PALLADIANA.

II.

THE *Dialogus de Vita Chrysostomi* AND THE *Historia Lausiaca*: AUTHORSHIP.

IT had been my intention to discuss in the second section of these 'Palladiana' the questions raised by Dr Richard Reitzenstein in his work *Historia Monachorum und Historia Lausiaca* as to the historical character of the Lausiac History. And it is well to say at once that his attitude is quite different from the crude scepticism of Weingarten, fashionable a generation ago, which saw in the two works a sort of *Gulliver's Travels*. But there will be firmer ground for dealing with Reitzenstein's theories, if the question of authorship can be settled first.

Reitzenstein does not deny that Palladius of Helenopolis was the author of the Lausiac History; but he holds his claim to be at best unproven, and probably unfounded. The investigation will afford an opportunity of making good what must seem a strange omission in my edition of the Lausiac History—the absence of any formal discussion of the authorship (see Part II p. 183). The reason was twofold: (1) it seemed permissible, in view of universal consent, to take Palladius' claim for granted; and (2) it was not possible to go into the question with any thoroughness without an examination, such as I had not then made, of the *Dialogus de Vita Chrysostomi*, also attributed to Palladius. The study on the authorship of the Dialogue appeared in 1908, buried away in a great volume of 'Chrysostomica', produced by the Collegio Graeco at Rome in celebration of the fifteenth centenary of St John Chrysostom, where it has lain inaccessible and little known. I am glad to have the opportunity of resuscitating the material in a place where it will be easily and permanently accessible, and at the same time of presenting the case in a somewhat new way.

We shall therefore consider

A. The question whether the Dialogue and the Lausiac History are the work of one and the same author; and if so,

B. Whether the author was Palladius of Helenopolis.

The Lausiac History is sufficiently well-known, as being a principal authority, perhaps on the whole the principal authority, for the history of Egyptian monachism in the fourth century; and the Dialogue

similarly is recognized as the principal authority for the troublous years of St John's episcopate and the controversy and struggle that raged around him during the last part of his life. The Dialogue is preserved in a single Greek MS of the eleventh century—Florence, Medic. Laurent. Plut. IX, cod. xiv—all others being copies of this. The text was first edited by Bigot (Paris, 1680), and it is printed in all subsequent editions of the Works of Chrysostom (in vol. xlvii of Migne's *Patr. Graeca*). It is a dialogue between a deacon of the Roman Church and an Eastern bishop, an adherent of St Chrysostom, who is represented as being in Rome about the time of his death.

With this by way of preface we proceed to the investigation.

A. Evidence as to whether the Dialogue and the Lausiac History are the work of one and the same author.

It is a case of internal evidence:

(1) *Question of literary style:*

The present writer ought to know the literary style and characteristic peculiarities of the author of the Lausiac History, having gone through it time after time, in collating the MSS, in constructing the text, and in revising the proofs. From mere general style and vocabulary I should not have been led to suspect that the Dialogue is by the author of the Lausiac History. Indeed certain turns of expression much affected by the writer of the Lausiac History are not found in the Dialogue: e. g. εἰς λόγον (in such phrases as εἰς λόγον τροφῆς), which occurs four times in the Lausiac History, but not in the Dialogue. I feel, however, that I am lacking in that sense which seems to enable some critics confidently to identify the authors of writings by similarity of style. But in this case I find my impression is the same as Tillemont's: 'Quoique l'un et l'autre ouvrage soit d'un grec assez barbare, il me semble néanmoins que la Lausiaque a partout un air simple et naturel, et que le Dialogue est plus affecté, et d'un homme qui avoit quelque teinture d'une méchante rhétorique. . . . Ainsi je ne sçay pas si son style mesme ne seroit pas une raison essentielle de distinguer ce Pallade de l'autre' (*Mémoires* xi 643). It must, however, be acknowledged that the author of the Lausiac History shews himself capable, on occasion, of flights of bad rhetoric.

On the other hand, of modern critics, the late Dr Zöckler speaks of 'the essential resemblance of the two works in regard to literary style'[1]; and Dr Preuschen declares that the alleged difference of style is not a sufficient ground for questioning Palladius' claim to the authorship.[2] Dr Reitzenstein holds that the similarity of style and expression makes it extremely likely that the two works are by the same author (*op. cit.*

[1] Herzog *Realencyklopädie* (ed. 3), art. 'Palladius'.

[2] *Palladius und Rufinus* p. 246.

p. 6). This is a matter of appreciation whereon each one may form his own opinion after reading the two books.

(2) *Phraseology and Vocabulary.*

I proceed now to marshal the more tangible evidence, so far as it is known to me, in favour of the unity of authorship.

The following is a list of such definite phrases and expressions as I have been able to collect in the Dialogue, that seem to present positive resemblances to the Lausiac History. The references to the Lausiac History are to my edition (Cambridge, 1904); those to the Dialogue are to Bigot's pagination, which is preserved in the Paris edition of the *Opera Chrysostomi*, 1839, XIII i, the columns in Migne *P. G.* xlvii being inserted in brackets.

Dialogue.	*Hist. Laus.*
41 (18) μυσταγωγηθεὶς τὴν τοῦ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίαν	133 ἀφ' οὗ ἐμυσταγωγήθην καὶ ἀνεγεννήθην
σφριγώσης τῆς νεότητος	16 σφριγώσης ἔτι τῆς ἡλικίας
	119 ὡς νέῳ καὶ σφριγῶντι τὴν ἡλικίαν
εἰ καὶ σῶον ἦν τὸ φρονοῦν	117 ἐλευθερωθεὶς τὸ φρονοῦν
	153 διέφθαρτο αὐτοῦ τὸ φρονοῦν
52 (22) συγκροτήσας τὸ ἱερατεῖον	165 συνεκρότησε τὸ ἱερατεῖον
97 (37) θεασάμενοι . . . τὴν Ἰωάννου εὐχάριστον φιλοσοφίαν ἀδομένην	141 ἵνα δείξω αὐτοῖς τὴν εὐχάριστόν σου φιλοσοφίαν
99 (38) παρέστη αὐτῷ ὁ τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου μάρτυς, Βασιλίσκος ὄνομα αὐτῷ, . . . φήσας, Θάρσει, ἀδελφὲ Ἰωάννη· αὔριον γὰρ ἅμα ἐσόμεθα	154 καὶ παραστὰς αὐτῇ ὁ μάρτυς ὁ ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, Κόλλουθος ὀνόματι, λέγει αὐτῇ· Σήμερον μέλλεις ὁδεύειν πρὸς τὸν δεσπότην καὶ ὁρᾶν πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους
105 (40) τῶν λοιπῶν ἀρετῶν τῶν εἰς εὐσέβειαν συντεινουσῶν	83 τὰ εἰς ἡδονὴν συντείνοντα
	116 θαυμαστὰ πράγματα τὰ συντείνοντα εἰς ἀπάθειαν
116 (44) γυναικοϊέρακες	161 γυναικοϊέρακες

These are the only references in Sophocles' Lexicon to γυναικοϊέραξ (a lustful man) = γυναικομανής: nor does Dindorf's ed. of Stephanus' Thesaurus give any other.

