

Pachomian Sources Reconsidered¹

by DERWAS J. CHITTY

It had seemed that Ladeuze had firmly established the literary priority of the best Greek sources for the *Life* of Pachomius and his first successors as against the Coptic. Halkin's edition of the *Vitae Graecae*, while suggesting that the surviving 'Vita Prima' was not the earliest recension, had supported the same main conclusion—'Cette première Vie de Pachôme fût certainement rédigé en grec. La discussion est présentement close.'

The outline seemed clear—a *Life*, to which the 'Vita Prima' (G¹) is the nearest surviving approach: a collection of stories ('*Paralipomena*' or '*Ascetica*')—Asc.): and the *Letter of Bishop Ammon* (Ep. Amm.) describing, after several decades, his memories of three years at Pabau under Theodore.

The character of the other significant Greek Lives also seemed clear—the 'Vita Altera' (G²), a Life of Pachomius consisting of a conflation and rewriting of G¹ and Asc., with a few sentences from the *Lausiac History* (HL): the 'Vita Tertia' (G³) a Life of Pachomius and Theodore, in the main a putting together, without serious rewriting except in a few passages, of practically the whole of G¹ and Asc., with longer passages from HL, and two or three short chapters from the collections of *Apophthegmata*. The Latin Life by Dionysius Exiguus (D) appeared to be a translation of a Greek original closely resembling G², with one long section and two shorter ones absent, and with the Angelic Rule from HL incorporated.

Halkin's work was published in 1932. In the following year, 1933, Lefort published the text of the fragmentary Sahidic Lives—he had published the Bohairic text in 1925. In his French translation of these Coptic Lives, published in 1943, he sets out to reverse Ladeuze's conclusions—to argue that G¹ is a late compilation, Ep. Amm. apocryphal, and the Greek original of D (used by G² as its main source) the earliest Greek Life, while all are dependent on Coptic Lives or collections of stories to which he conjecturally attributes certain of the surviving Coptic fragments.

The magnitude of Lefort's achievement in piecing together and editing the Coptic remains has made his views widely accepted by scholars. Thus Peeters in *Analecta Bollandiana*, while pleading for the genuineness of Ep.

¹ *Sancti Pachomii Vitae Graecae*, ed. F. Halkin, S.J., Brussels, 1932. *S. Pachomii Vita bohairici scripta*, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, Scr. Copt., ser. tertia, t. vii (1925). *S. Pachomii Vitae sahidici scriptae*, C.S.C.O., Scr. Copt., ser. tertia, t. viii (1933). L. Th. Lefort, *Les Vies coptes de S. Pachôme et de ses premiers successeurs*: Traduction française, Louvain 1943. P. Ladeuze, *Étude sur le cénobitisme pachômien*, Louvain, 1898.

Amm., seems hardly to question Lefort's account of G¹, and to regard his main conclusions as 'acquies une fois pour toutes'.¹

We presume to suggest that, for all the greatness of his work on the Coptic (though even here we shall find that, on one or two significant details, Homer has been nodding), Lefort's work suffers from too cavalier a treatment of the Greek sources (especially of G¹ and Ep. Amm.), and is repeatedly guilty of 'petitio principii'.

We propose first to deal mainly with the Greek, Latin, and Syriac works, and their relation to each other, and the evidence adduced from them for the existence, by the end of the fourth century, of a lost collection of Pachomian stories on which all the surviving works are based. This first discussion is simplified by the fact that, with one doubtful exception, all the parallels contained in these works to surviving Coptic material are present in G¹. That doubtful exception provides our first subject.

The 'De Oratione' and the Letter of Ammon.

The 153 Chapters on Prayer, published in P.G. lxxix as the work of St. Nilus, have been convincingly shown by P. Hausherr (*Rev. d'Ascétique et de Mystique*, xv) to be more probably the work of Evagrius Ponticus, and therefore written before the latter's death in A.D. 399. If they were the work of Nilus, they would not be more than two or three decades younger.

Chapter 108 begins, "Ἀνέγνως πάντως καὶ τοὺς βίους τῶν Ταβεννησιωτῶν μοναχῶν . . ." P. Hausherr, in his annotated translation, comments, 'Le fait en question ne se trouve cependant pas dans les S. Pachomii Vitae Graecae publiées par le P. Halkin.' Lefort (*Vies Coptes de S. Pachôme*, xxii) assumes that ch. 109 also belongs to the Lives of the Tabennesiote Monks, and speaks of the two chapters as 'deux anecdotes, dont la première est absolument inconnue à nos *Vitae* grecques; bien que la seconde puisse, avec beaucoup de vraisemblance, correspondre à G¹ § 101 = Denys § 50 = G² § 84a, il est hors de doute que Nil, ou Évagre, visait autre chose que nos actuelles *Vitae* grecques'.

Actually, the story in De Or. 109 concerns a *viper*, and the monk suffers no harm; while the parallel quoted in the Greek Lives (also in the Coptic, Bo. 99) concerns a *scorpion*, and the monk, while persisting in prayer, almost dies of the pain. Moreover, there is nothing in the *De Oratione* to show that § 109 is regarded as sharing in the Tabennesiote origin of § 108.

For the first anecdote—Lefort, basing himself on the Greek text as published in Migne, where the hero appears simply as ὁ ἀββᾶς, claims that this title, used alone, always refers to Pachomius in Tabennesiote sources, and that this is confirmed by the appearance of the story as concerning Pachomius in the Bohairic and Arabic Lives.² But when, guided by a foot-note, we turn to p. 167, we find a story with certain marked differences from that of the *De Oratione* (though it certainly is remarkable that this parallel

¹ *Anal. Boll.* lxiv (1946), 277. Peeters had already taken the bait on the publication of the Sahidic text: see *Anal. Boll.* lli (1934), 286-320.

² Actually, there is some doubt whether the contents of Bo. 98 do concern Pachomius and not Theodore.

to De Or. 108 is immediately followed by the alleged, but much more distant, parallel to De Or. 109). And there is a foot-note admitting that at least one Greek MS. reads not simply 'τοῦ ἀββᾶ' but 'τοῦ ἀββᾶ Θεοδώρου' (this is the reading accepted without comment by Hausherr, loc. cit.). Lefort would discount this on the ground that the Greek text is 'flottante', and that the Arabic reading, Tahoum, is probably a misprint for Bahoum (= Pachomius)—in Arabic the difference between B and T is only one of pointing, and this certainly seems a more probable explanation of 'Tahoum' than Hausherr's attempt to derive it from a translation of the name Theodore. Thus fortified, Lefort tries to explain the Greek reading 'Theodore' by asserting, 'on sait, par la lettre d'Ammon et par ailleurs, que dans certains milieux grecs Théodore éclipsa Pachôme'. Still no parallel in the Greek sources is admitted for the story. But we are referred back, without further comment, to p. liv of the Introduction.

Here at last we find, drawn up parallel with the chapter of the *De Oratione*, a story from the *Letter of Ammon* (c. 19) concerning Theodore, and an admission by Lefort that the two passages show 'une parenté littéraire difficilement contestable'. But it is argued that it would be temerarious to identify the *Letter of Ammon* with the βιοὶ τῶν Ταβεννησιωτῶν μοναχῶν which 'Nilus' (Evagrius is not this time mentioned) cites as his source; that we have an 'élément de contrôle' in the fact that the hero in 'Nilus' is simply 'Abba'—i.e. Pachomius; and that the appearance of the anecdote in the Bohairic Life *proves* that we are dealing indeed with a Pachomian story.

Although a foot-note refers us for variants to p. 167, note 8, there is not a hint at this point that the variants there given include a reading 'τοῦ ἀββᾶ Θεοδώρου'.

Actually, the positive evidence that the Greek text is 'flottante' falls to the ground on examination. Had Lefort looked at the Latin translation printed beside the Greek in Migne, he would have found there also 'abbate Theodoro'. Migne is here faithful in both languages to the text of Suaresius's edition. But as the Latin appears to be based on the same Greek MSS. as the Greek printed text, it seems certain that the omission of Θεοδώρου in the Greek is due, not to MSS., but simply to a printer's error. If there are Greek MSS. showing this omission, their readings have yet to be recorded. The only remaining evidence against the Theodoran attribution is the doubtful witness of the Arabic—and it is surely more natural to suppose that the name of Pachomius has supplanted the lesser-known Theodore in the Arabic, than that Theodore has supplanted his master in all known Greek MSS.

It is hard to understand how a scholar of Lefort's standing should fail so completely to correlate his evidence.

It will be well to draw up at this point alongside each other the restored Greek text of Evagrius, that of Ep. Amm., and the Bohairic (in Lefort's translation):

De Or.	Ep. Amm.	Bo. 98 (Lefort, p. 167, 4)
<p>Ἀνέγνως πάντως καὶ τοὺς βίους τῶν Ταβέν-νησιωτῶν μοναχῶν, καθά φησιν ὅτι λαλοῦντος τοῦ Ἀββᾶ Θεοδώρου τὸν λόγον τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, ἤλθον δύο ἔχιδναι πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ. ὁ δὲ ἀταράχως στάς, ποιήσας τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ ὥσει καμάραν, ὑπέβαλεν αὐτὰς ἔνδοθεν ἕως ἐπαύσατο λαλῶν τὸν λόγον· καὶ τότε ταύτας ὑπεδείκνυε τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἐξηγούμενος τὸ πρᾶγμα.</p> <p>(I have given the text of the Bodleian MS. Canon. Gr. 16. Coislin 109, given by Lefort on p. 167, reads ἀταράχως ποιήσας αὐταῖς ὥσει καμάραν, omitting the second τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ. On p. liv, Lefort gives only the text of Migne—without Θεοδώρου—alongside that of Ep. Amm.)</p>	<p>Τῇ τετράδι τοῦ σαββάτου Θεόδωρος ἐστὼς ἐν τῇ νήσῳ ἐδίδασκεν τοὺς ἀδελφούς κεκυκλωκότας αὐτόν· καὶ σιωπήσας καὶ ἀποστάς τοῦ τόπου ἐν ᾧ εἰστήκει, δύο μικρὰς ἐχίδνας ἔδειξεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς λέγων, Φονεύσάτω τις αὐτάς. ὥς γὰρ ὠμίλουν, περὶ τοὺς πόδας μου γινομένης, ἵνα μή τις τῶν ἀδελφῶναραχθῇ, ὥσπερ καμάραν ποιήσας τοὺς πόδας μου, ἔκρυσσε αὐτάς. Καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἀναιρεθῆναι αὐτάς . . .</p>	<p>Se trouvant quelque part à moissonner avec les frères, lorsque le soir arriva, il adressa aux frères la parole de Dieu; pendant qu'il parlait, vinrent deux serpents qui s'enroulèrent autour de ses pieds. Mais lui, il ne les regarda aucunement, ni ne changea ses pieds de la place qu'il occupait. Lorsqu'il eut fini de parler, on fit la prière pour que chacun regagnât sa demeure; après cela il dit qu'on lui apportât une lampe. Quand on la lui eût apportée, il vit les bêtes enroulées autour de ses pieds; alors il les tua aussitôt et rendit gloire à Dieu qui sauve ceux qui espèrent en lui.</p>

Surely the impression one gets is that *De Oratione* is directly summarising the *Letter of Ammon*, while the Bohairic, if based on the same story at all, is only a distant echo.

But if the *De Oratione* is quoting the *Letter of Ammon*, and is the work of Evagrius, then the *Letter of Ammon* was already well-known by A.D. 399 at latest—when Theophilus, its addressee, was still on the patriarchal throne of Alexandria—and its genuineness can hardly be doubted. Moreover, it must already at that date have formed but one element in a body of works which together could be called the 'Lives of the Tabennesiote Monks'.—Alone, it could hardly bear that name. But it is worth noting that a *corpus* such as that which survives, in which Ep. Amm. is found together with G¹ and Asc., would most naturally be given precisely that title.

Before proceeding to discuss whether these or other documents were the actual other constituents of the original Pachomian *corpus*, it will be

convenient to digress for a moment, to examine some other arguments brought forward by Lefort against the genuineness of Ep. Amm. We shall not discuss further the perverse conclusions drawn by him from the parallel with the *De Oratione*. But we should note the real possibility that Bo. 98 actually betrays a knowledge of Ep. Amm., and not vice versa; and must ask ourselves whether the Coptic account (Bo. 89, S⁴⁸⁹, S⁵⁸⁹) of the early life in Alexandria of Theodore the Alexandrian, which is shown by its chronology to be manifestly unhistorical, is not also copied from Ep. Amm., rather than a source for that document as Lefort suggests (liii–liv). We note this in passing for its hint of a characteristic of the Coptic Lives which we shall have occasion to test later.

The comparison, and contrasts, between Ep. Amm. 12 and G¹102, Bo. 103, etc., surely do *not* suggest common derivation from a more primitive *written* redaction, but divergent *oral* accounts of the same vision.

Divergences between our different documents as to the chronology of Theodore's life are no evidence either way. If Ammon be mistaken here (which is by no means certain), that kind of mistake might easily be made by Theodore's contemporaries.

More strange is Lefort's attempt (pp. lvii–lviii) to identify Athanasius's flight to the Thebaid under Julian, when Theodore announced Julian's death, with the occasion of the search for Athanasius by the duke Artemius—whose name is found in the Coptic (Bo. 185) as well as the Greek (G¹137–8), even if that of Constantius only is mentioned in G¹. Lefort appears to be completely ignorant of the well-known facts about this duke, to be gleaned from Ammianus and elsewhere. He was, of course, put to death by Julian at Antioch in 362—apparently a few days before Athanasius's renewed flight—and was subsequently revered as a martyr throughout the Orthodox Church, in spite of his Arian antecedents. Certainly any search for Athanasius conducted by him was at the command of Constantius and not of Julian. And in fact, such a search carried out by Artemius in Alexandria is recorded in the *Festal Index* for the year A.D. 360; while both the *Historia Acephala* and the *Festal Index* confirm that Athanasius was in flight in the Thebaid (the *Hist. Acephala* actually mentions Antinoopolis) at the time of Julian's death. It seems, to say the least, far-fetched to suggest, as Lefort does, that Ep. Amm. has built up the whole of this story on the basis of the *Historia Acephala* and the account, in the Lives, of Artemius's search!

Lefort argues that Ammon does not use the technical terms found in the other Greek Pachomian documents—speaks of Psarphius as τὸν πάντων πρῶτον ἐν τῇ Βαῦ, and not as τὸν οἰκονόμον τὸν μέγαν, and instead of οἰκιακός speaks once of προεστώς ('terme inconnu des anciens institutions pachomiennes'—its only occurrence appears to be in G², twice in c. 37, of the father of a monastery, but its early use in this sense, in Meletian monasteries at least, is attested by Bell's Meletian papyri—1913. 2, 15), and once of ἡγούμενος. Lefort is not strictly correct in saying that this last term is reserved in Pachomian use for the Superior of a *monastery*. Twice in G¹ (53. 12 and 74. 37—this last, πατέρας τῶν μονῶν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους

ἡγουμένους) it is used alongside of πατέρες in a manner which necessarily implies that it is a word with a different or wider connotation: once (84. 24) it is used in the plural to cover all appointments of leaders within a single monastery (Hermonthis). But in any case, the argument tells rather for than against the genuineness and early date of Ep. Amm. What is more natural than that one who had left Pabau in A.D. 355, long before Rule or Life had appeared in Greek, should make his own choice of translations for the *Coptic* technical terms?

