarters with the *Lausiac History*. And for this purpose no better starting-point can be found than the massive collection of material which the Flemish Jesuit, Rosweyd, the true founder and spiritual progenitor of the Bollandists, published at Antwerp in 1615 (ed. 2 in 1628) under the title of *Vitae Patrum*. Of the ten books into which Rosweyd's folio volume is divided, part of book i and the whole of books ii–viii (besides much of the Appendix) are devoted to the monks of Egypt: and though Rosweyd's texts are unfortunately all Latin, it is only within comparatively recent years that any serious advance has been made on them.

Book i, then, of Rosweyd consists entirely of biographies of individual fathers of the desert, not all of them Egyptian; and this book is by far the longest in the volume. Book ii is a (Latin) account of the visit of a party of travellers to various Egyptian monks and monastic centres, known as the *Historia Monachorum in Aegypto*. Books iii and v–vii are Latin versions of the collections of the sayings of the leading monks, which go under the generic title of *Apophthegmata Patrum*. Book iv consists of such portions of the writings of two Western authors, Cassian and Sulpicius Severus, as describe visits to the Egyptian monks. Book viii and portions of the Appendix contain three separate recensions of the *Lausiac History*[2].

[1] *The Lausiac History of Palladius: a critical discussion together with notes on early Egyptian monachism*, Cambridge, 1898; *The Lausiac History of Palladius*, II, *the Greek text edited with introduction and notes*, Cambridge, 1904: forming together vol. vi of the Cambridge *Texts and Studies*, edited by Dr Armitage Robinson, Dean of Westminster.

[2] Butler I p. 6 n.

It results from the first glance at these headings that the literature that bears upon the monastic Egypt of the fourth and early fifth centuries falls into two main divisions, the biographies of individual fathers by their disciples or admirers, and the accounts written by travellers, especially Western travellers, of their experiences on the grand tour—the former more internal and particular, the latter more external and general—with the *Apophthegmata* as a sort of connecting link between the two; and the new material that has accrued since Rosweyd's time adapts itself easily enough to this classification, which will therefore be taken as the basis for the succeeding paragraphs.

I. Among the fathers of Egyptian monasticism five names stand out with special prominence—Paul and Antony, the first hermits; Macarius, the most celebrated of Antony's disciples; Pachomius, the founder of the Coenobites; and Schnoudi, Pachomius' most illustrious successor.

For Paul we have the Latin life by Jerome—who wrote also the life of Hilarion, the founder of Palestinian monasticism—and a corresponding document in Greek, as well as a shorter recension of the same biography extant in Latin, Greek, Coptic, and Syriac. It is clear that, if Jerome's book is the ultimate source of all this material, no first-hand authority can be claimed for it, since Paul's death (about A.D. 340) preceded by more than thirty years St Jerome's arrival in the East. The Bollandists had, however, suggested that the shorter Greek life, in which no mention is made of Jerome's authorship, was the original of the rest; and M. Amélineau makes a similar claim on behalf of the Coptic. If either of these theories had held good, the way might have been open for a further attempt to establish the contemporary character of the Life of Paul; but as a matter of fact both the Syriac and the Coptic narratives (which were unknown to the Bollandists) retain at the end of the Life St Jerome's statement of his own authorship, and the question of priority must be considered settled in favour of the Latin. And just as on external grounds the *Vita Pauli* cannot be regarded as strictly contemporary, so also on internal grounds it cannot be regarded as strictly historical [1].

[1] Butler I 230–232, 285.

'Huius vitae auctor Paulus, illustrator Antonius.' If Jerome's epigrammatic comparison of the two men may be trusted, Antony was a later arrival in the monastic life than Paul: but the difference cannot have been one of many years, for Antony is said to have been more than a century old at the time of his death (about A.D. 356), and he embraced monasticism in his youth. In any case his fame and influence were far greater than Paul's; and Dom Butler dates the 'Inauguration of Christian Monachism' from the time when, about A.D. 305, Antony began to organize the monastic life for the disciples who had gathered round him. Certainly we possess for the life of Antony a document much more nearly contemporary than anything we have for Paul; for the Greek *Vita Antonii*, whether or no it was written by St Athanasius, was undoubtedly translated into Latin by one Evagrius within a year or two of St Athanasius' death. A Syriac version, printed by Bedjan, *Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum* vol. v, represents an abbreviated redaction of the Greek; and the Coptic fragments appear also to be translated from the same language [1].

Macarius, the disciple of Antony—called Macarius the Great or Macarius of Egypt to distinguish him from his namesake of Alexandria—survived his master for more than thirty years, and his posthumous fame was so great that brief accounts of his life are included in both the *Historia Lausiaca* and the *Historia Monachorum*, though the author of neither work can actually have seen him. A fuller and independent biography by a certain Serapion, or Sarapamon, has lately been published in Coptic by Amélineau and in Syriac by Bedjan. But modern criticism has not been so busy with Macarius as with Antony or Schnoudi and while there is no reason to doubt in general the authenticity of the many *Apophthegmata* attributed to him, it is still uncertain whether the Homilies and Epistles that pass under his name are really his [2].

About the same time that Antony began his work among his disciples in middle Egypt, Pachomius was founding in the far south a monastery in the modern sense of the word, and at the time of his death forty years later, *i.e.* about A.D. 345, was ruling

[1] Butler I 227; II page c of the Introduction.
[2] Ibid. I 220, 225; II 43, 193.

over eight monasteries of a more or less uniform type. As would naturally be the case with the founder of an Order, the documents which deal with his life and work are more numerous and more complicated than the *Vita Pauli*, or even than the *Vita* and *Regula Antonii*. The various redactions of the *Vita Pachomii* can be traced back easily enough to two main sources, a Greek Life and a Coptic Life: but to decide upon the relative priority of these two is not quite so simple. The theory of Coptic originals would have more *a priori* probability here than in the case of Paul or Antony, since the scene of Pachomius' labours, being much further south, lay in a far less graecized district; and it is indisputable that all the material relating to Schnoudi is of Coptic *provenance*. Nevertheless, Dom Butler holds it to be certain that the *Vita Pachomii* was first written in Greek, and that this *Vita*, and another Greek document known generally as the 'Asceticon,' but called in the *Acta Sanctorum* the 'Paralipomena'—a collection of stories illustrative of Pachomius' life and character—are the ultimate sources not only of the Latin *Vita* but also of the Coptic. At the same time, as some of the Coptic fragments are little, if at all, later than A. D. 400, the latter version must have been almost contemporary with the Greek originals, and therefore any supplementary information which it contains has good claim to be taken into account [1].

With the biography of Pachomius was generally circulated the biography of Theodore—his successor in office during the years 350–368—as contained in the (Greek) *Epistula Ammonis ad Theophilum*, which describes the life of the Pachomian monasteries shortly after the death of their founder.

Last of the great monastic leaders whose biographies form the subject of this section is Schnoudi or Shenoute, the most celebrated abbot of the Pachomian monasteries after their founder. Within the last twenty years Amélineau has published a volume of nearly 500 pages, consisting entirely of documents relating to him; and quite lately an important monograph has appeared in Germany from the pen of Dr Leipoldt [2]. But there is the less

[1] Butler I 159–171, 288–292.

[2] Amélineau *Monuments pour servir à l'histoire de l'Égypte chrétienne au iv^e et v^e siècles* I i (1888); Leipoldt *Schenute von Atripe* in Gebhardt and Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen* N. F. X i (1903). See Butler I 107; II Introd. xi, xii, ci, cii.

reason to speak of him here in detail, because on the one hand, as has been said, the Schnoudi literature is exclusively Coptic, and, on the other, the period of his influence falls well outside of the fourth century; his death took place about 451–452. At the same time, if he had then been, as his biographers state, a monk for no less than 109 years, he would have been, one would think, sufficiently important to be an object of interest to the travellers whose visits to Egypt at the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century will occupy us in the next section of this paper. Yet no single visitor so much as mentions his name; so strong was the barrier which diversity of language was already raising, and which was to crystallize soon after Schnoudi's death into the permanent separation of Greek- and Coptic-speaking Christians.

With the Lives of these fathers may be fitly grouped the Rules which bear their names. These, however, must be sought not in Rosweyd but in Lucas Holsten's still invaluable *Codex Regularum* (Paris, A.D. 1663). The *Regula Antonii* is not original, but is made up out of the life of Antony and the sayings attributed to him. Of the *Regula Pachomii* various recensions are in print, and a genuinely Pachomian nucleus could probably be extracted from them: Palladius, who had very likely seen the original text, gives an outline of the Rule in the *Lausiac History*: the body of minute regulations which St Jerome translated into Latin as the 'Rule of Pachomius', he describes more fully and no doubt more correctly as 'praecepta Pachomii et Theodori et Orsiesii', so that the collection before him appears to have been not so much a formal Rule delivered once for all to the Order as a code admitting of indefinite developement and expansion in the face of new needs—a code of which part no doubt did, but the whole certainly did not, go back to the original founder. Of this version of St Jerome two recensions are in print, differing, however, neither in subject-matter nor in language, but only in arrangement; and of the Greek text on which the version is based two forms also are extant, a shorter and a longer: the shorter Greek is represented also in Ethiopic. To the documents which come to us under the name of Schnoudi a still higher degree of authenticity may be ascribed, and Dom Butler reckons them among the most valuable of our authorities:

these, however, like his Life, are known to us neither in Greek nor in Latin, but only in Coptic. Mention should also be made here, for completeness' sake, of the *Regula Macarii*[1].