144 (54), 185 (68) οἱ ἐπὶ πλεῖστον φαῦλοι	7 οἱ ἐπὶ πλεῖστον φαῦλοι
150 (56) τὸ δὴ λεγόμενον	23, 82, 98 (introducing a proverb)
158 (58) φαντασίαι τε νυκτεριναί	75 πρὸς τὰς φαντασίας τὰς νυκτερινάς
ὀκταμηνιαίῳ χρόνῳ ἐπὶ κλίνης ἐταριχεύετο	119 Θεὸς . . . ἐξαμηνιαίῳ χρόνῳ ταριχεύσας αὐτοῦ τὸ σαρκίον
162 (60) (of Olympias) ὅσην δὲ περιουσίαν χρημάτων ἢ κτημάτων τοῖς δεομένοις διένειμεν, οὐκ ἐμὸν τὸ λέγειν, ἀλλὰ τῶν εὖ παθόντων	146 (of Melania) αὕτη μὲν ὅσην ὕλην ἀνήλωσεν ἐν τῷ θείῳ ζήλῳ καθάπερ πυρὶ φλέξασα, οὐκ ἐμὸν τὸ διηγήσασθαι ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν τὴν Περσίδα οἰκούντων
223 (81) ὁ μισόκαλος δαίμων	9 ὁ μισόκαλος δαίμων

As we have said, Reitzenstein holds that community of authorship is established by resemblances of language and thought in the two books, and he signalizes in his notes a number of the parallels that in his eyes justify this conclusion. Two or three of his examples are among those that I had already indicated, as above; the others follow:

Dialogue.	*Hist. Laus.*
3 (5) πόθεν παραγέγονας καὶ περὶ ὧν ποθοῦμεν μαθεῖν	102 πόθεν εἶ, καὶ τί παραγέγονας;
7 (7) πόθεν σε νῦν παραγενόμενον ἔχομεν τέως;	
8 (7) οἶμαι γάρ σε τῆς συνόδου εἶναι Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως	στοχάζομαι γάρ σε τῆς συνοδίας εἶναι τῆς Εὐαγρίου
24 (13) μικροῦ δὲ παριππάσαντος χρόνου	23 χρόνου δὲ παριππεύσαντος
Reitzenstein says: Read παριππεύσαντος: the forms appear to be collateral.	
65 (27) εἰς τὴν τοῦ δράματος ὑπηρεσίαν	23 σοφίζεται δρᾶμα τοιοῦτον
146 (54) τὸ κατὰ Ἀκάκιον δρᾶμα	42 ἀστοχήσας ὁ δαίμων τοῦ δράματος τούτου
223 (81) τοῦ διαβόλου εἶναι τὸ δρᾶμα	110 εἶπω ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ δράματος
	112 κατὰ τὸ πρῶτον δρᾶμα
	162 ἐγνώσθη τὸ δρᾶμα
112 (43) διδασκαλία πνευματική	16 διδασκαλία πνευματική
166 (61) λέγεται δὲ ὅτι καὶ αἰδουμένῳ ἐῴκει τῆς αἰσθητῆς μεταλαμβάνων τροφῆς	16 αἰδοῦμαι μεταλαμβάνων ἀλόγου τροφῆς

I am quite prepared to find that a more extensive knowledge than I possess of Byzantine Greek and of the literature of the period would shew that some of these expressions have no significance as indications of identity of authorship; I merely state this part of the case as it presents itself to me, and leave it to those who are more competent to pass judgement.

(3) *Employment of biblical texts.*

For my own part, I attach greater weight to the following three cases of resemblance in the employment of biblical texts:

Dialogue.	*Hist. Laus.*
104 (40) ἦλθε γὰρ Ἰωάννης μήτε ἐσθίων μήτε πίνων, ἐν ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης· καὶ λέγουσι· δαιμόνιον ἔχει	13 ἦλθε Ἰωάννης ἐν ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης, μήτε ἐσθίων μήτε πίνων . . . καὶ λέγουσι· δαιμόνιον ἔχει

Cf. Mt. xi 18 ἦλθε γὰρ Ἰωάννης μήτε ἐσθίων μήτε πίνων, καὶ λέγουσιν· δαιμόνιον ἔχει. Mt. xxi 32 ἦλθε γὰρ Ἰωάννης πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης, καὶ οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ.

I have been able to find no authority of any biblical MS for the insertion in Mt. xi 18 of the clause from xxi 32, nor any instance of the combination outside the two passages just cited.

Dialogue.	*Hist. Laus.*
154 (57) κἂν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ὀνειδίζωσι τοὺς μαθητάς, λέγοντες· Ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν μετὰ τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει	13 καὶ πάλιν τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἐπεμβαίνοντες ὀνειδισμοῖς ἔλεγον· Ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει

Cf. Mk. ii 16 . . . ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει (ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν).

The last three words do not belong to the text and are an insertion from the parallel passage in Mt. ix 11; they are, however, added in a considerable number of MSS and are a well attested reading. But the only MS that places them at the beginning of the sentence is the Old Latin Colbertinus (c); and it is doubtful whether a translation can be taken in a mere matter of order as representing a Greek reading. Thus the two passages cited agree in a form of the text very likely not found elsewhere, and certainly of extreme rarity. When to this agreement is added the further agreement that in both cases the text is introduced by a preface containing the root of ὀνειδίζειν, not found in the Gospel context in any of the parallel passages, the resemblances become very striking.

