

PALLADIANA.

III

THE LAUSIAC HISTORY: QUESTIONS OF HISTORY.

THIS Note is concerned only with questions of the historical and literary criticism of the Lausiatic History. But Dr R. Reitzenstein's book *Historia Monachorum und Historia Lausiaca* has a much wider scope. His general subject of study is the History of Religions during the first Christian centuries, and for him the two books are only an incidental episode in the greater investigation. He possesses a knowledge, since the death of W. Bousset probably unique, of not only the highways, but even more the by-ways among the remains of the religious, philosophical, and literary movements and currents of the second, third, and fourth Christian centuries: gnosticism in its many ramifications; pagan cults and mystery-religions; late philosophies, as neo-platonism, neo-pythagorism, neo-stoicism; astrology, magic, medicine; and in particular the whole range of the literature of early monasticism—Reitzenstein moves about in it all with perfect freedom, and possesses it with a mastery that enables him to illustrate curiously and in unexpected ways, from all these other sources, the records of early Christian monachism. His theory is, that out of this welter of religious movements and strivings arose the Christian monastic system, and that its vocabulary, its ideas and ideals, and its inspiration were in large measure taken over from the systems out of which it originated.

Here we find ourselves in the region of the science called Comparative History of Religion, a region beyond my ken. I shall touch on these higher questions only incidentally, if at all, and shall confine myself primarily to what is for me *terra firma*, viz. the Lausiatic History itself, as it is affected by Reitzenstein's criticism.

As said already, his attitude towards the Lausiatic History is quite different from that of the radical criticism prevalent among the scholars of a generation ago, such as Weingarten and Lucius, as described in Part I of my *Lausiatic History of Palladius*. Reitzenstein holds that the Lausiatic History, as it stands, is manifestly the work of a single author, one of the circle of disciples of Evagrius. That he was Palladius of Hetenopolis has, I trust, been established in the previous section. Though the book as we have it is, as a whole, by this author, Reitzenstein distinguishes in it two great sections, (a) roughly xxix to the end,

almost wholly the personal composition of the author, and (*b*) the first or Egyptian portion, made up out of earlier materials.

Reitzenstein's general thesis as to the genesis of all this literature was first formulated in the tract *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen* (1906). It may be summed up by saying that there existed a vast mass of little novelettes of the lives, mostly wondrous, and the sayings of famous men, of all sorts and conditions—philosophers, orators, generals, physicians; and in Christian circles, apostles, martyrs, monks—which constituted the popular literature of the time. These separate βίαι were soon brought together into collections according to subject-matter; and thus were formed various 'aretologia', or collections of anecdotes, wonders, and sayings of the various categories of heroes. Both types of remains of such early monastic literature are, according to Reitzenstein, to be found embedded in the Lausiatic History: the story of Sarapion Sindonita (xxxvii) is a good example of the separate novelette; the first, or Egyptian, half of the book had as its basis a collected 'aretologion' of the monks of the Nitrian and Scetic deserts.

Reitzenstein's method of investigation is as follows. His book ends with the dictum that on the history of the two words γνωστικός and πνευματικός depends in great measure the understanding of the evolution of Christianity in the earliest times (p. 241). Applying this test to the Lausiatic History he finds that the words γνώσις, γνωστικός, πνεῦμα, πνευματικός occur in the first four chapters, but not again until c. xxxii. This fact he looks on as representing such a difference in vocabulary and range of ideas as to prove an essential difference of origin. But in the later portion of the book the vocabulary and range of ideas are such as should be expected in a disciple of Evagrius; therefore the first portion is of a different nature, and is shewn to be earlier material utilized by the author.

In his very thorough study of the Lausiatic History, made in the light of Reitzenstein's speculations, the late W. Bousset accepts the main thesis as proven.¹ He goes carefully through the book with the object of determining what portions are the original composition of Palladius; and, in the parts considered to be made up out of earlier materials, what scraps are due to his editorial hand. Such an investigation is of its nature largely subjective; and while recognizing the acumen and possible validity of some part of Bousset's treatment, I have doubts as to the critical soundness of the method followed. Consequently, I propose to examine the problem from another standpoint.

There is a sort of borderland between the two portions of the book as delimited by Reitzenstein: he is uncertain about xxiv–xxviii, and begins the definitely Palladian¹ portion at xxix. But neither test word appears

¹ *Komposition und Character der Historia Lausiaca*, 'Göttinger Nachrichten', 1917.

until xxxii (on Pachomius), and concerning the three Pachomian chapters there are special considerations to be dealt with later on. Consequently, it is at xxxv (on John of Lycopolis, p. 100 of my edition), the most strongly personal chapter in the book, that what is confessedly and in the fullest sense the Palladian portion begins. I propose to institute a somewhat minute stylistic comparison between this portion of the book (xxxv to the end) and the earlier portion, with the object of discovering whether the thesis of different ultimate authorship is borne out by the evidence of general style. Palladius is an author to whom it is easy to apply this test, because he has very marked mannerisms and tricks of style.

