

OXFORD

THE GREEK *HISTORIA*  
MONACHORUM  
*IN AEGYPTO*

Monastic Hagiography in the Late Fourth Century

*Andrew Cain*

OXFORD EARLY CHRISTIAN STUDIES

OXFORD EARLY CHRISTIAN STUDIES

*General Editors*

Gillian Clark   Andrew Louth

THE OXFORD EARLY CHRISTIAN STUDIES series includes scholarly volumes on the thought and history of the early Christian centuries. Covering a wide range of Greek, Latin, and Oriental sources, the books are of interest to theologians, ancient historians, and specialists in the classical and Jewish worlds.

TITLES IN THE SERIES INCLUDE

**Cyril of Alexandria's Trinitarian Theology of Scripture**

Matthew R. Crawford (2014)

**The Canons of Our Fathers**

*Monastic Rules of Shenoute*

Bentley Layton (2014)

**Gregory of Nyssa's Tabernacle Imagery In its Jewish and Christian Contexts**

Ann Conway-Jones (2014)

**John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy**

*The Coherence of his Theology and Preaching*

David Rylaarsdam (2014)

**The Practical Christology of Philoxenos of Mabbug**

David A. Michelson (2014)

**Law and Legality in the Greek East**

*The Byzantine Canonical Tradition 381–883*

David Wagschal (2014)

**The Role of Death in the *Ladder of Divine Ascent* and the Greek Ascetic Tradition**

Jonathan L. Zecher (2015)

**Theophilus of Alexandria and the First Origenist Controversy**

*Rhetoric and Power*

Krastu Banev (2015)

**Debates over the Resurrection**

*Constructing Early Christian Identity*

Outi Lehtipuu (2015)

**The Consolation of Boethius as Poetic Liturgy**

Stephen Blackwood (2015)

**The Theological Anthropology of Eustathius of Antioch**

Sophie Cartwright (2015)

# The Greek *Historia monachorum in Aegypto*

*Monastic Hagiography in the Late Fourth Century*

ANDREW CAIN

OXFORD  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,  
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.  
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,  
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of  
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Andrew Cain 2016

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

First Edition published in 2016

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in  
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the  
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted  
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics  
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the  
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the  
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form  
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press  
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2015958908

ISBN 978-0-19-875825-9

Printed in Great Britain by  
Clays Ltd, St Ives plc

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and  
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials  
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

## *Preface*

The Greek *Historia monachorum in Aegypto* was one of the most widely read and disseminated Greek hagiographic texts during Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages. To this day it remains, alongside Athanasius' *Life of Antony*, one of the core primary texts on fourth-century Egyptian monasticism as well as one of the most famous pieces of hagiographic literature to survive from the entire patristic period. This book provides the first full-scale scholarly study in any language on this fascinating yet perplexing work. Each of the eleven chapters seeks to break new ground and revise current scholarly orthodoxy about a wide range of topics. I have adopted a cross-disciplinary approach which, depending upon the particular issue or problem being addressed, incorporates insights from source criticism, stylistic and rhetorical analysis, literary criticism, historical and geographical studies, and theological analysis.

The staff at Oxford University Press, as always, were the model of efficiency and grace in guiding this book to publication. I offer my thanks to Gayathri Manoharan, Karen Raith, Albert Stewart, Elizabeth Stone, and above all the senior Commissioning Editor of Religion at Oxford University Press, Tom Perridge, with whom I have had the immense pleasure of working on (now) three books. Especially warm thanks are due to Gillian Clark and Andrew Louth, editors of the Oxford Early Christian Studies series, for accepting this book for publication.



# Table of Contents

<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	ix
Introduction	1
1. The Text	9
Deconstructing the “Lost Primitive Greek <i>HM</i> ” Theory	10
Restoring the Primacy of <i>G</i>	17
Syriac Translations of the <i>HM</i>	26
Status of the Greek Text	31
2. Provenance, Date, and Authorship	33
Provenance	33
Date of Composition	39
Candidates for Authorship	40
Intentional Anonymity	49
3. Genre	58
Itineraria	58
Collective Biography	62
Encomium	64
<i>Acta martyrum</i>	66
<i>Apophthegmata patrum</i>	70
<i>Sui generis</i>	72
4. Literary Influences and Intertexts	74
Classical Greek Literature	74
The Bible	76
The <i>Life of Antony</i>	80
5. Style	92
Figures of Sound	93
Figures of Repetition	97
Figures of Redundancy	103
Figures of Parallelism	107
Figures of Imagery	112
Other Figures of Rhetoric	115
Prose Rhythm	118
Conclusion	119
6. The Pilgrimage: Reality and Representation	125
Preliminary Considerations	126
From Jerusalem to Egypt	127



The Egyptian Itinerary	129
A Divinely Ordained Pilgrimage	135
7. The New Prophets and Apostles	146
Direct Typology (Old Testament)	148
Indirect Typology (Old Testament)	152
Indirect Typology (New Testament)	158
Indirect Typology (Inter-Testamental)	165
The <i>HM</i> as Post-Biblical "Scripture"	178
8. Characterization and the Unholy Other	182
Pagans	183
Syrian Ascetics	188
Manichaean "Heretics"	190
Conclusion	193
9. "Through Them the World is Sustained"	195
Paradise Regained	196
Conservators of Humanity	200
Ministers of Salvation	205
10. A Manual for Monastic Living	214
Intended Audience	214
The Monks as Exemplars and Teachers	221
The Monastic Regimen	225
Conclusion	243
11. Piety and Propaganda	245
Evagrius in the <i>HM</i>	246
Active vs. Contemplative Monasticism	247
Pure Prayer	250
<i>Apatheia</i>	252
Demons and Impure Thoughts	253
Evagrius and His Teachings in Rufinus' Latin <i>HM</i>	259
Conclusion	265
<i>Bibliography</i>	271
<i>General Index</i>	309
<i>Index of Greek Words</i>	315
<i>Index of Latin Words</i>	317
<i>Index of Biblical Citations</i>	318
<i>Index of Ancient Sources</i>	320

## *List of Abbreviations*

AATC	<i>Atti e Memorie dell'Accademia Toscana di Scienze e Lettere La Colombaria</i>
A&R	<i>Atene e Roma</i>
AB	<i>Analecta Bollandiana</i>
ABR	<i>American Benedictine Review</i>
AC	<i>L'Antiquité Classique</i>
ACF	<i>Annuaire du Collège de France</i>
AH	<i>Ancient History</i>
AHB	<i>Ancient History Bulletin</i>
AJPh	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
ANRW	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</i>
AnnSE	<i>Annali di Storia dell'Esegesi</i>
ArchRom	<i>Archivum Romanicum</i>
AU	<i>Der altsprachliche Unterricht</i>
AugStud	<i>Augustinian Studies</i>
BASP	<i>Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists</i>
BICS	<i>Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies</i>
BLE	<i>Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique</i>
BSFE	<i>Bulletin de la Société Française d'Égyptologie</i>
BSI	<i>Byzantinoslavica</i>
BZ	<i>Byzantinische Zeitschrift</i>
CCR	<i>Coptic Church Review</i>
CE	<i>Chronique d'Égypte</i>
CF	<i>Classical Folia</i>
CFC	<i>Cuadernos de Filología Clásica</i>
ChHist	<i>Church History</i>
CivCatt	<i>Civiltà Cattolica</i>
CJ	<i>Classical Journal</i>
ClAnt	<i>Classical Antiquity</i>
ClassStud	<i>Classical Studies</i>
CollCist	<i>Collectanea Cisterciensia</i>
CPh	<i>Classical Philology</i>
CQ	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>

CSEL	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</i>
CSQ	<i>Cistercian Studies Quarterly</i>
CTh	<i>Codex Theodosianus</i>
DACL	<i>Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie</i>
DOP	<i>Dumbarton Oaks Papers</i>
EMC	<i>Echos du Monde Classique</i>
EphL	<i>Ephemerides Liturgicae</i>
EphThL	<i>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses</i>
EuA	<i>Erbe und Auftrag</i>
FZPhTh	<i>Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie</i>
G&R	<i>Greece and Rome</i>
GRBS	<i>Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies</i>
HSCP	<i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i>
HTHR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
JbAC	<i>Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JEA	<i>Journal of Egyptian Archaeology</i>
JECS	<i>Journal of Early Christian Studies</i>
JEH	<i>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</i>
JHS	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
JHSex	<i>Journal of the History of Sexuality</i>
JJP	<i>Journal of Juristic Papyrology</i>
JLA	<i>Journal of Late Antiquity</i>
JML	<i>Journal of Medieval Latin</i>
JÖByz	<i>Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik</i>
JRA	<i>Journal of Roman Archaeology</i>
JRS	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
JSAN	<i>Journal of the Society of Ancient Numismatics</i>
JThS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
JWAS	<i>Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences</i>
LICS	<i>Leeds International Classical Studies</i>
LingBibl	<i>Linguistica Biblica</i>
LO	<i>Lex Orandi</i>
MD	<i>Materiali e Discussioni per l'Analisi dei Testi Classici</i>
MEFRA	<i>Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'École Française de Rome, Antiquité</i>
MisCath	<i>Missions Catholiques</i>