Dialogue.	*Hist. Laus.*
202 (74) Cites 1 Jn. ii 18 παιδία, ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστίν, and goes on εἰ δὲ πρὸ τετρακοσίων ἐτῶν εἴρηται παρὰ τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἐσχάτη κτλ.	147 παιδία, γέγραπται πρὸ τετρακοσίων ἐτῶν ὅτι ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστίν.

Here again it looks as if the reference '400 years ago' in citing this text is one of those mannerisms or tricks that betray personality and point to unity of authorship.

(4) *Descriptions of persons.*

We pass to another class of evidence. The author of the Dialogue and the author of the Lausiac History came into personal contact with the same individuals, and it will be to our purpose to see what they tell us of some of them—of Isidore the hospitaller of Alexandria, of Ammonius the Tall, and of Olympias the deaconess of Constantinople.

Isidore the hospitaller:

Dialogue.	*Hist. Laus.*
50 (22) Ἰσίδωρός τις . . . ὃν ἴσασι Ῥωμαίων οἱ πλεῖστοι ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἕνεκεν εἰσβαλόντα εἰς αὐτήν, ξενοδόχον Ἀλεξανδρείας ὄντα . . .	15 . . . Ἰσιδώρῳ τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ ξενοδόχῳ ὄντι τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐκκλησίας.
54 (23) χωρεῖ ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος τὸ τῆς Νιτρίας πρὸς τὸ τάγμα τῶν μοναχῶν, ἔνθα τὰς τῆς νεότητος ἐσχήκει διατριβάς· καὶ καθίσας ἐν τῷ κελλίῳ αὐτοῦ . . .	16 οὗτος γνώριμος ὢν τῇ κατὰ Ῥώμην συγκλήτῳ πάσῃ καὶ ταῖς γυναιξὶ τῶν μεγιστάνων 15 ὃς τὰ μὲν πρῶτα τῆς νεότητος ἆθλα ἐλέγετο ἠνυκέναι ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· οὗ καὶ τὴν κέλλαν ἐθεασάμην ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῆς Νιτρίας

Ammonius the Tall:

Dialogue.	*Hist. Laus.*
159 (59) λέγεται δὲ τὸ μνῆμα τοῦ μονάζοντος Ἀμμωνίου νόσους τὰς περὶ ῥῖγος ἐλαύνειν. τέθαπται δὲ ἐν τῷ μαρτυρίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων πέραν θαλάσσης	34 θάπτεται ἐν τῷ μαρτυρίῳ τῷ λεγομένῳ Ῥουφινιαναῖς. οὗ τὸ μνῆμα λέγεται θεραπεύειν πάντας τοὺς ῥιγιζομένους.

The Martyrium of the Apostles across the Bosphorus was the Rufinian.

The piece from *Hist. Laus.* is critically not quite certain; but I have little doubt myself of its genuineness (see my edition p. 34, and note 22, p. 191). The passage in the Dialogue is strong confirmation of its authenticity.

Olympias:

Dialogue.	*Hist. Laus.*
150 (56) . . . νύμφην ποτὲ γενομένην Νεβριδίου τοῦ ἀπὸ ἐπάρχων . . .	150 νύμφη δὲ πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας Νεβριδίου τοῦ ἀπὸ ἐπάρχων τῆς πόλεως, γυνὴ δὲ οὐδενός·
162 (60) . . . οὐδὲ εἴκοσι μῆνας δουλεῦσαι τῇ τῆς σαρκὸς ἡδονῇ . . . λέγεται δὲ παρθένος ὑπάρχειν	λέγεται γὰρ κεκοιμῆσθαι παρθένος.

It has to be considered whether the similarity of the information given concerning these three personages can be accounted for by the supposition that the author of the Dialogue and the author of the Lausiac History each had known them and their surroundings: or whether it is of such a kind as to point to identity of authorship.

(5) *General Experiences.*

It may be inferred from the following piece that the author of the Dialogue had himself been in Egypt, and had seen the temples: καὶ γὰρ καὶ οἱ Αἰγυπτίων ναοὶ μέγιστοι ὄντες, καὶ κάλλει λίθων κομπάζοντες, πιθήκους ἔχουσιν ἔνδον καὶ ἴβεις καὶ κύνας ἀντὶ θεῶν (39 (18)).

Further, it is evident from the whole tenor of the book that he was one of the innermost circle of adherents of St John Chrysostom during the controversies of his last years, and that he was one of those who went to Rome in his behalf. The author of the Lausiac History says the same of himself (pp. 105, 157).

The author of the Dialogue claims to have conversed—ὡς αὐτὸς ἡμῖν

διηγήσατο, a favourite phrase in the Lausiac History (pp. 19, 49, 117, 121, 133) for introducing the author's reminiscences—with one Hierax, an aged monk expelled from Nitria by Theophilus, who had previously dwelt in the Desert of Porphyritis (or Calamus) by the Red Sea, and had there been a disciple of St Anthony (160 (59)). And the author of the Lausiac History mentions Hierax as one of those from whom he had heard the story of Paul the Simple and Anthony, who dwelt by the Red Sea, near the Desert of Porphyritis (p. 69).

(6) *Familiarity with the writings of Evagrius.*

This point of resemblance we owe to Dr Reitzenstein. He shews that both works contain citations from the writings of Evagrius. In *Hist. Laus.* there are two such citations: one was signalized by me on p. 123; and Reitzenstein recognized line 5 on p. 126, γνῶσις φυσικὴ ἣν διαδέχεται θεολογία καὶ ἡ ἐσχάτη μακαριότης, as verbally taken from the Πρακτικός of Evagrius. He points out also that the expression ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀληθείας, meaning Christ (p. 150, l. 5), is found also in Evagrius (*Cent.* ii 22).[1] As for the Dialogue, Reitzenstein confronts the words ἀπὸ τῆς λογικῆς ἀρξάμενος σύριγγος τῆς τῶν προβάτων δοκιμασίας, ὀλιγάκις δὲ καταχρώμενος καὶ τῇ ἐλεγκτικῇ βακτηρίᾳ (45 (20)), with the following from Evagrius: γινώσκω σε ὅτι πολλῶν προβάτων εἶ ποιμὴν καὶ εὕρηκας βόσκημα ποιμαίνειν, ὀλίγον αὐτῶν διὰ ῥάβδου, τὸ δὲ πολὺ διὰ συριγμοῦ: and πῶς τὰ πρόβατά σου ποιμαίνεις, ὀλίγον διὰ ῥάβδου καὶ τὸ πολὺ διὰ συριγμοῦ.[2]

The author of the Lausiac History was a close disciple of Evagrius, living with him for several years in the Desert of the Cells; it is striking to find the author of the Dialogue also citing Evagrius.