Between the material dealing with individual names, which has occupied us so far, and the more general and external impressions of Egyptian monastic life, which will claim our attention in a moment, a sort of intermediate position is filled by the *Apophthegmata Patrum*—'short anecdotes and sayings of the chief fathers of the desert, often full of shrewdness and deep knowledge of human nature'. Of larger collections of these sayings three forms are extant: one in Greek, arranged alphabetically according to the names of the authors of the Sayings (so that the whole of Antony's would be found grouped under A, and so on), which was printed by Cotelier; one known in Greek to Photius, arranged according to the subject-matter of the Sayings, which has survived only in Latin (printed in Rosweyd, books v and vi) and in Coptic (printed by Zoega); and a third, also arranged according to subject-matter, and also printed in Latin by Rosweyd (book vii). The material contained in these three great collections is substantially the same, though in arrangement they are wholly independent of one another; and since the two Latin translations are not later than the early years of the sixth century—that of Rosweyd, books v and vi, was made by 'Paschasius the deacon at the request of Martin the presbyter and abbot', while that of book vii is cited in the Rule of St Benedict—the Greek collections must go back to the fifth century. But these Greek collections obviously grew out of a number of smaller collections (such as alone are extant in Syriac), which were combined and recast at pleasure; and if time is to be allowed for the process of growth and development, the commencement of the movement to preserve and record the 'Sayings of the Fathers' must be traced to the beginning of the fifth century and even to the end of the fourth[2].

II. The second main division of the literature concerned with the early monasticism of Egypt consists of a series of accounts of tours made by travellers from other parts of the Christian world,

[1] Butler I 197, 155–158; II Introd. p. xii.
[2] Ibid. I 6, 208–214, 283–285; II Introd. p. xii.

and especially from the West, to the principal monastic settlements and the most eminent ascetics of the Egyptian deserts. Pilgrimages to the holy places of Palestine had been in vogue among Greek Christians from the beginning of the third century; but it is only after the conversion of the Empire that we hear, in this connexion, of travellers from the West. The Bordeaux pilgrim of A.D. 333, with his terse record of distances covered, appears thoroughly conscious of the unusual character and magnitude of his undertaking; but half a century later the journey had ceased to be exceptional, and the Holy Land had ceased to be the only goal of the pilgrim. Egypt lay, in fact, so close to Palestine that it was natural to complete the devotional recourse to the sacred sites of the Christian past by similar recourse to the sacred sites of the present. A visit to Nitria or the Thebaid became almost as essential an element in the 'Grand Tour' of a Latin Christian as are Delhi and Agra in the oriental travels of an Englishman; and to write a record of experiences for the benefit of less enterprising friends at home was as fashionable then as it is to-day. We need not shut our eyes to the romantic and adventurous side of the business, if we are willing at the same time to remember that it had another and a more serious side, and that Egypt was a true Holy Land to the minds of these fourth-century Christians just because the spiritual conflict seemed more real and tangible there than elsewhere, and the powers with which the Christian saint is endued for it more visibly and more triumphantly exercised.

1. Few recent discoveries in the domain of early Christian literature have excited as much general interest as the fragmentary record of a lady's pilgrimage to Palestine, which Gamurrini found in a MS at Arezzo and published under the title 'Peregrinatio S. Silviae'. In its present mutilated form the story opens in the desert of Mount Sinai; but there is now good reason to believe that the lost opening included a visit to the Thebaid. For Gamurrini's identification of the pilgrim with Silvia was purely conjectural; Dom Butler, in his first volume, brought weighty arguments against it, and quite lately a new and much more acceptable solution has been offered by a French Benedictine, Dom Férotin[1]. A letter is extant in which Valerius,

[1] *Revue des questions historiques*, Oct. 1903: Butler II 229.

a Spanish hermit of the seventh century, writing to the 'brethren at Vierzo', describes summarily the eastern travels of a certain virgin, also a Spaniard, named Etheria or (perhaps more probably) Egeria. What he tells us tallies well enough with the extant portion of the 'Peregrinatio'; and he tells us further that Egeria had travelled to the Thebaid, 'Thebeorum visitans monachorum gloriosissima congregationum coenobia, similiter et sancta anachoretarum ergastula'. The lady's travels took place about or soon after the year 380; and if she really was the Egeria of Valerius, the recovery of a complete MS of her pilgrimage would give us our earliest description from outside of Egyptian monasticism [1].

2. But if Egeria's account is lost, we have four extant records of the impression made on visitors whose experiences all fell within the same quarter of a century, A.D. 385–410: the *Instituta* and *Collationes* of Cassian, the (first of the) *Dialogues* of Sulpicius Severus, the *Historia Monachorum*, and the *Lausiac History* of Palladius. And of these it will be convenient to speak in the order given.

John Cassian's ascetic writings—the *Instituta* or Institutes of the Monastic Life, and the *Collationes* or Conferences—were not published till the third decade of the fifth century, A.D. 420–430, when their author was settled at Marseilles and was doing his best to introduce the Egyptian type of monasticism into Gaul: but the residences in Egypt on which the latter work is wholly and the former largely based fall within the last fifteen or twenty years of the fourth century, during which Cassian and his friend Germanus twice visited the country. On the first occasion they stayed several years in the Delta; on the second they extended their travels to Nitria and Scetis, and from this second journey they returned apparently in 399. On neither occasion did they go as far as the Thebaid, so that Cassian's own experiences are confined to the monasticism of Northern Egypt and do not cover the coenobite monasteries of the Pachomian type.

Of the Conferences the second and third series (nos. xi–xxiv) represent discourses or instructions given to Cassian and his friend during their first journey by different monks whose acquaintance from time to time they made, while the series

[1] Butler I 296 n.; II 229, 230.

which comes first in order (nos. i–x) were later in actual date and belong to the second journey and to Scetis. The Conferences purport of course to represent the very words of the Egyptian ascetics: Cassian is only the translator from Greek or Coptic into Latin: it is not a history of monasticism, nor even a picture of its external side, that we are to look for in them, but a summary of the teaching in which the inner meaning of the monastic life revealed itself. What we get in Cassian in the way of biographical matter or illustrative details is to be found not so much in the Conferences as in the Institutes: and though the long interval of years which elapsed between his Egyptian experiences and the time when he made use of them in his writings must be taken into account in any estimate of the fidelity of the record, the absolute *bona fides* of both works has until lately been generally treated as above suspicion[1].

3. In the strict order of chronology the *Historia Monachorum*, or rather the travels which it recounts, would claim the next place: but the literary criticism of the *Historia* is so intimately bound up with that of the Lausiac History itself, that it will be convenient first to deal with Postumian, the story of whose journeyings during the years 402–405 in the East—to Cyrene, Alexandria, Bethlehem and the Thebaid—is embedded in the first of the three *Dialogues* of his friend Sulpicius Severus. The part devoted to the description of the monastic life (*Dial.* i 10–22) is rather a collection of marvels or miracles than a chronologically arranged record of travels or an ordered series of biographies: the heroes are generally left anonymous, and in fact the whole account is only introduced to serve as a foil to the histories that follow in the second and third *Dialogues* about St Martin of Tours. Sulpicius is too exclusively occupied with the marvellous to rank quite on a level with our other authorities: but in his case again there seems no reason at all to doubt the genuinely historical character of the background[2].

4. In the winter of 394–395 a party of seven persons from the monastery on the Mount of Olives made the Egyptian tour, and it is their experiences which are retailed to us in the so-called *Historia Monachorum*. This book is found in numerous Latin

[1] Butler I 203–208; II Introd. p. xii.
[2] Ibid. I 213, 231, 232.

MSS, and Rosweyd collated twenty when he incorporated the *Historia* as book ii of the *Vitae Patrum*. Rosweyd proved conclusively that the author of this Latin document was no other than Rufinus: Tillemont with equal conclusiveness proved that the experiences related by the writer in the first person did not tally with the known facts of Rufinus' life, and (on the strength of a notice in Gennadius' *de Viris Illustribus*) suggested that Rufinus was only the editor of materials supplied by Petronius of Bologna. But the true key to the problem was to be found in another direction. The *Historia*, in fact, is extant in a Greek as well as in a Latin form: even before Tillemont wrote, Cotelier had described four Paris MSS of a 'Paradisus', which turns out to be nothing else than the Greek equivalent of the *Historia*: and this Greek text has now been published complete by Dr Preuschen in his *Palladius und Rufinus* (1897)[1]. But Preuschen still held to the originality of the Latin: it was left to Dom Butler to solve all the difficulties that attach to the Rufinian authorship by the simple hypothesis that Rufinus in the early years of the fifth century turned into Latin a Greek account of a tour that had been made some ten years before by members of his own monastery[2].