<i>M&amp;L</i>	<i>Music and Letters</i>
<i>MonStud</i>	<i>Monastic Studies</i>
<i>Mus</i>	<i>Le Muséon</i>
<i>NT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>OC</i>	<i>Oriens Christianus</i>
<i>OLP</i>	<i>Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica</i>
<i>Or</i>	<i>Orientalia</i>
<i>PBSR</i>	<i>Papers of the British School at Rome</i>
<i>PEQ</i>	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
<i>PP</i>	<i>Parola del Passato</i>
<i>PThR</i>	<i>Princeton Theological Review</i>
<i>QS</i>	<i>Quaderni di Storia</i>
<i>RAC</i>	<i>Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum</i>
<i>RAM</i>	<i>Revue d'Ascétique et de Mystique</i>
<i>RBén</i>	<i>Revue Bénédictine</i>
<i>RBi</i>	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
<i>RdÉ</i>	<i>Revue d'Égyptologie</i>
<i>RE</i>	<i>Real-Enzyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft</i>
<i>REA</i>	<i>Revue des Études Anciennes</i>
<i>REAug</i>	<i>Revue des Études Augustiniennes</i>
<i>RecAug</i>	<i>Recherches Augustiniennes</i>
<i>RecTh</i>	<i>Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale</i>
<i>REL</i>	<i>Revue des Études Latines</i>
<i>RHE</i>	<i>Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique</i>
<i>RHR</i>	<i>Revue de l'Histoire des Religions</i>
<i>RicSRel</i>	<i>Ricerche di Storia Religiosa</i>
<i>RM</i>	<i>Revue Monastique</i>
<i>RomForsch</i>	<i>Romanische Forschungen</i>
<i>SIFC</i>	<i>Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica</i>
<i>SJOT</i>	<i>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</i>
<i>SO</i>	<i>Symbolae Osloenses</i>
<i>SOCC</i>	<i>Studia Orientalia Christiana Collectanea</i>
<i>StLit</i>	<i>Studia Liturgica</i>
<i>StudAns</i>	<i>Studia Anselmiana</i>
<i>StudMon</i>	<i>Studia Monastica</i>
<i>StudPatr</i>	<i>Studia Patristica</i>

SVTQ	<i>St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly</i>
TAPA	<i>Transactions of the American Philological Association</i>
<i>Th&amp;Ph</i>	<i>Theologie und Philosophie</i>
VChr	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
WissWeis	<i>Wissenschaft und Weisheit</i>
WS	<i>Wiener Studien</i>
YCLS	<i>Yale Classical Studies</i>
ZAC	<i>Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum</i>
ZDMG	<i>Zeitschrift der deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i>
ZKG	<i>Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte</i>
ZPE	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>
ZST	<i>Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie</i>
ZTK	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

## Introduction

On September 6, 394, the emperor Theodosius scored one of the most significant military victories of the fourth century when his army defeated the battalions of the usurper Eugenius and his co-conspirator Arbogast at the Battle of the Frigidus. Around this very same time, on the other side of the Roman Empire, another event was taking shape which would prove to have extraordinarily significant implications of its own—not for the political fate of the Empire but rather for the evolution of ancient monastic hagiography and the modern academic study of Egyptian monasticism. In early September, seven monks set out from their monastery on the Mount of Olives in Jerusalem and began making their way to Egypt, where they would spend the next several months visiting an array of monastic celebrities from the Thebaid in the south to the delta town of Diolcos in the north.

Not long after the monks' return, one of them composed a lively and entertaining account of their experiences. He entitled the work *Ἡ κατ' Αἴγυπτον τῶν μοναχῶν ἱστορία*. This title sometimes has been translated into English as "History of the Monks of Egypt."<sup>1</sup> However, *ἱστορία* in this case does not have historiographic connotations. As is evident from the form and content of his narrative, the author did not venture to write anything resembling a linear "history" of contemporary Egyptian monasticism.<sup>2</sup> This Greek abstract noun is etymologically related to the Indo-European verbal root *weid-*, *woid-*, *wid-* ("see," "know"), and it here involves the gathering of knowledge through autopsy and the subsequent writing down of the results of these investigations.<sup>3</sup> As such, *Ἡ κατ' Αἴγυπτον τῶν μοναχῶν ἱστορία* may succinctly

<sup>1</sup> E.g. D. Brakke, *Demons and the Making of the Monk: Spiritual Combat in Early Christianity* (Cambridge, Mass., 2006), 128.

<sup>2</sup> Incidentally, the same can be said of Palladius' *Lausiac History*, which has the word *ἱστορία* in the title but does not resemble classical or late antique historiography any more than the work in question does; see D. Katos, *Palladius of Hellenopolis: The Origenist Advocate* (Oxford, 2011), 106–7.

<sup>3</sup> See B. Snell, *Die Ausdrücke für den Begriff des Wissens in der vorplatonischen Philosophie* (Berlin, 1924), 59–71; R. Thomas, *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science, and the Art of*

be translated as “Inquiry about the Monks of Egypt.”<sup>4</sup> Nevertheless, modern scholars typically refer to the writing as *Historia monachorum in Aegypto*, the title of Rufinus of Aquileia’s Latin translation of the Greek original. I adopt this scholarly convention in this book and refer to the work by the shorthand “*HM*.” Additionally, because the *HM* was written anonymously and because its author’s identity is irrecoverable, we are not afforded the convenience of calling him by name, and so I refer to him throughout the book variously as “Anon.” (shorthand for “Anonymous”), “the author,” “the narrator,” and so on.

The *HM* was one of the most widely read and disseminated Greek hagiographic texts throughout Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages. The sun of its popularity has not shone nearly so brightly in modern times. Even though in the past fifty years it has been made accessible to mainstream audiences through translations into French,<sup>5</sup> German,<sup>6</sup> English,<sup>7</sup> and Dutch,<sup>8</sup> overall the work has attracted only sporadic and incidental attention from specialists, usually being accessed as a source for fourth-century Egyptian monastic *mores* and oral traditions not preserved elsewhere. In recent decades the *HM* has been the subject of surprisingly few individualized studies—articles, notes, book chapters, and published conference papers which discuss matters of genre,<sup>9</sup> textual criticism,<sup>10</sup> prosopography,<sup>11</sup> and

*Persuasion* (Cambridge, 2000), 161–7; L. Zgusta, “History and its Multiple Meaning,” in L. Zgusta, *History, Languages, and Lexicographers* (Tübingen, 1992), 1–18.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. “Inquiry on the Monks of Egypt”: B. Flusin, “Palestinian Hagiography (Fourth–Eighth Centuries),” in S. Efthymiadis (ed.), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography*, Vol. I: *Periods and Places* (Farnham, 2011), 199–226 (204). Cf. also “Enquiry about the Monks of Egypt”: J. Konstantinovskiy, *Evagrius Ponticus: The Making of a Gnostic* (Aldershot, 2009), 12.

<sup>5</sup> A.-J. Festugière (ed. and trans.), *Historia monachorum in Aegypto. Édition critique du texte grec et traduction annotée* (Brussels, 1971).

<sup>6</sup> F. Suso (trans.), *Mönche im frühchristlichen Ägypten (Historia Monachorum in Aegypto)* (Düsseldorf, 1967).

<sup>7</sup> N. Russell (trans.) and B. Ward (intr.), *The Lives of the Desert Fathers: The Historia monachorum in Aegypto* (Kalamazoo, 1980).

<sup>8</sup> P. W. van der Horst (trans.), *Woestijn, begeerte en geloof. De Historia monachorum in Aegypto (ca. 400 na Chr.)* (Kampen, 1995).

<sup>9</sup> P. Cox Miller, “Strategies of Representation in Collective Biography: Constructing the Subject as Holy,” in T. Hägg and P. Rousseau (eds.), *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 2000), 209–54; G. Frank, “The *Historia monachorum in Aegypto* and Ancient Travel Writing,” *StudPatr* 30 (1997): 191–5; G. Frank, “Miracles, Monks and Monuments: The *Historia monachorum in Aegypto* as Pilgrims’ Tales,” in D. Frankfurter (ed.), *Pilgrimage and Holy Space in Late Antique Egypt* (Leiden, 1998), 483–505.

<sup>10</sup> C. Bammel, “Problems of the *Historia monachorum*,” *JThS* n.s. 47 (1996): 92–104; A.-J. Festugière, “Le problème littéraire de l’*Historia monachorum*,” *Hermes* 83 (1955): 257–84; Tóth, “Syriac Versions of the *Historia monachorum in Aegypto*: A Preliminary Investigation on the Basis of the First Chapter,” *OC* 94 (2010): 58–104; Tóth “Lost in Translation: An Evagrius Term in the Different Versions of the *Historia monachorum in Aegypto*,” in G. Heidl and R. Somos (eds.), *Origeniana, IX* (Leuven, 2009), 613–21.

<sup>11</sup> J. Gasco, “La vie de Paternouthios moine et fossoyeur (*Historia Monachorum X*),” in C. Décobert (ed.), *Itinéraires d’Égypte. Mélanges M. Martin* (Cairo, 1992), 107–14.

minor points of historical interest.<sup>12</sup> Not a single monograph dots the sparse bibliographic landscape.

On account of the relative neglect from which the *HM* has suffered, its rich complexity as a literary artifact—as opposed to its bare utility as a primary source for fourth-century Egyptian monasticism—has gone vastly underappreciated across the board. It is my intention with the present book to help turn this tide and to show that the anonymous author was executing far more nuanced and multi-tiered literary and theological agenda than scholars have previously recognized. Indeed, I argue that his writing was one of the most innovative and sophisticated pieces of Christian literature of its time and that he himself deserves, despite his anonymity, to be classed as one of the elite patristic authors in Greek.

Each of the eleven chapters seeks to break new ground and to revise current scholarly orthodoxy about a wide range of topics, and I have aimed to be comprehensive in scope and to leave as few stones unturned as possible. This has necessitated a cross-disciplinary approach which, depending upon the particular issue or problem being addressed, incorporates insights from source criticism, stylistic and rhetorical analysis, literary criticism, historical and geographical studies, and theological analysis. Furthermore, one of my secondary aims is to contextualize the *HM* in the broader literary tradition of early monastic hagiography and also to underscore its exemplarity within this tradition. To this end, I adduce in the text and the notes a great many parallel passages, episodes, and literary commonplaces from comparable late antique writings.