Such is the evidence, so far as it is known to me, on which the question of community of authorship for the Dialogue and the Lausiac History has to be judged. It is a case of many converging lines of evidence; and taken all together it is very strong. In my judgement the conclusion is justified that the two books are the handiwork of one and the same author.

We have now to consider the second question:

B. Whether the author was Palladius of Helenopolis.

(1) It will be best to begin by ascertaining what is known of Palladius of Helenopolis apart from the Lausiac History. Our principal source of information is the Dialogue, which speaks of him in the third person. The earliest mention of him is that he took part as bishop of Helenopolis in a synod at Constantinople, held in the late summer of 400, and

[1] Frankenberg, *Evagrius Ponticus*, p. 145 (Abhandlungen der k. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen: Berlin, 1912).

[2] From Evagrius' Letters published for the first time by Frankenberg, 1912, nos. 9 and 24 (pp. 573, 581): the Greek is Frankenberg's attempted retranslation from the Syriac, the original not being extant. Consequently it is quite likely that *βακτηρία*, not *ῥάβδος*, was the word used by Evagrius.

was one of three commissioners deputed to investigate a case at Ephesus (*Dial.* 131 (49)). In the following year he was one of those chosen by St John Chrysostom to accompany him on a visitation at Ephesus (134 (50)). He was one of the bishops who in 405 went to Rome to urge St John's cause with Innocent (26 (13)). In 406 he returned to Greece along with others bearing letters from the Pope and the Emperor, to the effect that an ecumenical Council should be convened; but on landing they were arrested and cast into prison at Athyra, a fortress in Thrace (32 (15)), and were afterwards sent into exile in distant places, Palladius to Syene in Upper Egypt, the modern Assouan, at the First Cataract (194 (71)).

Outside the Dialogue I find only three references to Palladius of Helenopolis: (1) The account of the Synod of the Oak in 403, contained in cod. lix of Photius' 'Bibliotheca', mentions Palladius of Helenopolis as one of the group of St John's friends accused of Origenism. (2) Sozomen (viii 26) preserves the letter written by Innocent in 405 to the clergy of Constantinople, wherein Palladius is mentioned as one of the Eastern bishops who had come to Rome bringing information of what was happening in the case of St John: this confirms the statement of the Dialogue. (3) Socrates (vii 36), in a list of bishops translated from one see to another, names Palladius, 'from Helenopolis to Aspouna'; this doubtless was part of the pacification of the troubles arising out of the case of St John, and may be placed about the year 417.

Thus what is known of Palladius of Helenopolis from sources other than the Lausiac History may be summed up as follows: he was bishop of Helenopolis in 400; he took part as a foremost supporter of St John Chrysostom in the struggles of 400–405; he went to Rome in 405; he returned to Greece and was exiled to Syene (Assouan) in 406; and he was translated from his see of Helenopolis in Bithynia to that of Aspouna in Galatia, probably about 417.

(2) Let us confront with this what the author of the Lausiac History has to say of himself. In the Prologue (p. 10 of my edition) he says he is going to set forth in a narrative form the stories of the fathers whom he had seen, or of whom he had heard, in the Egyptian desert and Libya and the Thebaid and Syene; also in Mesopotamia and Palestine and Syria, and in the parts of the West, Rome and Campania and the neighbourhood. It is at once evident how well this fits in with what is known of Palladius of Helenopolis.

When we pass to the author's more detailed statements as to his career, we find that the outstanding facts may be scheduled as follows:—

He made a sojourn in Egypt of twelve years; this began in 388 and ended in 400, or more probably in 399. The evidence will be recited just now.

His adventures on leaving Egypt are learned from c. xxxv (p. 105): he went first to Palestine and then to Bithynia, where he was ordained bishop; he took part in the controversy about St John Chrysostom, being at one time hidden for eleven months in a gloomy cell.[1] Finally, in c. lxi, p. 157, the author says that he was one of those that went to Rome on St John's account. There is nothing in the body of the book about Syene, but we have seen that in the Prologue Syene is mentioned as one of the places where the author had been.

To sum up: If the author of the Lausiac History left Egypt in 399, or even early in 400, and betook himself to Palestine and thence to Bithynia, there was ample time for him to be consecrated bishop before the synod in the summer of 400, at which Palladius assisted as bishop of Helenopolis. The other points enumerated tally exactly with the principal features of the career of Palladius: Helenopolis was a bishopric in Bithynia, and the author says that it was in Bithynia that he became bishop; the sufferings in behalf of St John, and the visits to Rome and to Syene are points in common. That two lives should thus agree in experiences so remarkable would be a most extraordinary coincidence.

(3) We shall now take the Dialogue and examine the grounds it may afford for supposing that its author was Palladius of Helenopolis.

The narrative in this work is thrown into the form of a dialogue between an Eastern bishop and a deacon of the Roman Church named Theodore. The bishop is the principal speaker; he is represented as having been one of St John's personal friends and adherents, and as having gone through all the long struggle in his behalf. Neither his name is mentioned, nor the name of his see, but it was a diocese in the East. The scene of the Dialogue is Rome; the time shortly after St John's death, before the news had definitely reached Rome, i. e. 407 or early in 408. Of course it does not follow that the Dialogue was written at that date. The bishop is represented as being quite an old man, and as having come to Rome for the first time. Neither circumstance could be true of Palladius of Helenopolis: for in 407 he was not yet 45 years of age; he had been in Rome in 405 on St John's business; and in 407–408 he was in exile at Syene in Upper Egypt. Moreover Palladius of Helenopolis is frequently throughout the Dialogue spoken of in the third person, as being a different man from the bishop who tells the story. Thus it is quite clear that the author did not intend his bishop to be Palladius of Helenopolis; but surely it by no means follows that—as Bigot and Tillemont and many