Dom Butler's position on this question appears to me to be in the main sound and unassailable: but at one point in his statement of the case hesitation may legitimately be expressed. Among the early witnesses to the text of the *Historia Monachorum*, Sozomen, whose Church History was written 440–450 A.D., holds a foremost place: and the curious feature about his evidence is that he shews in turn marked coincidences with the Greek form of the *Historia* against the Latin, and with the Latin form against the Greek. Dom Butler suggests that of the original Greek edition of the *Historia*, which both Rufinus and Sozomen had used, no MSS remain, all extant Greek MSS representing a revision in which the later chapters were abridged. But is not this explanation quite unnecessarily complicated? Is there anything which militates against the much simpler view

[1] It ought to be noted here that Dr Preuschen, on several important points connected with the *Historia Lausiaca*, arrived independently at the same results as Dom Butler.

[2] Butler I 10–15, 198–203, 257–277, 286.

that (1) Rufinus, in translating the Greek, expanded it in various places by drawing on his personal knowledge of Egyptian monasticism: (2) Sozomen, having access to both the original Greek and the version of Rufinus, and finding that on occasions they differed not inconsiderably, wrote with both of them open before him[1]?

We are now on the threshold of the *Lausiac History*: but before crossing it, it may be well to pause for a moment and cast a brief glance back over the history of the literature just described. We shall find that the era of unhesitating credulity was succeeded by a generation of critics whose incredulity was quite as unhesitating: but we shall find that their day too is over, and that the reaction which has set in to saner views gives every prospect of being permanent.

Dr Weingarten was the leader of the critical assault. In his *Der Ursprung des Mönchtums* (A. D. 1877), and in his article *Mönchtum* (A.D. 1882) in the second edition of Herzog's *Realencyklopädie*, he expressed himself decisively as to the worthlessness of one after another of our authorities. There never was such a person as Paul the Hermit. Though the existence of Antony must be admitted, he did not live till late in the fourth century, and the *Vita Antonii* is therefore not by Athanasius: nor is there any basis of fact in it whatever. The *Vita Pachomii* must go also, for there were no monks in Egypt at all before the year 340. The *Apophthegmata* are in no sense historical, but are a purely ethical composition, redolent of the best mysticism of the Greek Church, and certainly later than the fourth century. The Conferences published by Cassian were never delivered at all by Egyptian monks, but are his personal contribution to the Semi-Pelagian controversy: the setting of the story is all mythical, and the geographical details are as trustworthy as Homer's. The *Historia Monachorum* deserves no more credit than *Gulliver's Travels*. The monastic literature, as a whole and in its individual parts, is built up out of mere imitation of Greek

[1] One illustration may be quoted (from Butler I 275) which seems to me not merely to bear out but forcibly to suggest or even compel this view: Greek *Historia* πῦρ ἐν κόλπῳ ἐβάσταζεν: Rufinus 'ardentes prunas uestimento ferebat illaeso': Sozomen ὡς καὶ πῦρ ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ κομίζειν καὶ μὴ καίειν τὴν ἐσθῆτα.

romances. The sources of Jerome and Cassian, Rufinus and Palladius, are to be found not in historical facts but in pagan Θαυμάσια and Μεταμορφώσεις, and more particularly in Philostratus' Life of Apollonius of Tyana[1].

Of Weingarten's followers the most important were Dr Lucius in Germany and Mr Gwatkin in England: and the scepticism of the followers appeared to outdo that of the master. Professor Gwatkin, in his otherwise admirable *Studies of Arianism*, wrote of the *Historia Monachorum* that it was 'past defence except as a novel', while in his later *Arian Controversy* he could still speak of 'the great hermit Antony who never existed'[2].

It is obvious that the attitude we adopt towards the surrounding literature must create some sort of *praeiudicium* with regard to the *Lausiac History*. If the verdict of critics stood unchallenged that the biographies of Antony and Pachomius, and the writings of Cassian and Rufinus, were fiction from one end to the other, there would be an antecedent probability that Palladius was no more to be trusted than his contemporaries. But if the efforts of Weingarten and his school, on the consentient testimony of all serious scholars of later years, have failed to shake the credit of the rest, we shall be free to approach the study of the *Lausiac History* without committing ourselves to the belief that Palladius was a 'monkish falsifier of history', who relates other men's experiences as his own, and had perhaps never set foot in Egypt at all[3]. And for proof of this consentient testimony the reader need only turn to the impressive pages with which Dom Butler's second volume opens. The revolution of opinion is a significant one, and its significance is perhaps not exhausted in its immediate subject-matter.

Palladius, according to his own account of himself, was born in Galatia about 363, became a monk at twenty-three years of age, and after two years on the Mount of Olives spent some eleven years, *circa* 388–399, as an ascetic in Northern Egypt—in Alexandria, in Nitria, and in the region of the Cells. During one year more he resided in Palestine again, and early in 400

[1] Butler I 3, 215, 156, 208, 203, 195.
[2] Ibid. I 198, 216.
[3] Ibid. I 4, 5 (from Lucius: even Weingarten does not go so far as this).

was consecrated bishop of Helenopolis in Bithynia, by the hands probably of St Chrysostom himself. At any rate he was one of that saint's most faithful supporters, travelled on his behalf to Rome, was sent into exile as a leading 'Joannite', and (if the *Dialogus de vita Chrysostomi* is rightly attributed to him) became ultimately his biographer. Six years of Palladius' exile, from 406 to 412, were spent in Upper Egypt, and he was thus enabled to round off and complete his knowledge of Egyptian monasticism in a way to which no other of our authorities can lay claim. Cassian had never visited Upper Egypt, Postumian had not been to Nitria: neither Egeria nor the party of the *Historia Monachorum* were much more than passing travellers. Although it was not till 419 or 420 that Palladius, at the request of his friend Lausus, chamberlain at the court of Theodosius II, put his recollections on paper, there is every reason to approach the book with a confidence in the general truth of the description, based on the unique opportunities of the writer. Nor will this confidence be found to be misplaced. Whatever may have been true of the *Historia Lausiaca* in the form under which it has hitherto passed, it would seem to be impossible for any one to rise from the perusal of the text which Dom Butler has given us without feeling the strongest and most vivid impression of the reality of the narrative and of the good faith of the narrator.

For there is just this much excuse for the faulty tendency of recent criticism of Palladius' work, that it was exercised on a text that was largely not Palladius' at all. It has already been mentioned that Rosweyd printed no less than three recensions of the *Lausiac History*: and all subsequent scholars, with the exception only of Tillemont and one or two of Tillemont's followers, have accepted as the genuine form that one of the three which Rosweyd, possibly because it was the longest, distinguished as Book viii of his *Vitae*, while the other two were relegated to the obscurity of the appendix. Put in a nutshell, the difference between Rosweyd's text-document and his first appendix-document (the second is a mere fragment, both truncated and interpolated) is this, that the text-document contains the whole matter of the *Historia Monachorum* imbedded in the *Historia Lausiaca*, whereas the appendix-document gives a redaction of the *Historia Lausiaca* that differs from the other exactly by the absence of

everything that comes from the *Historia Monachorum*. In other words, the *Historia Lausiaca* of Rosweyd's appendix added to the *Historia Monachorum* make up between them the *Historia Lausiaca* of Rosweyd's text. It is strange that neither Rosweyd himself nor any of the scholars who followed him in the seventeenth century should have drawn what would seem to be the most obvious deduction from this state of the facts: it was reserved for Tillemont—whose greatness as a critic in comparison with predecessors, contemporaries, and successors alike stands out more clearly the more one knows of him—to anticipate, in the few paragraphs which he devoted to the subject, the main conclusion of Dom Butler[1]. But while Tillemont's brief words failed to catch the ear of modern critics[2], it is impossible that there can be any one to whom Dom Butler's massive argument will not carry conviction. By one line of proof after another he demonstrates that Rosweyd's appendix is the real *Lausiac History*, and that Rosweyd's text is a patchwork combination of the *Lausiac History* and the *Historia Monachorum*.

The mere statement of fact, that we possess in Rosweyd's appendix and in the *Historia Monachorum* two absolutely independent documents which yet between them make up the whole of Rosweyd's text, is of itself so nearly conclusive that it will be sufficient to summarize the earlier chapters of Dom Butler's first volume very cursorily. But simple though the matter now seems, it is nothing less than a revolution in the criticism of Palladius that Dom Butler has here brought to pass.