One other term is attacked by Lefort as evidence of late date—ἡγιασμένος, which he says is 'absolument inconnu dans tout le dossier, et en dehors d'Ammon on ne la rencontre que dans des textes byzantins d'assez basse époque et de caractère plutôt liturgique'. But as this participle occurs seven times in the New Testament (one passage, 2 Tim. ii. 21, is quoted in G¹, 64. 20), there is hardly any need to look for other occurrences of it in the Fathers in order to justify our refusal to treat it as evidence of late date.

Perhaps the only real difficulties remaining in Ep. Amm. are the talk in c. 22 of *Twelve Prayers* as against the *Six Prayers* of the Rule and the Lives; and the impression which can be gained that Athanasius's talk about Theodore as recently dead in c. 34 was given soon after Athanasius's return from exile. But Ammon's long years in Nitria may easily have obscured his memory of Tabennesiote practice: or again, the occurrence of Twelve Prayers in Palladius's account of the Tabennesiotes also, may imply that there is some other explanation which escapes us: while to press the second point is surely to overstress the meaning of the word φθάσας—there is nothing really to make clear the date of Athanasius's talk.

Certainly neither of these points, nor any of the others adduced, is of any weight against the overwhelming impression of genuineness created by the series of accurate chronological details, verifiable from other sources, found in the *Letter*. It is impossible to believe that a forger of the following centuries would have taken the trouble, even if he had the means, to get these right.

But this conclusion has wider implications, apparently not realised by P. Peeters, who, though arguing for the genuineness of Ep. Amm., appears convinced by Lefort's main contention as to the superiority of the Coptic sources. Actually we shall see that, if we can rely upon Ep. Amm., the Coptic account of one series of events at least automatically becomes impossible, while the account of the same events in G¹ is fully vindicated.

Halkin, in his introduction (pp. 31*-32*) summarises with admirable lucidity the chronological evidence of Ep. Amm., and the conclusions to be drawn therefrom. In particular we learn that Ammon arrived at Bau rather over a year (ἐνιαυτοῦ καὶ ὀλίγω πρὸς παρέλθοντος) after the proclamation of Gallus as Caesar (c. 7). As we know the date of this to have been 15 March 351, we conclude that Ammon's arrival was not later than the summer of A.D. 352. This date is confirmed by the fact that Ammon stayed three years at Bau (c. 1), and that Athanasius's flight from Alexandria (8 February 356) was six months (c. 31) after Ammon's arrival in

Nitria from the Thebaid, which therefore must be dated in the summer of A.D. 355. In c. 9 it is stated that, at the time of Ammon's arrival at Bau in A.D. 352, Pachomius had been dead six years. His death can therefore be dated in A.D. 346.

Turning to the 'Vita Prima,' we read (c. 116) that Pachomius died on the 14th Pachon (9 May) after forty days' sickness (c. 115) of a plague which had broken out in the monastery *μετὰ τὸ Πάσχα* (c. 114). As in the language of the 'Vita Prima' (cf. c. 7) this phrase could refer to Easter Day itself, we thus learn that Easter that year could conceivably be as late as 31 March, but no later. Actually, Easter fell in 346 on 30 March (Ath. Ep. Fest. Index xviii). In 343 it fell on 27th, in 349 on 26th, and in 351 on 31st: all other years from 341–353 are incompatible with these details. The date indicated coincides with that deduced from Ep. Amm. The Sahidic account on the other hand (S⁷—ed. Lefort, pp. 41–51) is incompatible with this date, placing the beginning of the plague and of Pachomius's forty days of sickness before Easter, and giving no indication of the interval between Easter and Pachomius's death (at the 10th hour on 14th Pachon) beyond the fact that this was in the fifty days after Easter ('the days of Pentecost'). The Bohairic is missing. The placing of the death of Paphnutius on Holy Saturday in the Sahidic is suspiciously like the death of Heron on Holy Saturday before the death of Theodore, and gives a further suggestion of that tendency to assimilate one story to another which we referred to in regard to the similarities between the Bohairic version and Ep. Amm.

The 'Vita Prima' proceeds to describe the succession of Petronius, his death on 27th Epiphi (21 July) and the succession of Orsisius (c. 117). This is followed by the description (c. 120) of the visit of the brethren in the boat to St. Antony on their way to Alexandria, *ὅτε ὁ ἀρχιεπίσκοπος ὁ ἅγιος Ἀθανάσιος ἀνέκαμψεν μετὰ δόξης Κυρίου ἀπὸ τοῦ κοιμητηρίου*—Athanasius returned to Alexandria on 21 October (24th Paophi) A.D. 346 (Ath. Fest. Ind. xviii), and this date accords perfectly with the dating of the death of Pachomius in May of the same year, and of Petronius in July. Ep. Amm., c. 28, describing the return of the boat from Alexandria to Pabau on 22 November 354 (?), after visiting St. Antony on the way back, suggests that the autumn season was the regular time for the voyage to Alexandria—and also for visits of St. Antony to his Outer Mountain. But 'Vita Prima' might equally well imply that the voyage was a special one, to welcome St. Athanasius on his return.

All is in place, and all is delightfully sober and free from the miraculous. St. Antony has not heard either of the death of Pachomius or of the succession and death of Petronius. He modestly disclaims the praise offered him by Zacchaeus, suggesting that he himself was perhaps not worthy to see Pachomius in the flesh, but making no clear assessment of the relative value of the coenobitic and eremitic life. His mention of an earlier abortive attempt to found a similar coenobitic institution by one Aotas, whose name is found in no other document, must surely belong to a primary source.

Zacchaeus alone is mentioned among the Pachomian voyagers, although c. 136 adds the information that Theodore was with Zacchaeus (cf. cc. 109 and 113) on the visits both to St. Antony and to St. Athanasius. The chapter could well be almost a verbatim report of a self-effacing account of the journey from Theodore's own lips.

Once again the Sahidic account (S⁵—the Bohairic is missing) is incompatible with the chronology of G¹ and Ep. Amm. (this is recognised by Lefort, p. 265, note 2. He concludes 'Qui a raison? S⁵, ou la chronologie actuellement admise pour l'année de la mort de Pachôme?' Our answer is not in doubt!). In the Sahidic, the brethren are sent with a letter to Athanasius entrusted to *Theodore*, by *Petronius*, who does not die until after they have reached Alexandria. Athanasius is, therefore, supposed to have been in Alexandria through that summer, as he certainly was not in the summer of A.D. 346. And this is so deeply woven into the Sahidic narrative that, if Ep. Amm. is right, the whole structure of the Sahidic account falls to the ground. (A similar ignorance of Athanasius's movements is shown in the account of the first visit of Zacchaeus and Theodore to Alexandria in Bo. 96a, where they are made to deliver to Athanasius a letter from Pachomius, though G¹ 113, and even the end of Bo. 96c itself, make it clear that Athanasius was in exile at this time!)

With the vindication of the Greek chronology against the Coptic, we find confirmation of a principle on which we should have inclined to prefer the Greek account quite apart from the chronological argument. Lefort says that G¹ 'n'est qu'un résumé'. But of all the extra Coptic material there is hardly a sentence free from some tendentiousness—stress on the marvellous, glorification of Theodore (Zacchaeus takes very markedly second place), glorification of the coenobitic life against the eremitic, etc. The interesting account of Meletian and Antonian visits to the Tabennesiotes reads like an *ad hoc* later insertion in view of some particular problem confronting the Community. The Coptic version of Antony's words to Zacchaeus ('ἀποπείθω σε, Ζακχαῖε' in the Greek) not only replaces the idiomatic ἀποπείθω with the simple πείθω (τῆλεπυθε), but in its development, '“Petit Zacchée”;—il était en fait de petite taille', it is surely merely assimilating this Zacchaeus to the Zacchaeus of Scripture (Luke xix. 3). And, we may ask, what eye-witness of the whole episode would have given the account as we have it in the Coptic? Certainly neither Zacchaeus nor Theodore.

To sum up—the vindication of the *Letter of Ammon* not only confirms the historicity of G¹ against the Coptic on one important series of events, but thereby supports the principle, followed in an earlier generation by Ladeuze and Dom Cuthbert Butler, of preferring in general the shorter and more factual account of an event to the longer and more picturesque. The importance of this principle will appear more fully later in our discussion.

The Title of the Paralipomena or Ascetica: and a Possible Occasion for the Assembling of the Pachomian Corpus.

The *De Oratione*, with its 'βίοι τῶν Ταβεννησιωτῶν μοναχῶν', is not the only early document to give direct evidence of the existence of a Pachomian *corpus*. The document published by Halkin (and the earlier Bollandists) under the name of *Paralipomena* existed early enough to be used by the Greek original translated by Dionysius Exiguus, and to be translated into Syriac not later than the sixth century, and perhaps much earlier. For its title, we have the evidence of three Greek MSS., and of the Syriac Version:

In the Florentine MS.—'Ἐκ τοῦ Βίου τοῦ ἁγίου Παχουμίου.

(in this MS., Asc. follows the 'Vita Prima' and the *Letter of Ammon*).

In the Athenian—'Ἐκ τῶν Ἀσκητικῶν περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν κεφάλαια ιδ'.

In the Ambrosian—'Ὁ Βίος ἐκ τῶν Ἀσκητικῶν περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν κεφάλαια ιδ'. (in these two MSS., Asc. follows immediately on the 'Vita Prima').

In the Syriac (apparently)—'Asketikon of the House of Pachomius, Tabennesiote monks'—'of the house of Pachomius' might possibly stand for the Greek ἐκ τῶν τοῦ Παχουμίου.

On the face of it, we would seem to be dealing with extracts from a larger lost collection of stories. And certain of the stories surviving in our earliest Coptic fragments might plausibly be ascribed to the same collection as these Greek 'Ascetica'. On the other hand, it is remarkable that not one of the stories from the Greek collection actually survives in Coptic—except when there are parallels in G¹, in which case the Coptic agrees with G¹, not with Asc. Moreover, only the Florentine title appears definitely to imply that we are dealing with a selection of stories from a larger lost Pachomian work. The ἐκ τῶν ἀσκητικῶν of the other Greek MSS. might even refer to a general collection of Ascetica—for the name of Pachomius or his community is not directly mentioned, though the περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν implies it. Or, most probably, the rest of the collection might consist of other Pachomian works—e.g. the Rule and Letters (which had already been translated into Greek by A.D. 404–5, when Jerome turned them from the Greek into Latin), the 'Vita Prima' (or its archetype if it be not original), and the *Letter of Ammon*. All or any of these could be classed together, with the *Paralipomena*, under the title of 'Ascetica (or Asketikon) of the Tabennesiote monks of the company of Pachomius'. The phrase 'Tabennesiote monks' occurring in the Syriac title of Asc. instantly suggests the identity of this collection with the Lives of the Tabennesiote Monks spoken of in the *De Oratione*, and therefore (if the Evagrian authorship of that work be accepted) existing before A.D. 399.

Jerome was commissioned to make his translations for the use of Latin monks of the Pachomian monastery at Canopus; and we may assume that the Greek MSS. were sent him from there. Jerome speaks of this monastery as having happily changed its name from Canopus to Metanoea. And the pagan Eunapius gives us the clue to its origin, telling us (V. Phil. 472) how the pagan temple there was destroyed by the Patriarch Theophilus about the same time as the Alexandrian Serapeum, and monks were installed on the site, who worshipped the bones and skulls of martyrs. Surely we have here (A.D. 391–2) the occasion for the setting up by Theophilus of

the only Tabennesiote monastery in Northern Egypt—and also the occasion for his requesting from the community a *corpus* of works in Greek describing its history and character. In fact, Ep. Amm., c. 1, and Theophilus's acknowledgment at the conclusion of that work, show the Patriarch in the act of procuring one document for the *corpus*. And the document published in Coptic by Crum from a sixth century Cheltenham papyrus, and translated by Lefort (p. 389 ff.), though of questionable historicity, may at least reflect a true tradition when it shows Theophilus inviting Orsisius to bring with him to Alexandria 'the Life (*sic*) of our blessed holy fathers Apa Pachomo the father of the Community (*κοινωνία*) and Theodore his gentle disciple'.

Such a *Life* would form the principal document in the whole *corpus*, without which the title 'Lives of the Tabennesiote Monks' would hardly be justified. And if the papyrus gives a correct tradition, this work corresponded to the Greek 'Vita Prima' at least in including Pachomius and Theodore in a single biography.

The 'Ascetica', or 'Lives of the Tabennesiote Monks', may then be supposed to have included the following documents:

- a. A Life of Pachomius and Theodore
- b. The 'Paralipomena'
- c. The Letter of Ammon
- d. The Rule
- e. The Letters of Pachomius
- f. The Letter of Theodore
- g. The Book of Orsisius.

We may take it that all these documents appeared in Greek within a year or two before or after the founding of the Canopus monastery in A.D. 391–2.

The 'Vita Prima' claims to be the work of a writer, or writers, who had come to the community after the death of Pachomius, but had known survivors of the first generation (cc. 10, 46, 98–9), and in particular Theodore himself (c. 82, *ὡς εἴρηκεν ἡμῖν τοῦτο Θεόδωρος*), who provided the information required for the work. For the period of Theodore and Orsisius no direct claim is made, but there are several passages (e.g. cc. 143–4, 146, 149) which give the inescapable impression of eye-witness accounts. Ladeuze accepted the work as genuine, identifying it with the work of the 'Interpreter Brothers' spoken of in the Coptic (Bo. 196: S^{3b} ed. Lefort p. 341)—on the basis of which he wanted to place its writing immediately after the death of Theodore in A.D. 368. But this date is excluded for the work as we have it by its own statement (c. 149) that after Theodore's death Orsisius '*τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἐκυβέρνησεν χρόνον πολὺν*'. This statement leaves it in doubt whether Orsisius was alive or dead at the time of writing, but fits in perfectly with a date near A.D. 390 for the writing of the work—when Theodore's surviving contemporaries would be anxious to ensure the recording for posterity of the lives of the two saints.

Is there any valid evidence that the 'Vita Prima' was not in fact written at this time, or that (whatever its date) it was based on a Coptic original?

Can the original, whether Greek or Coptic, be shown to have been published first as a Life of Pachomius alone, before the addition of the 'Appendix' on Theodore and Orsisius? And what evidence is there for the existence of other lost documents, in Greek or Coptic, employed either by the 'Vita Prima' or by any of the surviving works? These are the questions we must seek to answer.