[1] There can be no doubt that Ep. cxiii among St Chrysostom's Letters, Παλλαδίῳ ἐπισκόπῳ, was to our Palladius. It says λανθάνοντες καὶ κρυπτόμενοι πλείονα σχολὴν ἔχετε νῦν προσκαρτερεῖν ταῖς εὐχαῖς. This suggests the situation depicted in the above passage of the Lausiac History.

after them have argued—therefore Palladius of Helenopolis was not the author. The writers of dialogues do not always introduce themselves among the interlocutors. Tillemont's contention that such a literary device would be unworthy of a bishop (*Mémoires* xi 643) is plainly inadmissible. There is no real difficulty of any kind presented by the theory that Palladius of Helenopolis at any date between St John's death (407) and his own (*c.* 425) may have written the Dialogue and introduced a fictitious 'bishop' in place of himself as the chief spokesman: there is no difficulty in supposing he may have written it at Syene and placed the scene at Rome to give actuality to the story. Nor should his speaking of himself in the third person cause any difficulty. The ground is thus clear for an examination of the evidence.

Palladius of Helenopolis could very well have written the Dialogue. What the 'bishop' describes as his own experiences are known to have been the experiences of Palladius: Palladius played in St John's affairs just the part that the 'bishop' claims to have played—he was one of the forty bishops who adhered to St John, as the 'bishop' claims to have been. The writer of the Dialogue appears to have been very well informed concerning Palladius and his doings. On pp. 198, 199 (72) two trivial stories connected with Palladius are related, under cover of what seems to be a transparent literary device—*ὡς ὁ ἐλθὼν διηγήσατο συστρατιώτης*: while on p. 134 ff (50) is given a minute and circumstantial account of the mission to Ephesus in 401, on which St John was accompanied by only three bishops—one being Palladius of Helenopolis.

(4) We must next turn to the external evidence. The tradition that the Dialogue was by Palladius goes back to the seventh century, being witnessed to by Theodore, bishop of Trimithus in Cyprus, *c.* 680. He writes in his Life of Chrysostom: *Διαλέγεται περὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ τῶν συμβεβηκότων τούτων πάντων, μετὰ Θεοδώρου διακόνου τῆς μεγάλης Ῥώμης, ἀνήρ τις τίμιος Παλλάδιος τοὔνομα· οὗτος, πρῶτον μὲν τὴν ἔρημον οἰκήσας ἐπὶ ἱκανοὺς χρόνους κατηξιώθη τῆς ἐπισκόπης ἐν Βιθυνίᾳ. οὗτος συγγράφεται καὶ ἀρετὰς πολλῶν πατέρων· ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς κοινωνικὸς ὢν Ἰωάννου, κατάκλειστος γέγονεν ἐνδεκαμήνεον χρόνον ἐν οἰκίσκῳ ζοφερῷ* (§ 2, *P. G.* xlvii, col. lv).

These details are taken from *Hist. Laus.* c. xxxv (p. 105). In this passage the two books are explicitly assigned to a single author, named Palladius, a bishop; and though it is not explicitly said that he was Palladius of Helenopolis, still it cannot with any show of reason be maintained that there was another Palladius who became bishop of a see in Bithynia about 400 and suffered in the cause of St John. Thus the tradition that the two books were composed by Palladius of Helenopolis goes back certainly to the seventh century. The

tradition that the Dialogue was composed by 'Palladius the bishop' is attested also by Photius *Bibliotheca* cod. xcvi.

The evidence of Socrates has to be considered. His account of the Monks of Egypt is given in bk. iv, c. xxiii; it ends with the following words: *εἰ δέ τις βούλοιτο τὰ περὶ αὐτῶν μανθάνειν, ὧν τε ἐποίησαν, ὧν τε ἔπραξαν, καὶ ὧν πρὸς ὠφέλειαν τῶν ἀκουσάντων ἐφθέγξαντο, ὅπως τε αὐτοῖς τὰ θηρία ὑπήκουον, πεπόνηται Παλλαδίῳ τῷ μοναχῷ ἴδιον μονοβίβλιον· ὃς Εὐαγρίου μὲν ἦν μαθητής· πάντα δὲ ἀκριβῶς περὶ αὐτῶν διεξῆλθεν· ἐν ᾧ καὶ γυναικῶν ἐφάμιλλον τοῖς προειρημένοις ἀνδράσιν ἐπανελομένων βίον μνήμην πεποίηται.* This is so applicable to the Lausiac History, setting forth its characteristic features, and especially the prominence it gives to holy women, that no question could have arisen as to the book referred to by Socrates being the Lausiac History, were it not that in the preceding account of the monks, who all figure in the Lausiac History, no use was made of that work, Socrates evidently getting his information from other sources. This apparent anomaly has so much impressed some modern critics, that they cannot think Socrates refers to our Lausiac History. Reitzenstein, for instance, surmises that a disciple of Evagrius named Palladius may have formed the great collection of Apophthegmata (*op. cit.* p. 5), and that this was the book referred to by Socrates. I do not think he will press this tentative suggestion now, in face of the body of evidence in support of Palladius' authorship of the Lausiac History.

(5) I have reserved till the end the question of the evidence of the MSS, to make it clear that the claim of Palladius is not based primarily upon this.

In the Greek MSS and the Versions the Lausiac History is attributed to

Palladius bishop of Helenopolis
Palladius bishop of Aspouna
Palladius bishop of Cappadocia
Palladius the bishop
Palladius the monk, disciple of Evagrius
Palladius
Heracleides bishop of Cappadocia
Heracleides the disciple of Anthony
Heracleides the hermit, or the Alexandrine
Heraclius the bishop
Hieronymus (only one MS)
In some of the authorities the work is without name.

The evidence of the MSS is recited in full in my edition, ii pp. 3, 6, 8, 9, 170; summarized pp. 182–183.