One is the use of *ελαύνειν* with *ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον* or *εἰς ἄκρον*. I collect the cases that occur from p. 100 to the end of the book, prefixing one from the Prologue, which is undoubtedly the composition of Palladius :

12. 27 ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἤλασαν κουφοδοξίας
 128. 17 ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἀκτημοσύνης ἐλάσασα
 143. 8 ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἤλασεν ἀπαθείας
 153. 13 εἰς τοσοῦτον ἀπαθείας ἤλασεν
 155. 9 εἰς τοσοῦτον μῖσος ἤλασεν
 162. 13 ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἐλπίδος ἤλασαν
 164. 26 εἰς τοσοῦτον ἤλασε μετανοίας
 146. 14 εἰς ἄκρον παιδείας καὶ τρόπων ἤλασε
 150. 15 εἰς ἄκρον σεμνότητος ἐλάσασα
 157. 21 εἰς ἄκρον φιλοθείας ἐλάσαντες
 164. 24 εἰς ἄκρον μῖσος ἐλάσασα
 εἰς ἄκρον occurs frequently without *ελαύνειν*
 120. 13 καθαρεύσας εἰς ἄκρον τὸν νοῦν
 129. 2 σεμνοτάτη εἰς ἄκρον
 137. 2 γνωστικώτατος εἰς ἄκρον
 150. 24 ἐμψύχων εἰς ἄκρον ἀπέσχετο
 151. 11 εἰς ἄκρον ἀσκούμενοι

Similar expressions occur in the earlier portion of the book :

32. 17 εἰς ἄκρον φιλοθείας ἐλάσαντες
 35. 2 εἰς ἄκρον ἀσκήσας
 39. 14 εἰς τοσοῦτον ἤλασε φόβον θεῖον
 67. 12 εἰς ἄκρον με χεϊμάζει
 77. 14 εἰς ἄκρον γενόμενος ἀσκητής
 79. 4 ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἤλασεν ὑπερηφανίας
 79. 23 εἰς ἄκρον ἐπέισθη τῇ πλάνῃ

Also :

28. 4 εἰς ἀπάθειαν ἐληλακότες
 52. 9 εἰς γῆρας ἤλασας

¹ I make no apology for thus assuming Palladius's authorship.

Another favourite word is *ὑπερβολή*. From p. 100 onwards it occurs :

123. 5 δι' ὑπερβολὴν ζήλου
 129. 17 καθ' ὑπερβολὴν κατατήξας τὸ σαρκίον
 130. 6 δι' ὑπερβολὴν ἐγκρατείας
 131. 4 ἀπλούστατος καθ' ὑπερβολὴν
 131. 16 καθ' ὑπερβολὴν γέγονεν ἄκακος καὶ ἀπλοῦς
 151. 17 ὑπερβολῇ ἀγαθώτατος
 153. 15 ὑπερβολῇ παρρησίας
 163. 19 ὑπερβολῇ εὐλαβείας

Before p. 100 it occurs :

17. 18 ὑπερβολῇ νυσταγμοῦ
 32. 20 καθ' ὑπερβολὴν φιλόλογος
 56. 9 πρᾶς καθ' ὑπερβολὴν
 58. 6 ὑπερβολῇ ἀσκήσεως
 69. 19 καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἄκακος καὶ ἀπλοῦς
 73. 9 καθ' ὑπερβολὴν δεινότητος
 78. 9 ὑπερβολῇ παρασκευῆς θεϊκῆς
 81. 12 καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἦν λεπτός
 83. 15 ὑπερβολῇ ὑπερηφανίας

There is another frequently occurring expression.

From p. 100 onwards :

100. 15 κατηξιώθη χάρισματος προρρήσεων
 120. 13 κατηξιώθη χάρισματος γνώσεως
 124. 15 κατηξιώθη χάρισματος ἰαμάτων
 126. 4 κατηξιώθη χάρισματος γνώσεως φυσικῆς
 129. 19 κατηξιώθη τιμῆς χάρισματος ἰαμάτων
 131. 17 χάρισματος ἡξιώθη κατὰ δαιμόνων (al. κατηξιώθη χάρισματος)
 143. 25 κατηξιώθη χάρισματος κατὰ δαιμόνων

Before p. 100 :

35. 3 κατηξιώθη χάρισματος ἰαμάτων
 35. 5 τοιούτου χάρισματος καταξιωθείς (WTB ; ἀξιωθείς P)
 39. 20 χάρισματος ἡξιώθη (ὡς) καταπτύειν δαιμόνων
 62. 10 κατηξιώθη χάρισματος κατὰ δαιμόνων
 73. 13 οὕτω ἡξιώθη χάρισματος κατὰ κτλ.
 77. 14 κατηξιώθη χάρισματος ὥστε κτλ.
 86. 12 κατηξιώθη χάρισματός προρρήσεων

Not one of these expressions would be of significance by itself¹ ; but their constant repetition seems to mark them as quite definitely mannerisms or tricks of style characteristic of the author, and Bousset signalizes some of them as such (*op. cit.* p. 184, notes). It will be observed that they all run right through the book, there being no distinction in regard to their use in the earlier and later portions. This phenomenon, so far as it goes, is an argument against any difference of origin or nature of the first half as contrasted with the second. At the

¹ For instance, I notice in Sozomen vi 31, in a passage not based on *Hist. Laus.*, the phrase ὅσοι τῆς φιλοσοφίας εἰς ἄκρον ἐληλύθασι.

least, it indicates that the first half, if made up out of earlier materials, was so completely rewritten by Palladius as to become in general style wholly indistinguishable from his own composition.

This impression is confirmed by a further examination of special points.