The Ascetica¹ and the 'Vita Prima'

The introductory paragraph of Asc. takes us a step further than the title of this work in implying the existence of some other Life or collection of stories to which Asc. is added as an appendix, although this involves returning to some extent over the same ground. It is particularly significant that this paragraph is found even in the Syriac, although Asc. is actually the only Pachomian work of which we have any record in Syriac, apart from a few stray *Apophthegmata* with which we shall deal presently. What was this other Life?

It is natural to turn first to the 'Vita Prima' which precedes the *Ascetica* in the only three known Greek MSS. which preserve either document as a separate work. Here we have a Life of Pachomius and Theodore which includes, scattered about the Pachomian portion, four stories apparently describing events also described—at greater length and with large divergences—in the *Ascetica*, and three others where the connexion is probable but rather more doubtful, as well as several more points where echoes may be traced.

But can these doublets give us the explanation of the prologue of Asc.? —ἐνέχεσθαι δὲ τῶν αὐτῶν οὐ βλαβερὸν, ὅτι τὸ μὲν ἀναδραμεῖν ἐπὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἀσφαλέστερον πρὸς τὴν θεωρίαν παρασκευάζει τῶν λεγομένων τὸν ἀκροατήν. . . ὅθεν ἐπαναδραμόντες τῷ λόγῳ συγγενῇ τῶν προτέρων ὀλίγα ἐκθώμεθα.

Ladeuze, noting a similarity in ethos between Asc. and the Coptic fragments, suggests that the narratives found in Asc. were added to G¹ on its translation into Coptic, and subsequently translated into Greek and added to G¹ as an appendix. It is true that certain characteristics of Asc. are most easily explained on the supposition that it is a translation from the Coptic (the fact that its Greek is purer and more literary than that of G¹ in no way prejudices the issue). And it is true that a close analysis of Asc. shows it at several points to be further removed from the facts—and therefore presumably later in date—than G¹.² But the suggestion of a

¹ For convenience, we will henceforth follow the Syriac in restricting this term to the 'Paralipomena' of the Bollandists, although, as we have seen, this is really begging a large question.

² Thus in the story of Silvanus, the name of the lad's surety is given as 'a certain Petronius'—surely the well-known name of Pachomius's successor—in place of the otherwise unknown Psenammon of G¹—although what we know of Petronius from G¹ is incompatible, chronologically and otherwise, with his being Silvanus's surety. And further on in the same story, when the brethren seek to find whom Pachomius is praising, the names of Petronius, Orsisius and Theodore are suggested. Orsisius has replaced the Cornelius of G¹—we can well suppose that the fame of Cornelius had faded in the interval between the writing of the two documents.

Coptic original is confronted by the complete absence of any trace of the *Ascetica* in Coptic. Now some of the Coptic Lives are very closely connected with G¹, and the inconsistencies between the two documents make it inconceivable that a Coptic translator should have inserted the Asc. stories in G¹ in the face of what it already contained.

On this ground Halkin argues further that the Life referred to in the Prologue to Asc. cannot have contained the doublets in the form or order in which they are found in G¹. He points out that no one who had read G¹ in its present form could have started the first story in a work written as a supplement thereto with 'Θεοδώρω τινι' as if Theodore were unknown to his readers: that the accounts given in Asc. contain chronological impossibilities (Theodore, and then Silvanus, are stated to have been twenty years *in the monastery* before the events recorded) absent from G¹, and many other details quite inconsistent with G¹'s account. Pointing to the fact that the doublets seem to be gathered together at the head of Asc., and not in the order in which they are found in G¹, he argues that a reviser of G¹ has supplemented that work from an incomplete form of Asc. (he suggests that there is a growth of the marvellous in the later part of Asc., giving the impression of a later stage in the development of the story), distributing the stories where he thought good, and correcting manifest errors. He supports his theory by alleging that the close parallel between G¹ and G² ceases precisely at the point where the first Asc. story appears in G², and that G² always (with one possible exception) adopts the Asc. form of the stories to the exclusion of the G¹ form, thus suggesting that G² was using an earlier, incomplete form of G¹. We shall be dealing a little later with the relationship between G¹ and G². But in regard to the order of Asc., Halkin does not perhaps give sufficient weight to the existence of two recensions. The order of his published text is that of one MS. only, F. The other two Greek MSS., and the Syriac version, supported by G³, and in large measure by G², place three of the episodes quite differently. It will be convenient to give here the order of the chapters, named by their numbers in Halkin's edition, as they are found in the other recension—with definite parallels in G¹ underlined alongside, and vaguer links bracketed:

1	<u>77</u>
2-4	<u>104-5</u>
5-6a	<u>103</u>
13	(93?)
14	(18?)
15-16	
<u>7</u>	(31?)
17-20	(102?)
21-23	(cf. 39, 109)
<u>8-11</u>	<u>85</u>
24-26	(cf. 88)
27	(cf. 94-5)

28-31	(cf. 79)
32	
33	
12	
34	
35-36	

At first sight it would look as if the recension of F must be secondary—the distribution of the three underlined episodes at random through the work seems a much less natural proceeding than the assembling of them by F after the first three episodes in the same order in relation to each other in which they occurred in the other recension. And, except for c. 12, the occurrence of doublets in G¹ might be precisely the reason for assembling these chapters together in F—though the parallel between Asc. 7 and G¹31 is really rather distant: while c. 12 comes perhaps more naturally as a comment on cc. 8-11 than anywhere else in the work, and it is hard to see why it should be transferred to the position it occupies in the Syriac recension. At the same time we must admit that, if F be the original order, the bringing together of 6 and 13 in Syr. by the removal of the three episodes to another position can be explained as an artistic improvement (the c. 6a which links them in Syr. is absent from F), and that in other details the text of F frequently rings truer. But even in F, the doublets allowed by Halkin (cc. 1, 2-4, 5-6, 8-11, 14, 17-20) are interrupted by cc. 7, 12, 13, and 15-16.

But apart from the doubt as to order, it is difficult to accept Halkin's theory that our present recension of G¹, including the doublets, was made by a writer who knew the Asc. version of these stories. The differences are surely too great to allow of any literary dependence either way. Lefort (introd. p. xx) is justified here in concluding, 'Nos actuels recueils de *Paralipomena* n'ont donc ni emprunté, ni prêté à la *Vita Prima*'.

But Lefort concludes from this that both Asc. and the Lives are dependent upon an earlier collection of Pachomian stories. To his views upon D, G², etc., we will return presently. So far as G¹ and Asc. are concerned, a study of the parallels surely forces us to a conclusion which does not seem to have occurred either to Halkin or to Lefort: that the divergences are such as to exclude, not only direct literary dependence between the two documents, but even *the possibility of their deriving from a common literary source*. They are manifestly based on divergent *oral* traditions of the same event. Both the similarities (e.g. sayings quoted identically in the two documents) and the divergences are of the type to imply this. And as both documents have passages in which the writer claims to have known Pachomius's immediate disciples, we must not *assume* that stories they contain need have any literary stage separating them from the oral traditions on which they are based.

But does the fact that G¹ and Asc. are independent of each other in their contents necessarily imply that the Greek *editor* of the Asc. collection

was ignorant of G¹ in a form already containing the parallels to Asc.²¹ We can well imagine a writer of more artistic interest feeling that G¹ was too ascetic and pruned a work, its author too much of a historian, to give a sufficient picture of the life of the community—that it needed to be completed by a series of stories as he had heard them—or perhaps as he had found some of them already in writing, in Greek or Coptic—which, though they might be less accurate or reliable as history, should be none the less true ‘ikons’ of the Saint, with a warmth and fulness of detail missing in the more continuous historical work. He would realise that to attempt to conform his stories to such parallels as might be found for them in G¹ would be to rob them of their freshness. So he would give them as he had received them, without caring to remove inconsistencies or historical impossibilities, of which in fact writers of this type are frequently far too tolerant. But he would add just the kind of prologue we have, apologising for not having tried to avoid covering ground already covered in G¹. Surely this is the most natural explanation of ἐνέχεσθαι τῶν αὐτῶν . . . ἀναδραμεῖν ἐπὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς . . . ἐπαναδραμόντες τῷ λόγῳ. If this is so, then Asc. does not contain, in its prologue or elsewhere, any proof of the existence of a prior *Life* or collection of *Ascetica* other than the documents still surviving in Greek.

Testimony in the ‘Vita Prima’ to the Existence of Earlier Documents

After dealing with Asc. and the *De Oratione*, Lefort writes (p. xxiv) ‘Quoiqu’il en soit des rapports littéraires entre nos *Ascetica* ou *Paralipomena*, et les *Bioi* que lisait Nil, un fait se dégage avec pleine certitude: les ascètes grecs pouvaient lire aux environs de l’an 400 des séries de récits sur les Pachomiens distinctes de nos actuelles *Vitae* grecs dont l’existence, à pareille date, reste encore à prouver’. While we have not yet given our positive arguments for the existence of G¹ at this date, at least we may claim to have overthrown the certainty with which Lefort claims already to have proved the existence at this date of any Pachomian documents in Greek other than those we actually possess, and to have given a strong positive argument for believing that Ep. Amm. was already in existence as one of the documents included under the title ‘Lives of the Tabennesiote Monks’. But Lefort goes on in the next sentence to try to support his conclusion from G¹ itself—‘Ce fait, d’ailleurs, est nettement confirmé par un témoignage formel; on lit en G¹ § 99: τινὲς ἀκούοντες, ὑπεραγαπῶντες αὐτόν (Pachôme), ἔγραψαν πολλὰ παρ’ αὐτοῦ νοήματα τῶν Γραφῶν, ὥς τε καὶ εἴ ποτε ὄραμα εἶδεν ἢ ὀπτασίαν κτλ’.

Here, certainly, we have formal testimony for the existence in the first generation of other Pachomian writings. But (as is made still clearer by the first part of the same sentence, not quoted by Lefort—καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς πολλάκις τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ ἀββᾶς Παχούμιος) the writings here

¹ We should note in passing that analysis of the language and the vocabulary of the two documents makes it quite certain that they are not from the same hand—though it is to be noted that the Greek of the Homily on Idolatry appended to F but to none of our other sources for Asc. is allied to that of G¹ rather than of Asc., and would not be inconsistent with its being due to the same Greek hand as G¹.

referred to are interpretations of Scripture (*νοήματα τῶν Γραφῶν*) and visions (*εἶποτε ὄραμα εἶδεν ἢ ὀπτασίαν*). In other words, what is suggested is a collection of homilies (presumably in Coptic) and *not* a biography or collection of biographical stories. Such a collection of homilies (both of Pachomius and of Theodore and Orsisius) is surely suggested also by much of the contents both of G¹ and of Asc. The homily *Against Idolatry* appended to Asc. in F might seem to be a complete specimen of its contents. And other examples are to be found in Coptic, both in the surviving Lives and as separate works (e.g. the catechesis published by Budge, *Coptic Apocrypha*, p. 146 ff.).

A clue to the character of the collection of *νοήματα τῶν Γραφῶν* is provided by Theodore himself when, in G¹ c. 142, he seems even to be quoting from the collection in question—*‘Νοήσωμεν δὲ καὶ τοῦτο τὸ κέρδος, ὅπερ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν ἠκούσαμεν ἐκ τῶν νοημάτων τῶν θείων Γραφῶν, ὅτι—*and there follows a little homily clearly given as Pachomius’s rather than Theodore’s own. As to *ὄραμα*, the disquisition in c. 48 about a pure and humble man being *ὄραμα μέγα* suggests that here at least we have another extract from the collection: while c. 102—*ὡς ὄραμα δέ ἐστιν—*almost proclaims itself another item; and here we have a vision with a close parallel in Ep. Amm. 12, and at least some resemblances in Asc. 17. We should also note G¹ c. 125, where the brethren ask Theodore *πνευματικὸν ῥῆμα λύειν αὐτοῖς, ἢ ὄραμα τοῦ ἀββᾶ Παχουμίου εἰπεῖν*, while c. 135 gives a disquisition of Theodore on *ὀράματα*. The use of *ὀπτασία* in cc. 87 and 88 indicates to us the kind of way in which it is to be distinguished from *ὄραμα*. And this kind of instruction by way of narrative might not be out of place in a homiletic collection (though we should remember that in c. 87 *ὀπτασία τῶν ἀγίων* suggests a literary indebtedness to V. Ant. 896 AB.). The word occurs again in Pachomius’s speech at the Synod of Latopolis, and here there is some other evidence (e.g. the mention of Moses *ὁ τοῦ Μαγδώλου* otherwise unknown) which may point to a written verbatim record of the Synod. But minutes of a Synod might be quite independent of the Pachomian homiletic collection.

In Asc., *νόημα* is only used in quite a different sense, and *ὄραμα* not at all. *Ὀπτασία* is used to describe visions in cc. 17 and 24–6, and the seeing of *ὀπτασίαι* is described in c. 33 as something not to be coveted.

G¹ c. 99, the chapter which tells of these writings, is that which also tells of the Rule (*περὶ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τοῦ κοινοβίου λόγους καὶ θεσμούς*), and the Letters employing the secret alphabetical code (*ἐπιστολὰς πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας τῶν μοναστηρίων, καὶ ἐν αὐταῖς ὀνόματα γραμμάτων, οἷον ἀπὸ ἄλφα ἕως ὦ, σημαίνων τινὰ ἐν γλώσσει κρυπτῇ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐκείνοις νοοῦσιν ἐνεκεν κυβερνήσεως ψυχῶν*)—clearly the Rule and Letters translated into Latin by Jeromē from a Greek translation. This confirms the impression that we are concerned here with a definite collection of homiletic writings, forming part of a regular corpus of Pachomian works (presumably all in Coptic in the first instance); but no evidence is given of narrative material, and G¹ c. 98 appears expressly to deny the existence of any earlier Life.

*Pachomian Extracts in the Apophthegmata Patrum*¹

Lefort proceeds (p. xxiv), 'Outre ces séries de récits sur les premiers Pachômiens, il exista, en dehors des *Vitae*, un autre groupe de récits détachés; nous voulons dire ceux qui furent absorbés par les recueils d'*Apophthegmata*, *Paradis des Pères*, *Λειμῶνες*, ou *Prés spirituels*'. He points out that none of the stories in Asc. or in the 'Bioi de Nil' (i.e. De Or. 108-9) are found in the collections of *Apophthegmata* we possess, and that all the Pachomiana found in these collections are also found in the *Vitae*. He proceeds to list ten passages, in the order of their occurrence in G¹. He tentatively adds another possible parallel with an anonymous *Apophthegm* (G¹ c. 87, || PJ xv. 70) which cannot be allowed—there is only a very vague resemblance between the stories. And he points to two *apophthegmata* found in the collections and in G³, but not in G¹ or G².