Reitzenstein's theory as to the twofold attribution to Palladius and Heracleides is that they were the two most prominent figures fulfilling the general conditions of the case—monks in Nitria, then bishops and

foremost supporters of St John and sufferers in his cause—so that they were the two most obvious persons on whom to father the Lausiac History: thus they cancel one another and leave the work anonymous (*op. cit.* p. 4). But neither historically nor textually are their claims on the same footing. Not one of the statements set forth above concerning Heracleides can be true of the friend of St John, whom he made bishop of Ephesus in 401; nor are the personal statements of the author of the Lausiac History concerning himself true of Heracleides, as they are of Palladius. On p. 183 of my book I have shewn that the textual attestation of Heracleides' name is weak, and not such as to indicate a firm tradition.[1]

But in regard to Palladius it is quite otherwise. If we revert to the stemma given in the previous article (p. 28) we shall see that the two principal branches of the textual tradition are those there designated $\beta\lambda$ and γ. All the representatives of γ, viz. W P T syr_1, agree in naming as author Palladius, bishop of Helenopolis[2]; and the principal copy of syr_1, the sixth-seventh century 'Addit. MS 12173' in the British Museum, presents the following title: 'Histories of the Egyptian Fathers, composed by Palladius, bishop of Helenopolis, the disciple of Evagrius, at the request of Lausus.' This, dating from about the year 600, is the earliest extant explicit assertion of the claim of Palladius of Helenopolis. When we turn to the other branch of the textual tradition, $\beta\lambda$, we find that lat_1, the representative of λ, gives us 'Palladius the bishop', but without name of see, and 'Palladius the monk, disciple of Evagrius'. The representatives of β, the great class of B MSS, are so divergent in their testimony to the authorship that no conclusion can be drawn in regard to their common ancestor β; only it is to be noted that in some B MSS Palladius bishop of Helenopolis is found, and in others Palladius bishop of Aspouna, his other see.

[1] A suggestion by M. Alfaric in *Les Écritures Manichéennes*, II, 114, to account for the attribution to Heracleides, perhaps deserves mention. He supposes that Heracleides the disciple of Mani and commentator of his writings, named with Hierakas in the form of abjuration of Manichaeism, was identical with the monk Heracleides, a disciple of Anthony, seen by Rufinus about 375, and that he was the author of a more ancient work on the monks, used by Palladius as basis of the Lausiac History: 'L'étude du texte semble indiquer que Pallade exploite un travail plus ancien. Elle permet donc d'en atribuer la paternité première à Héraclide': hence the attribution to him in certain texts.

Here we are evidently in the realm of fine-spun hypothesis. I do not propose to discuss its intrinsic likelihood or reasonableness. For the textual critic it will be enough to examine the character of the attestations of Heracleides' name, as set forth on p. 183 of my book, in order to be satisfied that it would have been a textual impossibility for the original name to have filtered down in the manner suggested through the great mass of sources of the text.

[2] P names also 'Palladius bishop of Cappadocia', but this was introduced from an extraneous source.

The case of the Dialogue is much more simple: for only a single MS exists, and it is of eleventh century. Both in title and explicit it attributes the Dialogue to Palladius of Helenopolis: Διάλογος ἱστορικὸς Παλλαδίου ἐπισκόπου Ἑλενουπόλεως γενόμενος πρὸς Θεόδωρον διάκονον Ῥώμης περὶ βίου καὶ πολιτείας τοῦ μακαρίου Ἰωάννου ἐπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου. Opposite Ἑλενουπόλεως in the margin is written ἐν ἄλλοις γράφεται Ἀσπόνων, showing that other MSS also attributed the work to Palladius, who was translated from Helenopolis to Aspouna: similarly MSS of the *Historia Lausiaca* exist in which Palladius is styled bishop of Aspouna.

The title and explicit of the Florence MS contain the words τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου, which cannot have stood in the original, the epithet not having come into vogue as an agnomen of St John until a later period; but the insertion would be so natural that it does not discredit the rest.

I trust that what has here been written will remove Dr Reitzenstein's scruples as to accepting Palladius of Helenopolis as the author of the two books, and will moreover prevent the critics from being carried away by Reitzenstein's mere name. But already Dr W. Bousset, in a most thorough survey of Reitzenstein's book, has expressed his adherence to Palladius of Helenopolis as author of the Lausiac History.[1] And, indeed, the author's remark concerning himself, that, about 400, he was made bishop in Bithynia, is practically tantamount to an explicit statement that he was Palladius of Helenopolis: for the bishops in Bithynia were few; and it cannot be imagined that in any other of them should the series of statements made about his own career by the author of the Lausiac History have found verification, as it did in the person of Palladius.

Similarly in the case of the Dialogue: the evidence, both internal and external, supports the early and only tradition as to authorship. The historical value of the document is probably not thereby intrinsically enhanced, for the writer is, in any case, well informed and worthy of credit; but it certainly is a satisfaction to know that the chief source of information on St Chrysostom is the work of the historical personage Palladius, whose career is well known, whose knowledge of the saint was so intimate, and whose devotion to him was proved by the persecutions unflinchingly endured in his cause.

We may claim to have shewn by separate investigations that each of the two works we have been considering was written by Palladius of Helenopolis. This conclusion in respect to either of them gains greatly in strength from the independent proof that both proceed from one and the same writer. It will be well to carry the matter a stage further, and to examine the character of Palladius as an author, especially in the Lausiac History. The particular question is the measure of

[1] *Göttinger Nachrichten*, 1917, pp. 194, 199.

credence to be given to the numerous touches of personal reminiscence and the statements concerning himself that abound in the Lausiac History.

Those scholars, from Tillemont onwards, who have had to deal with the writings and career of Palladius have considered how these statements are to be fitted into the known framework of his life, and have produced schemes, agreeing in general contour, but differing in points of detail, setting forth the chronology of his life. But Reitzenstein and Bousset pronounce this to be mere futility and misplaced ingenuity—a taking seriously what in reality was only a literary device to give life and actuality to the story (Reitzenstein, p. 8; Bousset, p. 197): indeed Bousset declares fact and invention to be so mixed up that it is wellnigh impossible to separate them, and that the reconstruction of Palladius' life has to be made from those statements alone that are found outside the Lausiac History (p. 204).

It is evident that such a view of the many personal traits found in the Lausiac History, if true, gravely compromises the character of the book as a first-hand account of Christian monachism at the close of the fourth century, and weakens its authority as an historical source. No apology therefore is needed for a re-examination of the evidence.

The two critics of course accept the general statement that Palladius did live as a monk in Nitria and Cellia, and was a disciple of Evagrius; but they are sceptical concerning what he relates concerning his movements in those places. Let us test what he says by bringing together his various statements concerning his stay in Egypt.