In the past century and a half, most debates in the scholarship on the Greek *HM* have been centered on the nature of the surviving text itself. Do we possess what is essentially the author's autograph? Many scholars have answered resoundingly in the negative, maintaining that what has come down to us is a mutilated redaction of the autograph, itself a lost primitive Greek original on which Rufinus based the Latin translation he made within a decade of the composition of this alleged *Vorlage*. They observe that Rufinus' version is longer than the extant Greek text and diverges from it in a number of substantial respects, and they also note that in his account of Egyptian monasticism in his *Ecclesiastical History* Sozomen, the earliest independent (Greek) witness to the text of the *HM*, generally follows the Latin more faithfully than the Greek and includes details found in the Latin but not in the Greek. Because these scholars assume that Sozomen could not have accessed Rufinus' Latin *HM*, much less been proficient enough at reading Latin to make meaningful use of it, they conclude that the Greek version he had in hand closely resembled Rufinus' source-text and that the surviving

<sup>12</sup> D. Woods, "An Imperial Embassy in the *Historia monachorum*," *JThS* n.s. 48 (1997): 133–6.



Greek text must be the outcome of extensive bowdlerization. In Chapter 1 (“The Text”) I employ philological and source-critical analysis to show that their argument is based on faulty presuppositions and suffers fatally from internally inconsistent logic. I argue that the Greek text as it has been reconstructed by André-Jean Festugière approximates the author’s autograph, notwithstanding of course minor and ultimately inconsequential variant readings resulting from scribal errors and interventions which crept into the text over the centuries of its transmission—none of which rises to anywhere near the level of substance to justify suspicion of a lost Greek archetype along the dramatic lines that some scholars have proposed. I point out that Sozomen not only could read Latin but even competently accessed Latin sources (e.g. Rufinus’ *Ecclesiastical History*), and I contend that he used both the Greek original and Rufinus’ translation simultaneously, following one more closely than the other for his treatments of individual monks. This conclusion has two important implications for our purposes. First, the significant differences between the Greek *HM* and Latin *HM* are attributable to Rufinus’ translation technique and other factors which are explored in Chapter 11. Second, the Greek *HM* may be appreciated and studied on its own terms as a complete, rather than badly fragmented, literary artifact.

Having established that we do indeed possess the Greek *HM* in a reliable form, in Chapter 2 (“Provenance, Date, and Authorship”) we move on to address other vital questions surrounding the text: where and when was it composed, and who authored it? Careful consideration of the primary-source evidence and of various pieces of circumstantial evidence enables us to identify, with a very high degree of probability, the seven monks’ monastery of origin as Rufinus’ monastery on the Mount of Olives, which formed part of the monastic compound he co-founded with Melania the Elder around 380. The chronological book-ends of their travels may likewise be fixed with a fair degree of precision: they left Jerusalem in early September of 394 and returned home in late January or early February of 395. The author composed his account of their travels at some point between the spring of 395 and 397, though perhaps more likely at the earlier end of this chronological spectrum. Late antique and medieval scribes attributed the Greek *HM* incorrectly to Bishop Timothy of Alexandria, Jerome, and Palladius. However, the author’s identity remains shrouded in a thick, impenetrable cloud of mystery, largely because he released his writing anonymously. His voluntary suppression of his name, I argue, was a literary device calculated to accentuate his humility as a monastic author and to prioritize his subject matter by passing himself off as nothing more than a nameless mouthpiece of inspired spiritual teachings handed down by the Egyptian monks.

In recent years various scholars have assigned the Greek *HM* to one or other ancient literary genre. Some read it principally as a first-person travelogue, others as collective biography, and still others as encomium. In Chapter 3

("Genre") I review the *status quaestionis* and weigh in with my own contribution to this ongoing conversation by adducing the work's generic affiliations with not only the *itinerarium*, collective biography, and encomium, but also *acta martyrum* and the aphoristic-hagiographic tradition of "Sayings of the Fathers." I argue, *in nuce*, that the *HM* defies the kind of rigid generic categorization that modern scholars overwhelmingly tend to impose upon it. It is *sui generis*—an innovative hybrid composition in which multiple literary forms work together in synergy. Indeed, Anon. brilliantly typifies the contemporary practice of experimenting with a mix-and-match compositional technique to produce literary works which are conspicuous for their deviation from stale generic templates.

One of the most fundamental exercises that can be performed on a piece of ancient literature is the identification of its literary antecedents and intertexts. In Chapter 4 ("Literary Influences and Intertexts") the *HM* is subjected to a formal source-critical analysis along these lines. Somewhat surprisingly, given that Anon. had received a classical education, no phraseological echoes of secular literature are evident in his prose. His prose is, however, larded with biblical quotations, paraphrases, and allusions, and representative case studies highlight the author's sophisticated handling of biblical subtexts and intertexts. In the second half of the chapter we explore the nuances of the intertextual relationship that the *HM* carries on with Athanasius' *Life of Antony*. I first cite evidence, in the form of a phraseological borrowing from the *Life*, to confirm that Anon. indeed had read this wildly popular hagiographic work. I then map the extensive Antonian material from the *HM* against that from the *Life* and show that Anon. deliberately included stories about Antony not preserved in the *Life* and yet did not replicate any stories already found in the *Life*. His primary intention here, I argue, was to make his own independent contribution to the continuation of Antonian lore. Furthermore, his "Antony," unlike Athanasius', does not tower over all others as the preeminent figure in the desert monastic movement. Rather, he shares the stage with other great monks and in fact often is seen playing a subordinate role to them. He thus subverts the Athanasian archetype and offers a more even-handed (and more historically accurate) assessment of Antony's importance in the grand scheme of fourth-century Egyptian monasticism.

We continue our investigation of Anon.'s literary prowess in Chapter 5 ("Style"), this time turning to his prose style. Scholars traditionally have denigrated his style as simplistic and lacking in refinement. I demonstrate, however, that his prose actually is rich in rhetorical embellishment and registers the same stylistic pretensions that are associated with the literary aesthetic of the Second Sophistic. Indeed, he systematically deploys an impressive range of rhetorical figures and shows a marked preference for aggregating multiple figures in close proximity. What is more, he consistently incorporates into his sentences rhythmic *clausulae*, a hallmark of artistic late

Greek prose. All these features not only affirm that Anon. was a skilled wordsmith who took great pride in his craft but also strongly suggest that he had received advanced training in rhetoric during his youth, and this in turn indicates that he came from a privileged socioeconomic background.

The *HM* purports to be a trip-diary documenting an expedition throughout monastic Egypt. In Chapter 6 (“The Pilgrimage: Reality and Representation”) we investigate the party of seven’s travels both as an historical reality and, in its literary form in the *HM*, as an idealized religious pilgrimage. I first use the *HM* as a documentary source for reconstructing the itinerary of the party’s expedition and then, moving from reality to representation, I argue that Anon. did not set out to compose simply a bare transcript of his travels. In this, as in all other aspects of his narrative, he is painstakingly deliberate in how he shapes readers’ perception of his experience in Egypt. In the Prologue and Epilogue he portrays his pilgrimage as a divinely ordained affair from start to finish: God inspired him and his fellow monks to go in the first place and led them safely back to Jerusalem. Anon. dramatizes the many life-threatening perils they faced in part to provide an element of pulse-pounding entertainment for the reader, but mainly to emphasize God’s providential care for them, for it is God whom he credits with preserving them unharmed through all their harrowing misadventures.

In the Prologue Anon. portrays his pilgrimage as something of a reverse biblical exodus—whereas the Israelites fled from Egypt to find the Promised Land, he and his fellow monks temporarily left the Promised Land (i.e. the fourth-century “Holy Land”) to go to Egypt. What he leads readers to believe they found there was a land full of divine wonder, a place where the Holy Spirit’s power was so intensely focalized that Egypt seemed like a contemporary land of the Bible. Anon. makes this point by using typological figuration to cast the Egyptian monks as “prophets” and “apostles,” latter-day successors to their biblical counterparts. In Chapter 7 (“The New Prophets and Apostles”) I analyze the nuances of his sophisticated typological technique through close readings of numerous stories about the Egyptian monks and their miracles. I observe that Anon. was the first hagiographer on record to develop the prophet-apostle successorship premise so emphatically that it ascends to prominence as the overt guiding motif of his writing. Indeed, the resulting implication of his typological technique is that the *HM* comes across to readers as a virtual extension of the Bible, a piece of post-biblical “Scripture,” as it were.

In the drama that unfolds in the *HM*, the Egyptian monks of course assume the starring roles. There is a rich supporting cast of human characters who complement the monks by reifying their resemblance to biblical archetypes—for instance, people from all walks of life who are grateful beneficiaries of their miracles, which more often than not conspicuously echo miracles recorded in the Bible. Other human characters complement the monks, but do so

indirectly as foils. These people play the part of the hostile “other” in contrast to whom the monks appear even more godly than they otherwise would. In Chapter 8 (“Characterization and the Unholy Other”) we look closely at three different types of rivals of the Egyptian monks—pagans, Syrian ascetics, and Manichaeans—whom Anon. appropriates as oppositional and inherently flawed characters in order to legitimize the monks as spiritual authorities and to make his own broader, real-world criticisms about the three classes of people whom these characters represent.