Putting the question of the origin of these *Apophthegmata*, he admits that 'plusieurs des apophthegmes pachômiens dénotent une évidente parenté littéraire avec la *Vita Prima* (G¹)': but, pointing out that evidently the collections of *apophthegmata* were gathered in several stages from many sources, he argues rightly that we cannot affirm the derivation of these *apophthegmata* from G¹ until we have established G¹'s chronological priority. And, pointing out that R 34a attributes to Theodore an episode rightly ascribed in our Lives to Pachomius (that of his sister), he argues that therefore it cannot be derived from these Lives and says 'nous trouverons d'autres exemples ailleurs' for the substitution of Theodore for Pachomius, and insists that R 34a must derive from a source in which the hero is called simply 'abba' or 'ὁ μέγας'—'c'est-à-dire selon l'usage des *Ascetica* et des *Bioi* de Nil'.

Actually, there seems no justification for treating the ὁ μέγας of Asc. as the exact equivalent of 'Abba'. It represents a different Coptic term. And we have already seen that the 'Bioi de Nil' do *not* use 'abba' unaccompanied by a name; while the *Letter of Ammon* (the *one* example later given by Lefort) can *not* be shown to substitute Theodore for Pachomius. Thus, if there be any transposition, it would more probably be Bo. 98 that has substituted Pachomius for Theodore. But in any case, R would seem to be the least exact of the Latin versions of the *Apophthegmata*, and the story of Theodore's mother in R 34b was quite sufficient to induce a careless writer to attribute the preceding story to Theodore's sister instead of Pachomius's. The change is quite inadequate to prove dependence of R on any source other than our actual Lives.

Lefort proceeds to refer to the use of a Paradise of the Fathers containing stories of Palamon, Pachomius, Horsisi, Petronius, Theodore, etc., by the writer of the Life of St. John Kolobos—Zacharias bishop of Sakho, whom he dates c. A.D. 600.² Admitting that we do not know what Pachomian anecdotes this Paradise contained (the list of names sounds suspi-

¹ *Apophthegmata* references are given according to the tables in Bousset's *Apophthegmata*.

² Actually, he was consecrated bishop during the Patriarchate of Simon I (A.D. 689-701), and held his see for thirty years.

ciously as if it had actually reproduced a complete Life of the G¹ type, just as the Syriac Paradise reproduces the complete *Life of St. Antony*, and the *Ascetica* of Pachomius), he continues, 'Qui oserait prétendre *a priori* que toutes ces anecdotes dérivent, en dernière analyse, de l'un ou l'autre de nos actuelles *Vitae* grecques, quand on sait d'une part que ces dernières, comme nous le verrons plus loin, sont toutes des compilations . . . et d'autre part que, vers 400, . . . il existait des recueils de récits sur les anciens Pâchômiens entre les mains des ascètes grecs.'

But the fact remains that, so far at least, Lefort has *not* proved that all the Greek Lives (including G¹) are compilations: nor, as we have seen, has he satisfactorily proved the existence, c. A.D. 400, of any collection of Pachomian stories other than those we possess. Of course we have not yet *proved* the use of G¹ by the collections of *Apophthegmata*. But it is certainly not disproved. Of course we make no *a priori* claim (can Lefort make the same disclaimer?). But attention to the facts may perhaps establish a probability. Let us examine first the cases listed by Lefort.

In the three *Apophthegmata* found in the Greek Alphabetical collection (P.G. lxx, cols. 316 and 436—the Orsisius and Psenthaïsius *apophthegmata*), verbal identity with G¹ is as close as could be expected from a reliable MS. of G¹ itself: the two Orsisius *apophthegmata* are also found in the Latin of PJ, which also implies the same Greek text, though the translator has wildly misunderstood it at certain points. Lefort had not noticed that one of these (=G¹ c. 120) is also found, attributed to *Arsenius* (a natural error) in the Syriac (214—again the same Greek text is implied, though the translator seems to have used a MS. defective at one point, failed to construe certain phrases, and made one or two expansions), and in a second Latin translation (Pa. 11. 1), which gives a free version of a small portion, but again bears evidence of having used the same Greek text.

Three other Pachomian *apophthegmata* are found in the Syriac (108, 109, 354. In all three cases the Greek text of G¹ is implied (cc. 14, 22 and 73—the Syriac text of G¹ c. 14 in particular may be of value in correcting the somewhat doubtful text of F)).

One of these three is found, also, together with the four remaining *Apophthegmata* of Lefort's list, in R 34-5. This collection, like Pa, is in rather a different category. A comparison of other passages therein with the Greek originals shows that the author is not concerned with making other than a loose version of his Greek sources. And if this is borne in mind, we find nothing in these two chapters—not even the erroneous attribution of the sister to Theodore—inconsistent with their being based, directly or indirectly, on the stories as we have them in G¹.

We conclude, therefore, that in all the Pachomian stories they give, G, PJ, and Syr. certainly, and Pa and R probably, had before them a Greek text indistinguishable, in these passages at least, from that of G¹. Certainly, we have not up to this point *proved* that the document containing them was otherwise identical with G¹. But equally certainly nothing so far has disproved it.

We must turn for a moment to the three *Apophthegmata* which G³ alone of the relevant Pachomian Lives contains. One of these (c. 160) concerns the visit of Macarius to Pachomius, and belongs rather to a Macarian cycle than to a Pachomian. The second (c. 195) is, probably rightly, attributed in the Alphabetical collection to Theodore of Pherme, not to the Tabennesiote. The third (c. 158—the Angels of Wednesday and Friday accompanying the bier of a dead monk) is not mentioned by Lefort, probably because he has not found it in the published collections of *Apophthegmata*. Halkin also (p. 70*) failed to find it in Bousset's tables. But in fact Bousset does record it in the first Armenian recension (Arm. 18, 53): and I have found it in the collection contained in the Bodleian MS. Cromwell 18 (a collection which has many affinities with the Armenian—being, like it, a later development of the PJ collection). Here certainly we have a Pachomian anecdote (though it has some resemblance to some Macarian anecdotes) not found in the surviving primary sources, Greek or Coptic. But one swallow does not make a spring. One anecdote is not a sufficient basis on which to assume the existence of a whole collection.

To sum up—the PJ Latin translation was probably made before the middle of the sixth century: the Syriac perhaps earlier, certainly not much later: Pa before the death of Martinus Dumiensis in A.D. 583: and R, of uncertain date, seems closely connected with Pa. Probably all of these, certainly the first two, used Greek collections containing Pachomian anecdotes in the form in which they are found in G¹.

To this we can add that the recorded utterances of the abbot Zosimas, written down also not later than the middle of the sixth century, contain a longish quotation¹ from G¹ cc. 15–16 (ed. Halkin, p. 10, 7–27) in a text verbally identical with that of G¹.

It seems, then, that by about the time at which Dionysius Exiguus was translating into Latin a Greek Life of Pachomius whose text closely resembled that of G², a considerable number of anecdotes existed in a form textually indistinguishable from G¹. Of course, it is not *proved* that they were excerpted from that or any other Life. But it seems the most natural explanation. Perhaps it would not be exceeding the bounds of caution to claim that we have already established a strong *prima facie* case for the genuineness of the 'Vita Prima.'

The Latin Life and the Greek Lives

We can now turn to examine the relationship between the Latin Life translated from the Greek by Dionysius Exiguus (D), G², and G¹.

The close connexion between D and G² extends even to the forms of names—thus for the (correct) Ψόης of G¹ (c.25), G² has *Οψις and D Obsis. For the name of the bishop of Tentyra, Sarapion (Σαραπίωνος) in G¹ (c. 29), G² has Ἀπρίωνος, and D S. Aprione—both probably standing for *Sapriion*, which is the form in which this bishop's name is given in Athan-

¹ Του οσίου πατρος ἡμῶν Ζωσιμᾶ κεφάλαια πάνυ ὠφέλιμα, ed. Augoustinos, Jerusalem 1913, 2. 20–3. 11.

asius, Ep. Fest. xi. The existence of this name alongside of and in distinction from the commoner Sarapion is borne out by papyri. The bishop is probably the same who is named among the Egyptian bishops at the Synod of Tyre, (Ath., *Ap. c. Ar.* 79). We should note that D gives the Coptic date (14th Pachon) for the death of Pachomius, where G² falls into error by giving 14 May: but the substitution of the known May for the unknown Pachon, though found in all known MSS. of G², need not be taken to represent the original text of that *Life*. The larger differences between G² and D are the presence of one long section and two short passages in D, derived from HL, and of three long sections in G². G² as well as D shows, in certain sentences, knowledge of HL. Otherwise, virtually the whole of the contents of G² and of D is represented either in G¹ or in Asc. Halkin's arguments for their derivation from these two works might appear sufficient and conclusive. But Lefort proposes a completely different conclusion. For him, the Greek original of D is the earliest Greek *Life*, based (apart from the extracts from HL) on a collection of stories ('*Ascetica*') in part identical with our Asc.: G² subsequently supplemented this with other stories, some of them from Asc. in its present form, and cut out all passages which could appear to derive from Palladius owing to the latter's Origenist reputation: Lefort argues against the dependence of G² on G¹ on the ground that G² is shown to be faithful to his sources by his exact reproduction of Asc. in passages absent from D, and of D in the sections they have in common. Lefort overlooks the possibility of explaining this last by seeing D as a faithful translation of G² itself; and also the fact that, even if D be the original, the parallelism of the first long section of D itself with G¹ calls for an explanation. As to the faithful reproduction of Asc. by G² in the sections parallel to Asc. and absent from D—this is perfectly true of the two shorter sections (G² cc. 73–8 and 85–6): their text accurately reproduces the text of Asc., as found in the Syriac recension, and can be taken as evidence for that text equal to any surviving MS. (see Lefort, p. xxxii). If we could conclude from this as to the faithfulness of G²'s reproduction of its sources throughout, it would be quite clear that G² was nowhere directly dependent on G¹. This identity of text with that of Asc. in these chapters is in marked contrast with the comparative looseness of the correspondence with Asc. in the chapters immediately preceding the first of these sections or immediately following the second, whereas in both cases the Latin *Life* seems manifestly translated from a Greek text faithfully reproduced in G². The transition from G² c. 72 to c. 79 is made in D with four sentences, absent here from G², the first three of which are found forming the conclusion of the Appendix (cc. 91–3) added in some MSS. to G², while the last ('*Haec dicens sine mora surrexit, et commendans eos Domino, profectus est*') provides continuity in the narrative as is customary in G² and D. It loses its point if c. 73 follows immediately, and Lefort (p. xxxv) is probably right in supposing these sentences to have been omitted by G²—although he has not observed that the appearance of *καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς* in the Syriac, followed by the final two sentences of Asc. 20 as

in F, shows that in fact this phrase has its normal sense, indicating that a biblical quotation is cut short, and is not just inserted in G² in place of the omitted sentences. The transition from G² c. 84 to c. 87 is made with half a sentence ('Et quia nobis de magnanimis viris sermo processit') which would be absurd if following immediately on G² c. 86, but brings out the real structural link between D li, lii, and liii (G², cc. 84 and 87), which G² cc. 85-6 interrupt. All the evidence suggests, then, that both these sections are later insertions from Asc. in the text of G².

But when we turn to G² cc. 40-58—the longest section absent from D, which is parallel partly to Asc. and partly to G¹—we find a very different situation indeed. First, the passages parallel to Asc. prove on examination not to show that continuous exact reproduction of the text of Asc. which marks the other two sections: the degree of correspondence is just that which we find between Asc. and those chapters of G² which are found also in D—e.g. cc. 60-1, 62b-4, 67-72, 81-3, 87-8a. Moreover, the regular correspondence between G² and D ceases a sentence or so *before* the end of G²39, II.D 37, and begins again not at the beginning of the story of Silvanus, but half-way through it. To take first the beginning of the section:

D	G ²	G ¹
Et si quando poscens aliquid a Domino, petitionis suae non consequeretur effectum, non contristabatur omnino, sed patientissime sustinebat, sciens hoc expedire vel sibi vel omnibus, quidquid divina misericordia censisset: quia frequenter intentione sincera videmur postulare contraria, quae Domini bonitas, cum non concedit, praestare dignatur; et tunc potius clementer exaudit, cum vota nostrae ignorantiae nocte velata non perficit.	Εἰ δέ ποτε καὶ προσευξάμενος μὴ ἔτυχε τοῦ αὐτοῦ περὶ ὑγείας τινός, αἰτήματος, οὐκ ἐξενίζετο· ἀλλὰ τὴν θείαν ἐκείνην καὶ μεγάλην ἣν ἐδιδάχθη διὰ παντὸς ἐπὶ στόματος ἔφερεν εὐχὴν, "γενεθῆτω," λέγων, "πάτερ τὸ σὸν θέλημα."	Ἐὰν δὲ πάλιν εὐχομένου αὐτοῦ περὶ ὑγείας τινός, μὴ δῶ ὁ Κύριος τὸ αἶτημα, οὐκ ἐξενίζετο οὐδὲ ἐλυπεῖτο ὡς μὴ εἰσακουσθεὶς, εἰδὼς τῶν ἀγίων τὸν σκοπόν. καὶ αὐτὸς εὐχόμενος ἔλεγεν τὸ "Γενεθῆτω τὸ θέλημά σου καὶ μὴ τὸ ἐμόν". Ἐδίδασκεν γὰρ ἡμᾶς ἐν τούτῳ ὁ μετὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἔν εἰς πάντα, ὅτι οὕτως ὀφείλει εἶναι.

Up to 'contristabatur', D corresponds exactly with G². From that point the correspondence ceases completely, while G² continues to show the same parallelism as before with G¹. D's conclusion would be a natural one for him to add supposing he had a text of G² interrupted at ἐξενίζετο, or perhaps at οὐκ, as 'contristabatur' is not a natural translation for ἐξενίζετο.

Similarly in G² 58–60—c. 58 combines the story found in G¹70 with the beginning of the Silvanus story, and is most naturally explained as a somewhat lame attempt to make a narrative link between G¹70 and Asc. 2. From this point, G²59–60 shows throughout the same correspondence with Asc. that is continued in G²61. When we turn to the story in D—the G¹70 story is, of course, entirely missing, and the early part of the Silvanus story is not really parallel with either Asc. 2 or G¹104—we find no true parallel in surviving Pachomian literature. Only a few sentences after the beginning of G¹60 do we find D returning to its normal close correspondence with G², which is continued from that point.

In G², adapting Asc., Pachomius after twenty years' beating and bearing with Silvanus, at last decides to expel him, but yields to his pleas on condition that Petronius stands surety for him. In D, it is first a number of the brethren, then later all the community, who demand Silvanus's expulsion, while Pachomius himself persistently resists the demand, and in the end brings him to the fear of God, so that he cannot refrain from tears. The story of the surety, found in G¹ as well as Asc. and G², is not mentioned. We can then watch the transition back to correspondence with G² by setting D, G², and Asc. alongside each other in the passage that follows.