First comes (§ 4) a table shewing the correspondence of the subject-matter of the Rosweyd text (A) with the Rosweyd appendix (B) and the *Historia Monachorum* (C): only in a few cases is it found that B and C so far overlap as to deal with the same topics, and even there the treatment is entirely independent. In three of these cases (the lives of John of Lycopolis, of Paul the Simple, and of Amoun of Nitria) the texts of A B and C are all printed side by side (§ 5): and as it is essential, for purposes of

[1] Butler I 44–46.

[2] Nothing can be more delightfully naïve than Weingarten's reason for brushing Tillemont's hypothesis aside (Butler I 44 n. 6): 'denn aus dem allein, was Palladius von sich selbst berichtet, ergiebt sich ein Charakter, der Wunder hernahm, wo er sie fand.'

detailed comparison, to test the documents in their original language—all three documents were not only composed in Greek, but are still extant in it—the parallel texts are given not from Rosweyd's Latin but from Greek MSS, with the addition, wherever he diverges far from his original, of the translation of Rufinus. In the result A is shewn to be a conglomerate of B and C, successful enough where B and C move on different lines, but awkward and inconsistent if they happen to give separate versions of the same incident. Further inconsistencies in A are enumerated in § 6: sometimes the difficulty arises merely out of the attempt to combine the first person singular of Palladius' story with the first person plural of the *Historia Monachorum*: or Ammonius the Tall is described in one section of A in terms borrowed from B, and in another context of A, as though he were another person, in terms borrowed from C: or the converse mistake is made, and a Nitrian monk of the name of Or, who was already dead when Palladius came to Nitria about 390, is identified with another Or whom the party of the *Historia Monachorum* visited in the Thebaid in 394. Finally it is shewn (§ 8) that the account of Sozomen, *H. E.* vi 28–31 [1], is not adequately explained by the assumption of A as his single source: he certainly had C in his hands [2], and what does not come from C is wholly satisfied by B. In fact no early witness to the existence of A can be adduced: it is a secondary combination of two first-hand documents, which could only have acquired importance if one or other of the originals had disappeared.

Thus the first stage in reconstruction is (1) to alter wholly the received tradition as to the size and extent of the *Historia Lausiaca*, and (2) to make it therewith independent entirely of the *Historia Monachorum*. The next stage leads us on to enquire how far Rosweyd's Latin appendix-document B, which has been provisionally established as the true *Historia Lausiaca* in place of A, is itself a faithful representative of the Greek of Palladius. And the evidence will fall, according to the classification familiar to students of the Greek Testament, under the three heads of Greek MSS, Versions, and Quotations.

[1] The evidence of Socrates *H. E.* iv 23 is inconclusive: Butler I 47.

[2] I have argued above that he had before him not only the original Greek of C but also Rufinus' Latin version of it.

(*a*) *Greek MSS.* Dom Butler's list (II xiv) may be divided into two classes, those which he has inspected personally—that is, practically, those of Western Europe—and those which he only knows through catalogues. The former class consists of about fifty MSS (of which, however, some ten are only fragments), ranging in date from the tenth century to the sixteenth. But beyond these the libraries of Mount Athos contain no fewer than twenty-two, those of Jerusalem and Mount Sinai four each, while four other Oriental libraries possess one apiece. If indeed the Western class were more satisfactory in character, this wealth of the East might be treated as mere surplusage: but the number of those on which Dom Butler ultimately relies is so small, that the possibility still remains open that one or more of the Eastern MSS might sensibly modify in detail the text as he has now restored it. For the Western MSS fall into three groups, of which only one, and that the least numerous, preserves anything like the form of the book as written by Palladius. One group of MSS corresponds in Greek to Rosweyd's text-document, Dom Butler's A, incorporating the *Historia Monachorum* into the *Historia Lausiaca*: and not only is their general structure as a whole composite, but the text of the parts which correspond to the genuine Palladius is composite also, and combines the characteristic features of the texts of both the other groups. Thus the A group of Greek MSS, as being in a double sense secondary, may for the present be safely set aside. To Rosweyd's appendix-document, Dom Butler's B, corresponds another large group of over twenty Greek MSS. But there remains yet a third group of Greek MSS, called by Dom Butler the G group, represented (apart from fragments) by only three extant MSS and a lost one used by Rosweyd, which, while in general *structure* it ranks entirely with the B group (as being free from contamination with the *Historia Monachorum*), yet distinguishes itself from the B group in its form of *text*, which is 'simpler, shorter, and less rhetorical[1]'. These qualities raise at once a presumption that we possess in this family of G MSS a truer representation of the

[1] Indeed these expressions of the editor seem to understate the nature and character of the divergence of these two types of text: from a comparison, for example, of the passage from B printed on II xix with the corresponding words of G on II 65, it results that the former is between three and four times the length of the latter, and is indeed a sort of 'metaphrastic' expansion of it.

Historia Lausiaca even than Rosweyd's appendix-document and the Greek MSS which lie behind it. At the same time, seeing that an interval of five centuries separates the date of Palladius from the date of the earliest extant Greek MSS of his book, an appeal to the collateral evidence of Versions and Quotations is more than usually imperative.

(*b*) *Quotations.* Unfortunately the evidence from quotations is divided and therefore so far inconclusive. The principal place belongs again to Sozomen: and the case for his adhesion to the G type of text is conclusive[1]. On the same side are the quotations in the *Apophthegmata Patrum*, the Greek text of which must, as we have seen, go back to the fifth century, since more than one Latin version was in circulation soon after A.D. 500. Coincidences with the B text, on the other hand, are found in the Life of the younger Melania († 440 A.D.)—written by a personal friend of hers, and so before the end of the fifth century—and in Dionysius Exiguus' Life of Pachomius. It follows that both forms of the text of Palladius existed within some half-century of the time when he wrote, though the G text possesses in Sozomen the earlier attestation of the two.

(*c*) *Versions.* The popularity of hagiographical material of the class of the *Historia Lausiaca*, if it is well illustrated by the numerous recensions among the Greek MSS, is illustrated even more strikingly by the different and often independent versions of the whole or of parts of it which sprang up in all the chief languages of early Christian literature, Latin, Syriac, Coptic, and Armenian. The Coptic and Armenian evidence indeed—apart from their versions of the chapter in the *Historia* on Evagrius, which demands separate treatment—is neither of sufficient bulk nor of sufficiently close bearing on the textual problem to delay us here: but both the Latin and the Syriac are of primary importance.

The *data* to be extracted, whether from Syriac MSS of Palladius or from the mass of Palladian matter incorporated in the *Paradise* of the Syriac writer Anan-Isho, are singularly complicated by the fact that no Syriac MS gives more than

[1] I suspect that even the few apparent instances to the contrary, in which he supports B against G, would disappear if we had access to earlier and better MSS of the G text.

a part of the *Historia Lausiaca*: nor are the difficulties of the critic lessened by the different numbering of the chapters of the *Historia* in Dom Butler's two volumes—in the first volume he uses Rosweyd's chapters, and in the second his own—or by a change of the editor's view on one point, induced by fresh evidence that came to hand in the interval between 1898 and 1904[1]. But this much at any rate is clear. Anan-Isho, who wrote in the middle of the seventh century, was not the first translator of Palladius into Syriac, for we have at the British Museum three Palladius MSS of earlier date. Further, two of these MSS—Add. 17177, saec. vi, and Add. 12175, A.D. 534—overlap one another for several chapters of Palladius, and their versions of the matter common to them are quite independent[2]. It is thus certain that there were very ancient and indeed not far from contemporary Syriac renderings of parts of the *Historia Lausiaca*, but it does not follow that there was ever a complete translation: a series of more or less independent biographies, such as make up the *Lausiac History*, lent itself very obviously to a process of extracts or selections for purposes of edification. In any case Anan-Isho's *Paradise*, the nearest approach to a full version of Palladius which we possess, not only postulates the previous existence of partial versions by its references to more than one Syriac codex, but also (as now appears to be proved) itself co-ordinated and supplemented these imperfect Syriac

[1] Of course I must not be understood as in any sense blaming Dom Butler for either of these inconsistencies between his two volumes. They are exactly the sort of thing which is inevitable in the work of a pioneer.