Reitzenstein pointed out the use of the word *δρᾶμα*, somewhat like our colloquial 'show', as a sign of unity of authorship for the Dialogue and the Lausiac History. I take it on his authority that it really is significant; but it must be equally significant of unity of authorship for the entire Lausiac History, because it occurs in both parts, as follows:

23. 10; 42. 2 || 110. 8; 112. 9; 162. 6

The following turns of expression are noticeable in the second half:

112. 13 *ἔβαλεν ἑαυτὸν ποτε εἰς πλοῖον*

119. 8 *βαλὼν πάντα τὰ αὐτοῦ εἰς πλοῖον*

134. 8 *πάντα αὐτῆς ἐμβαλοῦσα εἰς πλοῖον*

146. 20 *ἐνέβαλεν ἑαυτὴν εἰς πλοῖον*

In the first half we find

65. 20 *βαλὼν τὸν λεωβημένον εἰς πλοῖον* (also 66. 4)

μηδενὶ μηδὲν εἰρηκῶς

39. 14; 70. 6; 83. 9 (*ὀμιλῶν*) || 101. 10; 119. 13; 134. 5

The Evagriean term *ἀπάθεια*, *ἀπαθής*, runs through the whole book:

12, 3; 28. 4; 34. 12 || 116. 4; 117. 2; 143. 9; 153. 13

The formula

ὡς ἐπὶ θεοῦ

11. 7; 39. 9 || 133. 16; 156. 15

Certain more striking expressions occur once in the first half and once in the second: such are—

καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἄκακος καὶ ἀπλοῦς

69. 19 || 131. 16

εἰς ἄκρον φιλοθείας ἐλάσαντες

32. 17 || 157. 21

κατατήξας αὐτοῦ τὸ σωματίον (σαρκίον)

60. 23 || 129. 17

κεκοσμημένος } ἔν τε ἦθει καὶ γνώσει
τεγορνευμένος }

15. 8 || 114. 2

ὁ πόλεμος ὁ πορνικός 75. 14

ὁ τῆς πορνείας πόλεμος 133. 2

and in the same sense

ὁ πόλεμος 60. 14; 77. 9 || 167. 21

κυκλεύει τὰ μοναστήρια 37. 4

κυκλεύει ἀνὰ τὴν ἔρημον 134. 15

κυκλεύει ἀνὰ τὰς κέλλας 145. 2

φιλόλογος ἦν ὁ ἀνήρ
 ἀνήρ εὐλαβῆς καὶ φιλόλογος
 32. 20 || 148. 18

τρισμακαρία used as epithet of Melania, and of no one else
 21. 10 || 134. 1

ὡς βλασφημοῦσα τοὺς καιροὺς καὶ τοὺς βασιλεῖς
 18. 19 || 161. 4

διαφοραὶ εἰσι δαιμόνων, ὥσπερ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, οὐκ οὐσίας ἀλλὰ γνώμης 47. 7
 διαφοραὶ εἰσι φύσεων οὐκ οὐσιῶν 109. 9

ἐν συγγράμμασιν ἀνδρῶν ἑλλογιμῶν Ὀριγένους καὶ Διδύμου καὶ Πιερίου καὶ
 Στεφάνου διήλθε μυριάδας ἑξακοσίας 34. 6

πάν σύγγραμμα τῶν ἀρχαίων ὑπομνηματιστῶν διελθοῦσα· ἐν οἷς Ὀριγένους
 μυριάδας τριακοσίας, Γρηγορίου καὶ Στεφάνου καὶ Πιερίου καὶ Βασιλείου . . .
 μυριάδας εἰκοσιπέντε 149. 12

On these two passages it may be observed (1) that the omission of *στίχων* with *μυριάδες* is remarkable; (2) that the writer Stephanus is entirely unknown, being mentioned nowhere except in these places of Palladius. They are quite evidently the handiwork of one and the same writer.

The evidence just recited would, there is little doubt, in ordinary cases of literary criticism, be accepted as overwhelming proof of full unity of origin and authorship. We must now subject the first half of the work to an examination in respect to its contents, and in particular in respect to the personal notes that run through it.

Omitting the Proem (p. 3), which belongs to the B recension and so is almost certainly unauthentic, and the Dedicatory Letter (p. 6), probably authentic, we come to the lengthy Prologue (p. 9), which is certainly the composition of Palladius, and affords a means of studying his style and manner.

Of the History itself chapters i-iv are accepted by Reitzenstein and Bousset as being by Palladius, though with reserves. According to their theory, the earlier work or collection of Lives adopted by Palladius begins with v. They draw the line here, because the test word *γνώσις* occurs for the last time in iv, and not again until the second, or confessedly Palladian, part of the book. But to draw the line thus sharply at the spot where *γνώσις* ceases is too mechanical. For them the second part begins perhaps at xxiv (p. 77), certainly at xxix (p. 84). But there is no occurrence of *γνώσις* before p. 114. The next is on p. 120, then on p. 129; in the long chapter, xlvii (pp. 136-142), it occurs eight times; the last occurrence is on p. 152, and in the last eighteen pages it does not occur at all. Thus if xlvii be left out of count, the employment of *γνώσις* is slight and sporadic—much too slight to justify drawing a hard and fast line of division at p. 20.

If, now, we look at the chapters following iv, this is what we find: iv had been on Didymus the Blind, whom Palladius says he had seen, as no doubt had every one in Alexandria at the time, and it had concluded with two anecdotes which he says he had heard from him. v begins with another anecdote, similarly said to have been heard from Didymus. Further information follows, said to have been received from the elder Melania, certainly well known to Palladius, and in other places similarly mentioned as his informant concerning monks of the elder generation (pp. 29, 30, 57). It is noteworthy that she is called ἡ τρισμακαρία Μελάμιον here and also in the later portion of the book (134. 1), an epithet applied to no one else in the Lausiatic History.¹

vi is an Alexandrian story which Palladius may have learned either by hearsay or by some writing. But there is an introductory paragraph of moralizing, altogether in Palladius's manner. Such passages should be compared: they are—

- The Letter to Lausus;
- The Prologue;
- vi first paragraph (22. 3-23. 6);
- xv last sentence (40. 8-11);
- xxv last paragraph (80. 16-23);
- xlvi (138. 2-142. 10);
- lxxi concluding paragraph of book.