D	G ²	Asc.
Emendatus itaque per omnia, magnum ceteris documentum conversionis exhibuit. In omni namque loco et in omni operatione flebat jugiter; et nec tunc quidem cum cibum inter fratres caperet, a lamentatione cessabat. Quae res etiam permovet multos ex monachis, qui ei dixerunt: Tandem a planctu te cohibe, nec tanta, quaesumus, afflictione dejicias. Qui respondit: Conor quidem, sicut jubetis, a lacrymis temperare nec possum. Pectus enim meum veluti quaedam flamma comburens, quietum	‘Ο δὲ τυχὼν τῆς ἀφέσεως ταύτης οὕτως ἑαυτὸν ἐταπείνωσεν ὥστε αὐτὸν ὑπογραμμὸν γενέσθαι πολλοῖς κατὰ πᾶσαν μὲν ἀρετὴν θεοσεβείας, ἐξαιρέτως δὲ ἐν τοῖς κατὰ Θεὸν δάκρυσι πάσῃ τῇ ἀδελφότητι. ὡς καὶ ἐσθίοντος αὐτοῦ πολλάκις μὴ δύνασθαι ἐπισχεῖν τὴν τῶν δακρύων φορὰν ποταμῆδὸν γενομένην, ἀλλὰ συμμίγνυσθαι καὶ αὐτῇ τῇ ἀναγκαίᾳ τροφῇ καὶ πληροῦσθαι ἐπ’ αὐτῷ τὸ δανιτικὸν ἐκεῖνο τὸ “Σποδὸν ὡσεὶ ἄρτον ἔφαγον καὶ τὸ πόμα μου μετὰ κλαυθμοῦ ἐκίρνω.” Λεγόντων δὲ αὐτῷ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μὴ ἐπὶ ξένων ἢ ὅλως τινῶν τοῦτο ποιεῖν, διῶσχυρίζετο λέγων ὅτι, “Πολλάκις	‘Ο δὲ Σιλβανὸς τυχὼν τῆς ἀφέσεως οὕτως ἠγνώσκατο πάσῃ ψυχῇ αὐτοῦ, ὥστε αὐτὸν ὑπογραμμὸν γενέσθαι εἰς πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν θεοσεβείας πᾶσιν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μικροῖς τε καὶ μεγάλοις. Τὸ δὲ μέγα πλεονέκτημα αὐτοῦ τῶν ἀρετῶν ἦν ἡ ἐπ’ ἄκρον ταπεινοφροσύνη καὶ τὸ μὴ διαλείπειν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ δακρύων, ὥστε καὶ ἐσθίοντος αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν, μὴ δύνασθαι ἐπικρατεῖν τῶν δακρύων ἀλλὰ συνμίσγῃ εἶναι τῇ τροφῇ τὰ δάκρυα. Λεγόντων δὲ αὐτῷ τῶν ἀδελφῶν τὸ μὴ ἐπὶ ξένων προσώπων ἢ ὅλως τινῶν τοῦτο ποιεῖν, διῶσχυρίζετο λέγων ὅτι “Πολλάκις ἠθέλησα ἐπικρατῆσαι τῶν δακρύων

me esse non sinit. Rursum ipsi dixerunt: Apud te in secreto tuo, vel certe in orationibus plangito; cum vero convenimus ad mensam, cibum sumere debemus et a fletibus abstinere. Nam possibile est animam et sine istis exterioribus lacrimis semper in compunctione persistere.

βουληθεὶς ἐγκρατεύσασθαι τούτου χάριν, καὶ οὐκ ταύτης μάλιστα τῆς ἰσχυσα. Φασκόντων δὲ αἰτίας, ὅλως οὐκ ἡδυνή- τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὅτι “ Δυνα- θην.” Αὐτῶν δὲ πάλιν τὸν ἐστὶ καθ’ ἑαυτὸν μὲν δυνατὸν εἶναι λεγόντων κλαίειν τὸν κατανευγ- καθ’ ἑαυτὸν μὲν ἐν κατα- μένον, καὶ ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ νύξει τοῦτο ποιεῖν καὶ ἐν ποιεῖν ὁμοίως μετὰ τῶν τῇ προσευχῇ, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ἀδελφῶν, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς τρα- τραπέζης ἐσθίοντα ἐγ- πέξης ἐσθίοντα μετὰ τῶν κρατεύεσθαι. “ Δύναται ἀδελφῶν ἐπικρατεῖν· δύ- γὰρ, ἔφασκον, ψυχὴ καὶ ναται γὰρ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ χωρὶς τῶν ἔξωθεν δακ- χωρὶς τῶν φαινομένων ρύων πάντοτε ἐν κατα- τούτων δακρύων πάντοτε νύξει εἶναι” . . . κλαίειν . . .

The close textual correspondence that is normal between G² and D is only resumed at ‘Rursum ipsi dixerunt’.¹ From that point, it continues as usual. The conclusion seems irresistible, that in this long section G² has not been expanding D, and D has not been abridging G², but simply the Greek text used by D had a gap at this point, extending from G² (ed. Halkin), p. 208, l. 22, ἐξενίζετο, to p. 230, l. 16, οὐκ ἡδυνήθη.² And the consistent agreement in order and, so far as we can judge from a translation, in text between D and G² throughout the rest of D, apart from the section introduced from HL, makes it a natural supposition that the *Life* translated by Dionysius had originally agreed with G² over this lost portion also.

It seems probable, then, that we have in G² the original text of the *Life* used by Dionysius except in the two sections introduced subsequently into G² from Asc., in the Appendix found in some MSS. of G², and in the extracts from Palladius peculiar to D. Lefort argues that these extracts were in the Greek original of D, and were cut out by G². It seems more natural to suppose that they were inserted by Dionysius or his Greek original, and did not belong to the common source of D and G². But this point may be more easily dealt with after we have examined the connexion of G²D with G¹ and Asc.

For the text of the chapters where the parallel is clear, the example given above will be sufficient to show the relationship in the case of G² and Asc. The verbal dependence of one on the other is quite clear, and there can be no doubt which way the dependence lies. The substitution by G² of the lengthy phrase for the simple word, the extra quotation from Scripture,

¹ The comparison of the three documents here has, incidentally, given us a good example of the freedom of the correspondence normal between Asc. and G¹ in a passage where G² does not correspond to D.

² It is curious, and possibly significant, that one MS. of G²—H in Halkin’s apparatus—was based on a text which had a similar, though rather shorter gap, beginning on p. 210, l. 23 (49 lines of Halkin’s edition later than the gap we trace in D), and ending on p. 228, l. 21 (46 lines earlier than the D gap).

the smoothing out of linguistic roughnesses, are all clear indications of the secondary document. The same relationship is found between G² and G¹ in the passages where they correspond. If the differences are more considerable, this is explained by the fact that Asc. is much more to the literary taste of G² than is G¹. But even where G² is most expansive, the recurrence of particular words and phrases from G¹ proves G²'s dependence.¹ At the same time, we can see in the changes and developments something of the character and purpose of G². The writer is concerned with composition and literary style as G¹ is not. He is concerned with edification and not with history (Pabau, spelt Παβου, is only mentioned at its foundation, and not identified as the new seat of government of the community). He will modify a story to cut out anything which could for a moment seem disrespectful to his hero or otherwise shocking to his hearers. He will cut out editorial passages in his original, modify or omit homiletic chapters, expand for literary effect, introduce links—sometimes very artificial ones—between successive but seemingly disconnected stories, eliminate doublets, simplify his history to conform to his artistic pattern. He will confine his work to the *Life* of Pachomius (whether his sources did so or not) and tend to omit chapters concerning Theodore or the community which are not directly relevant to Pachomius himself.²

With these points in mind, we can now examine a table showing the relationship of the contents of G¹, Asc., G² and D.

We have already seen that the apparent identity of the beginning of the first long omission in D with the beginning of G²'s first substantial omission or transposition of chapters of G¹ (46–9) is deceptive, as D diverges a few sentences earlier. G¹ 46–9 are homiletic chapters, and Halkin recognises that the close parallelism between G² and G¹ goes further than this point, but argues that it ends with G¹ 54, G² 43, at the point at which G² begins to use Asc. But if certain principles are recognised, a careful examination suggests that the parallelism may extend much further—perhaps right to the end of G². And the absence of the post-Pachomian portion from G² is, of course, no evidence that he was not using a copy of G¹ which contained it. If we allow that G² may, apart from pure omissions, have modified the order and contents of G¹ sometimes by substitution of stories from Asc., and sometimes by transposition of chapters for literary reasons, the grounds for supposing that G² used G¹ in an uncompleted form disappear.

G² 12b adds to G¹ 12 the story of the angelic vision and giving of the

¹ A typical example, where a change bears in itself the marks of dependence, can be quoted from G² 17||G¹ 18. The latter (p. 11, l. 26) speaks of Pachomius's heart *ὡς θύρα χαλκῇ ἡσφαλισμένη κατὰ ληστῶν*. G², finding the simile of the door unacceptable, describes Pachomius as *τὸν ἡσφαλισμένον τῷ τῆς πίστεως θυρεῶ* (p. 183, l. 12).

² I am not unaware that in this paragraph I have tended to assume that G² did in fact take from G¹ the chapters in which his correspondence is with that *Life*. But even if these could conceivably have been isolated chapters, or parts of a different collection, afterwards used by G¹, their text would appear to have been as we find it in G¹, and they would be found to share the same characteristics in contrast with G².

PACHOMIAN SOURCES RECONSIDERED

	G ¹	Asc.	G ²	D	
	1-12a	-----	1-12a	-----	230-236B
			12b	-----	236C
	12b-16	-----	13-16a	-----	236C-239B
			16b	-----	239B
ed. 17	-----		om.		Death of John
18	-----		17	-----	239B-240A (last story modified from Asc. 14)
19-23	-----		18-21a	-----	240A-242B
					242B-243A = HL (ed. Butler) 88. 9-93. 4
24-38	-----		21b-34	-----	243B-252C
39	-----		om.		
40-5	-----		35-9	-----	252C-255C/
hom. & ed. 46-9	-----		(tr. to 91-3 in some MSS.: otherwise om.)		
50-2	-----		40-2	-----	
53	-----		om.		(but see last sentence of 42)
54	-----		43	-----	
55 subst. Asc. 28-32	-----		44-6a (Mouchonsis. Opening sentence from G ¹ 54b. Asc. arranged 28, 31, 29, 30, 32)		
56a	-----		46b (first phrase from G ¹ 54b)		
hom. 56b-7 subst. Asc. 12, 33	-----		47-8		
58	-----		49a		
59 summarised in	-----		49b		
60-1	-----		50		
62	-----		om.		
63	-----		51a		
Theo. 64	-----		om.		
Theo. 65-6	-----		51b-2		
Theo. 67-8 subst. Asc. 1	-----		53		
Theo. 69	-----		54		
70	-----				
71	-----				
72	-----		om.		
73-5	-----		55-6		
76	-----		57a		
Theo. 77	-----		om.		
78	-----		57b		
			58a		
79	-----		om. (but cf. Asc. 30 = G ² 45b)		
Petr. 80 cf. Asc. 2-4	-----		58b-61	-----	(255D)-257C
81a	-----		62a	-----	257C
Asc. 5-6	-----		62b-3	-----	257C-258D
6a, 13	-----		64	-----	258D-259B
81b-2	-----		65-6	-----	259B-260B
83 subst. Asc. 15-6	-----		67	-----	260B-261B
84 "	-----		68	-----	261B-262A
			17-20	-----	262A-266A
			21-3	-----	73-5
85 corr. to	-----		8-11	-----	76-8
			79a	-----	266A-C
86-7	-----		79b-80	-----	266C-267A
Theo. 88 subst. Asc. 24-6	-----		81-3	-----	267B-269B
89	-----				
			84a	-----	269BC
Theo. 90	-----		84b	-----	269C
Theo. 91-2	-----		om.		
93 (cf. Asc. 13)	-----				
94-5 subst. Asc. 27	-----		85	-----	
96-7 "	-----		34	-----	86
ed. 98-9	-----				
100	-----		om.		
101	-----				
102 (cf. Asc. 17)	-----				
103 (corr. to Asc. 5-6)	-----				
104-5 (, , 2-4)	-----				
Theo. 106-8	-----		om.		
109 cf. Asc. 35-6	-----		87	-----	269D-271A—ZACCHAEUS
110-3	-----		om.		
114	-----		88a	-----	271A-272A
115-6a	-----		om.		
116b	-----		88b	-----	272A
117	-----		89	-----	272AB
			90	-----	272BC

Rule from HL, in direct contradiction of G¹, which speaks of voices at this point, and adds οὕτω μέντοιγε ὄραμα εἶδεν ἕως ἄρτι.

The editorial G¹17 is replaced in G²D by a general sentence, τοιοῦτος ὢν καὶ τηλικούτος ἐν πολλῇ πραότητι καὶ εἰρηνικῇ καταστάσει συνδιήγε τῷ ἀδελφῷ, followed by an account of the death and burial of Pachomius's brother John. It is to be noted that the Sahidic *Life*, S³, also briefly mentions John's death at a corresponding point, immediately before the account of Pachomius's temptations. But the sentence is absent from the Bohairic. Its form does not suggest any connexion with G², and it may well have been introduced independently in the two documents to explain the disappearance of John from the narrative.

In the following chapter, the account of Pachomius's temptations is somewhat expanded in G²D. The story of the escort of devils, given in its G¹ form, is introduced in G² with sentences clearly reminiscent of the context of the story in Asc. 14. This is the only case in which G² in any measure conflates accounts from the two documents, and the only case in which G² prefers G¹ to Asc. for the main story.

In regard to the insertion of the Rule from HL in D after G¹23—the presence of the same passage in the same position in the 'Vita Tertia' is no proof of literary connexion between this *Life* and D. Anyone introducing the Rule would do so at this point, and it is not introduced in the same manner in the two documents.

The omission of the name of Theodore found in G¹26 from G²23a, D xxiv, can be explained by a desire for tidiness, and the avoidance of unnecessary repetition—the detail from this point about Theodore's age is inserted in G²30. There is no proof here that G² was using a different recension of G¹.

G²24, D xxv, curtailing G¹28, introduce elements from HL. In G²28 we find the only use of the word ἀπάθεια (D renders it 'mortificatio passionum omnium') in the Pachomian Lives. In the account of the nuns' rule and funerals, D, but apparently not G², borrows from HL. Half a sentence from HL is introduced in G²34, D xxxii.

G¹39 is omitted without apparent reason in G²D. The gap is partly compensated for by the addition of an editorial sentence at the end of the previous chapter.

The long gap in D has already been dealt with and need not detain us. The omission or transference by G² of the editorial and homiletic chapters G¹46–9 is quite in keeping with the practice of G² throughout.