[2] Dom Butler accordingly distinguishes them as s and s_2. The third MS—Add. 12173, saec. vi–vii—certainly does not belong to s_2: it nowhere overlaps s, but Dom Butler assigns it to the same version, on the ground that the Swedish scholar Tullberg, who in 1851 edited a few chapters of the *Paradise* from MSS ot the British Museum and the Vatican, cites from a MS which he calls A readings that are found to be homogeneous in certain chapters with Add. 17177, and again in other chapters with Add. 12173, and thus in Dom Butler's words 'supplies the link that enables us to identify these two MSS as containing portions of the same Syriac translation'. But Dom Butler has himself examined the Syriac MSS of Palladius both in Rome and London: he has found nothing to correspond exactly to Tullberg's A, and can only say that it must have presented striking resemblances to Add. 12173. I suspect that Tullberg's A was not only like Add. 12173, but was Add. 12173 itself; and that it was only by confusion with some other MS that Tullberg cited it for chapters 22, 23, which Add. 12173 does not contain. If so, there remains no proof that Add. 12173 formed part of the same version as s, and it must be ranked rather as a separate entity, s_3.

sources by the help of a Greek MS. These difficulties and complications do not, however, detract from the value of the Syriac evidence for the problem before us: on the contrary they enhance it, for the more independent the different collections of extracts turn out to be, the greater is the weight of their consentient testimony to the underlying type of Greek text. And while Anan-Isho's Greek MS was of the B type, the whole of the Syriac evidence that lies behind him—the MSS that he himself used, and the MSS of a date earlier than his that have survived to our own times—points to a G text, and a G text only[1].

For textual purposes, however, the Latin version of a Greek work must ordinarily, from the nearer relationship of the two languages, have a considerable advantage over a version in any Oriental language: and of Latin versions of the *Historia Lausiaca* Rosweyd, as we have seen, printed no less than three. His text-document, Dom Butler's A, may indeed be dismissed at once, for it was only made, from still existing Greek material, in the sixteenth century. Both appendix-documents, on the other hand, are genuinely old translations. Even the second of them (Dom Butler calls it l_2), incomplete and corrupt as it is, appears in its biblical citations to be independent of the Vulgate, while its marked agreements with the readings of the Coptic fragments guarantee its descent from an early form of the Greek text. In the other and more important of the two appendix-documents the true structure of the *Historia Lausiaca* has been shewn above to be preserved. As this version stands in Rosweyd and in most of the MSS, it is relatively late: but a group of Italian MSS—two at Monte Cassino, and a Sessorian MS in the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele at Rome—contain a more primitive recension (Dom Butler's l), which on the evidence of its biblical text must in Mr Burkitt's opinion be set as far back certainly as the sixth, perhaps as the fifth, century[2]. Both l and l_2 are made from a G type of Greek text[3].

[1] Butler I 77–96; II l, lxxvii–lxxx, lxiii–lxv.

[2] Perhaps the hand of a contemporary may be traced in the chapter on various holy women known to Palladius (II 128), where this version draws a distinction between Theodora the wife ('coniugem') of 'the tribune', and Veneria and Bassianilla, widows ('relictam') respectively of Vallovicus and Candidian, while the Greek has in each case only *τὴν τοῦ τριβούνου*, *τὴν Βαλλοβίκου*, *τὴν Καν&διανοῦ*.

[3] Butler I 58–76; II lxxv–lxxvii, lix–lxiii, lxv.

The preceding paragraphs have made it clear that, while an antique origin must be conceded to the expanded or metaphrastic B text, on the strength of indubitable though scanty traces of its early use, the G text can not only point in Sozomen to a witness earlier still, but in the Latin and Syriac versions can shew evidence of a much wider and more extended circulation in the generations that immediately followed Palladius. The external evidence of wider circulation combines thus with the internal evidence of higher originality to assure us that it is to the G text that we must look to restore the true form of the *Lausiac History*. And the difficulty of the editor's task can be estimated when we add that he had to commence the construction of his text with only two Greek MSS anything like complete of the G type, and both of them quite late, Paris gr. 1628 (P) of the fourteenth century, and Turin gr. 141 (T, probably now destroyed) of the sixteenth. Obviously it is only by the most skilful and careful balancing of the respective weights to be attached to late Greek, and early Latin or Syriac, evidence that a satisfactory text can be produced.

Take for instance a problem that confronted Dom Butler at the outset. Down to chapter 39[1], the order of the contents of the *Lausiac History* is the same in all our authorities whether of the B or of the G type: but from that point to the end the Greek MSS of the G text, supported by a Syriac version, give one order, and the Greek MSS of the B text, supported by the Latin version[2], give another and entirely different order. The *prima facie* deduction from the results so far attained would be that the combination of Greek G MSS with Syriac evidence was decisive. But Dom Butler elects to follow the B order, with no help from G except the Latin version, and there cannot be the least doubt that he is right: for he proves that, whereas the alternative arrangement involves us in a chaos of grammar, the order in B l is the natural order for Palladius, and for no one else, to have adopted, since it preserves roughly the sequence

[1] I use of course Dom Butler's new numbering of the chapters: Rosweyd's numbering depends on the A text, and includes so much that is not really Palladius that the only possible course was to abandon it entirely.

[2] The other Latin and Syriac versions (l_2, s_2) do not contain enough of the later part of the book to shew which of the two orders they followed.

of his own travels and experiences[1]. The immediate moral, though the editor does not draw it perhaps as clearly as he might have done, is to enhance enormously the value of l, as the only authority which gives at once the true order of the chapters and the true type of text. So important in fact does this Latin version seem to me to be, especially as represented by the readings of the Sessorian MS, that the most (and indeed the only) fundamental criticism I should pass on Dom Butler's edition is that the Latin text ought, in my opinion, to have been printed throughout opposite the Greek. But I willingly admit that the direction of my own studies may have led me to attach even more than their due weight to the historical and textual value of Latin versions; and I know with what reception any such scheme as I have desiderated would have met at the hands even of University Presses.

Of course when we descend from questions of substance to questions of verbal expression, there are scores of cases where a version, even a Latin version, fails to help us, and we are thrown back on our Greek authorities. In all such readings Dom Butler, in his laudable anxiety to present an objective text, determined from the first to follow the authority of his fourteenth-century Greek MS P; with the result, for instance, that both the text (p. 71, l. 4) and the *index graecitatis* are enriched with the novel form *ὑποπιάζειν*. It is all very well in theory to choose 'not that reading which seems in itself the best, but that one which seems best attested' (II xciii); yet on the other hand it is certain that the instinct of Dom Butler would often give us a more original text than the caprices of a fourteenth-century scribe. Fortunately it proved unnecessary to carry out the theory to the bitter end: not only are there some fragmentary G MSS of the eleventh century, but by one of those happy 'accidents' which, as a rule, befall only the right people, Dom Butler discovered at the last moment, in a tenth-century Wake MS at Christ Church which was supposed to be exhaustively catalogued, a large portion of the *Historia Lausiaca* with a purely G text. About half the book had already been printed off, so that for pp. 1–87 the readings of the new MS (W) must be found in the appendix (pp. 170–176): and it is an instruc-

[1] Butler II xlviii–lvi.

tive comment on the difficulties of Dom Butler's system that he there distinguishes no less than 170 instances where the evidence of W now turns the balance against a reading of P which appears in his text of these earlier chapters[1]. Many of these differences are trivial enough: but there are some which are not, and one of them is sufficiently curious and instructive to be worth quoting at length. On p. 48 l. 12 we learn that the great ascetic, Macarius of Alexandria, in his efforts to reduce further and further his daily meal, determined to content himself with so much only of his allowance of bread as, after crumbling it into a jar, he could bring up in one handful; 'and he used to tell with a smile how he would clutch a number of pieces but could not get them out whole owing to the narrowness of the mouthpiece, *τὸ γὰρ παντελῶς μὴ ἐσθίειν ὁ τελώνης μοι οὐ συνεχώρει*'. But, in spite of P and Dom Butler, to say that 'the tax-gatherer did not allow me entirely to stop eating' is sheer nonsense: and though the general drift might have been correctly recovered from the Latin ('ut aliquis publicanus non sinebat me tantum tollere quantum quiuissem tenere'), it required the evidence of W to establish the actual wording of the Greek, and to shew that the expansions in P and l are alike glosses and the former a misleading one. W has simply *ὡς τελώνης γάρ μοι οὐ συνεχώρει*: the narrow opening of the jar 'took toll' of the handful of bread that had come up so far.

And yet, even after the new discovery, our Greek authorities for the *Lausiac History* still stand in need of reinforcement: for not only does W lack about half the book, but it shares the erroneous arrangement of the later chapters with the other Greek MSS of the G group. An approximately final text will only be possible if the libraries of the East yield up to the explorer better and completer MSS of this type than have been found in the libraries of the West. Only it may safely be asserted that the measure of advance which any future editor may make on Dom Butler's text will be absolutely insignificant in comparison with the measure of advance which Dom Butler has made on the work of all previous editors of the *Lausiac History*.

[1] Nor are the 170 instances exhaustive: the editor ought at least to have added p. 17, l. 14, where the reading adopted in his text, even if it is sense, is certainly not grammar; W, by omitting the word *λέγοντες*, restores the one without injuring the other.