It will be found, I think, that there is a recognizable unity of thought and style and method in them all.

At the beginning of vi it is said that the story is told *εἰς ἀσφάλειαν τῶν ἐγτυγχανόντων*. The same words occur in the piece just referred to from xxv (80. 17); cf. also 11. 22; 64. 16; 116. 8. The body of the story may very well have been reproduced from an apophthegma or written anecdote; but the first paragraph is surely stamped as Palladius's own. And in the story itself occur *δρᾶμα* and *χρόνον περιπεύσαντος*, both alleged by Reitzenstein as evidence of unity of authorship for the

¹ I take the opportunity of putting on record that I accept as certainly true Prof. Turner's contention, accepted also by Reitzenstein and Bousset, that the chapter hitherto entitled 'Silvania' or 'Silvia' (lv in my edition) in reality belongs to Melania the elder, and gives additional and highly interesting information about this very remarkable fourth-century figure (*J. T. S.*, 1905, April, p. 353). As to the date of the journey that Palladius and Melania made from Aelia to Pelusium, what Prof. Turner proposes is quite plausible. But, if it be not necessary to stress strongly the 'sixty years' (149. 6), and it were permissible to identify the journey with Palladius's first journey to Egypt, in 388, it would be a more satisfactory solution. On any showing Palladius wrote twenty years after the event; it is not to be supposed he had shorthand notes of what was said; so that he may easily have written 'sixty', instead of 'forty', especially under the influence of the 'sixty years' at 146. 20.

Dialogue and Lausiatic History, and therefore characteristic of the author; also the curious τῶν ποδῶν σου without ἐφάπτομαι, which occurs again in xiv (38. 18).

vii is a description of the monastic settlement of Nitria. Into it are interwoven some of the data that help to fix the chronology of Palladius's life, which we learned in the previous article to treat as worthy of respect. It opens: 'After spending three years in Alexandria I went to Nitria'; the journey is sketched, and the situation; then 'After a year there I went into the innermost desert (Cellia)'. He says he saw in Nitria certain monks who had been acquainted with Anthony and Pachomius, some of whom are known to have been there at the time. The description of the monks of Nitria is by far the most circumstantial and realistic that we possess, and is quite evidently the handiwork of an eyewitness. Why not allow that the eyewitness was Palladius, who, as is recognized on all hands, did live for a number of years in Nitria and its neighbourhood? I cannot imagine what reasons prompted Bousset to pronounce this to be an earlier document incorporated by Palladius. For me it is one of the most certainly Palladian pieces in the book. Consequently, if a dividing line has to be drawn to mark where Palladius began to use an earlier collection of Lives, it should not be at v, but at viii.

viii, on Amoun, the first monk of Nitria, who died before 350, claims to be based on information given to Palladius by one of the elder Nitrian monks; but it may very conceivably be based on some written record of the kind postulated by Reitzenstein. Variations of the story are to be found in *Historia Monachorum* and Socrates.

ix and the first half of x are part of the sections said to be derived from Melania, a claim to which no reasonable objection can be raised. The latter part of x is said to be derived from Ammonius the Tall, to whom is devoted xi. In this chapter Palladius does not say he had personally known him; but elsewhere he does. And why not? During the years he lived in Nitria and its neighbourhood Ammonius and the other Tall Brothers were among the most prominent monks of Nitria; it is certain that Palladius must have known them.

xii is told as a personal experience of Palladius, in company with Dioscorus, one of these Tall Brothers, and Evagrius, his master and friend.

xiii and xiv are stories of which the source is not indicated; they might be from earlier documents, or from hearsay. Palladius claims to have met the hero of xv, but not the hero of xvi, 'because he had died fifteen years before my coming'.

xvii and xviii are on the two famous Macarii. Palladius says: 'I did not meet Macarius of Egypt, for he died a year before my entry into the

desert; but Macarius of Alexandria I did meet, for he survived for three years of my nine years' sojourn in Cellia. And some things I saw, some I heard from him, and some I learned from others' (p. 47).

xix and xx have no indication of origin. xxi professes to be a story heard from one Kronios; also xxii, the well-known story of Paul the Simple, of which variations exist. The first half of xxiii is perhaps the most curiously personal passage in the book, and it is wellnigh impossible to imagine it as an invention inserted in other material at haphazard, just to impart an air of personal narrative. The rest, which seems extraordinary and even grotesque, purports to be Pachon's relation of his own experiences.

Concerning the section xxiv-xxviii Reitzenstein and Bousset are undecided whether it is to be assigned to Palladius as his own composition, or is made up of earlier materials worked over by him. There can, I think, be no reasonable doubt that it is his own composition. It covers pp. 77 to 83, and the foregoing tables shew that these pages supply their fair proportion of the turns of expression characteristic of Palladius.