G¹53 is omitted in G²—unless it be summarily represented by the last sentence of G²42. The last sentence of G¹54 is omitted, but the sentence before—ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ ἀρχαῖός τις καὶ ἅγιος μονάζων ὀνόματι Ἰωάννης, τέλειος ἀσκητής—provides G² with a smooth transition (*Ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ μονῇ ἦν τις ἀρχαῖος καὶ ἅγιος λίαν ἀγαπῶν τὸν Κύριον, ὀνόματι Ἰωνᾶς, τελειότατος ἀσκητής*)—the name in G¹ was probably originally Ἰωνᾶς, not Ἰωάννης) to the story of Jonas, taken from Asc. and rearranged (cc. 28, 31, 29–30), while c. 32 is given a closer link to this story by the identification of the

monastery of the crooked *εὐκτῆριον* as Mouchonsis. The omission of G¹55, which also concerns that monastery, appears to be explained by the substitution for it of the Asc. stories concerned therewith.¹

G¹56a is represented by G²46b. But the homiletic chapters 56b–57 are replaced in G² by Asc. 12 and 33 (the order inverted from that of the Syriac recension, to make c. 33 an illustration of c. 12, to which G² gives it a narrative link). G¹58–9 is represented by G²49 with some literary expansion and considerable omission of details of rule which did not interest the author of G² as they do us.

G¹62 and 64 are omitted. They are both anecdotes in which Theodore enters. But their omission cannot be explained on that account, as both are chiefly concerned with Pachomius, while G¹65, which is much more essentially a Theodoran anecdote, is retained. *Pace* Halkin, the Theodoran chapters omitted in G² are fewer than those retained, and are also fewer than those omitted which do not concern Theodore.

The opening phrase of G¹67 provides the opening of G²53,² but is used for transition to the account of Asc. 1, which here replaces G¹67–8 as illustration of Theodore's wisdom—the equivalent of Asc. 1 in G¹77 is accordingly omitted in its own place.

G²54 makes notable modifications in the story of G¹69.

The next nine chapters of G¹ (70–8) present at first sight more of a problem in their relationship to G². But as cc. 72 and 76 are omitted (both of them stories of a type seen by other examples to be unacceptable to G²), and c. 77 has already been dealt with, the problem reduces itself to that of the deferment of cc. 70 and 71. Actually, we may think that c. 73 forms such a natural sequel to c. 69—especially when c. 72, which provided an occasion for it in G¹, is omitted—as to give us in itself sufficient explanation of this deferment. And as it would not be in the manner of G² to break the links which bind in a real consequence c. 73 and the next two chapters, it is only after c. 75 that the author of G² can retrace his steps, to find in the concluding prophecy of c. 71 a link to lead on to G¹78—here at least, in Theodore, he had someone sufficient to continue his work.³

G¹79–80 are historical matter of a kind not interesting to G². But we note that G¹79 contains one item (about old monks dying on their *καθισμάτια* and having to be buried so) which has already been recounted, from Asc., in the story of Jonas: while G¹80, concerning Petronius, may be regarded as replaced by the Asc. form of the story of Silvanus, which also, somewhat anachronistically, brings in Petronius. But the introduction of this story in G² by coupling it, as one concerning a young novice, with that

¹ We should note that G²'s spelling *Μουχονους* seems closer to the normal Coptic spelling of the name of this monastery than the *Μογχωωσις* of G¹.

² *Βλέπων δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν Παχούμιος σοφὸν ὄντα*—G¹

Τούτου τοῦ Θεοδώρου τὸ συνετὸν θεασάμενος ὁ Παχώμιος—G²

³ We must note how natural it is for a writer concerned with edification and not history, and restricting himself to the *Life* of Pachomius, to leave out all mention of Theodore's subsequent disgrace. G² would allow us to suppose that Theodore continued as *οἰκονόμος* of Tabennesi without interruption until Pachomius's death.

of the old novice found in G¹⁷⁰ and deferred to this point, in the account in G²⁵⁸ of the receiving of both these as novices on the same morning, would appear due simply to G²'s ingenuity, and is one of the most curious things in the book. Probably we ought not to rack our brains for any deeper explanation of it.

When the story of Silvanus is completed, G² (and D) returns (62a) to G¹⁸¹, into the middle of which are sandwiched (cc. 62b-4) Asc. 5-6 and 13 (which are consecutive in the Syriac order of Asc.). G¹⁸¹ is completed in G²⁶⁵, and followed by G¹⁸² in G²⁶⁶. G² and D then omit G¹⁸³, which is more detailed history, and 84, which does not directly concern Pachomius, and proceed with Asc. in the Syriac order up to the end of Asc. 20, after which comes the second section of G² absent from D. I have suggested that this is a later addition in G²: but if that be so, as I believe it must be, it remains a curious fact that Asc. 8-11 comes here in just the right place G²⁷⁶⁻⁸) for its correspondence with G¹⁸⁵.

Of the next four chapters of G¹ (86-89), 89 is taken first (G^{279a}) to link it conveniently with 86-7—all these being concerned with events at Tabennesi (the reason for the introduction of the name of Cornelius in G^{279a} is not apparent). For G¹⁸⁸ (the fearful vision), G²⁸¹⁻³ substitutes the apparition to Pachomius and Theodore in Asc. 24-6. G² finishes this with a link passage introducing a summarised version (G^{284a}) of G¹¹⁰¹, transferred here as an example of enduring pain to introduce the story of Theodore's headache (G¹⁹⁰ = G^{284b}). G¹⁹¹⁻² are omitted as purely Theodoran; G¹⁹³ as having been sufficiently represented by Asc. 13 (G²⁶⁴). We have arrived at the last section of G² absent from D—probably a later insertion in G²: otherwise we might regard G¹⁹⁴⁻⁵ (Theodore the Alexandrian) as replaced by the story of the Roman monk in Asc. 27 (G²⁸⁵). And, while G¹⁹⁶⁻⁷ are mainly homiletic, the story in c. 97 might be regarded as replaced by Asc. 28 (G²⁸⁶). G¹⁹⁸⁻⁹ are editorial, but are partly represented in G²⁹⁰—the concluding chapter in D and in some MSS. of G².

G¹¹⁰⁰ is omitted—again a story uncongenial to G². G¹¹⁰¹ has already been used. G¹¹⁰² has in some measure been represented by Asc. 17 (G²⁶⁹); 103 by Asc. 5-6 (G^{262b-3}); 104 by Asc. 2-4 (G^{258b-61}). G¹¹⁰⁶⁻⁸ is the story of Theodore's disgrace. When we come to G¹¹⁰⁹, we may ask ourselves whether the substitution in G²⁸⁷||DLII of the name of *Zacchaeus* for the Athenodorus of Asc. 35-6 is not somehow connected with G²'s adapting his work to a list of chapter-headings of G¹—c. 109 appearing as *περὶ Ζακχαίου* is replaced by Asc. 35-6 as under the same heading! We note that the phrase *πάντα ἔπαινον ἀνθρώπων νικῶντα* in G²⁸⁷ appears to be taken straight from the mention of the real Zacchaeus in Asc. 23 (150. 24-5).

We are rather surprised after G²⁸⁷ to find at the opening of c. 88' a phrase from the end of the *Homily against Idolatry* appended by F to Asc., embedded in a linking passage as G² passes on to the account of Pachomius's last illness. (G¹¹¹⁰ is omitted as concerned with details of rule; 111 as concerned with Theodore the Alexandrian who has not been mentioned

in G², 112-3 as concerned with historical events which G² finds either shocking or unedifying). In the account which follows the little picturesque stories of G¹ 115-6a are omitted: the story of the appointment of a successor is summarised, and Orsisius's part therein left out: Petronius is said to be at Chenoboscia instead of Tismene. But there is also some expansion, e.g. when Pachomius is represented as giving a death-bed warning against heresies. The death of Petronius and the succession of Orsisius (G¹ 117) are stated baldly without further development in G² 89.

To sum up—when we take into account the method of substituting passages of Asc. for passages of G¹, we find parallelism unmistakable as far as G¹ 69 G² 54; reasonably demonstrable (with certain transferences and omissions) from G¹ 70 to 90 (G² 55-84). After that the contacts are vaguer until we come to the story of Pachomius's death. But when all is taken into account, there is nothing to prove that the author of G² had not G¹ in its complete form before him, and some evidence to suggest that he did have it.

Internal Evidence of the 'Vita Prima'

We can now examine the internal evidence of G¹ adduced by Lefort to support the late and composite character of this *Life*.

Unfortunately, Lefort takes away in one sentence what he has stated in the one before — 'Aujourd'hui . . . il est possible de procéder à l'analyse précise du caractère du document. Naturellement nous ne pouvons ici fournir qu'une esquisse pour souligner les traits essentiels, ou plutôt pour indiquer dans quel sens il faut chercher la solution du problème posé' (pp. xxxviii-xxxix).

But a sketch is not enough. Ladeuze's position cannot be overthrown by mere sweeping statements but only by solid and exact argument. Does Lefort actually produce this?

He begins by claiming that G¹ gives at first reading the impression of a compilation. This, then, is so far a subjective impression. The statement is made that there is neither logic nor chronology in the order of G¹ after c. 53. But such unsystematic work is perhaps more likely in the original monastic biographer than in a later compiler.

Lefort then argues that the impression of a compilation is increased by the disproportionate number of stories not directly concerning Pachomius, and the extension beyond Pachomius's death, so that the title *Life of St. Pachomius* 'no longer' corresponds more than imperfectly with the contents. But there is no evidence that this title is original. The Cheltenham papyrus, whether it be genuine or apocryphal, was written in the sixth-seventh century, and implies that, at that date at any rate, the best-known work was a *Life of Pachomius and Theodore*. The earliest writer is more likely to have been concerned with the whole history of the community rather than with its founder alone. And that such was the nature of the earliest work is borne out by the *De Oratione*—'βίαι τῶν Ταβεννησιωτῶν μοναχῶν'.

Lefort proceeds to adduce the 'flottement' in the form of proper names in G¹. But the insufficiency of our MS. evidence makes this an uncertain

argument. And even with the original writer, one can by no means be sure that he would have been consistent in his transliteration of Coptic names—witness the varieties of spellings of the same names in the groups of related papyri published by Idris Bell (*Jews and Christians in Egypt*).

To take in order the four cases advanced:

1. *Πβόου* or *Παβαῦ*. The reading of F, *Πρόου*, for the first two occurrences of this name in G¹ suggests that *Πβόου* was original here, while elsewhere G¹ always reads *Παβαῦ*, and this last is supported by Ep. Amm. (*Baῦ*) and by Jerome in his preface to the Rule and in the titles of two of the letters (*Bau*). G³ consistently gives *Παβῶ*, and G² *Πιβοῦ* the only time he mentions the name. It is certainly interesting that this sole occurrence in G² corresponds to one of the two occurrences of *Πβόου* in G¹; and that both occurrences of *Πβόου* in G¹ have to do with the foundation of this monastery and its becoming the headquarters of the community. Here we seem to have a suggestive indication—but no more.

As to the Coptic form—Halkin derives *Πβόου* from the Bohairic form *ϣḃωⲟⲩ*; *Παβαῦ* from the Sahidic *ⲡḃⲁⲩⲁⲩ*. Lefort correctly describes *ⲡḃⲟⲟⲩ* as 'forme sahidique authentique' (the Bohairic form is *ϣḃωⲟⲩ*.) But he omits to point out that his published text of the Coptic Lives shows *ⲡḃⲁⲩⲁⲩ* to be the form consistently adopted by at least one of the *Sahidic* texts, S⁴—a fact which does not reveal itself in his translation, which consistently gives 'Pbow' for all the Sahidic MSS.

2. The form *Παφνούθης* occurs once only in G¹ (F) for the more usual *Παφνούτιος* (four times). As the omission of the -ο- of a termination is common and haphazard in Greek MSS., there is no significance in the difference between -ης and -ιος. The use of τ or θ for the Coptic τ is likely also to be haphazard. In the group of papyri published by Bell all possible variations of the consonants in this name are found—*Παπνούτιος*, *Παπνούθιος*, *Παφνούθιος*, *Παφνούτιος*—the last two within a single letter.

3. *Ψεντάησις* c. 25 (F. *Ψινθαήσιος* P)

Ψενταήσιος c. 79 (F. *Ψενταίσις* A), c. 123 (F. *Ψενθαήσιος* P)

Ψενθάης c. 106 (F)

Lefort here prints *Ψενθάησις*, *Ψενθαήσιος*, for the first two cases—thus himself treating the difference of T and Θ as unimportant. The complete omission of the termination in the last variant might possibly have significance. But our MS. evidence is too slight for any argument to be based on it.

4. *Ψαρφεῖν* cc. 124 and 138 (F. *Ψαρφθίν* or *Ψαρφθήν* in inferior MSS. are insignificant)

Ψάρφιος c. 138 (F. *Ψαρφής* N)

In view of what has already been said, no distinction is to be drawn between *Ψαρφίν*, *Ψαρφεῖν*, and *Ψάρφιον* (accents are haphazard in Coptic names), or between *Ψάρφης* and *Ψάρφιος*. Ep. Amm. (19 and 26) also gives the name as *Ψάρφιος* (the reading *Ψάμφιος* in c. 19 is manifestly a scribal error).

But Lefort, by an unbelievable confusion, adds *Ναφερσαεῖς* (c. 149, F.

—*Ναφεροῦς* A: *Φερσαῖς* N). This name is a completely different Coptic name, vouched for in papyri (see Crum, *Coptic Dictionary*, 240a and 544b —*ⲛⲁⲃⲉⲣⲱⲛⲁ*—P. Lond. 4), its simple etymology (it is a Coptic equivalent of *Eutychius*) having no connection with that of Psahref (ⲱⲥⲁⲣⲉⲩ Bo.: ⲛⲉⲁⲣⲱⲛ Sa.). And a different person is referred to—Nafersaes is described as *δεύτερος* of Pabau at the time of the death of Theodore, while Psarphius is described in both passages in G¹ as *μέγας οικονόμος* of Pabau, and by Ammon as *τον πάντων πρώτον ἐν τῇ Βαῦ*—clearly a non-technical description of the same office. There is no room for confusion—both names and functions are quite distinct.

5. C. 83 *Τισμηναι* (F: *ἱσμίν* A): c. 114 *Τομήν* (F): c. 134 *το μηνέ* (F). Here surely we are dealing only with textual errors in face of a name unknown to the scribes. The Coptic name *ⲧⲥⲁⲙⲛⲉ* indicates what is meant. There is no special significance in the occurrence, noted by Lefort, of the variant *Zμινος* in papyri.

But Lefort admits that something more is needed to affirm categorically that G¹ is a compilation than these 'indices plus ou moins significatifs'. He proceeds, therefore, to examine four episodes of G¹ and compare them with what we find in other sources. At the conclusion of this enquiry he states, 'Les exemples que nous venons de citer démontrent amplement que le rédacteur de G¹ utilisait des documents déjà singulièrement élaborés'. And two pages later, while discussing 'copticisms' in G¹, he says, 'Son oeuvre, nous pouvons en être certains, est une vaste compilation'. This enquiry, then, appears to be the core of his argument. A final judgment must wait until we have examined the Coptic sources in their entirety. But we must state here that Lefort's decision that in each of the four cases the Greek version is derived from the longer Coptic story rests on subjective grounds, and that our own subjective impression of the comparison would lead us to exactly the opposite conclusion. And we can claim Ladeuze in our support.