Dom Butler is indeed probably stronger as an historical and literary critic than as an exact scholar. We have in the preceding pages threaded under his direction the mazes of the Palladian documents and literature with a practically implicit confidence. The points on which we have ventured to differ from him have been minor ones: we have followed him from one step to another, and have rarely had anything to do except to ratify his judgement[1]. Even in the domain of exact criticism, what a little there really is to add! The total that one reader has accumulated by way of correction to a closely printed text and apparatus of 170 pages will be found at the foot of the page[2]. But the core of the whole work are the 'Notes critical and historical', which are appended to the text of the *Lausiac History*, and occupy pp. 182–236 of vol. II. I do not know where else one could find so much matter packed together that either illustrates or rectifies the history of Palladius' times: the study of them is a genuine intellectual pleasure. I should confidently appeal to them as evidence of a marked development of Dom Butler's powers as a historian in the interval between the appearance of his two volumes: and I should instance in particular the treatment of all questions of chronology as far

[1] If one were told to find something to criticize in Dom Butler's Introductions, one might perhaps say that it is occasionally a little difficult in the first volume to see the wood for the trees: the multitude of minute data seem to obscure the course of the argument. But perhaps this is unavoidable; and at any rate, whether or no there is any lack of clearness in the method, there is never any in the conclusion. I sometimes fancy that the pages of *Texts and Studies* in general are made unnecessarily difficult to the reader by being broken up into too many paragraphs, with the result that they get a scrappy appearance.

[2] Questions of reading: 31. 6, 7 ἄλλο γάρ σοι οὐκ ἔχω τί (for τι) καταλείψω: 38. 1 ἄλλος κατ' ἄλλου (for κατ' ἄλλο) διαφωνοῦντες: 66. 8 ἐμπεφιβλωμένον (for ἐμπεφιβλωμένος): 87. 6 τούτῳ (for τοῦτο) μὴ συνθεμένη: 112. 7 τινὰ τῶν πρώτων (for τὸν πρῶτον) τῆς πόλεως: 128. 9 εὐφυεστάτην οὖσαν (for εὐφυεστάτη οὖσα): 132. 8 περὶ τὸ (for περὶ τὸν) Λαζάριον: 165. 7 οὐ μετὰ πολύ or μετ' οὐ πολύ (for οὐ μετ' οὐ πολύ, a clearly conflate reading of P). Questions of punctuation: 129. 14 transfer comma from ἁμαρτίας to γενόμενοι: 134. 5 place ἐκωλύετο γάρ within brackets 'for she would have been prevented': 152. 5, 6 comma after Διοκλῆς, none after τὰ πρῶτα, comma after φιλοσοφίαν (φιλοσοφία, does not, I think, in Palladius mean 'asceticism', but philosophy in our sense of the word): in I 138, l. 8 of the quotation from Socrates, comma, not full stop, after μαθητής—the usage of μέν . . . δέ seems in this and other places to have proved a stumbling-block to the editor. Question of translation: II 274 μίαν παρὰ μίαν (157. 1) cannot, I am quite sure, mean 'once a day', but only 'every other day'. There remain besides a few passages in Dom Butler's text which are almost certainly corrupt as they stand.

more satisfactory in this volume than in the first. In a word, Dom Butler was then still feeling his way: now he moves as the acknowledged master of his subject.

If there chance to be, among the readers of this article, any who are accustomed to contrast the study of the text with the study of the subject-matter of a book, and to lament as disproportionate the time devoted to the former, they must I think admit that the *Lausiac History* forms an exception to their rule. The direct bearing upon history of questions of introduction and textual criticism, such as have been investigated at length in the foregoing pages, cannot be better illustrated than by the group of variations which I now propose to adduce. For these *variae lectiones* will take us straight to the heart of the most burning questions of Palladius' day.

Palladius' active life fell between the overthrow of the Arian and the outbreak of the Nestorian heresy. The half century which separated the council of Constantinople from the council of Ephesus witnessed no doctrinal crisis in the Eastern Church to compare with those of the preceding and succeeding generations; but it was a time far from free of personal jealousies and party passions which cloaked themselves under the mask of zeal for orthodoxy. The quarrel of Theophilus and the Egyptian monks over the name of Origen, the mutual invectives of John of Jerusalem and Epiphanius, Jerome and Rufinus, the persecutions directed against St Chrysostom, were symptoms of divisions among churchmen almost as bitter and as thoroughgoing as any between catholic and heretic. In all these developements Palladius, the disciple of Evagrius and biographer of Chrysostom, played his part; and his sympathies left their mark upon the text of the *Lausiac History*. The verdict of posterity supported him in the cause of Chrysostom: but this was the one element in the troubles of the time which the subject-matter of the *Historia* necessarily excluded, and on which also in the *Dialogus de vita Chrysostomi* he elsewhere had his say. On the other hand, Evagrius, Didymus, Origen, the great masters of Alexandrine and ascetic theology to whom Palladius and his friends looked up as their guides and leaders, became the sport of heresy-hunters from the fifth century onwards: Palladius him-

self did not escape censure, nor his book mutilation, at their hands.

Origen's name occurs in Dom Butler's text of the *Historia* on four occasions[1]. A certain Domninus, 'a disciple of Origen', was the leading ascetic found in Rome, perhaps about 300 A.D., by the wandering fakir Serapion Sindonita (ch. 37). Juliana, a virgin of Cappadocian Caesarea, received Origen when a fugitive from persecution and maintained him for two years; Palladius adds that he had himself seen an autograph note of Origen's ἐν παλαιοτάτῳ βιβλίῳ στιχηρῷ, to the effect that the book had been given him by Juliana, who had 'received it from Symmachus the interpreter of the Jews' (ch. 64)[2]. Ammonius, the Tall Brother, had learnt by heart the Old and New Testaments, and had (so the fathers of the desert bore witness) read 6,000,000 [lines][3] of the writings of famous scholars such as Origen, Didymus, Pierius, and Stephen (ch. 11). And in ch. 55 similar industry is credited to a lady 'who turned night into day in reading through every accessible work of the ancient commentators (ὑπομνηματισταί), including 3,000,000 [lines] of Origen, and 2,500,000 of Gregory, Stephen, Pierius, Basil and other standard authors: nor did she simply read them once and have done with them, but went through each book carefully seven or eight times'.

In no one of these cases is the name Origen left intact by all the leading authorities for the text. In ch. 37 the words μαθητῇ Ὠριγένους are omitted by the three principal MSS of the G group (W P T) and by the A group. The whole story of Juliana is absent, perhaps because the connexion with Origen was an integral feature of it, from one of the G MSS and from the Syriac.

[1] I take these and similar references from the editor's excellent Index III 'Personal Names'.

[2] From Eusebius *H. E.* vi 17 it is evident that Eusebius too had seen the book and Origen's note. Eusebius' words make it clear that the book was not only possessed but composed by Symmachus: and they seem to imply that it was his Commentary on St Matthew's Gospel.

[3] μυριάδας ἑξακοσίας: so too, in the passage quoted immediately below from ch. 55, μυριάδας τριακοσίας, μυριάδας εἰκοσιπέντε. Presumably one must supply στίχων: even so, the numbers are enormous, though not beyond belief. Perhaps the number of στίχοι were noted, as in the Cheltenham list, in each book. Of the writer Stephen, mentioned both in ch. 11 and ch. 55, nothing appears to be known, which is certainly strange.

Ammonius' favourite authors in ch. 11, Origen, Didymus, Pierius, and Stephen, become in all the three extant G MSS and in some of the A group 'Athanasius and Basil', and in the inferior Latin version 'the holy ancient orthodox fathers', while the Syriac omits the whole sentence. The similar list in ch. 55 is docked of Origen's name by one of the G MSS, by the A group, and by the Syriac. With so little intelligence were these proceedings directed, that the references in ch. 10 to a namesake of the great Alexandrine, Origen the steward of Pambo, were deleted with almost equal care: some or all of the G MSS, together with the Coptic and lesser Latin version (whose close relationship to one another has been already emphasized), substitute on the first mention of the steward the name John, on the second and fourth the name Theodore, and on the third the name Macarius. The choice of these three names was apparently arbitrary: and the agreement of the offending authorities over them shews both that a systematic reviser has been at work, and also that the alterations must go back to a remote date. And the fact that the name of Didymus, except when brought into connexion with that of Origen in ch. 11, has been allowed to remain in the text[1], suggests that this dishonest recension was carried through before the time when Justinian's council joined Didymus in a common anathema with Origen and Evagrius.

If any one father of the desert may be called the central figure and hero of Palladius' story, that one is certainly Evagrius, his 'master' in the monastic life, and like him a foreigner from Asia Minor. The affectionate veneration with which Evagrius was regarded by his disciple is evident throughout, and adds a further feature of interest to the history of this extraordinary man. Posterity has done him scant justice[2]. If Origen's name was too deeply imprinted on the history of Christian scholarship to be easily erased, the conspiracy of silence had better chances with a more recent author like Evagrius. It is probable that to him belongs the real credit of the first critical edition of the Pauline epistles: but if so, the suppression of his name in the

[1] It is only in some of the B group of MSS that the Life of Didymus (ch. 4) is omitted.