The case for xxiv is peculiarly strong. It would be difficult to find a more characteristically Palladian sentence than the opening one: *οὗτος εἰς ἄκρον γινόμενος ἀσκητῆς καὶ διακριτικὸς κατηξιώθη χάρισματος ὥστε κτλ. Διακριτικός* occurs 34. 11, and *χάρισμα διακρίσεως πνευμάτων* 120. 14, both of Evagrius. This Stephen had known St Anthony and had survived until Palladius's time, but he had never met him 'owing to the distance of the place'; he heard, however, from Ammonius and Evagrius the report of a visit they paid to him. The chapter closes with the apology: *ταῦτα διηγῆσαμεν ἵνα μὴ ξενιζόμεθα ὅταν ἁγίους τινὰς ἴδωμεν τοιούτους περιπεσόντας πάθειν*. An almost identical apology had occurred concerning the sufferings of Benjamine in xii: *ἀναγκαίως ἐξηγησάμεν τὸ πάθος τοῦτο, ἵνα μὴ ξενιζόμεθα ὅταν τι περιστατικὸν ἀνδράσι δικαίοις συμβαίη* (36. 7).

The next four chapters relate the stories of certain monks who had fallen away. Palladius vouches for three of these cases from personal knowledge, and introduces, as in many other places, his friends Macarius, Evagrius, and one Albanus, mentioned also at 137. 9, and perhaps at 101. 5, as one of the companions of Evagrius. These chapters all appear to me as truly Palladian as any in the book.

With xxix begins the portion recognized by Reitzenstein and Bousset as being certainly in the full sense the original composition of Palladius. I do not perceive the special reasons for this favourable verdict in behalf of xxix, xxx, xxxi (84-87). They are almost wholly void of the various expressions cited already as characteristic of Palladius, and neither *γνώσις* nor *πνευματικός* occurs in them: not that I desire to question the correctness of the judgement in their case.

The three chapters on Tabennisi and the Pachomian monks and nuns (xxxii-xxxiv), though passed as Palladian by Reitzenstein, will call for further treatment presently. And this brings us to chapter xxxv (p. 100), on John of Lycopolis, which has been taken above as the beginning of the portion of the book admitted by common consent as uncontrovertibly the original composition of Palladius.

I cannot but think that the series of personal notes just recited makes a favourable impression. They are simple, straightforward, natural: they suggest a genuine record. There does not seem to be any intrinsic ground for doubt when Palladius says he saw such and such monks, and did not see such and such others, but heard about them from such and such persons. Bousset's verdict that in this first part 'he polished up an earlier document with a varnish of personal reminiscences, and so made an interesting travel-novel' (*op. cit.* p. 190), is certainly not what is suggested by the book itself, but is imposed by a theory. Touches of personal reminiscence run through the second part of the book, just the same in kind and in number as in the first. This uniformity in the personal element constitutes an argument for homogeneity strongly confirmatory of that derived from general stylistic and linguistic considerations.

The theory of Reitzenstein and Bousset postulates, of course, that in the first portion, not only the definite personal notes, but also the allusions to Palladius's circle of friends, to Melania, Evagrius, Ammonius, Dioscorus, and, furthermore, the parallelisms between striking expressions in the two parts of the book, and the idioms characteristic of Palladius, have all been worked into the supposed earlier document by Palladius himself. Indeed Bousset formulates it as a definite critical canon, that 'where striking contacts are found in the different parts of the book, the hand of the Redactor has been busy' (*op. cit.* p. 176). But there are limits to the burden that a redaction-theory will bear; and an examination of the whole text shews, I believe, that these manifold traces of Palladius are so all-pervading, so woven into the very stuff of the narration, that the idea of their being but redactional additions must be set aside as beyond the limit of what is reasonable. Nor can I think that any one who reads the whole book through, will, on passing from the first portion to the second, be aware of any change in regard of matter, or of style and idiom, or of atmosphere.

Though it may seem that the case has been sufficiently laboured, still it is due to the authority and reputation of Drs Reitzenstein and Bousset, that the reasons be considered which led them to the opposite conclusion. These reasons may be quite simply stated:

(1) the words *γνώσις*, *γνωστικός*, after occurring half a dozen times up to p. 20, do not occur again until p. 114, and then sixteen times to the end of the book;

(2) *πνευματικός* occurs on p. 16, and not again till p. 91, and then seven times to the end;

(3) *σωφροσύνη, σώφρων* occur on pp. 56 and 84, but from p. 128 to the end eleven times.

These facts, reinforced by subsidiary points, are held to constitute a difference in vocabulary, and in mentality, enough to prove that the section of the book from p. 21 to p. 77 (or 84) is essentially different in origin from the rest, which is properly Palladius's composition.

We must test the facts.

I cannot think that the significance attached to *πνευματικός* is justified in the Lausiac History. *πνευματικός* (*spiritualis*) has been at all times a common word in Christian language, and need mean no more than 'spiritual'. Its employment is not frequent (only eight or nine times in all), and in few instances does it seem to bear the technical sense so strongly emphasized by Reitzenstein. Had he worked on one of the old editions, as Migne's, he would have found *πνευματικός* perpetually throughout; for it is part of the literary padding of B, the metaphrastic recension. Merely skimming through the text in Migne *P. G.* xxxiv, I noted the following occurrences of *πνευματικός* in places where it does not occur in my text: 1017 A, 1059 A D, 1091 A, 1092 B D, 1097 A in first half; and in second 1186 B, 1194 B, 1195 A, 1244 D, 1249 D. The Metaphrast who made B lived not more than half a century after Palladius; from the manner in which he inserted *πνευματικός* into Palladius's text it is clear that he did not attach any special significance to it, but regarded it as on a par with the other epithets, *θανμαστός, ἀθάνατος, μέγας*, and the rest, that he interspersed so light-heartedly.