In the Prologue Anon. asserts of the Egyptian monks that “people depend on their prayers as if on God himself” and that “it is clear to all who dwell there that through them the world is sustained and on account of them human life is sustained and is honored by God.” In Chapter 9 (“Through Them the World is Sustained”) I explore the implications of these daring claims, whereby Anon. attaches grand cosmic significance to the monks’ lives and ministries. I focus in particular on the three primary areas in which he establishes the universal reach of their spiritual authority and positions them as being indispensable to the divine plan for redemption. They are cast implicitly as new Adams who have restored a measure of prelapsarian equilibrium to the cosmos through their close communion with God. Through their various miracles of healing and prophecy they preserve human lives from destructive forces (e.g. disease and famine) and they mitigate the harsh realities of everyday life for those who desperately seek their help. Finally, and most importantly, the Egyptian monks are key figures in the unfolding drama of salvation history, acting as divinely appointed emissaries through whom God redeems the souls of the lost.

In the penultimate chapter (“A Manual for Monastic Living”) we address one of the most pressing questions of all: why, and for whom, was the *HM* composed? This question is deceptively simple, yet the response it merits is complex. I begin the chapter by isolating Anon.’s stated target audience: male ascetics ranging from rank neophytes to seasoned veterans. I then show that he adopts a two-pronged, open-ended approach to edifying this readership. First, he sets up the Egyptian monks as Christ-like exemplars who are worthy of being emulated; the example of their holy lives thus is itself a vehicle of instruction. Second, he presents them as divinely inspired teachers and preserves their teachings as a motley compilation of discourses, anecdotes, and aphorisms, all of which the monks relay ostensibly in their own voices. The cumulative result is a free-form “guidebook” for the monastic life in which the didactic content is conveyed in a rather fragmented yet lively fashion.

In addition to providing a chrestomathy of generalized instruction in the ascetic life, Anon. was motivated to compose the *HM* by another important factor, as I argue in Chapter 11 (“Piety and Propaganda”). I first show that most of the monks’ discourses promulgate the core spiritual teachings of Evagrius of Pontus. This ideological common ground is no accident. Evagrius

maintained very close ties to Anon.'s monastery and was a longtime friend and spiritual mentor of his abbot, Rufinus, who went to considerable lengths to disseminate Evagrius' ideas and writings. Anon. thus had ample opportunity to be exposed to Evagrius' teachings above and beyond the personal consultation with him that he recounts briefly in the *HM*. What is more, his documented sympathies with these teachings, evident throughout the *HM*, strongly suggest that he conceived this writing to be, in part at least, a creative platform for popularizing the foundational principles of Evagrian ascetic theory, to make these ideas accessible in a streamlined form to a far broader readership than would normally be predisposed to study Evagrius' corpus of theoretical treatises.

The text of the *HM* on which this study is based is that of André-Jean Festugière, which first appeared in 1961 and remains the definitive critical edition. Quotations from Rufinus' Latin translation of the *HM* come from the critical edition of Eva Schulz-Flügel.<sup>13</sup> All English translations of both the Greek and Latin *HM* are my own.

<sup>13</sup> *Tyrannius Rufinus, Historia monachorum sive De vita sanctorum patrum* (Berlin, 1990).

## The Text

For more than a century the most contentious scholarly debates about the Greek *Historia monachorum in Aegypto* (hereafter *HM*) have revolved around the surviving text itself and specifically its relationship with Rufinus of Aquileia's Latin translation of this work. Erwin Preuschen, the first modern editor of the Greek text,<sup>1</sup> believed that the Latin was the original and the Greek its translation. Although Preuschen's theory found favor among many Continental scholars at the time,<sup>2</sup> the Benedictine scholar Cuthbert Butler laid it to rest by definitively demonstrating the anteriority of the Greek text.<sup>3</sup> Over half a century later, André-Jean Festugière, the second and most recent modern editor of the Greek text,<sup>4</sup> confirmed Butler's conclusions from his own text-critical work.<sup>5</sup>

As a result of the efforts by Butler and Festugière, there is now no doubt whatsoever that Rufinus' Latin *HM* is based on a Greek original. But do we possess this original today? For reasons we will explore in a moment, both of these scholars believed that it actually has not come down to us. They hypothesized that the Greek text in its extant form is a heavily redacted version of a lost primitive *Vorlage* used by Rufinus and that all known surviving Greek manuscripts descend from this redaction. A measurable scholarly consensus has since coalesced around this position. However, as I demonstrate in this chapter, this theory in fact is destabilized by its own logical inconsistencies, and it raises more troubling questions than it purports to answer.

The following notations are used in this chapter. "Anon." is shorthand for "Anonymous" and denotes the anonymous author of the Greek *HM*.<sup>6</sup> *L* stands

<sup>1</sup> *Palladius und Rufinus. Ein Beitrag zur Quellenkunde des ältesten Mönchtums* (Giessen, 1897), 1–131.

<sup>2</sup> For example, Richard Reitzenstein, the eminent scholar of Hellenistic religion and early Christian gnosticism, accepted Preuschen's view as a point of departure for his monograph *Historia monachorum und Historia Lausiaca. Eine Studie zur Geschichte des Mönchtums und der frühchristlichen Begriffe Gnostiker und Pneumatiker* (Göttingen, 1916).

<sup>3</sup> *The Lausiaca History of Palladius: A Critical Discussion Together with Notes on Early Egyptian Monachism* (Cambridge, 1898), 257–66.

<sup>4</sup> *Historia monachorum in Aegypto. Édition critique du texte grec* (Brussels, 1961).

<sup>5</sup> "Le problème littéraire de l'*Historia monachorum*," *Hermes* 83 (1955): 257–84.

<sup>6</sup> The issue of his self-imposed anonymity is discussed at length on pp. 49–57.

for Rufinus' Latin translation of the Greek; all quotations from *L* come from Eva Schulz-Flügel's critical edition published some two and a half decades ago.<sup>7</sup> *G<sub>x</sub>* represents the lost primitive Greek original posited by Butler, Festugière, and others, and supposed by them to have been the version on which Rufinus based *L*. Finally, *G* stands for Anon.'s Greek autograph, which I argue is the true original underlying *L*. All quotations from it are taken from Festugière's critical edition.

### DECONSTRUCTING THE "LOST PRIMITIVE GREEK *HM*" THEORY

Historically, scholarly discussions about how closely the extant Greek *HM* approximates Anon.'s autograph have begun with attempts to ascertain the precise nature of the relationship between *G* and *L*. This assessment in turn takes Sozomen, the earliest independent witness to the text of the *HM*, as an initial frame of reference for discussion. In his *Ecclesiastical History*, composed in the early 440s, he includes an account of Egyptian monks which draws heavily on the *HM*.<sup>8</sup> The following table lists, in their order of appearance in his work, the monks (and monastic settlements) about whom Sozomen retrieves information solely from the *HM*. The numbers in the columns for *G* and *L* correspond to chapter numbers in these works.

Monk	Sozomen	<i>G</i>	<i>L</i>
Apollonius (Apollo)	3.14.18–19	8	7
Anouph	3.14.20	11	10
John of Lycopolis	6.28.1–2	1	1
Or	6.28.2–3	2	2
Ammon	6.28.3	3	3
Theon	6.28.3	6	6
Bes	6.28.3	4	4
Copres	6.28.4	10	9
Helle	6.28.5	12	11
Elias	6.28.6	7	12

<sup>7</sup> E. Schulz-Flügel (ed.), *Tyrannius Rufinus, Historia monachorum sive De vita sanctorum patrum* (Berlin, 1990).

<sup>8</sup> *hist. eccl.* 3.14; 6.28–31.

Apelles	6.28.7	13	15
Isidore	6.28.8	17	17
Serapion	6.28.9	18	18
Dioscorus	6.28.10	20	20
Eulogius	6.28.11	16	14
Apollo	6.29.1–2	8	7
Piammon	6.29.7	25	32
John of Diolcos	6.29.8	26	33
Origen	6.30.1	—	26
Didymus	6.30.1	20	24
Chronion	6.30.1	20	25
Monks of Nitria	6.31.1–2	20	21
Monks of Kellia	6.31.2–6	20	22

Sozomen includes entries on twenty different monks (more than half of all those profiled in the *HM*) and the monastic settlements at Nitria and Kellia.<sup>9</sup> These notices, two of which are embedded in Book III of the *Ecclesiastical History* and the remaining in Book VI, vary in length among themselves and in most cases present only a cursory abridgement which focuses on at least one salient individuating characteristic about the monk (or monastic settlement) in question.

When Sozomen, *G*, and *L* are compared synoptically, a great number of interesting discrepancies can be detected. Some are cases in which Sozomen reports topographical details found in *G* but not in *L*. For example, he states that Abba Or spent considerable time as an ascetic “in deserts,”<sup>10</sup> and his plural phrase ἐν ἐρημίαις appears to be a consolidation of *G*’s “further desert” and “nearer desert”;<sup>11</sup> in *L* only one “desert” is mentioned.<sup>12</sup> Along similar lines, all three texts agree that the hermit Elias lived outside Antinoë, but Sozomen and *G* call this outlying area “the desert,”<sup>13</sup> while *L* describes

<sup>9</sup> There are two differently worded entries on Apollo, the Latinized form of whose name, Apollonius, is given in the first entry, and the Greek form, in the second one.

<sup>10</sup> *hist. eccl.* 6.28.2–3.

<sup>11</sup> *G* 2.2: οὗτος πολλὰ πρότερον καθ’ ἑαυτὸν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἀσκήσας τῇ πορρωτέρᾳ, ὕστερον ἐν τῇ πλησίον ἐρήμῳ τὰ μοναστήρια συνεκρότησεν.

<sup>12</sup> *L* 2.2: hic prius in ultima eremo plurimis abstinentiae laboribus exercitatus postremo in vicino urbis monasteria instituit. *L*’s in vicino urbis is the nearest equivalent to *G*’s “nearer desert.”