(a) The first example is that of G¹38, compared with the story contained, imperfectly, in S¹ (a sixth century fragment) and S³ (a composite *Life* in an eleventh–twelfth century parchment). The Coptic story is, apart from the very long prayer contained in it, a picturesque account rather reminding us of the stories in Asc. And its similarities to G¹38 are not unlike those of some of the stories in Asc. to stories in G¹. The G¹ account with its brevity and obscurities, is in keeping with the general character of that work and is as intelligible in itself as we should expect the work of that inexperienced writer to be. The likeness between the two accounts does not extend beyond the general pattern of the event: there do not appear to be verbal echoes. And yet Lefort concludes, 'Il ne peut y avoir le moindre doute que la rédaction de G¹ n'offre qu'un pâle résumé, dont les termes eux-mêmes ne deviennent vraiment intelligibles qu'après lecture du long exposé de S¹–S³.' The present writer would prefer to apply here the terms used by Lefort (p. lv)—with what little justice in that case we have already seen—in contrasting De Oratione 108 with Ep. Amm. 19: he

would say that the G¹ account is 'fruste comme un apophthègme', while the Coptic 'se présente comme une rédaction en forme'.

(b) Lefort deals next with G¹⁸⁷, saying that it comes in G¹ almost at the end of Pachomius's life while it belongs chronologically to the beginnings of his 'vie anachorétique'; and that it is 'un résumé tellement concentré et dépourvu de tout contexte qu'il n'est intelligible qu'après lecture des pages 7 et 8 de notre traduction'. Actually the order of the Arabic version (Av) in which Lefort tells us that the S² account is 'repris textuellement' appears to represent a missing chapter of the Bohairic (c. 113) which comes there further on in the *Life* of Pachomius than does G¹⁸⁷. The position of the story in G¹ can be explained both on chronological and literary grounds (there is no reason for rejecting the idea that this vision belonged to one of Pachomius's visits to Tabennesi after Theodore's installation there). But that explanation can be reserved until we can make a thorough analysis of the construction of G¹ in itself. As to its intelligibility, once more we have to remember that G¹'s language was probably more intelligible to the writer and his contemporaries than it is to us. Actually, we must turn for its understanding, not to the Coptic account, which again reads like a secondary 'rédaction en forme', but to the *Vita Antonii* (P.G. xxvi, 806A)—one of several pieces of evidence suggesting direct literary dependence of G¹ on V. Ant.

V. Ant.

Ἡ μὲν γὰρ τῶν ἁγίων ὀπτασία
οὐκ ἔστι τεταραγμένη . . .
ἡούχως δὲ καὶ πρῶτως γίνεται
οὕτως ὡς εὐθὺς χαρὰν καὶ ἀγαλ-
λίαν καὶ θάρσος ἐγγίνεσθαι τῇ ψυχῇ
. . . οἱ τε λογισμοὶ αὐτῆς ἀτάραχοι
καὶ ἀκύναντοι διαμένουσιν.

G¹

Τῇ ὀπτασίᾳ τῶν ἁγίων
τοῦ θεωροῦντος τὴν
ὀπτασίαν οἱ λογισμοὶ
ἐκλείπουσι τέλειον.

(c) Next comes the story of Mavos (G¹⁷⁶). Here Lefort omits to mention that the version of the story found in Bo. and S⁴—the only version which can with certainty be recognised as telling the same story—is quite clearly in direct literary dependence on the version found in G¹, whether the original of that be Greek or Coptic. Incidentally, the S⁴ version though slightly altered in form from that of G¹, suggests one conceivable explanation of one great difficulty in the latter, where F reads ἐν αἰτία κλοπῆς ἑτέρας κρῖναι. Lefort inadvertently quotes this as ἐν αἰτία ἑτέρᾳ κλοπῆς κρῖναι, and sees in it evidence of 'scissors and paste' in the composition of G¹, in which no other case of theft is found preceding it. But the reading of F suggests that the true explanation is more likely to be of a textual nature. Now in S⁴ the phrase is made part of the bishop's letter to Pachomius—'We have caught him ρεη σταιτια η̅χιουτε, and have sent him to thee ε̅τρεκκρινε̅κ̅μοϣ. A direct Coptic version of G¹ would therefore read ρεκοσταιτια η̅χιουτε ε̅τρεκκρινε̅κ̅μοϣ. Is it conceivable that the Greek ἐν αἰτία κλοπῆς ἑτέρας κρῖναι αὐτόν is actually due to the inadvertence

of a Copt who, translating the story into Greek, whether from a written Coptic account or from the spoken word, forgets to translate and writes down *ετρεψκριται*, which has later been normalised into *έτέρας κρῖναι*?

This may be far-fetched. But in any case, the Greek is so peculiar that a textual error seems a more likely explanation than that of the story's having originally followed a lost account of another theft.

The Coptic account found, in very fragmentary form, in S¹⁰, but complete in the Arabic (Am) described a homily warning the brethren against touching each other, which makes some of the elders indignant. The elder of austere aspect, sent by the bishop, has been found guilty of paederastia, and is sent to Pachomius for judgment. Pachomius, instead of forgiving him, strips him of the monastic habit, and expels him.

Lefort continues, 'Il est superflu d'insister pour demander de quel côté il faut chercher le récit primitif'. But in fact, the homily about sexual temptation is certainly no more natural an introduction to this story than the series of security discourses (*λόγους ἀσφαλείας πολλῆς πρὸς τὴν σωτηρίαν*) summarised in G¹72-5, which S⁴ and Bo, as usual trying to give more consecutive form to the *Life*, make the direct occasion of Mavos's complaint. The expulsion, and the referring of the story to paederastia, absent from the S⁴ Bo version as well as from the Greek, are suspiciously typical of the Coptic sources represented in S¹⁰—which also tend to greater picturesqueness, and greater stress on the miraculous. Actually, the freedom from emphasis either on sex or on vision or on miracle seems to the present writer (as it seemed to Ladeuze) one of the most refreshing characteristics of G¹, and one of the strongest evidences of its early date.

(d) Finally, Lefort cites G¹84 as a last example of 'édulcoration' (as we might say, 'bowdlerisation') in G¹, as S¹⁰ (+ Am) makes Tithoes's temptation that of paederastia, while G¹ appears, rather obscurely, to make it simply one of gluttony. Admittedly there is something not wholly satisfactory in the G¹ story as it appears in the text of F: *ἦλθεν πνεῦμα πονηρὸν πειράσαι αὐτὸν τῇ ἀπάτῃ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν αὐτὸν πρῶτον μὲν τῶν βρωμάτων τῶν νασούντων· καὶ ὅτι διὰ τοῦ ἀγῶνος μᾶλλον δοκιμάζονται οἱ πιστοί . . .*. Note that in F there is no δὲ or corresponding clause answering to the *πρῶτον μὲν*. Has not something dropped out? In fact, when we turn to G³ (c. 135), we find a clear indication of the original text of G¹: *ἦλθε πνεῦμα πονηρὸν πειράσαι αὐτὸν τῇ ἀπάτῃ τῆς ἁμαρτίας. Καὶ πρῶτα μὲν ὑπέβαλεν αὐτῷ ὅπως μεταλάβῃ ἐκ τῶν βρωμάτων τῶν νοσούντων, καὶ ἂν αὐτὸν ἴδῃ ἡττηθέντα ἐν τῷ βρώματι, ἐπιρρίψῃ αὐτῷ τὸ πάθος τῆς πορνείας· αὐτοῦ δὲ μὴ παραδεξαμένου, κατησχύνθη ὁ ἐχθρὸς. Καὶ γὰρ διὰ τοῦ ἀγῶνος δοκιμάζονται οἱ πιστοί*. The Greek, then, probably did here touch lightly on sexual temptation. The Coptic blossoms into its favourite subject of paederastia, complete with beautiful youth. 'Encore une fois, faut-il se demander où nous devons chercher la forme originale?' As to the beginning, **Ἦν δέ τις ἀθλητῆς ἄλλος*—surely this is taking up the thread of the concluding sentence of c. 82 (**Ἦν δὲ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ μονῇ ἅγιος καὶ δυνατὸς τῷ πνεύματι Ταλμὰς λεγόμενος*), slightly interrupted by c. 83 concerning the foundation of other

monasteries, while the reference in the last sentence but one of c. 83 to τοὺς ὀχλουμένους ὑπὸ λογισμῶν ποικίλων gives clear occasion for the introduction at this point of c. 84.

'Copticisms' in the 'Vita Prima'

Having demonstrated to his own satisfaction that G¹ is 'une vaste compilation', Lefort asks if we can determine at least some of the documents used. But rather than answer the question directly, he prefers first to try to fix the character of the editor.

Quoting Tillemont's recognition of the obscurity, even barbarism, of the Greek (which Tillemont already regarded as suggesting a Coptic original), he claims that this is only partially true, as in some passages 'la langue n'est pas plus anormale que celle, par exemple, de plusieurs chapitres de l'*Historia Lausiaca* ou des *Apophthegmata*', and suggests that this is further evidence of diversity of sources. To the present writer at least—and he has made some slight study of the Pachomian vocabulary—the variations of style from passage to passage are not apparent, or certainly not such as to imply different authorship or different sources.

But Lefort proceeds to enquire after the source of the barbarisms, and not unnaturally finds abundant evidence of Copticisms in the Greek. We should not need to dwell at all on the first part of this argument, as there is certainly no need to assume a Coptic original in order to explain Copticisms in the Greek of a fourth century Egyptian writer, especially one who has clearly been living for many years in monastic surroundings where Coptic was certainly dominant in speech and liturgy. And Lefort himself admits that Copticisms 'fourmillent' in the κοινή of the period. But we cannot refrain from pointing out that when, on p. xliii, Lefort proceeds to give examples of Copticisms, he starts with a list of phrases (ἀπῆλθεν ἔξω, etc.) of which none would be out of place, and most are found, in Holy Scripture—βάλλειν ἔξω, for instance, occurs 5 times (e.g. I Joh. iv. 18, ἡ τελεία ἀγάπη ἔξω βάλλει τὸν φόβον) in the New Testament, and its near equivalent ἐκβάλλειν ἔξω 11 times; while the occurrence of πατεῖν ἐπάνω ὀφείων (G¹21) is, of course, in a direct quotation from Scripture (Luke x. 19)! As for the other points adduced—the constant use of καὶ as a conjunction; of κατὰ πάντα with an adjective where a superlative might perhaps be expected; the repeated use of an ambiguous 3rd personal pronoun, etc.—none of these are evidence of a Coptic original, however much they may suggest a writer accustomed to think in Coptic. We certainly agree that, from the general style of the document, 'il ressort clairement que le rédacteur de G¹ est un Copte n'ayant qu'une médiocre connaissance du grec'. But we have seen no reason so far to accept the following opinion: 'Or son oeuvre, nous pouvons en être certains, est une vaste compilation'. His Copticisms do not affect in either way the probability of his having used written Coptic sources.

To demonstrate that this hypothesis is not a piece of 'Coptomania', Lefort places G¹122 and the first sentence of 123 alongside his translation

of S³b. As he says, 'la parenté littéraire, pour ne pas dire l'identité, de ces deux rédactions est évidente'. And there are, indeed, obscurities in the Greek. But it does not seem to us at all manifest that the Coptic cannot be a translation of this 'almost unintelligible' Greek. The crucial phrase is that in which the Greek makes *καὶ τὰς διαταγὰς* part of the object of *παρήγγειλεν τηρεῖν*, starting a new sentence with *Καὶ ἔταξεν αὐτοὺς*, while the Coptic makes it the object of the following *ⲁⲓⲧⲟⲩⲱⲛⲁⲩ* (*ἔταξεν αὐτοῖς*). Of course, our MS. authority for G¹ is not strong, and it is not impossible that the Greek originally read *ἔταξεν αὐτοῖς*. But an analysis of the 31 other occurrences of *τάσσω* in G¹ shows that in every case but two it is used of the appointment of *persons* to offices—so that the natural meaning in this case would be that Orsisius appointed the fathers and house-masters and seconds at the two gatherings, and *not* the *διαταγαί*—cf. c. 83 (speaking of the two gatherings in Pachomius's time). *Καὶ εἴ τινα διαταγὴν ὁ πατὴρ ἐκάστης μονῆς ἐθέλοι, ἔλεγεν αὐτῷ· καὶ ἔτασεν οἰκιακὸν ἢ ἄλλον*—This passage would seem to make clear G¹'s meaning here. The Greek is certainly obscure, and typical of our author. The Coptic trying to clarify it, has misread *αὐτοὺς* as *αὐτοῖς*, and so has treated the *διαταγαί*, and not the officers, as the direct object of *ἔταξεν*.

Lefort writes, 'Si le rédacteur de G¹ était autre chose qu'un compilateur inhabile, il se serait souvenu de ce qu'il avait écrit au c. 83, et y aurait trouvé de quoi mieux comprendre le passage ici en question'. Lefort does not make quotations from c. 83, but it would hardly seem that he himself had understood the relevance of that chapter in this connexion.

From all this, Lefort goes on, it results that the Greek of G¹ is a bad translation, and in places a simple transposition of the Coptic, 'comme la langue nous invitait déjà à le soupçonner'. But, if I am right, the proof has failed. We would not claim to have disproved a written Coptic original for G¹: but at best it cannot be more than a conjecture—except for the witness of G¹ itself to written *νοήματα τῶν γραφῶν* which probably provided at least the homiletic chapters of G¹. In any case we have the impression that G¹ is throughout far closer to the original written source, whether that was in Coptic or in Greek, than any other surviving document in either language.

Was the 'Vita Prima' preceded by a Lost Collection of 'Ascetica'?

Having convinced himself of G¹'s use of Coptic texts, Lefort goes on to admit that that does not mean that the main part of his documentation was not in Greek. He returns to the theory of a common source for G², D, several Coptic MSS., and G¹ 1-54, in a document 'qui sera examiné plus tard'. And he claims that it is relatively easy to reckon that in the second part G¹ depends directly or indirectly on the *Ascetica*. As he had admitted that 'nos actuels recueils de *Paralipomena* n'ont donc ni emprunté ni prêté à la *Vita Prima*' (p. xx), we conclude that here he is using the term '*Ascetica*' in a more comprehensive sense, though part of the argument

which follows seems aimed to prove the use by G¹ of at least one story from our actual collection.