[2] No adequate account of Evagrius exists yet, as far as I know, in English. The merit of first calling attention to the importance of the subject belongs to Dr Zöckler's *Evagrius Ponticus* (Munich, 1893).

copies of the so-called 'Euthalian' apparatus has successfully imposed on all generations till our own[1]. It was not to be expected that his position in the *Lausiac History* as Palladius wrote it would rest unassailed. On six occasions, outside the chapter specially devoted to him, is the 'blessed' Evagrius mentioned in Dom Butler's text: and on each one of them some of our authorities either omit entirely the mention of him or replace his name by 'Theodore' or 'Eulogius' or 'Macarius'. Chapter 38, which gives a history of his life, is silently dropped by two of the three chief G MSS and also (it would seem) by the chief Syriac version. On the other hand there were still all through the fifth century churches and monasteries, especially among non-Greek speaking Orientals, where Evagrius' works were held in high honour and studied as leading expositions of the ascetic life: and this curious result followed, that, while in some quarters the *Historia Lausiaca* began to be copied without the thirty-eighth chapter, in others exactly this chapter was excerpted from the main body of the work, and was then either incorporated among *Vitae Sanctorum* or prefixed as an introduction to Evagrius' collected writings. It is found separately in no less than three Syriac translations of which sixth-century codices are extant. It is found in Armenian with a peculiar colophon, which appears to be beyond doubt imitated from the colophon found under the name of Evagrius in codex H of the Pauline epistles[2]. It is found in an expanded form in the Coptic: for where the *Lausiac History* only relates that 'Evagrius was accosted one day by three devils in clerical dress, who began disputing with him on

[1] In spite of the Dean of Westminster's criticisms in the October number of the JOURNAL (vol. vi, no. 21, p. 87), I am still of the opinion that the Evagrian origin of the 'Euthalius' collection affords the most probable solution of all the difficulties connected with this question. But I have to acknowledge gratefully a reference, which had escaped me when writing in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* (v 524–529) on this subject, to a paper by von Dobschütz, where attention is called to Syriac evidence of the early date of the 'Euthalian' Prologue. Von Dobschütz's discovery does not of course affect the issue as between a fourth-century Euthalius and a fourth-century Evagrius.

[2] As far as it goes, the existence of this colophon seems to support the claim of Evagrius to the original authorship of the Euthalian edition of St Paul. Dr Robinson makes it probable indeed (Butler I 105) that, as appended to the Life of Evagrius, it does not go further back than an Armenian translator or scribe: but whoever added it must surely have known the Pauline colophon under the name of Evagrius and not of Euthalius.

religious topics, one posing as an Arian, another as a Eunomian, the third as an Apollinarian, but a few words of his inspired wisdom sufficed to refute them', the Coptic gives the whole of the discussion; and it must be added that its account, from whatever source it is derived, bears all the marks of truthfulness[1].

Of the genuineness of the chapter as part of the *Lausiac History* there cannot be the least doubt. Apart from the special versions just enumerated, the Greek MSS of the A group contain it, so do some of those of the B group, and one complete and two fragmentary MSS of the G group, as well as both Latin versions[2]. Naturally the defection of the editor's leading MSS makes the construction of the text less easy: and if I now select this chapter for description and discussion, on account both of the interest attaching to Evagrius himself and of the historical and critical difficulties which the text raises, it must be remembered that it is in no sense an average specimen of the *Lausiac History*, and that there would be few other chapters in which one could record two separate instances of dissent from the judgement of the editor.

(*a*) Was Evagrius ordained deacon by Gregory of Nazianzus or by Gregory of Nyssa? In the article in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* to which I have already referred, I followed the ordinary authorities in naming Gregory of Nyssa: but Dom Butler shews conclusively that Nyssa is an error of the B text[3], while Nazianzus has the support of the extant G MSS and of all the versions, except one of the three Syriac.

(*b*) Evagrius was left by Gregory at Constantinople after the Council of 381, and enjoyed a great reputation there under Nectarius as a *malleus hereticorum*. He fell in love with a married lady, ὡς αὐτὸς ἡμῖν διηγήσατο. ὕστερον ἐλευθερωθεὶς τὸ φρονοῦν, ἀντηράσθη τούτου πάλιν τὸ γύναιον. So Dom Butler prints the text: but why make Palladius guilty of a nominative abso-

[1] Butler I 131–148.

[2] And here let me note in passing that the principal Latin version, on the special merits of which I dwelt above, again distinguishes itself as the solitary representative of the G text which (save for a lacuna in chapters 11, 12) preserves uninjured every mention of Evagrius, Didymus, and Origen.

[3] And presumably of the A text also. Butler states decisively that the A MSS contain this chapter (I 139): but he does not quote A anywhere in the *apparatus criticus* to it.

lute, when the interchange of the first full stop and the comma improves both sense and grammar, 'As he himself told us in after times, when his soul was freed from sensual passion' (cf. 122. 16)? For the story of his prayer and of the wonderfully vivid and thrilling dream which seemed to him a Divine call to flee from the city, the reader must be referred to Dom Butler's text.

(*c*) From Constantinople Evagrius fled to Jerusalem, only to suffer fresh trials, for he began to doubt his vocation and 'to change his clothes and his habit of speech'—apparently from the clerical to the lay. Illness came to his help, and he was nursed by his hostess, the noble Roman lady Melania, who urged him to dedicate himself to a monastic life, and 'then, said she, sinner as I am, I will pray that you may be granted κομίατος ζωῆς' (*i. e.* a 'commeatus' or furlough: 120. 3), as Dom Butler happily restores the text from a combination of Greek and Latin evidence; not uninfluenced (as one may conjecture) by reminiscence of the imperishable language of the Acts of St Perpetua 'an passio sit an commeatus'.

(*d*) On his recovery he 'changed his dress' again, and adopted once for all the monastic life of Egypt, first at Nitria and then in the desert. Every year he made use of his calligraphic skill for just so long as was needed to earn the cost of his scanty food; 'for he wrote beautifully τὸν ὀξύρυγχον χαρακτῆρα' (120. 12). One would like to translate this remarkable but not quite unique expression—see the note, II 217—'the Oxyrhynchus character', nor does the form of the adjective (ὀξύρυγχον rather than ὀξυρυγχίτην or the like) seem a quite fatal objection. But the discoveries of papyri at Oxyrhynchus do not indicate any one style of handwriting as exclusively or especially characteristic of the place, and we must be content to say that the allusion is to some sort of uncial handwriting distinctive of manuscripts *de luxe*.

(*e*) Literary labours were, however, a more constant source of employment to Evagrius. 'He wrote three books ἱερὰ μοναχῶν ἀντιρρητικὰ οὕτω λεγόμενα' (121. 1), which could only mean 'three holy books for monks under the name of Answers'. Dom Butler has 'no doubt' that this is 'the original reading'. But the Ἀντιρρητικά are known to have consisted not of three but of eight books: the Coptic and Latin versions both understand the three

books to be three different works, Ἱερέα, Μοναχόν, and Ἀντιρρητικά: and as regards the second of the three, this interpretation is borne out by the evidence of Socrates (*H. E.* iv 23), who gives Μοναχὸς ἢ περὶ πρακτικῆς as the title of one of Evagrius' writings. Except for Dom Butler's dissent, the evidence would seem to me absolutely conclusive. One book was the 'Answers': another was the 'Monk': whether the third was the 'Priest', as the versions imply, or the 'Sacred Things', according to the reading of the Greek MSS, is a problem which our present knowledge of the bibliography of Evagrius does not enable us to solve.

Evagrius, more than most men, was *felix opportunitate mortis*. He died at the age of fifty-four, worn out probably by austerities for which his early training had not fitted him, on the Feast of the Epiphany either in 399 or 400, only a few months before Theophilus of Alexandria kindled the flame which was to set the whole East ablaze over the name and memory of Origen. About the patriarch himself the *Lausiac History* preserves a judicious silence: but Palladius' estimate of the other protagonists of the controversy is clear enough. 'There was not to be found among men any one of greater knowledge or more modest temper' than Rufinus of Aquileia (136. 1). 'A certain Jerome, a presbyter', on the other hand, 'distinguished Latin writer and cultivated scholar as he was, shewed qualities of temper[1] so disastrous that they threw into the shade his splendid attainments', and exercised a fatal effect on the life and happiness of his disciple Paula (ἡ ἐλευθέρα, ἡ Ῥωμαία: 108. 6–18; 128. 6–13). But of all the Western colony settled in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem it was Melania and her family who held the most prominent place in the reminiscences of Palladius. This illustrious lady, the friend of St Paulinus and St Augustine, was the first of a long line of Roman settlers at the Holy Places. Jerome in his *Chronicle*, under A.D. 373, had mentioned her settlement at Jerusalem, and had passed a glowing eulogy upon the virtues she there displayed; but she espoused the cause of Rufinus and the Origenists, and then no language was too virulent for him to use of her: 'her nature', he wrote, 'was as black as her name'.