<sup>13</sup> *hist. eccl.* 6.28.6: Ἡλίας δὲ τότε μὲν οὐ πόρρω τῆς Ἀντινόου πόλεως ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐφιλοσόφει — *G* 7.1: εἵδομεν δὲ καὶ ἕτερον πρεσβύτερον ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῆς Ἀντινόου, μητροπόλεως τῆς Θηβαΐδος, Ἡλίαν ὀνόματι.



it less precisely as being *in finibus Antinoo*.<sup>14</sup> Finally, both Sozomen and G situate Apelles in the district of Achoris,<sup>15</sup> but *L*, in place of a specific toponym, has *in vicina regione*, which vaguely locates Apelles somewhere in the Thebaid.<sup>16</sup> Sozomen and G agree with each other, against *L*, not just on the finer points of topography. Both specify that John of Diolcos was endowed with the charism of healing paralysis and gout,<sup>17</sup> but *L* speaks only generically about his healings (*sanitates*) and does not mention any particular afflictions that he was specialized in curing.<sup>18</sup>

Sozomen agrees with *L* against *G* even more frequently, and in more substantial ways than he agrees with *G* against *L*. For instance, on several occasions he uses the form of a monk's name that is identical to the one in *L* but different from the one in *G*.<sup>19</sup> Theon's polyglotism is duly noted by all three, but Sozomen and *L* list his languages as Coptic, Greek, and Latin, whereas *G* has a different order, listing the languages as Greek, Latin, and Coptic.<sup>20</sup> The most striking discrepancies between Sozomen-*L* and *G* surface in their respective accounts of the famous monastic settlement at Nitria, which are juxtaposed here:

Soz. *hist. eccl.* 6.31.1

Καλοῦσι δὲ τὸν χώρον  
τοῦτον Νιτρίαν,  
  
καθότι κώμη τις ἔστιν  
ὁμορος ἐν ᾗ τὸ νίτρον  
συλλέγουσιν.

*L* 21.1.1–2

Venimus autem et  
Nitriam . . .  
  
ex nomine vici adjacentis,  
in quo nitrum colligitur,  
Nitriae vocabulum trahens,

*G* 20.5–6

Κατήχθημεν δὲ καὶ εἰς Νιτρίας,

<sup>14</sup> *L* 12.1: *vidimus et alium senem venerabilem, Heliam nomine, in finibus civitatis Antinoo, quae est metropolis Thebaidis*.

<sup>15</sup> Sozomen, *hist. eccl.* 6.28.7: ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ Ἀπελλῆς τηνικάδε διέπρεπε περὶ Ἀχωριν—*G* 13.1: εἶδομεν δὲ καὶ ἕτερον πρεσβύτερον ἐν τοῖς μέρεσι τῆς Ἀχωρέως, ὀνόματι Ἀπελλῆν.

<sup>16</sup> That is, prior to the phrase *in vicina regione*, the reader is given geographical orientation only as recently as two chapters earlier, where the narrator comments on visiting Pityrion's community of monks on a mountain in the Thebaid. Achoris is not mentioned once in *L*, and so *in vicina regione* cannot refer back to a previous occurrence in the work.

<sup>17</sup> Sozomen, *hist. eccl.* 6.29.8: Ἰωάννη δὲ τοσαύτην ὁ θεὸς ἔδωκ' αὐτῷ δύναντα κατὰ παθῶν καὶ νοσημάτων, ὥς πολλοὺς ἰάσασθαι ποδαγούς καὶ τὰ ἄρθρα διαλελυμένους—*G* 26.1: πολλὴν χάριν ἔχοντα . . . δυνάμεις τε καὶ ἰάσεις ἐπιτελέσαντα καὶ πολλοὺς παραλυτικούς καὶ ποδαγούς θεραπεύσαντα.

<sup>18</sup> *L* 33.2: *sed et sanitatum gratia plurima ei a deo donata est*.

<sup>19</sup> In alphabetical order: Ἀμμών (*hist. eccl.* 6.28.3) = Ammon (*L* 3.1) ≠ Ἀμμωνα (*G* 3.1); Ἀπολλώνιος (*hist. eccl.* 3.14.18) = Apollonius (*L* 7.1.1) ≠ Ἀπολλῶ (*G* 8.1); Βῆνος (*hist. eccl.* 6.28.3) = Benus (*L* 4.1) ≠ Βῆς (*G* 4.1); Κρονίων (*hist. eccl.* 6.30.1) = Cronium (*L* 25.5.1) ≠ Κρονίδης (*G* 20.13); Πιάμμων (*hist. eccl.* 6.29.7) = Piammon (*L* 32.2) ≠ Πιαμμωνά (*G* 25.2).

<sup>20</sup> Ἰστορεῖται δὲ τῆς Αἰγυπτίων καὶ Ἑλλήνων καὶ Ῥωμαίων παιδείσεως (*hist. eccl.* 6.28.3) = *eruditus non solum Aegyptiorum et Graecorum lingua, sed etiam Latinorum* (*L* 6.7) ≠ ἐν τε Ἑλληνικοῖς καὶ Ῥωμαϊκοῖς καὶ Αἰγυπτιακοῖς ἀναγνώσασιν (*G* 6.3).

*prospiciente hoc, credo, iam  
tum divina providentia, quod  
in illis locis peccata hominum  
tamquam nitro sordes  
abluenda essent et abolenda.*

οὐ τὸ τυχὸν δὲ πλήθος  
ἐνταῦθα ἐφιλοσόφει,

καὶ μοναστήρια ἦν ἀμφὶ  
πεντήκοντα ἀλλήλοις  
ἐχόμενα,

τὰ μὲν συνοικιῶν, τὰ δὲ  
καθ' ἑαυτοὺς οἰκούντων.

*In hoc igitur loco quingenta  
fere aut non multo minus  
cernuntur vicina sibi et sub  
uno posita monasteria, in  
quibus aliqui plures simul,  
aliqui pauci, nonnulli etiam  
singulares habitant.*

ἐνθα πολλοὺς καὶ μεγάλους  
ἀναχωρητὰς ἐωράκαμεν, τοῦτο  
μὲν ἐγχαρίους, τοῦτο δὲ καὶ  
ξένους, ἀλλήλους ταῖς ἀρεταῖς  
ὑπερβάλλοντας καὶ φιλονικώτερον  
πρὸς τὴν ἀσκήσιν διακειμένους,  
πᾶσάν τε ἀρετὴν ἐνδεικνυμένους  
καὶ ἀγωνιζομένους ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ  
ἀλλήλους ὑπερβάλλειν. καὶ  
οἱ μὲν αὐτῶν περὶ τὴν θεωρίαν, οἱ  
δὲ περὶ τὴν πρακτικὴν  
ἡσυχολοῦντο. ἰδόντες γὰρ ἡμᾶς  
τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν πόρρωθεν  
ἐρχομένους διὰ τῆς ἐρήμου οἱ μὲν  
μετὰ ὕδατος ἡμῖν προῦπήντησαν,  
οἱ δὲ τοὺς πόδας ἡμῶν ἐνιπτον, οἱ  
δὲ τὰ ἱμάτια ἔπλυνον, οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ  
τροφὴν παρεκάλουν, ἄλλοι δὲ ἐπὶ  
τὴν τῶν ἀρετῶν μάθησιν, ἄλλοι δὲ  
ἐπὶ τὴν θεωρίαν καὶ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ  
γνώσιν. καὶ ὅπερ ἕκαστος αὐτῶν  
ἠδύνατο, τοῦτο ἔσπευδεν ἡμᾶς  
ὠφελεῖν. καὶ τί ἂν τις εἴποι πάσας  
αὐτῶν τὰς ἀρετάς, μηδὲν ἐπαξίως  
λέγειν δυνάμενος;

The close correspondences between Sozomen and *L* are clear. Both provide an etymological sidebar about the toponym “Nitria,” claiming that the place was so named on account of the natron extracted from nearby lakebeds.<sup>21</sup> Both estimate that there are fifty monasteries at Nitria—a very precious *testimonium* because these are the only two known ancient literary sources to provide this figure.<sup>22</sup> What is more, both Sozomen and *L* report that these monasteries are in close proximity to one another, and that some are inhabited by communities and others by monks living alone. All of these details are completely absent from *G*, which focuses instead on the Nitrian monks’ ascetic rivalry with one another and the warm hospitality they showered on the party of seven.

The representative examples cited here illustrate what is by all appearances a source-critical conundrum. How are we to explain the curious fact that Sozomen draws elements from *G* not found in *L* and also elements from *L* not found in *G*? Since for obvious reasons he could not have been using either *G* or *L* exclusively, the question naturally arises: what version of the *HM* was he in fact using? In answering this question Butler devised what he termed the “Revision-theory.” He proposed that Sozomen’s source-text was what in this chapter we call *G<sub>x</sub>*. Butler reasoned that when *L* disagrees with the combined authority of *G* and Sozomen, then the divergences may be attributed to Rufinus’ translation technique, but when *G* disagrees with the combined authority of *L* and Sozomen, then Sozomen must be following *G<sub>x</sub>*.<sup>23</sup>

Festugière, in an article he wrote while preparing his critical edition of the Greek text, seconded the “Revision-theory” but also identified not two but three different ancient recensions of the Greek *HM*: *G*, the Greek version on which Rufinus based *L* (i.e. *G<sub>x</sub>*), and the Greek version used by Sozomen.<sup>24</sup> Unlike Butler, he did not rest his case solely on a triangulation between Sozomen, *G*, and *L*. He also adduced a great many other instances in which *G* and *L* disagree—instances in which Sozomen does not provide a third-party control—and he cited these as “proof” that Rufinus had been working from a

<sup>21</sup> This explanation is accepted by modern scholars; see e.g. R. Bagnall and D. Rathbone (eds.), *Egypt from Alexander to the Early Christians* (Los Angeles, 2004), 110. Natron was put to many practical uses, especially as a cleaning agent to purify linen. Rufinus plays on this fact when he fancifully speculates that God foreordained Nitria to be so named because this would be a place where souls were purified. This sentiment is paralleled, in a more compressed form, in Jerome’s *Epitaphium sanctae Paulae*, composed in 404 and thus around the same time that Rufinus composed the Latin *HM*. When taking stock of Paula’s travels in monastic Egypt, Jerome says this about Nitria: *Nitriam, in quo purissimo virtutum nitro sordes lavantur cotidie plurimorum*; see A. Cain, *Jerome’s Epitaph on Paula: A Commentary on the Epitaphium Sanctae Paulae, with an Introduction, Text, and Translation* (Oxford, 2013), 62.