The argument based on *γνώσις, γνωστικός* has more weight. These words had a long history: one thinks of the New Testament, of Barnabas, Clement of Alexandria, and the Gnostic movement in its many phases. Reitzenstein seems to believe that, as used in the Lausiac History, it preserves traces of its gnostic sense. But a number of the instances may be ruled out, as certainly not bearing this sense, but meaning only 'knowledge' in general. Such are:

145. 16 *γνώσις τῆς οἰκείας ἀσθενείας*

149. 17 *ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως ἐλευθερωθεῖσα*

151. 9 *γνώσιν εἴληφα τῶν ἐκεῖ μοναστηρίων*

There are two such instances in the Letter (p. 7. 6 and 21).

Eighteen instances remain: of these five are in the first few pages and eight are in the single chapter xlvii. Thus, apart from this chapter, there are in the rest of the second part of the book (p. 100 to the end) only three possibly significant occurrences of *γνώσις* (114. 2, 120. 14, 129. 14) and two of *γνωστικός* (136. 3, 152. 1). Five occurrences

in sixty-three pages (100-136, xlvii 142-169) is a distribution too exiguous to afford foundation for Reitzenstein's theory of the dual origin of the Lausiatic History, or outweigh the strong body of evidence already adduced in favour of its unity.

It may be thought that this vindication of the unity of the Lausiatic History, as through and through the composition of Palladius, has been worked out with undue elaboration and insistence. But this has not been done without a purpose. Reitzenstein's dictum, that the words *γνωστικός* and *πνευματικός* supply in great measure the key to the understanding of the development of early Christianity (*op. cit.* p. 241) is original and striking, and his authority is great; and various German reviewers of his book have cited the words as pointing the way to new and fruitful methods of investigation. But the truth of the dictum can be appraised only by its being tested in single cases. When tested in the case of Lausiatic History it is found wanting, because it has led its author astray.

Needless to say there are numerous questions raised in Reitzenstein's volume which it would be of interest to pursue. In particular would I like to examine the section dealing with the first four chapters of the Lausiatic History, and offering reconstructions of an hypothetical earlier document lying behind them. Some of the certainties—the 'ohne weiteres klar', 'ganz sicher', 'kein Zweifel', 'Sicherheit'—of p. 157 challenge reconsideration, and it would, I believe, be instructive to arraign them before the bar of Cassian. But this could not be done within the space here available. I therefore pass on to a point of special interest in Bousset's article.

It is to be clearly understood that what has been controverted by me is the thesis that the section of the Lausiatic History v-xxiii (or xxviii) is an earlier document containing a collection of Lives of monks, just taken over by Palladius, and 'polished up with a varnish of personal notes', in order to give it the semblance of a story of the author's travels and experiences. It is not here questioned that individual chapters in this part of the work, or in the later part, may be based on earlier separate lives or apophthegmata. The chapters on Amoun of Nitria (viii) and on Paul the Simple (xxii) have been mentioned as very probably cases in point; and the same may be suspected in other cases of monks of the earlier generation, concerning whom Palladius says his knowledge was by hearsay: whether he learned these stories from an old monk or from a written apophthegma is quite immaterial.

Now if there be any part of the book that is likely to have an earlier document behind it, it is the Pachomian section, xxxii-xxxiv, containing as it does a full *résumé* of the Rule and an account of the system of Tabennesiot monasteries, and of the manner of life led in them. Such

a document Palladius might very well have found when visiting the Tabennesiot monastery at Panopolis, probably on the way back from his exile at Syene. Now Bousset points out that if in the account of the monasteries (p. 93. 7-96. 5) the personal passages of Palladius's own experiences be removed, what remains is better in grammar and construction, and is a more consistent description (*op. cit.* p. 191). It is therefore curious to observe that there exists an authority for the text in which precisely the passages cut out by Bousset do not stand, viz. the Syriac version found in Anan Isho's 'Paradise'.¹ The crucial portion of the Greek is here reproduced, the words omitted in the Syriac being enclosed in []:

Ἔστιν οὖν [ταῦτα τὰ] μοναστήρια πλείονα κρατήσαντα τοῦτον τὸν τύπον, συντιένοντα εἰς ἑπτακισχιλίους ἀνδρας. ἔστι δὲ τὸ πρῶτον καὶ μέγα μοναστήριον ἔνθα αὐτὸς ὁ Παχώμιος ὄκει, [τὸ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἀποκύψαν μοναστήρια] ἔχον ἀνδρας χιλίους τριακοσίους. [ἐν οἷς καὶ ὁ καλὸς Ἀφθόνιος ὁ φίλος μου γενόμενος γνήσιος, τὸ νῦν δευτερεύων ἐν τῷ μοναστηρίῳ· ὃν ὡς ἀσκανδάλιστον ἀποστέλλουσιν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἐπὶ τὸ διαπωλῆσαι μὲν αὐτῶν τὰ ἔργα, συνωνήσασθαι δὲ τὰς χρείας.] ἔστι δὲ ἄλλα μοναστήρια ἀπὸ διακοσίων καὶ τριακοσίων [ἐν οἷς καὶ εἰς Πανὸς τὴν πόλιν εἰσελθὼν εὔρον ἀνδρας τριακοσίους. ἥ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μοναστηρίῳ εὗρακα ῥάπτας δεκάπεντε, χαλκείας ἑπτὰ, τέκτονας τέσσαρας, καμηλαρίους δώδεκα, κναφεῖς δεκάπεντε.] ἐργάζονται δὲ πᾶσαν τέχνην, καὶ ἐκ τῶν περιπετευμάτων οἰκονομοῦντες καὶ τὰ τῶν γυναικῶν μοναστήρια [καὶ φυλακάς.] [τρέφουσι δὲ καὶ χοίρους· ἐμοῦ δὲ ψέγοντος τὸ πρᾶγμα, ἔλεγον . . . παροικεῖ (95. 5).] ἀναστάντες δὲ οἱ ἐφημερευταὶ ὄρθριοι οἱ μὲν περὶ τὸ μαγειρεῖον οἱ δὲ περὶ τὰς τραπέζας γίνονται [ιστωσιν οὖν αὐτὰς μέχρι τρίτης ὥρας ἀπαρτίσαντες] ἐπιθέντες κατὰ τραπέζαν ἄρτους . . . τυροὺς βοῶν [τὰ τῶν κρεῶν ἄκρα] κτλ.