[1] τοσαύτην εἶχε βασκανίαν . . . ἀπαλλαγεῖσα αὐτοῦ τῆς βασκανίας . . . τῇ ἑαυτοῦ βασκανίᾳ (108. 8, 12; 128. 10). Of the two passages about Jerome P W omit the first, P W T the second.

What, by the by, was her actual name? It is a curious question no doubt to ask, in face of the long line of editors and historians, down to and including Dom Butler, who have accustomed us to the form 'Melania': but the enquiry is not without its bearing upon the text of the writings both of Palladius and of his contemporaries. Among the MSS of the *Historia Lausiaca* W gives Μελάνιον, and Dom Butler admits that, if he had had this MS at his disposal from the outset, he would have accepted its reading. Μελάνιον as a Greek neuter diminutive is intelligible enough; and if we had to do with an originally Greek name there would be good reason for accepting this form of it. But Melania was a Roman, and the Latin evidence must therefore be first consulted. For Paulinus of Nola we have now a critical edition by Hartel in the Vienna *Corpus*, and it is clear that Paulinus knew her as 'Melanius'. The MSS of Jerome, according to Dom Butler, vary between masculine, feminine, and neuter, but in the *Chronicle* 'Melanius' is certainly the reading of all the older MSS, including the Bodleian codex of the fifth century[1]. For Augustine we have as yet no critical *apparatus*: but the evidence of the other two Latin fathers amply guarantees the correctness of 'Melanius', and this is also the form adopted in the Sessorian MS of the Latin version of Palladius. We are in fact reduced to no more than two alternatives: either the masculine is the genuine reading in Palladius, and we must restore it on the strength of the Latin (with some Syriac evidence also); or Palladius and the Greeks transformed the unintelligible masculine into a more intelligible neuter, and the Latin translator restored what he knew to be the Latin form of the lady's name. In favour of the first alternative is a curious phrase in ch. 9 (29. 10), which seems to me to gain in point if what Palladius wrote was really ἡ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ θεοῦ Μελάνιος, 'that female man of God Melanius', rather than ἡ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ θεοῦ Μελάνιον or Μελανία. Why her contemporaries called her Melanius I am unable to say; and it would perhaps be pedantic at this time of day to alter the traditional form in speaking of her.

Palladius has a good deal to tell us about Melania, up and down the *History*, even in Dom Butler's text: but has not the

[1] See Schöne *Die Weltchronik des Eusebius in ihrer Bearbeitung durch Hieronymus* (Berlin, 1900), p. 106.

editor wrongfully deprived her of a whole chapter? For ch. 55, if I am right, is no new section on a fresh subject, Silvania, but a continuation of ch. 54 on Melania[1]. It opens with the words *συνέβη ἅμα ὁδεύειν ἡμᾶς*, 'it happened that we were together on a journey, escorting the blessed Silvania the virgin, sister-in-law of the prefect Rufinus, on her way from Aelia to Egypt'; and the plural can only refer to Palladius and Melania. It closes with a eulogy couched in terms quite exceptional in the *Lausiac History*, appropriate enough to Melania, but wholly inappropriate to a person like Silvania, of whom (now that the so-called *Peregrinatio Silviae* is attributed elsewhere) we know absolutely nothing to justify it. Nor do the contents of the chapter tell a different tale. The second half of it is the description of the lady's zeal for studying the ancient exegetes of the Church which has already been cited above (p. 346): the first half of it is a story of ascetic habits which, even in the palmy days of asceticism, can only have been true of a woman like Melania, whose self-renunciation was absolute. Among the company that escorted Silvania was one Jovinus, at that time deacon, but when Palladius wrote bishop, of the church of Ascalon, 'a pious man and a scholar'. 'The heat became terrific, and when we reached Pelusium Jovinus seized a basin and gave his hands and feet a thorough wash[2] in ice-cold water, and then threw a rug on the ground and settled

[1] The chapter numbers are of course not in the MSS, but are supplied by the editors for purposes of convenience. Dom Butler encloses them throughout in brackets.

[2] *Νίψασθαι τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας πυγμῇ ὕδατι ψυχροτάτῳ* (148. 21). Has any one ever noticed this allusion (probably the only one in patristic literature) to Mc. vii 3? Unfortunately it does not settle the vexed question of the meaning of *πυγμῇ*, though the apparent contrast with *τῶν ἄκρων τῶν χειρῶν* (149. 7) perhaps supports the interpretation 'as far as the elbow' (and, in this case, 'the knee'). Dom Butler does not note the reference to St Mark, and it seems a pity that, by limiting his use of uncial type to actual quotations from the Bible, he calls no attention to the not infrequent echoes of Biblical language. Thus he nowhere indicates that the opening of the *Historia Lausiaca* is modelled on the prologue of St Luke's Gospel, *πολλῶν πολλὰ καὶ ποικίλα κατὰ διαφόρους καιροὺς συγγράμματα τῷ βίῳ καταλελοιπότων . . . ἔδοξε κἀμοὶ τῷ ταπεινῷ . . . ἄνωθεν ἐκθέσθαι σοι ἐν διηγήματος εἶδει τὸ βιβλίον τοῦτο* (9. 1, 10; 10, 8): add also 11. 18, Matt. xviii 24; 15. 19, Heb. xi 32; 19. 18, Ps. xxxvii 11, Matt. v 5; 30. 22, Marc. xii 42, Luc. xxi 2; 33. 10, Levit. xxi 17 sqq.; 38. 20, 21, Luc. xviii 22, ix 23, xiv 27; 44. 15, 4 Reg. v 20–27; 57. 2, Matt. xvii 17; 57. 9, Luc. xviii 43; 74. 8, Dan. iii; 115. 2, Gal. vi 14; 115. 6, Gal. i. 10; 138. 23, Rom. xii 8; 144. 6, Tit. i 8, 1 Tim. vi 17, 18; 146. 13, Rom. viii 35; 149. 17, 1 Tim. vi 20; 151. 5, Eph. iv 26; 165. 2, Ezech. xxxiii 11.

himself comfortably to rest on it. She (ἐκείνη) began to upbraid his lack of hardness, assuring him that, though she was sixty, she never used a litter when travelling and never under any circumstances washed her face or her feet or more than her fingers.'

We know nothing, as has been said, of Silvania, and therefore we cannot actually prove that the combination of asceticism and learning here depicted was alien to her character. But we do know that Melania was both a noted ascetic and a noted Origenist, and, even if female asceticism was no longer unusual, female study of Origen must have been always rare. The case for Melania, I feel confident, has only to be stated in order to be admitted, and that in spite of an argument which might conceivably be raised against it. The lady was in her sixtieth year when she made her profession of asceticism to Jovinus: but Melania was also sixty years old when she left Palestine to revisit Rome (ch. 54: 146. 20), and that journey took place not earlier than 398 and not later than 400 A.D. (Butler II 277, correcting II 227). Therefore if Melania is the subject of ch. 55, the episode at Pelusium must have taken place about 399. And in fact Palladius, between the years of his long residence in Egypt and of his episcopate in Bithynia, was just then in Palestine for a brief period (II 105. 5–8). But he had been sent from Egypt to Palestine, so he tells us, on account of ill-health: how then can he have been returning from Jerusalem towards Egypt in that particular year? The objection is specious rather than real: there may have been any one of countless reasons, necessarily unknown to us, to induce him to make the brief journey to Pelusium: we are not even told that he went on to Egypt, but only that Silvania was going there and that they escorted her so far. Indeed the fresh data brought into account in favour of the objection seem to me to constitute an additional argument in support of the Melania hypothesis, since they bring out the coincidence that during Melania's sixtieth year she and Palladius were both actually in Palestine.

The reader whose ideas of the *Lausiac History* are derived only from the foregoing pages would need to be warned that they would be leaving on him a false impression if he supposed that questions of controversy loomed at all largely in it. The

note of criticism is not the dominant one in Palladius' book, any more than it was in most of the men whom he set himself to describe. Rather his purpose is, writing himself as one of the secular clergy and addressing a layman in high office at the court, to depict a mode of life that stood in sharp contrast to the lives of bishops and chamberlains exactly by its aloofness from the controversies of the world and even of the Church.

There is much of interest that could be added on the characteristic features of the monastic life as depicted by Palladius: but it must be added, if at all, on another occasion. Enough at any rate has been said to shew under what a burden of obligation Dom Butler has laid us by the long and successful labours that have culminated in his edition of the *Lausiac History*.

C. H. TURNER.