After mentioning again the *'autre cas de vol'* and the *'autre athlète'* as evidence of scissors-and-paste, he returns to c. 54, claiming the sentence in F (omitted actually by Ath.)—*Ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ ἀρχαῖος τις καὶ ἅγιος μονάζων ὀνόματι Ἰωάννης, τέλειος ἀσκητῆς*—as evidence, in its identity of phrase with G²'s introduction to the story of Jonas, that G¹ or its source *'maniait les Ascetica'*. Actually, we have seen that G² takes the phrase from G¹, using it for transition from G¹ to the Asc. story. We entirely agree about the probability that Jonas was the original name in G¹. This is borne out by Bo and S⁵, both of which read 'Jonas' at this point (though showing their secondary character by making him *father* of the monastery of Moushons, whereas G¹ simply treats him as an ascetic, and Asc. as the gardener). But there is no evidence to prove a relation of dependency either way between G¹ and Asc.¹

Lefort next brings forward G¹'s short mention of Talmas (c. 82). But neither his name nor his disease give any reason for identifying him with the leper Athenodorus-Zacchaeus of Asc. and G²D. And while the fact that this is followed up, as is here admitted, *'après quelque lignes sur l'organisation de la Congrégation'* (=c. 83), with the story of Tithoes introduced *Ἦν δὲ τις ἀθλητῆς ἄλλος* certainly does explain that phrase independently of *'scissors-and-paste'*. No evidence of dependence on a collection of *'Ascetica'* is to be found in the fact that this sequence of stories (cc. 82, 84) is immediately followed in c. 85 by the story of the apostate monk in a form utterly different from that of Asc. 8-11, of which it cannot be a résumé.

Lefort then cites the other parallels between G¹ and Asc., and *'the last but not the least'*, the alleged parallel between c. 101 and De Oratione 109, to prove that G¹ or its source used a collection of *Ascetica* *'qui rappelle singulièrement ceux que nous connaissons'*. We need not deal with these matters again after what has been said. A footnote adds an error and an important fact: (a) it states that the phrase *ὁ μέγας* is found also in G¹, *par exemple* 4 times in cc. 41-3; but it fails to note that these appear to be the only occurrences in Halkin's published text; that they are all readings of A in chapters where F is missing; that only one of them is supported by the *'Vita Tertia'*; and that the reading is suspect, as A elsewhere also (c. 76) introduces the phrase where it is absent from F. (b) It points in passing to the one change of terminology in the course of G¹ which really does require explanation—the fact that the term *ἀββᾶς* (Lefort refers to its use with the name Pachomius, but what he says applies to all use of it) does not occur once before c. 61, and after that becomes constant. It is to be noted that in F the term *γέρων* is not applied to Pachomius in G¹ before this same chapter (it is found in A in c. 42, where F is not extant).

¹ Lefort is mistaken in stating that the Syriac version of the story in Asc. reads *John*. Both in Budge and in Bedjan the name appears as *ܝܘܢܢ* ('Yawnan' = Jonah), not as *ܝܘܠܢܐ* ('Yohannan' = John).

The Date of the 'Vita Prima'

Lefort returns for a paragraph to the extracts in the *Apophthegmata*—ground that we have already covered sufficiently. While we see no reason to suppose, with Lefort, that R is the earliest Latin recension of the *Apophthegmata*, and evidence against its early date in its inclusion of extracts from the abbot Esaias (who died A.D. 488), we certainly would date some of the collections containing Pachomian extracts back at least to the early sixth century. Lefort asks, 'Or peut on affirmer que G¹ était déjà rédigé à cette époque? C'est ce que nous allons essayer de déterminer'.

We believe we have already given sufficient grounds for concluding that both the *Apophthegmata* extracts and G²D are based on G¹. But let us look at Lefort's arguments against the early date for G¹.

After using the late date of F (though it is really quite early for a Greek MS.—A.D. 1021) to hint at an unreliable text, Lefort first adduces the verbal dependence of c. 99 on the *Vita Antonii* as giving a *terminus a quo*. We entirely agree—as we have seen, it is not a solitary case—and this is perfectly consistent with the claim made by the writer (or writers) to have known Theodore, but not Pachomius himself, while, as we have also seen, the end of c. 149 makes it clear that the work was composed some years after the death of Theodore. The phrase τὸν ἀρχιεπίσκοπον οὐ μόνον τὸν τότε ἀγιώτατον Ἀθανάσιον is certainly embarrassing for Ladeuze's theory that the *Life* was written almost immediately on the death of Theodore, and before Athanasius's death. But the use of τότε in G¹ does not, *pace* Lefort, force us to the conclusion that it was written 'fort longtemps' after Athanasius's death. It is fully consistent with any date at which Orsisius could have been said to have ruled the community χρόνον πολὺν after the death of Theodore, e.g. with a date under Theophilus such as we have suggested: it would not exclude a date under Peter or Timothy, though we see no reason for going back beyond Theophilus.

So much for Lefort's conclusion on p. xlviii: 'nous voici donc certainement au moins à la fin du IV^e siècle, et très probablement bien au delà, c'est-à-dire à une époque où, au témoignage de Nil (ou Évagre), les ascètes grecs pouvaient lire des *Bioi des moines de Tabennisi*, qui ne s'identifient certainement pas avec G¹, comme nous l'avons vu'. As we have seen, there is strong reason to suppose that G¹ *did* form one item in this collection of *Bioi*.

The last argument put forward in this section by Lefort for the late date of G¹ is the use of the word μαργώνιον in cc. 107–8. The word is found in the Coptic also, and it is interesting to note that here, at least, Lefort admits the indebtedness of the Coptic to the Greek, though on other occasions, even in the Bohairic *Life*, and at points where the verbal relatedness of the two documents is undeniable, he is prepared to argue for the priority of the Coptic.

The word has, it appears, only been found once elsewhere in Greek—in the *Spiritual Meadow* of John Moschus (unfortunately Lefort omits to give the full reference). It is not uncommon in Arabic in the form *مزرعونة*. It is used elsewhere to translate σπυρίδας. Its Arabic roots are not clear,

but the form appears a natural Arabic form. Lefort concludes, 'On peut donc considérer *marğuna* comme un mot authentiquement arabe, qui aura passé au grec dans un milieu en contact avec les Arabes: milieu très restreint, vu la rareté du mot'. He proceeds to argue that, while Sinai in the seventh century (the milieu of John Moschus) was indeed such a milieu, the same could not be said of Upper Egypt in the fourth or fifth century: therefore, the word in this context *must* be a late introduction. One point at least he has overlooked in the evidence he cites. His quotations from Biberstein-Kazimirski and from Amélineau show the word in use among the *Nubians* and *Sudanese* (for baskets carried on the head). In other words, it is found in use *in the Nile Valley*—the quotation from Amélineau expressly refers to its use at Assouan. The name of such an age-old object of common use is not likely to have changed in the course of a few centuries. And anyone conversant with Greek knows how little one can safely deduce from the rarity of a word's occurrence in literature.

Peeters was not ready to allow Lefort's conclusion on this point. His own suggestion of a Syriac origin and a transposition of letters is hardly convincing. But actually, the termination *-ώνιον* is not at all an improbable Greek termination. May we hazard a connection of *μαργώνιον* with the Greek *μόργος*, whose meaning is given in Liddell and Scott as 'the body of a wicker cart used for carrying straw and chaff'? The use of the diminutive form for a wicker basket seems to offer just the explanation we need here. And at least one Modern Arabic Dictionary I have consulted gives the meaning of the Arabic word as a *wicker* basket. At any rate, it is surely absurd to use the occurrence of a word about the origins of which so little is known, as an argument for the late date of the Greek document in which it is found.

It would be tedious to quote the conclusions which Lefort thinks fit to draw on p. 1 from these arguments. Let any reader refer to that page. He will find it hard to believe that the assertions there made are really based on nothing more than the arguments we have here been engaged in rebutting. But such is in fact the case.

A page follows on the 'Vita Tertia'. We need only pause to point out that, in view of our slight MS. evidence for G¹, we cannot conclude from agreements of G³ with G²D to a dependence of the former on the latter. It is more likely that the agreement gives us evidence for the primitive text of G¹. The occurrence of extracts from Palladius in the same position in G³ and in D is again no evidence. The position of these extracts is dictated by the nature of the case: and they are not introduced in identically the same manner.

The *Letter of Ammon* has already been sufficiently dealt with earlier.

The Coptic Sources

It remains to consider the Coptic sources, as sorted out by Lefort.

1. S¹. Stories told at length, of the early days of Pachomius, with his brother, and with unsatisfactory brethren. This early fragment can be in

part supplemented from the compilation S³. Its accounts are in many respects different from those found in G¹. In the character of these differences, and in the picturesqueness of the stories, we are reminded rather of Asc., and of its relationship to G¹. The stories might be due to independent oral accounts of events of which some are described or referred to in G¹. But the latter does not appear to be explicable as a summary of the S¹ version. An occasional tell-tale Greek word, such as the crucial *πέρπερος* in the story of the quarrel of the two brothers, suggests, though it does not prove, that the Coptic may after all be a free elaboration of the Greek. It is to be noted, incidentally, that S¹ supports G¹ as against Bo. etc., in making John, and not Pachomius, the speaker of the angry word.

2. S² 'trait exclusivement des charismes dont jouissait Pachôme: discernement des esprits qui se manifestaient à lui, ravissements au ciel, don de clair vue dans les consciences, don des miracles'. Lefort argues that the 'atmosphère toute imprégnée de merveilleux' is no proof that S² is not very near the primitive tradition; and that it is not dependent on any surviving Greek or Coptic document, while it does supply material for the later Coptic compilations. That it does that is quite clear. But when Lefort attempts to derive G¹ 42 and 87 directly or indirectly from S², we can but answer that here again the opposite appears to us to be the case—that the Coptic is a free elaboration based directly or indirectly on G¹. In regard to the marvellous atmosphere of this document—it is so far removed from that of G¹ that it seems impossible to believe that both are primitive. If G¹ is primitive, S² is not. And we see no reason in this document for reversing our judgment given in favour of G¹. We are not convinced that S² need necessarily belong to a different source from S¹.

3. S²⁰, S¹⁰, S¹¹—all fragments of one and the same recension, which can be largely reconstructed from the Arabic versions where the Coptic is missing. Lefort says it is clearly not in direct literary relation with any other document. But a table showing its contents alongside those of G¹ once more suggests that the Coptic is a free elaboration of the Greek, with extra stories inserted where the compiler thought them appropriate. We have already noted the interest this document appears to show in paederastia. It certainly seems to us that this is an interest introduced by a later writer, and not a primitive element 'bowdlerised' away by G¹.

Lefort argues from the prominence of Theodore in much of this document that it may have been the 'Life of Pachomius and Theodore' asked for by Theophilus. But we see no reason for identifying that *Life* with any document other than G¹.

4. S⁸. The only Coptic beginning of a *Life* surviving. It is incorporated with the normal preface (as in G¹ etc.) in S³. It included the story, found in other Coptic recensions, of the boy Pachomius's temptation to in chastity, an account of a second expulsion of him from the temple, and a disquisition on apparent fore-knowledge in evil spirits, elaborated and given as editorial comment, whereas in other recensions it is Pachomius himself who discourses on this.

The fragment, such as it is, suggests a rewritten and elaborated *Life*, with a different and independent introduction, but dependent ultimately for the rest on the same original *Life*.

We see no conclusive proof that all these four documents distinguished by Lefort do not really constitute part of a single rewritten *Life*, based ultimately on the same original which is represented in G^1 (if G^1 be not indeed itself the original), but elaborated, altered and enlarged.

5. S^3 —A 'vaste compilation', ending with the death of Pachomius. It certainly used documents 1, 2, and 4 above (none of its surviving portions correspond to 3 as represented in the Coptic fragments), as well as the standard *Life* (Bo., etc.) which we next deal with.

6. The recension of which alone we can form a fairly clear and complete picture from the extensive Bohairic and Arabic remains, and several long fragments of the Sahidic on which the Bohairic was based. Some forms of this recension seem to have ended with the death of Pachomius, but others to have continued, like G^1 , to the death of Theodore.

Referring to the imperfect state of our knowledge of this *Life* before his own publications, Lefort continues, 'Dans ces conditions il n'est pas surprenant que, devant les ressemblances manifestes entre cette recension copte et les Vies grecques, et plus spécialement G^1 , des critiques considèrent G^1 , qu'ils tenaient pour la rédaction primitive, comme source principale de ce qu'ils croyaient représenter toute l'hagiographie copte pachômienne. Maintenant que nous savons que G^1 est une vaste compilation, et que le modèle de Denys lui est très probablement antérieur, il faudra reviser radicalement le problème des rapports littéraires de ces Vies grecques avec la seule de nos Vies coptes qui dénote une intime parenté avec l'hagiographie grecque . . .'.—'Nous savons . . .'.—As we have seen, we know nothing of the sort. The essential thesis of Ladeuze is not overthrown. The Coptic documents (1, 2, 3 and 4) which Lefort claims to be our oldest sources show indications that even they may be in some measure dependent on G^1 . And for the main surviving Coptic version, represented by Bo., S^5 , etc.—a careful comparison of the general structure of this document shows dependence on G^1 , and not *vice versa*; while, in detail, in almost every chapter there is evidence of direct verbal dependence on the Greek original. Even Lefort, though refusing to recognise G^1 as the source concerned, admits that this Coptic recension is 'a manifestement absorbé des documents grecs'. Certainly there is much new material: and while this is of unequal quality, some of it gives an impression of factual historicity equal to that of the G^1 material, and superior to anything found in what Lefort claims to be the oldest Coptic sources. If G^1 was indeed the first *Life*, written c. A.D. 390, it is natural to suppose that it would immediately inspire a Coptic version with additions, and in some cases corrections, from local knowledge and direct oral tradition. But in several cases where the Greek and the Coptic are in conflict as to fact, the Greek can be shown to give the historical truth. This applies, it is to be noted, to events in the 'Appendix' after Pachomius's death as well as before it. Lefort does not pro-

duce any clear proof that this 'Appendix' was a later addition to the original *Life*, either in Coptic or in Greek. The evidence suggesting its separation from the *Life of Pachomius* in some Coptic recensions is perfectly consistent with the view that this separation was the subsequent, not the earlier, stage. That such was the case is borne out by the Cheltenham Papyrus—our earliest clear evidence on this point. In the Greek, also, the restriction of G²D to the *Life of Pachomius* alone is perfectly compatible with its use of G¹ in its complete form.

The publication of the Pachomian dossier still needs completion at certain points. We have not yet a critical edition of the Latin *Life*; the Vatican Arabic version (Av. in Lefort) remains to be published; the text of G¹ still requires the publication of the readings of the Athenian MS.; and a new critical edition of the 'Ascetica', setting forth both recensions clearly, with full collation of G², G³, and the Syriac version, would be a great convenience. But it is improbable that further publication can upset the main conclusions to be reached from the material already to hand. In regard to the Coptic material, Lefort's publications have corrected our view in showing that a wealth of matter which Ladeuze could believe to be merely late introductions into the Arabic *Life* published by Amélineau, actually derives from Coptic documents some at least of which may go back to the sixth century. He has not proved that these documents are our earliest sources, or are any nearer true history than many other documents of sixth century date.

A comparative table of the contents of G¹ and the Coptic and Arabic Lives must wait until we can make a closer examination of the literary structure and historical character of G¹. We hope then to give more positive and constructive demonstration of the reliability of that document, and of its great significance for the early history of Christian asceticism and spirituality.