The origin and character of the Pachomian section in Anan Isho's 'Paradise' is unknown. From what is said on pp. lxxix and 205 of my edition it will be seen that the redaction of the Lausiac History in book i of Anan Isho is a conglomerate made up from various sources. The Syriac of the Pachomian section is not known to exist outside of its place in the 'Paradise', and there is no reason for assuming it to belong to either of the standard Syriac versions of the Lausiac History. It may very well have been a separate fragment, Syriac or Greek, picked up by Anan Isho, and so may preserve an earlier Pachomian document utilized by Palladius.

What is more curious still is that a Greek text of this section exists closely, though not completely, akin to that represented by the Syriac. Any one who follows the text of this section through my apparatus will find that the sigla s^{an} and 33-47 go very consistently together. s^{an} is Anan Isho's Syriac; and 33 and 47 are two Greek MSS, not giving the

¹ In Syriac it is in Bedjan's ed., p. 112; in English it is in Budge's *Paradise of the Fathers*, i. 144.

Lausiatic History as a whole, but collections of oddments of pieces, of most miscellaneous textual character, from *Historia Lausiaca*, *Historia Monachorum*, and Apophthegmata (see description of 47 at p. xxi, and of 33 at p. lxxiv of my Introduction). The nature of these two collections makes it here again quite possible that the Pachomian section may have been, not an excerpt from the Lausiatic History, but an actual Greek text utilized by Palladius.

The pieces marked in the above extract as omitted in s^{an} are omitted also in 33-47, except that at the point marked with a + they have *ἐν τούτοις ἑώρακα ῥάπτας τέκτονας καμηλαρίους κναφεῖς*.¹ We are here in the presence of a difficult textual problem. These words are one of the series of definite personal touches—*ἑώρακα*—which are all absent from s^{an} . How are we to account for the presence of this one alone in 33-47? Our perplexity is increased by an examination of the whole series of readings of s^{an} and 33-47.² It seems impossible to propose any theory that will account at once for their agreements and their divergences. There is no doubt that the agreements are the dominant fact, and they shew a close relationship between the Greek that underlay s^{an} and 33-47, however the coincidences of the latter with the text of the Lausiatic History may be accounted for.³

Let it be assumed that this Greek represents an earlier Pachomian document: What are its bearings on the discussion of the theory of Reitzenstein and Bousset? Have we not here its verification—an earlier document into which Palladius introduced personal reminiscences, the very thing they say he did throughout the first half of the book?

But what he does in this case, where, *ex hypothesi*, his method of dealing with earlier documents may be tested, is something quite different from what Reitzenstein and Bousset suppose him to have done. The personal touches are not fictitious but genuine experiences. In regard to Aphthonius, the passage from the *Vita Pachonii* given under my text shews that specially trustworthy monks of Tabennisi used to be sent to Alexandria for the purposes named by Palladius; Bousset does not doubt that Palladius had met Aphthonius at Alexandria on such occasions. Nor is there reason for doubting that Palladius did

¹ 33-47 also have the sentence beginning *ἴστωσι*.

² It is to be remembered that though the full collation of 33 and 47 is given in xxxii, only select more important variants are recorded in xxxiii, xxxiv.

³ If we have here really an earlier Greek document used by Palladius as the groundwork of his narrative, it becomes certain that the three pieces on pp. 94, 95 of my edition placed in [] are genuine personal reminiscences, and belong to the text of the Lausiatic History. Their absence from PT and other authorities for the text of the Lausiatic History is to be attributed to the fact that the keeping of swine and the eating of their flesh, even by the old and the infirm, became offensive to later Greek ideas of monastic propriety.

visit the Tabennesiot monastery known from the *Vita* to have been at Panopolis; he would have passed it on the way to or from Syene.

Moreover it is seen that, if we here have an earlier document of the kind postulated, Palladius by no means rewrote it freely. On the contrary, he reproduced it practically as it stood. Apart from the personal additions bracketed in the extract above, the differences between his text and that of 33-47 are infrequent and trivial.¹ Of the turns of expression we have learned to recognize as his pet idioms, not one is to be found in xxxii, xxxiii, xxxiv.²

Thus, even if we are in the presence of an earlier document, it affords, not confirmation, but yet another refutation of the theory devised by Reitzenstein and Bousset.

In conclusion, a word must be said on the *Historia Monachorum*. This work, kindred to the Lausiac History, exists in Latin and Greek (and Syriac, but this is a translation of the Greek). The Latin is confessed on all hands to be the work of Rufinus. The question has been debated, as between the Latin and the Greek, which is the original and which the translation. By Dr Preuschen the priority of the Latin was defended, by myself that of the Greek; and this latter view has come to be commonly accepted. Reitzenstein now intervenes with a new theory: that Rufinus's Latin is a translation indeed from Greek, not, however, from our extant Greek, but from an earlier (lost) collection of Greek Lives, an 'aretologion', such as he postulates in the case of the first half of Palladius: this work is the one named by Sozomen (vi 29) as his source and as being by Timotheus, bishop of Alexandria (d. 385): and the extant Greek work is a translation of Rufinus's Latin.