<sup>22</sup> Palladius, who was at Nitria in 388, estimated its population at the time to be 5,000 (*hist. Laus.* 7.2, 13.2), and although he gives an illuminating description of the layout of the monastic establishment at Nitria (*hist. Laus.* 7.3–5), he does not mention how many μοναστήρια were located there.

<sup>23</sup> *Lausiaca History*, 267–78, esp. 274–5.

<sup>24</sup> “Problème littéraire,” 280.

lost Greek original.<sup>25</sup> However, as Festugière himself conceded, these examples prove nothing in the end because the discrepancies are easily explainable as emendations that Rufinus could have made to the existing Greek text.

In the last published study of her career, a review article on Eva Schulz-Flügel's critical edition of *L*, Caroline Bammel made a unique contribution to the ongoing debate about the source-critical issue at hand.<sup>26</sup> She accepted the "Revision-theory" but went a step further than either Butler or Festugière in that she tried to identify the precise circumstances under which *G<sub>x</sub>* might have been redacted. In particular, she proposed that it underwent a "revision as a result of the fear of Origenism caused by Theophilus of Alexandria's expulsion of the Nitrian monks in 399/400."<sup>27</sup> The crux of her argument is that Sozomen and *L* mention five prominent Nitrian monks—all four Tall Brothers (Ammonius, Eusebius, Euthymius, Dioscorus) and Antony's disciple Origen—only one of whom (Ammonius) is mentioned in *G*.<sup>28</sup> She adds that the redactor of the original Greek text omitted Origen's name "for the simple reason that the name was regarded with alarm."<sup>29</sup>

Bammel's suggestion—that *G* is "an anti-Origenist revision"<sup>30</sup> made at the turn of the fifth century in direct response to Theophilus' campaign against the Origenist monks at Nitria—seems attractive at first glance.<sup>31</sup> However, it quickly breaks down under scrutiny and actually creates more problems than it solves. First of all, if the redactor's aim was to excise all overtly pro-Origenist elements from the text, especially the names of some of the leading Origenist monks at Nitria, then why does *G*, which is the supposed redaction, not only mention Ammonius, one of the Tall Brothers, but also extol him at length for being one of the spiritual guiding lights at Nitria?<sup>32</sup> Furthermore, the author effusively praises the spirituality of the Nitrian monks as a group, concluding his encomium with this rhetorical question: "How can one relate all of their virtues since one is completely unable to do them justice?"<sup>33</sup> One naturally would expect an anti-Origenist redactor to suppress any statements favorable to monks of a hostile ideological persuasion.

Bammel neglected to explain her redactor's glaring inconsistency in purging all overtly pro-Origenist elements from the Greek text yet leaving in it high-pitched praise for the Nitrian monks as a whole, and in particular

<sup>25</sup> "Problème littéraire," 267–78.

<sup>26</sup> "Problems of the *Historia monachorum*," *JThS* n.s. 47 (1996): 92–104.

<sup>27</sup> "Problems," 99. <sup>28</sup> "Problems," 99–100.

<sup>29</sup> "Problems," 100. <sup>30</sup> "Problems," 100–1.

<sup>31</sup> For scholarly approvals of her theory, see e.g. D. Caner, *Wandering, Begging Monks: Spiritual Authority and the Promotion of Monasticism in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 2002), 28 n.39, and especially Peter Tóth's articles, which are cited and discussed later in this chapter.

<sup>32</sup> See *G* 20.9–11, where the focus is on how Ammonius mentors novice monks and takes care of them by building them cells, etc.

<sup>33</sup> *G* 20.6.

for Ammonius, who was the most famous and distinguished of the four Tall Brothers.<sup>34</sup> She used the account of Nitria as the sole text-case for her hypothesis and failed to recognize that her redactor's methodological inconsistencies far transcend this section of the narrative. Triangulating between Sozomen, *G*, and *L* in order to reconstruct *G<sub>so</sub>* as Bammel and others before her had done, let us consider just a few of the great many instances in which this alleged anti-Origenist redactor supposedly altered the Greek original in places where there are not even the faintest conceivable traces of Origenist propaganda.

For the names of many monks, none of whom is known to have been associated with any contemporary theological controversy, *G* preserves slightly different spellings from the ones on which both Sozomen and *L* agree.<sup>35</sup> In their respective treatments of the monk-priest Dioscorus,<sup>36</sup> Sozomen and *L* agree with each other, against *G*, on two points.<sup>37</sup> First, Sozomen's estimate of the number of monks under Dioscorus' care as being "not more than one hundred" (οὐ πλείους ἑκατόν) closely approximates *L*'s *centum fere monachos*, while *G* states the number as one hundred without qualification (πατέρα μοναχῶν ἑκατόν). Second, both Sozomen and *L* emphasize Dioscorus' conscientiousness (διὰ πάσης ἀκριβείας—*summam curam summamque . . . diligentiam*) about scrutinizing the consciences of monks who are about to commune. *G* does not explicitly reference Dioscorus' diligence but instead alludes to it by reporting his exhortation, in his own words, to monks who are about to partake of the Eucharist.<sup>38</sup> Regarding the otherwise unattested monk Anouph, Sozomen and *L* concur with each other on several points against *G*, but on no point does Sozomen agree with *G* against *L*. *G* introduces

<sup>34</sup> On his contemporary prominence, see J. F. Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism in Early Christianity: Epiphanius of Cyprus and the Legacy of Origen* (Macon, 1988), 166–8.

<sup>35</sup> In alphabetical order: Ἀμμών (*hist. eccl.* 6.28.3) = Ammon (*L* 3.1) ≠ Ἄμμουνα (*G* 3.1); Ἀπολλώνιος (*hist. eccl.* 3.14.18) = Apollonius (*L* 7.1.1) ≠ Ἀπολλῶ (*G* 8.1); Βῆνος (*hist. eccl.* 6.28.3) = Benus (*L* 4.1) ≠ Βῆς (*G* 4.1); Κρονίων (*hist. eccl.* 6.30.1) = Cronium (*L* 25.5.1) ≠ Κρονίδης (*G* 20.13); Πιάμμων (*hist. eccl.* 6.29.7) = Piammon (*L* 32.2) ≠ Πιαμμωνᾶ (*G* 25.2).

<sup>36</sup> This Dioscorus is not to be confused with the Tall Brother of the same name (cf. *L* 23.3.4). Palladius, who was at Nitria for a year starting in either late 388 or early 389, mentions a conversation he had with Dioscorus the Tall Brother c.390 and identifies him as having been a "priest of Mount Nitria" at the time (*hist. Laus.* 12.1). This Dioscorus evidently remained at Nitria until he was appointed bishop of Hermopolis Parva by 399 (see Socrates, *hist. eccl.* 6.7; Sozomen, *hist. eccl.* 8.12.2), and so he presumably was still at Nitria in 394, when the party of seven Jerusalem monks visited this area. The Dioscorus of *G* 20.1–4 and *L* 20.1–5, by contrast, is located by both Anon. (*G* 20.1) and Rufinus (*L* 20.1) somewhere in the Thebaid as a priest and abbot of an otherwise unknown monastery, and the entry on him is given separately from the one on Nitria.

<sup>37</sup> *hist. eccl.* 6.28.10; *G* 20.1–4; *L* 20.1–5.

<sup>38</sup> Ὁς μέλλοντας αὐτοὺς προσελθεῖν τῇ χάριτι τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλεγεν πρὸς αὐτούς: "ὁράτε μὴ τις ἐν γυναικὸς φαντασίᾳ γενόμενος ἐν νυκτὶ τολμήσῃ προσελθεῖν τοῖς ἁγίοις μυστηρίοις, μὴ τις ἐξ ὑμῶν φανταζόμενος ἐνυπνιασθῇ."

Anouph as “the great confessor” (τὸν μέγαν ὁμολογητήν),<sup>39</sup> but Sozomen and *L* introduce him instead with synonymous adjectival descriptors which are meant to capture his all-around holiness (θεσπέσιος—*sanctus*).<sup>40</sup> Both Sozomen and *L* make categorical statements about Anouph’s utter lack of desire for anything worldly (μήτε ἐπιθυμῆσαί τινος τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς—*neque . . . terrenum aliquid amarem*),<sup>41</sup> but no such statement is found in *G*. Sozomen and *L* share another phraseological element that is conspicuously lacking in *G*, namely an explicit reference to Anouph’s being a “confessor” in a time of persecution (ἐν τοῖς διωγμοῖς ὑπὲρ τοῦ δόγματος ὁμολόγησε—*nomen salvatoris nostri in persecutione confessus sum*).<sup>42</sup>

If we were to apply the logic of Bammel’s argument across the board to instances such as the ones adduced in this chapter, we would be forced to conclude that the anti-Origenist redactor indiscriminately purged from the primitive Greek *HM* innocuous details that have nothing at all to do with Origenist ideology. Therefore, her hypothesis, which she sets forth rather cursorily and without exploring its problematic implications, is untenable. She nonetheless deserves credit for attempting to discern a rhyme and reason behind the supposed redactor’s method. Butler and Festugière only posited a lost Greek text but stopped short of suggesting what underlying agenda could have motivated the redactor’s editorial choices. Their hypothesis, if it is to be valid, does in fact require a detailed explanation of his motivation and method. However, if we view the many discrepancies between Sozomen-*L* and *G* through the lens of the “lost primitive Greek *HM*” theory, we are confronted with a redactional approach that appears arbitrary and aimless, and we are left wondering what could possibly have prompted a redactor to retouch the original text so indiscriminately and in such trivial ways within a few years of its initial release.

