

WRITINGS OF PALLADIUS OF ANTIOCH

by Palladius of Antioch

Writings of Palladius of Antioch (c. AD 390). Palladius of Antioch was an early church father whose writings have been preserved for the edification of the church.

3 Chapters

Table of Contents

0. Writings of Palladius of Antioch
1. Dialogue on the life of St. John Chrysostom - Introduction
2. The Lausiatic History - Introduction

Writings of Palladius of Antioch

Dialogue on the life of St. John Chrysostom - Introduction

The Dialogue of Palladius concerning the Life of St. John

Chrysostom (1921). Introduction by Herbert Moore. Pp. vii-xxv.

- The subject of the Memoir • The teaching of the Dialogue
- The author
- The treatise • The present edition

INTRODUCTION [by Herbert MOORE] I. The Subject of the Memoir This treatise, obviously written by one who had full information, and was an eye-witness of many of the incidents which he narrates, is our best authority for the life of St. Chrysostom; we have other "lives," of no great value, by Theodore, Bishop of Trimitus (c. 680), George, Bishop of Alexandria (c. 620), "Leo the Emperor" (c. 900), and an anonymous writer; and accounts contained in the fifth-century Church Histories of Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret and Philostorgius, the theologian Photius (c. 850), and the pagan writer Zosimus, besides a few other references in ancient authors. From these various sources we are able to draw not only a record of Chrysostom's life, but also a picture of the man himself; and, incidentally, to gather light upon the life of the Church in his days, and information as to uses and observances, some of which have fallen into desuetude, while others are still practised among us. The more carefully we study his life, the more lovable the man appears, and the more conscious we are of our debt to him, for the noble standard of devotional, ministerial and intellectual Christian life which he so fearlessly, faithfully and outspokenly maintained,¹ and bequeathed to us; and the more admirable seems his life, by contrast with the lives of many of his contemporaries, pagan and, alas! even Christian. But he had the defects of his good qualities. "He was a man who in his enthusiasm for virtue was over-bitter, and given to wrath rather [viii] than to modest dealings; from the uprightness of his life he took no thought for the future, and from his simplicity of character acted without deep consideration. He used unmeasured freedom of speech with those whom he encountered, and as a teacher greatly benefited his hearers; but was considered by those who did not know him to be arrogant in his behaviour." ² The Dialogue shows us the grounds on which these criticisms were based, and the author offers various answers to them. "He had qualities admirable in a man of action; what could be more precious than his generous and sanguine enthusiasm? He lacked the command over himself, the coolness and tact, of a politician; we shall often notice this; but if he had possessed these, would he have been Chrysostom?" (Puech).³

It is impossible here to deal with Chrysostom's literary work, which is more abundant than that of any other Greek Church writer. While at Antioch he preached, chiefly during Lent, series after series of homilies, or expositions of Scripture, in which he dealt with most of the books of the Bible. "I think," writes Isidore of Pelusium, "that if the divine Paul had wished to expound his own writings, he would not have spoken otherwise than this famous master; so remarkable is his exposition for its contents, beauty of form, and propriety of expression." Suidas, in the tenth

century, says: "Since the world began, no one has possessed such gifts as an orator: he alone merited the name of Golden-mouthed

4 and divine orator." Most of these homilies were taken down by shorthand writers, and apparently corrected by himself. There are also extant a large number of sermons on special subjects, the most famous of

ix which are the twenty-one "On the Statues," delivered at Antioch in 387, when the city was threatened with destruction by the Emperor, in punishment for a disloyal outbreak; and many treatises on moral and theological subjects, including his splendid work "On the Priesthood." Most of his remains are of the period of his life spent at Antioch; at Constantinople he lacked the time, if not the opportunity, for such highly intellectual work.⁵ A considerable number of spurious works are also attributed to him, including some which were probably forged, or at least misreported, by his enemies, in order to enrage the Empress against him.

II. The Teaching of the Dialogue

Chrysostom's career is one more exemplification of the perennial conflict between the Church and the world. The Church is to act as the salt of the earth, the city set on an hill, the light of the world, the temple of the Living God; her ideals will always be too high even for the saints to attain, but it is the few who reach forth unto those things which are before that raise the average attainments of mankind. Yet she must not break the bruised reed, or quench the smoking flax, by pitching her requirements too high for the practical use of the ordinary man living in the world, and condemning things which God hath not condemned. She may neither make the heart of the righteous sad, nor strengthen the hands of the wicked, by promising them life.

Thus the problem before the Church at all times is to steer her way between the two extremes of undue severity and compliant subservience. Hence men of different temperaments will form different judgments upon Chrysostom's career. One temperament is all for severity, sometimes with the highest motives, sometimes, unconsciously it may be,

ix otherwise; it demands asceticism in life, rigour in doctrine, strictness in the enjoyment of the pleasures of the world. Another, with high or (again perhaps unconsciously) with low motives, thinks that men may best be won by being content with a low standard, with an eye to the possibilities of the multitude, rather than of the few; it seeks to teach that all worldly things are gifts of God, richly given us to enjoy. The first condemns the second as truckling to the world; the second looks upon the first as a dreamer of vain dreams. The first rebukes out of season as well as in season; the second marvels at his want of tact.