(1) The starting-point is that he came to Alexandria in the year 388 (c. i p. 15).[1] He tells us that he spent two or three years in the neighbourhood of Alexandria (cc. ii, vii, pp. 16, 24), a year in Nitria (c. vii, p. 25), and nine years in the desert of Cellia with Macarius and Evagrius (c. xviii, p. 47). This gives in all twelve to thirteen years, and takes us to 400 or 401 for the close of Palladius' sojourn in Egypt. The earlier date, 400, must be taken, because he was bishop by the middle of that year.

(2) Palladius says that on his first coming to Alexandria he met Isidore the hospitaller, who then was seventy years of age and lived for fifteen years more. Fifteen years from 388 would give 403 as the date of Isidore's death. Now it was in 402 that Isidore along with the Four Tall Brothers fled from Theophilus of Alexandria to St John

[1] There is some textual uncertainty about the clause, which is absent from the MSS W P T. In Appendix V ii of my book (ii 237–240) there will be found a minute technical examination of the textual evidence, as the result of which the clause is shown to be genuine. It is accepted as such by Reitzenstein, who adds the common-sense argument that such a clause, merely fixing a date, might easily have been omitted by a scribe, as of no interest; but would not have been inserted by any other than the author himself (*op. cit.* p. 7).

Chrysostom (Soz. viii 13), and this is the last that is heard of him; so that, considering his great age, 403 is a probable date of his death. The *Dialogus* affords confirmation of the Lausiac History, saying that in 398–399, when Theophilus began to persecute him, Isidore was eighty (50 (22)); if so, he would have been seventy in 388.

(3) There is some textual uncertainty as to whether Palladius says that he was present at the death of Evagrius (p. 122, l. 15); the context makes it probable that he was. Evagrius died at the Epiphany in 399 or 400.

(4) In the account of the visit to John of Lycopolis (c. xxxv) Palladius tells us that three years afterwards he grew ill and went to Alexandria to be treated by the physicians, who (doubtless after a period of treatment) advised him to go to Palestine. John of Lycopolis died shortly after Theodosius' victory over Eugenius, and therefore in the winter of 394–395; if Palladius' visit was made a short time before his death, 398 or 399 would be the year pointed to for the end of his stay in Egypt. As John was seventy-eight years of age at the time—25 + 5 + 48 (p. 100, ll. 8, 9, and p. 105, l. 16)—it is not straining things to suppose that Palladius' visit took place a short time before his death.

(5) That his stay in Egypt lasted about ten years is indicated by the statement in c. iv, that he saw Didymus the Blind on four occasions, visiting him at intervals during a period of ten years. It is known from other sources that Didymus was living at Alexandria at the time.

(6) In the Prologue (p. 9) Palladius says that at the date of writing he was in the thirty-third year of his monastic life and the twentieth of his episcopate. As he was consecrated in 400 the date of writing was 419–420, and consequently the date of his becoming a monk was 386 or 387.

These different chronological data do not tally with precise arithmetical exactitude; but they do hold together in a general agreement that is sufficiently remarkable when it is remembered that they are isolated statements picked out from many different places in the Lausiac History, and related to quite independent sets of facts. It has to be remembered, too, that the book was written twenty years after Palladius left Egypt, and thirty years after he first went there. After such a lapse of time minute accuracy is not to be looked for in such autobiographical reckonings of time. In those days, when there were no almanacks or diaries, it was much more difficult than it now is to keep an accurate count of the years. It would be pedantic unduly to criticize these round numbers, recorded twenty years and more after the events. Elsewhere[1] I have gone with care into all the chronological data, with the result that the period 388 to 399 emerges as the date of Palladius' stay in Egypt.

[1] *Lausiac History of Palladius* i 179 ff, 293 ff, ii 237 ff.

Against this stands one difficulty: a letter of St Epiphanius to John bishop of Jerusalem, written in 393 or 394 (51 inter Epp. Hieronymi), has been held to imply that one Palladius, a Galatian and Origenist, was at Jerusalem at the time. Various suggestions have been made:

(1) That of Bousset: that the statement is correct, and shews that no credence is to be given to Palladius' autobiographical notes (*op. cit.* p. 204).

But the series of agreements just set forth cannot be swept away in this manner; it cannot be imagined that notes of time arbitrarily interjected should hang together as these do.

(2) That of Preuschen: that Palladius' sojourn in Egypt should be placed earlier so as to make it fall before 393 (*Palladius und Rufinus* 243).

This solution may have been allowable at the time, while the textual evidence for the clause asserting that Palladius came to Egypt in 388 was open to doubt; but this is no more the case (see note, p. 151 above).

(3) That of Tillemont: that a second Palladius is to be postulated.

The name Palladius was common enough; but a second Galatian Palladius, an Origenist, is an unlikely hypothesis.

I myself made various suggestions (*Lausiac History* i 296, ii 242–243); but really all these suggestions are unnecessary. What Epiphanius says is: 'Beware of Palladius, though he once was a friend of mine, for he has gone in for Origen and his heresies, and he may mislead your people.'[1] He does not say that Palladius is in Jerusalem, or coming to Jerusalem. He simply says 'Beware', in case he should turn up. He may have heard a rumour that he was likely to come. That would be quite enough to explain the warning.

It may be thought that this is squeezing the item of evidence into line with the rest. But it is by such adjustments that general chronology is constructed. Unresolved difficulties beset chronology at every turn.[2] The chronology of those times is a series of nicely balanced combinations, against most of which there is some outstanding difficulty. Any one who has had occasion to scratch beneath the surface of the received chronology knows how it teems with recalcitrant facts, and that as a general scheme it is in great measure a balance of probabilities.

So much for Palladius' principal stay in Egypt. In other places he makes mention of other periods passed with various monks in divers places. They may be scheduled thus:

c. xxxvi—1 year with Posidonius in Bethlehem (p. 107, l. 1)

c. xliv—3 years with Innocent on the Mount of Olives (p. 131, l. 3)

c. xlv—'a long time' with Philoromus in Galatia (p. 132, l. 16)

[1] 'Palladium vero Galatam, qui quondam nobis carus fuit et nunc misericordia Dei indiget, cave, quia Origenis heresim praedicat et docet, ne forte aliquos de populo tibi credito ad perversitatem sui inducat erroris.'