## RESTORING THE PRIMACY OF *G*

A careful synoptic analysis of Sozomen, *G*, and *L* does indeed turn up some tangible discrepancies for which we must account, and it raises compelling

<sup>39</sup> *G* 11.1.

<sup>40</sup> *hist. eccl.* 3.14.20; *L* 10.8.2.

<sup>41</sup> *hist. eccl.* 3.14.20; *L* 10.8.10.

<sup>42</sup> In their respective entries on Anouph neither Sozomen nor *L* elaborates on the precise nature of this “persecution.” Rather, in *L* and also in *G* Anouph remains something of a timeless hero of Egyptian monastic lore precisely because no references in either text tie him down to a specific set of historical circumstances. Nevertheless, slightly earlier in Book III of the *Ecclesiastical History* Sozomen does provide his readers with some historical context. He closes Chapter 13 by announcing his intention to touch briefly on some of the monks who rose to prominence during the reign of Constantius II, who ruled as co-emperor (in charge of Egypt) from 337 to 350 and as sole emperor from 350 to 361. Sozomen then devotes Chapter 14 to Egyptian monks such as Anouph.

questions about the relationship between these three texts and especially about the validity of the Greek text as we presently have it. Butler, Festugière, Bammel, and others were convinced that this seemingly complicated source-critical equation can be solved only by factoring in a lost Greek original which has come down to us, in a selectively mutilated form, as *G*. However, as we have seen, this line of reasoning is unsound. Now, there certainly are occasions when it is necessary to posit a lost text or recension of a text,<sup>43</sup> but this is not one of those occasions. There is an alternative solution which resolves the significant discrepancies between Sozomen, *G*, and *L* without resorting to the *deus ex machina* of a lost original that differed markedly from its surviving counterpart.

I propose the following solution to the problem posed by the Sozomen-*G-L* triangulation. *G* is the original version of the Greek *HM*. Since this work was composed by a monk in Rufinus' monastery on the Mount of Olives,<sup>44</sup> it stands to reason that Rufinus used it as the basis for *L*, and in rendering the work into Latin he made many phraseological adjustments and sometimes substantial additions in content.<sup>45</sup> The glaring discrepancies between Sozomen-*L* and *G*, and between Sozomen-*G* and *L*, do not point to a lost primitive Greek text underlying *G* and *L*. Rather, they point to Sozomen using both *G* and *L* simultaneously as sources for his account of the Egyptian monks,<sup>46</sup> sometimes following *G* rather than *L*, and other times preferring *L* to *G*.

Two assumptions are implicit in this hypothesis: one, that Sozomen could read Latin; and two, that he was able to procure a copy of *L*. That he was able to read Latin with facility is evident from the fact that in his *Ecclesiastical History* he draws from Latin sources such as Jerome's *Life of Hilarion*<sup>47</sup> and Rufinus' translation and continuation of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*,<sup>48</sup> which he released under the Latin title *Ecclesiastica historia* (hereafter *EH*). It is not hard to ascertain how he may have come to acquire proficiency in Latin. Literacy in Latin in the late antique Greek East was not a widespread phenomenon among non-native Latin-speakers, but rather it appears to have been confined primarily to officials in the civil administration, intellectuals, and lawyers.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>43</sup> See e.g. A. Cain, "Miracles, Martyrs, and Arians: Gregory of Tours' Sources for his Account of the Vandal Kingdom," *VChr* 59 (2005): 412–37.

<sup>44</sup> See pp. 33–8.

<sup>45</sup> On his additions, see pp. 259–65.

<sup>46</sup> This was the opinion also of G. Schoo, *Die Quellen des Kirchenhistorikers Sozomenos* (Berlin, 1973), 57.

<sup>47</sup> R. F. Strout, "The Greek Versions of Jerome's *Vita sancti Hilarionis*," in W. A. Oldfather (ed.), *Studies in the Text Tradition of St. Jerome's Vitae patrum* (Urbana, 1943), 306–448 (308–11); Schoo, *Quellen*, 76–7.

<sup>48</sup> J. Bidez and G. C. Hansen, *Sozomenus Kirchengeschichte* (Berlin, 1960), xlviii–xlix; R. M. Errington, "Christian Accounts of the Religious Legislation of Theodosius I," *Klio* 79 (1997): 398–443 (410–35); Schoo, *Quellen*, 28–39.

<sup>49</sup> See Al. Cameron, *The Last Pagans of Rome* (Oxford, 2013), 637–44.

Sozomen belonged to these two latter demographic subsets: he was a lawyer and a highly educated man who authored his own church history.<sup>50</sup> Born in Bethelia, near Gaza in Palestine, he studied law at Beirut before eventually relocating to Constantinople, where he practiced law and composed his *Ecclesiastical History* in the 440s. It seems most likely that he learned to read Latin during the course of his legal studies at Beirut, for this city, from the third through sixth centuries, was a renowned eastern center for the study not only of Roman law but also of Latin language and literature.<sup>51</sup>

Sozomen not only could read Latin but he also accessed Latin sources, including Rufinus' *EH*, as we noted earlier. His fellow jurist and church historian Socrates of Constantinople, who completed his own *Ecclesiastical History* in 439, also could read Latin and used Rufinus' *EH* as a source for his work.<sup>52</sup> Rufinus finished his *EH* in 402/3 and died less than ten years later, in c.411. That this writing was being circulated in Constantinople within two decades of his death, and more than likely even during his lifetime, is owed to the strategic connections he had forged with influential ecclesiastical circles in the East.<sup>53</sup> He continued to cultivate these connections, especially ones in Constantinople, following his return to Italy from Palestine in 397,<sup>54</sup> and he relied on them to help disseminate his literary works throughout the East.

So, then, Rufinus' *EH* was circulating in Constantinople within about three decades of its completion, in time for Socrates and then Sozomen to use it as a source. There is good reason to believe that his Latin *HM*, which he composed in c.403 and thus within a year of the *EH*,<sup>55</sup> was in circulation at Constantinople at the same time. First of all, Rufinus himself appears to have intended both writings to be transmitted as a bundled unit. A telling clue is that he cross-references each of the two works in the other. In *EH*

<sup>50</sup> On his activity as a lawyer, see J. Harries, "Sozomen and Eusebius: The Lawyer as Church Historian in the Fifth Century," in C. Holdsworth and T. P. Wiseman (eds.), *The Inheritance of Historiography: 350–900* (Exeter, 1986), 45–52. See also G. F. Chestnut, *The First Christian Histories: Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius* (Paris, 1986), 199–200. On his education in classical Greek literature, see P. Allen, "Some Aspects of Hellenism in the Early Greek Church Historians," *Traditio* 43 (1987): 368–81.

<sup>51</sup> L. Jones Hall, *Roman Berytus: Beirut in Late Antiquity* (London, 2004), 192–209.

<sup>52</sup> P. R. Amidon (trans.), *The Church History of Rufinus of Aquileia, Books 10 and 11* (New York, 1997), xii; Errington, "Christian Accounts," 403–6; F. Geppert, *Die Quellen des Kirchenhistorikers Socrates Scholasticus* (Leipzig, 1898), 19–23, 113–29; D. M. Gwynn, *Athanasius of Alexandria: Bishop, Theologian, Ascetic, Father* (Oxford, 2012), 167, 176; T. Urbainczyk, *Socrates of Constantinople: Historian of Church and State* (Ann Arbor, 1997), 51–2.

<sup>53</sup> Cameron, *Last Pagans*, 639.

<sup>54</sup> See C. P. Hammond, "The Last Ten Years of Rufinus' Life and the Date of his Move South from Aquileia," *JThS* n.s. 28 (1977): 372–429 (376–9).

<sup>55</sup> Hammond, "Last Ten Years," 394–5; A. de Vogüé, *Histoire littéraire du mouvement monastique dans l'antiquité*, 3: *Jérôme, Augustin et Rufin au tournant du siècle (391–405)* (Paris, 1996), 317–20.



11.4 he concludes the story about Macarius and the hyena by allusively referring readers to a separate work in which they may read more about this Egyptian monk: "But if we were to relate each of the miracles, we would fail of our planned brevity, especially since these things deserve to be told of in a book of their own."<sup>56</sup>

A year or so later Rufinus delivered on his promise in the form of the *HM*, in which he reports more anecdotes about Macarius. He finishes the account with an explicit cross-reference to the *EH*: "As we have said, many other astounding things are related about the deeds of Macarius, and one who is inquisitive about them will find some incorporated into the eleventh book of the *Ecclesiastical History*."<sup>57</sup> This statement is a directive to readers to consult his *EH*. Thus, Rufinus expressly treats the collections of Macarian stories in the *EH* and *HM* as being supplemental to each other. What is more, it is noteworthy that he gives only the title of the *EH* (*Ecclesiastica historia*) and does not add a qualifier to specify *whose* church history it is. He assumes that readers of his *HM* will already know that it is *his*. Such an assumption on Rufinus' part makes most sense if he expected that readers of his *HM* would have his *EH* at their fingertips, and this expectation in turn makes most sense if he intended both texts, which he composed in quick succession, to circulate alongside each other.<sup>58</sup>

The Macarian cross-references are not the only points of intersection between the *EH* and *HM*. The two works also share conceptual overlap on the topic of asceticism and especially in their encomium of the monks of Nitria. In Latinizing Eusebius' church history, Rufinus made significant alterations to its structure and content, most notably by compressing the ten books of the original work into nine and then adding his own two books covering events from 324 until the death of Theodosius I in 395. One of his aims with these last two books was to glorify the contemporary ascetic movement in Egypt.<sup>59</sup> He has particularly glowing things to say about the monastic settlement at Nitria: its monks, he asserts, have more in common with angels than

<sup>56</sup> Quoted from Amidon, *Church History*, 65–6. The Latin text reads: *Verum si singulorum mirabilium gesta prosequi velimus, excludemur a proposita brevitate, maxime cum haec narrationem proprii operis habere mereantur* (E. Schwartz and T. Mommsen [eds.], *Eusebius Werke*, II [Leipzig, 1908], 1007).