There can be no doubt which is the point of view taken in this Dialogue. Records of events which so deeply stirred the hearts of men are naturally coloured by the prejudices of their writers; it is hard to believe that all the denunciations of Chrysostom's enemies contained in the treatise were truly deserved. The strong common sense shown in Chrysostom's writings, though sometimes obscured by extravagance of expression and ignorance of economic laws, in regard to the riches, the pomps and the vanities of the world, generally preserved him from the bitterness with which his disciple denounces them. But those who fall short of our author's ideal have "leaped upon the ministry," dealt deceitfully with the word of God, and perverted the Christian teaching. No language is too strong; the priest who has not the virtues of the monk is worthy only of a company of satyrs,

or a priesthood of Dionysus. True, " the sword could not be blunt, or the bold word be left unspoken," and Chrysostom did indeed "lift up his voice more clearly than a trumpet." Yet in spite of Palladius' defence of Chrysostom's zeal, it is difficult to rise from the study of the various records without forming the conclusion that in regard to Eudoxia he spake unadvisedly with his lips; it seems impossible to doubt that the charges of comparing her publicly to Jezebel and Herodias [xi] were founded on fact. Because his eloquence had stirred the populace to reform, and he had the support of many warm friends, he thought himself, like Savonarola in later days, strong enough to attack her; and the shining of his light in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation was extinguished for ever. Was he right or wrong? We answer the question according to our respective temperaments. Yet whatever be our judgment, we know that the world does, after all, respect high ideals, and unconsciously is raised by them, though it may seem to go on its own way, and prefer to join in the censure upon the outspoken tongue. Chrysostom's life and death were not in vain. So far as we can judge, making all allowances for the prejudices of our author, Theophilus' motives were not good, but evil. Chrysostom, like Cranmer, appealed to an oecumenical council, which never was held, and never can be held. "This world is a wrestling-ground," and Palladius sees that there is no such rough-and-ready way to solve our problems. We are come to the general assembly of the firstborn, which are written in heaven; but we are also come to God, the Judge of all. But the world is not only a spiritual force, seductive and attractive, continually tending to drag the ideal down to its own level. It has also its coercive power; its rulers bear the sword, and can help forward or restrain the work of the Church. Its good-will may be won by "tables" or by "flattery," but always with disastrous results. We find Chrysostom and the monks, no less than Theophilus and Atticus, appealing to the civil power, and using it, not as an impartial judge between conflicting parties, but as a means of forwarding their respective views of the doctrine and discipline of the Church. But Chrysostom found at last that the sword borne by the temporal power is two-edged. Theophilus' party gained the upper hand, by a dexterous use of the selfish passions which animate rulers and subjects [xii] alike; and the Church never regained her position as a power for righteousness. No check was left upon the absolutism of the Emperor, henceforth supreme in Church and State. No Ambrose said to him, " Thou hast imitated the guilt of David; imitate him also in thy penance;" no Hildebrand could raise the swan-like cry, "I have loved righteousness and hated iniquity, therefore I die in exile." But as the world advances in its conceptions of the worth of the individual, and of his rights and liberties, absolutism becomes impossible, and the long-pent-up forces at last break out in revolution, the more savage in proportion to the repression of the past. "Though the wheels of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceeding small." Our author, like other early historians, may or may not have been right in attributing various disasters to the Divine wrath at the judicial murder of Chrysostom; we see God's Hand in greater things than these. A meeting of forty discontented bishops in a suburb, fourteen hundred years ago, may seem of small importance to us; but it was one of the first steps to the placing of the Church, like the State, under the heel of the Emperors----the conception which has prevailed through the centuries in the Eastern Church. A certain nameless bishop is represented as paying a visit to Rome, where he has a conversation, lasting several days (p. 148), with a deacon, Theodorus, who has heard only one side of the story, emanating from Chrysostom's enemies, and wishes to know the truth, both as to the facts, and as to the cavils at Chrysostom's personal character, embodied in the charges brought against him at The Oak. Other persons are present during the discussion (pp. 6, 60, 119, 165), one of whom joins in for a moment; and the

final result is that Theodorus rejects the disparaging accounts he has received, and utters an eulogy upon the martyred saint. The supposed date of the Dialogue is shortly after Chrysostom's death, as the news of it which has reached the deacon needs confirmation (p. 33). [xiii The events referred to in the Dialogue may be arranged in historical order thus:----

A.D. PAGE 344-347. Chrysostom born at Antioch 37 His education 37 370. Baptized 38 373. Enters monastery near Antioch 38 381. Ordained deacon at Antioch 39 386.. Ordained priest at Antioch 40 398 (Feb. 26). Ordained bishop at Constantinople 42 Reforms in the Church and in the city 44 ff.

399. Healing of the schism at Antioch 50 400. Revolt of Gainas 122 Eusebius' accusation of Antoninus

117 ff.