[2] Rauschen's *Jahrbuch der Christl. Kirche unter dem Kaiser Theodosius dem Grossen* is a highly instructive study in the science of chronology.

c. xlviii—some time with Elpidius at Jericho (p. 142, l. 11)

c. lviii—4 years at Antinoë in the Thebaid (p. 151, l. 8)

There is no difficulty in finding time for all this. Palladius was sent into exile at Syene in 406; we know nothing further about him for ten years, until his translation to Aspouna about 417. He seems never to have returned to his bishopric of Helenopolis, another having been appointed to the see during his exile.[1] Thus there are ten years available; moreover it is quite possible that one of the above periods of monastic life may have taken place before he went to Alexandria in 388[2]; and another, if 399 be the date when he left Egypt, in the interval before he was made bishop. The four years at Antinoë are usually placed during his exile. Bousset objects that he was exiled to Syene, not to Antinoë; but we do not know how long he was kept at Syene—the sentence very likely was mitigated after a year or two—for Palladius speaks of himself at Antinoë as 'the exiled bishop' (c. lx, p. 154, l. 21).[3]

Another of Palladius' statements about himself is criticized, I think unreasonably, by Bousset. In the concluding chapter Palladius, as is agreed, speaks of himself under the thin disguise of a 'brother'. Among other things he says he had visited a hundred and six cities and had stayed at very many of them. Bousset ridicules this as impossible to harmonize with what Palladius records of his own career, and draws the inference that 'a great many of the apparently personal notices scattered throughout the Lausiac History are novelistic insertions not

[1] This seems to be the interpretation of Socrates' note (vii 36): Παλλάδιος ἀπὸ Ἑλενουπόλεως μετηνέχθη εἰς Ἄσπουνα. Ἀλέξανδρος ἀπὸ Ἑλενουπόλεως μετηνέχθη εἰς Ἀδριανούς.

[2] It will be noticed that 'the thirty-third year of monastic life' (above) would give 386 or 387 for the beginning of his life as a monk. *Pace* Reitzenstein, what is said in c. i is not incompatible with the notion that he may have lived as a monk for a couple of years in Syria or Palestine before coming to Alexandria. Passages might be adduced, e. g. from Cassian, showing that in passing from the monasticism of Syria to that of Egypt one was thought to be coming to the real thing.

[3] A good illustration of the lack of objectivity in the critical methods of the philologists as contrasted with those of the textual critics, is afforded by Bousset's treatment of this passage (*op. cit.* p. 202). It has been pointed out in the first of these articles that the structure of the second half of the book (c. xl to the end) is quite different in the group W P T syr$_1$ and in the group B lat$_1$, the difference consisting in a completely different order of the chapters, and in the absence from W P T syr$_1$ of a considerable amount of matter found in B lat$_1$. I shewed reasons for taking B lat$_1$ as preserving the authentic form of the book (*Lausiac History* ii p. xlviii), and this conclusion is fully accepted and acted on by Reitzenstein and Bousset. Only the latter wishes to adopt the order of W P T syr$_1$ just in the single case of detaching cc. lix, lx (the nuns of Antinoë) from c. lviii (the monks of Antinoë), and placing them after c. lxiii, a story about Athanasius, so that 'the exiled bishop' should be Athanasius! To the textual critic such procedure is intolerable; either the structure of W P T syr$_1$ is to be taken, or that of B lat$_1$.

to be taken seriously' (p. 204). But when we consider how widely Palladius had travelled, and, as he says, mostly on foot—*πεζῇ τῇ πορείᾳ πατήσας πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν Ῥωμαίων* (*Prologue* p. 11, l. 8)—that consequently his daily journeys could hardly have exceeded fifteen to twenty miles, and that he must each day have put up somewhere for the night; we shall see that a hundred and six is no extravagant or unlikely number of towns for him to have passed through: on the way from Alexandria to Syene he would have passed some fifty towns and villages, twenty of them being bishoprics.

To sum up this article: the following conclusions have been shewn to rest on good evidence: that the Lausiac History and the Dialogue are the work of a single author; that their author was Palladius of Helenopolis; and that the autobiographical notes scattered throughout the Lausiac History may not be dismissed as unworthy of credence.

E. CUTHBERT BUTLER.

NOTE.—After the foregoing had gone to press I received from Mr Herbert Moore a proof copy of the translation of the Dialogue that he has made for the S.P.C.K. series of Translations. He adduces a number of additional pieces of evidence in favour of the unity of authorship of the Dialogue and the Lausiac History. I signalize here three or four of the more striking.

1. Another instance of agreement in an apparently unique reading of a Scriptural text: Ecclus. viii 9 is thus cited in both Dialogue 101 (39) and Lausiac History 11: *μὴ ἀστοχήσῃς διηγήματος γερόντων, καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐτοὶ παρὰ τῶν πατέρων ἔμαθον.* In the Cambridge LXX and in Holmes and Parsons the text is as follows, without indication of any variant: *μὴ ἀστόχει διηγήματος γερόντων, καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἔμαθον παρὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτῶν.*

2. The word *συνασμενισμός* (Dial. 188 (69), Hist. Laus. 163) 'apparently does not occur elsewhere in Greek literature'.

3. Compare the words of Olympias (Dial. 164 (61)): *εἰ ἐβούλετό με ὁ ἐμὸς βασιλεὺς [Θεός] ἄρρενι συζῆν, οὐκ ἄν μου τὸν πρῶτον ἀφείλετο*, with those of Melania (Hist. Laus. 155): *εἰ γὰρ ἐβούλετο παιδοποιεῖν ἡμᾶς ὁ θεός, οὐκ ἄν μου ἐλάμβανεν ἄωρα τὰ τεχθέντα.*

4. In the same place Olympias is called *ἡ ἄνθρωπος*, just as Melania is called *ἡ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ θεοῦ* (Hist. Laus. 29). This use of *ἡ ἄνθρωπος* as a term of praise of a woman seems to be unusual.

5. Mr Moore has compiled a list of some seventy words that occur in the two books and may seem to form a cumulative argument of identity of authorship: they would have to be examined with much care before their probative force could be estimated. But there can be no question that his contribution to the solution of the problem is a very notable one.