For the first two-thirds of the book, after the first chapter, the two texts run closely parallel, and it is a mere case of translation on the one side or the other. But the closing portion is greatly different, being longer in the Latin than in the Greek; and here Sozomen's affinity is clearly with the Latin. Various hypotheses have been devised to account for the textual phenomena, none of them wholly satisfactory. Reitzenstein's is in some respects a new hypothesis. It involves the position that the Greek, edited by Preuschen in his work *Palladius und Rufinus*, was translated from Rufinus's Latin. As has been said, I had maintained the contrary view; and Reitzenstein's treatment of the subject in his second chapter is necessarily in large measure a criticism of my proofs and method of investigation. Our methods are, indeed,

¹ The piece ll. 13-16 p. 97, entered in the apparatus as wanting in s^{ms}, is in Budge; his copy is a better text than Bedjan's.

² At the very beginning we notice *ὡς καταξιωθῆναι προρρήσεων καὶ ὀπτασιῶν* (omitted in s^{ms}, but in 33-47) and *εἰς ἄγαν ἐγένετο φιλόανθρωπος*, instead of *εἰς ἄκρον*.

diametrically opposite. He selects from the later portion of the book a piece, the story of Paul the Simple, wherein the difference between the Latin and the Greek is at its maximum, so great that there is hardly question of translation at all: and he argues for, and shews, the literary and general superiority of the Latin over the Greek—which I would say is in great measure due to Rufinus's literary sense and free ideas in regard to translation and reproduction. I, on the other hand, selected a long chapter, that on Apollos or Apollonius, wherein the two texts are most closely parallel, so that it is indubitably a case of translation throughout; and I instituted a minute comparison, signaling some thirty indications, of very varying cogency, all pointing in the direction of the priority of the Greek. I should have thought that my method would appeal to a philologist. I will here repeat only one of the passages adduced:

Πολλάκις καὶ περὶ τῆς ὑποδοχῆς
τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἔλεγεν ὅτι

Δει ἐρχομένους
τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς προσκυνεῖν.
οὐ γὰρ αὐτοὺς, ἀλλὰ τὸν Θεὸν προσε-
κίνησας. εἶδες γάρ, φησί, τὸν
ἀδελφόν σου, εἶδες κύριον τὸν Θεόν
σου.
καὶ τοῦτο, φησί, παρὰ τοῦ Ἀβραάμ
παρειλήφαμεν.

Multa de hospitalitatis studio
disserebat, et praecipiebat attentius
ut adventantes fratres quasi Domini
suscipiamus adventum. nam et
adorari fratres adventantes pro-
pterea, inquit, traditio habetur, ut
certum sit in adventu eorum ad-
ventum Domini Iesu haberi, qui
dicit: 'Hospes fui et suscepistis
me.' sic enim et Abraham suscepit
eos qui homines quidem vide-
bantur, Dominus autem in eis
intelligebatur.

On this I commented: It will be seen at a glance that the beauty of the Greek is wholly gone in the Latin. The Greek owes its superiority very much to the striking quotation *εἶδες γάρ κτλ.*; this is an *Agraphon* cited twice by Clement of Alexandria in the same words, and also by Tertullian (*Resch, Agrapha*, 296). Rufinus did not recognize the citation, and so paraphrased it, substituting a biblical text for the apocryphal saying. It will hardly be suggested that a Greek translator or copyist inserted the *Agraphon*—indeed, although it has disappeared, its echo is still plainly discernible in the Latin.

This instance has been commonly accepted (and I am able to say, was accepted by my friend Dr Preuschen himself) as being in itself practically decisive in favour of the priority of the Greek. And so, when I found Reitzenstein discussing this chapter on Apollos, I began to feel excited as to how he would deal with this piece of evidence. Great was my disappointment on finding that he passed it over without mention.

Here I will ask the historians of Greek or Latin literature not to take

Reitzenstein's verdict unexamined, but to withhold their judgement until they have studied my presentation of the case in *Lausiac History* Part I, §§ 3 and 8, and Appendices I and II ; and also that of Dr Carl Schmidt in *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1899. In this article, which is an important contribution to the study of Egyptian monachism, he made an independent study of the question, and concluded that, where the texts run parallel, the Greek edited by Dr Preuschen is the original and the Latin the translation.¹

This article is entitled 'Questions of History'. My readers may be disposed to think its title ought rather to have been 'Questions of Literary Criticism'. But in truth it is a question of history that is at issue, viz. the character of Palladius as an historian, and the place his book should hold among the sources for the history of Monachism. Dr Reitzenstein's treatment of the problems involved has brought it about that the determination of this question is mainly a matter of literary criticism.

I trust I do not unduly flatter myself in hoping that the outcome of this series of 'Palladiana' will be to satisfy scholars and historians that there is no reason for revising or reversing the favourable estimate of Palladius and his work formed by the common consent of critics sixteen or twenty years ago, in their notices of Dr Preuschen's *Palladius und Rufinus* and my own *Lausiac History of Palladius*. Of these it will suffice to cite, as a sample, the verdict expressed by Dr Carl Schmidt in the aforesaid article: 'The high historical value of both sources is proved beyond all doubt.'

E. CUTHBERT BUTLER.

¹ At p. 13, l. 15, of this article there is an unfortunate misprint, which is calculated to throw the whole passage into confusion. The words 'erste' and 'zweite' should be transposed. As they stand, Preuschen's position and mine are inverted.