<sup>57</sup> *Sed et multa, ut diximus, alia de operibus sancti Macarii mirabilia feruntur, ex quibus nonnulla in undecimo libro ecclesiasticae historiae inserta qui requirat inveniet* (L 29.5.5).

<sup>58</sup> It was not uncommon in Late Antiquity for authors to couple texts which they wanted their readership to read in tandem. For an example from Jerome's epistolary corpus, see A. Cain, *The Letters of Jerome: Asceticism, Biblical Exegesis, and the Construction of Christian Authority in Late Antiquity* (Oxford, 2009), 177–8.

<sup>59</sup> See Rufinus, *EH* 10.4; 11.4, 8; cf. J. E. L. Oulton, "Rufinus' Translation of the *Church History* of Eusebius," *JThS* 30 (1929): 150–74; C. Torben, *Rufinus of Aquileia and the Historia Ecclesiastica, Lib. VIII–IX, of Eusebius* (Copenhagen, 1989); see also F. Thelamon, *Païens et chrétiens au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle: L'apport de l'Histoire ecclésiastique de Rufin d'Aquilée* (Paris, 1981).

with fellow mortals.<sup>60</sup> In the *HM* he devotes a substantial portion of the narrative to the Nitrian monks and singles out several individual ones for their conspicuous holiness and wisdom.<sup>61</sup> This pro-Nitrian sentiment is found in the Greek text but it is far more pronounced in the Latin in terms of both the heightened encomiastic tone and the sheer amount of narrative material presented, undoubtedly because Rufinus hoped to marshal widespread support for the Origenist monks there who had been expelled by Theophilus several years earlier in 399.<sup>62</sup>

Thus far I have tried to show that all necessary conditions were in place for Sozomen to have used Rufinus' Latin *HM* as a source. Let us now turn to his account of the Egyptian monks in the *Ecclesiastical History* to see how my hypothesis is able to resolve certain curious discrepancies. In Books III and VI Sozomen gives two separate and differently worded notices on Apollo of Bawit. He explicitly cites his source for this second one, as well as for notices on many other monks from the *HM* whom he profiles throughout Book VI, as a book by Timothy, bishop of Alexandria.<sup>63</sup> In the next chapter we will consider why by Sozomen's day this work had come to be ascribed anachronistically to Bishop Theophilus' predecessor Timothy. For now it suffices to say that scholars unanimously agree that the writing in question is none other than a version of the Greek *HM*. One important indication of this is that Sozomen spells Apollo's name as Ἀπολλῶς, the form found in *G*.<sup>64</sup> However, in his earlier entry on Apollo in Book III,<sup>65</sup> he refers to the monk as Ἀπολλώνιος, the Latinized form (Apollonius) found in *L*.<sup>66</sup>

<sup>60</sup> *EH* 11.4: *Per idem tempus patres monachorum vitae et antiquitatis merito Macarius et Isidorus aliusque Macarius atque Heraclides et Pambo Antonii discipuli per Aegyptum et maxime in Nitriae deserti partibus habebantur viri, qui consortium vitae et actuum non cum ceteris mortalibus, sed cum supernis angelis habere credebantur* (Schwartz and Mommsen, *Eusebius Werke*, 1004).

<sup>61</sup> Ammonius, Eusebius, Euthymius, Dioscorus, Didymus, Cronius, Origen, and Evagrius. See e.g. *L* 21.1.6: *Nusquam sic videas florere caritatem, nusquam sic videas opus fervere misericordiae et studium hospitalitatis inpleri. Scripturarum vero divinarum meditationem et intellectus atque scientiae divinae nusquam tanta vidimus exercitia, ut singulos paene eorum oratores credas in divina esse sapientia.*

<sup>62</sup> So Hammond, "Last Ten Years," 395.

<sup>63</sup> Ἄλλ' οἱ μὲν ἀγωγῇ ἐχρήτο καὶ ἡλικίαν ἦν θείων καὶ παραδόξων πραγμάτων ποιητῆς ἱστορεῖ Τιμόθεος ὁ τὴν Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐκκλησίαν ἐπιτροπέυσας, εἰ μάλ᾽ αὐτοῦ καὶ πολλῶν ὧν ἐπεμνήσθη καὶ ἄλλων εὐδοκίμων μοναχῶν τοὺς βίους διεξελθὼν (6.29.2).

<sup>64</sup> *G* 8.1.

<sup>65</sup> Κατὰ τοῦτον δὲ τὸν χρόνον καὶ Ἀπολλώνιος ἐπὶ μοναχικῇ φιλοσοφίᾳ διέπρεπεν, ὃν φασὶ δέκα καὶ πέντε ἔτων ὄντα φιλοσοφῆσαι ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις· εἰς ἔτη δὲ τεσσαράκοντα γεγονώς κατὰ θεῖαν πρόσταξιν εἰς τοὺς οἰκουμένους ἦλθε τόπους. εἶχε δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν Θηβαΐδι τὴν συνοικίαν. ἐγένετο δὲ θεοφιλῆς εἰσάγων καὶ παραδόξων ἰάσεων καὶ σημείων δημιουργὸς καὶ πρακτικὸς ὧν δεῖ καὶ τῶν εἰς φιλοσοφίαν ἰκόντων διδάσκαλος ἀγαθὸς καὶ χαρίεις καὶ ἐπὶ τοσούτων ἐν ταῖς εὐχαῖς εὐήκοος, ὥς μηδὲν ἀνήνυτον γενέσθαι ὧν παρὰ θεοῦ ἐζήτησε· πάντως γὰρ σοφὸς ὧν σοφῶς τὰς αἰτήσεις ἐποιεῖτο, αἷς ἐτόίμως τὸ θεῖον ἐπινεύειν πέφυκε (3.14.18–19).

<sup>66</sup> *L* 7.1.1.

From this name discrepancy, source critics unanimously, and reasonably, have inferred that Sozomen was accessing two different versions of the *HM* and that he did not bother to normalize the spelling of Apollo's name throughout his *Ecclesiastical History*. Disagreement, however, arises about *which* versions of the *HM* he was using. Proponents of the lost *Vorlage* theory who assume that Sozomen could not read Latin (and therefore could not have been working from *L*<sup>67</sup>) would argue that both versions were in Greek: one was *G*<sup>68</sup> and the other was *G<sub>x</sub>*. Thus, according to this line of reasoning, when Sozomen reports Apollo's name as Ἀπολλῶς, he is following *G*, and when he writes it as Ἀπολλώνιος, he is following *G<sub>x</sub>*. I have already demonstrated why the "Revision-theory" is an unnecessarily extreme measure taken for a problem that can in fact be solved in a much simpler, more straightforward way. In the present case we are able to resolve the discrepancy about Apollo's name by assuming that Sozomen is following *G* for the notice in Book VI and *L* for the notice in Book III. Furthermore, a synoptic comparison of the entry in Book III with *G* and *L* confirms that Sozomen was indeed working from *L* rather than from *G*:

Soz. 3.14.18–19	<i>G</i> 8	<i>L</i> 7
Κατὰ τοῦτον δὲ τὸν χρόνον καὶ Ἀπολλώνιος ἐπὶ μοναχικῇ φιλοσοφίᾳ διέπρεπεν,  ὃν φασὶ δέκα καὶ πέντε ἔτων ὄντα φιλοσοφῆσαι ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις· εἰς ἔτη δὲ τεσσαράκοντα γεγονὼς κατὰ θεῖαν πρόσταξιν εἰς τοὺς οἰκουμένους ἦλθε τόπους.	(1) Ἐθεασάμεθα δὲ καὶ ἕτερον ἄνδρα ἅγιον, ὀνόματι Ἀπολλῶ  (3–4) οὗτος πεντεκαίδεκα ἔτων ἀναχωρήσας τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ διατελέσας πᾶσάν τε ἀρετὴν ἀκριβῶς ἐξασκήσας, ὕστερον φωνῆς ἀκούειν ἔδοξεν τοῦ θεοῦ πρὸς αὐτὸν λέγοντος . . . ‘πορεύου εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην’ . . . ὁ δὲ εὐθὺς ἀκούσας εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην  (18) ἐγένετο δὲ συνοικία τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὁμοῦ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ὄρει ἄχρι πεντακοσίῳ	(1.1) <i>Vidimus et alium sanctum virum nomine Apollonium</i>  (2.1–4) <i>quindecim ergo annorum secessisse eum ferebant ad eremum atque ibi, cum quadraginta annis fuisset in exercitiis spiritalibus conversatus, aiebant vocem dei ad eum delatam dixisse . . . “perge ergo nunc ad loca habitabilia” . . . ille ergo post haec perrexit ad ea loca, in quibus homines habitabant.</i>  (4.8) <i>conventum quandam magnificum fecerunt apud eum in supradicto montis loco</i>

<sup>67</sup> So Festugière, “Problème littéraire,” 280.

<sup>68</sup> E.g., perhaps either the “vulgate” form represented by Festugière’s *x* and *y* families or something resembling it.