401 (Jan.). Visit to Ephesus 125 Deposition of six bishops 127 Theophilus' condemnation of Origenism 54 402. Arrival of the monks at Constantinople 58 403. The Synod of The Oak 65 ff First expulsion of Chrysostom 73 Theophilus' intrigues 74 ff 404 (Easter----April 16). Tumult in the Church 81 Chrysostom's letter to Innocent 10 ff.

Attempt upon his life 177 (June 20). Second expulsion 85 ff Burning of the Church 88 Reception of the news at Rome 21 ff Deputation of Western Bishops 28 ff.

Cruel treatment of Chrysostom's supporters

174 ff.

(Sept.). Arrival at Cucusus 90 407 (June). Removal to Pityus 94 (Sept. 14). Death 96

Accounts are introduced of Olympias (p. 150), of Porphyrius (p. 133 ff.) and of various monks (p. 145). The charges brought against Chrysostom which are

[xiv met are those of eating alone (pp. 98, 112), of deposing sixteen bishops (p. 116), of excessive outspokenness (p. 160), of personal attacks upon individuals (p. 163), and of haughtiness and insolence towards clergy (p. 165). The author also moralizes at great length upon various subjects, which will be found in the General Index.

III. The Author The treatise as it stands is anonymous, but it is generally attributed to Palladius, Bishop of Helenopolis. Its present title is "An historical dialogue of Palladius, Bishop of Helenopolis, held with Theodorus, Deacon of Rome, concerning the life and conversation of the blessed John, Bishop of Constantinople, the Golden-mouthed." And in the margin the words are added, "In other (copies) it is written, Bishop of Aspona."

Thus the title represents, not that Palladius of Helenopolis, or of Aspona, is the writer of the treatise, but that he is the nameless bishop who takes the chief part in the Dialogue. Yet this is nowhere stated. He is described simply as a member of John's synod (pp. 7, 66), from the east (p. 6), though not of Constantinople (p. 150), who had suffered on his behalf (p. 173). Nor can it be intended to identify the bishop with Palladius; it is asserted that it is the bishop's first visit to Rome (p. 6), yet within a few pages (p. 25) that Palladius of Helenopolis had been one of the first who brought to Rome the news of the troubles. He is represented as an old man (p. 33), while

Palladius was not forty-five years old at the time of Chrysostom's death. There is nothing except the title to suggest that the interlocutor is Palladius, who is always spoken of in the third person---a fact which some have supposed to forbid the idea of his being the author. The same argument would show that Boswell was not the author of the Life of Johnson. In fact, it is quite clear that the bishop of the Dialogue is an entirely

|xv imaginary person. Yet George tells us that he has made extracts from "the Dialogue of Bishop Palladius with Theodore," without naming his diocese; Theodore of Trimuthus also regards him as the bishop of the Dialogue. Neither of these writers had better information than we possess; they simply accepted the statement of the title as we have it.

Palladius, Bishop of Helenopolis (Drepanum, in Bithynia), is known to us as the author of the Lausiatic History, an English translation of which, by W. K. Lowther Clarke, is published in the present Series; this consists of a number of brief biographies or anecdotes of worthies, chiefly monks, whom he had known, or of whom he had heard, during his life as a monk in the desert, or in the course of his travels. The Introduction to this work states that it was compiled for the same purpose of moral instruction which is alleged for the Dialogue. He was evidently a friend of Chrysostom, who writes to him from Cucusus, asking for his prayers, and saying that he ceases not daily to be anxious for his welfare (Ep. 113).⁶ The History shows that he was consecrated Bishop of Helenopolis after leaving the desert, in the year 400, "having become embroiled in the disturbance connected with the blessed John"; ⁷ the Dialogue gives us the account of his journey to Ephesus (p. 125 ff.), of his visit to Rome (p. 25), his voyage to Constantinople (p. 29), and his exile to Syene (pp. 174, 178). On his return, he lived for two years in Galatia, and (in 417), as Socrates ⁸ informs us, he was translated as bishop to Aspona, in Galatia. Two years later he wrote his Lausiatic History, and some time between 420 and 430 he died. |xvi IV. The Treatise The only manuscript copy of the treatise appears to be one of the eleventh century (Bigot in error says the seventh) in the Medicean Library at Florence; the Life of Chrysostom by George contains copious extracts from the work, by which our text may be checked. It was first edited, with a Latin translation, by Emeritus Bigot, in 1680. It is written in late Greek, many words being used in senses unknown to classical authors, and grammatical mistakes are frequent. The historical order of events is disregarded, as it is the chief object of the author, not so much to write a biography, as to set forth an ideal, to stimulate his readers to follow the good example of the saint, and to warn them against improperly seeking the priesthood (p. 173).

It is cast in the form of a dialogue, a recognized method of presenting a moral treatise. Chrysostom's famous work On the Priesthood is so written; the "liberal education"----of which Palladius both here and in the Lausiatic History speaks with admiration-----which he had received certainly included the dialogues of Plato, and it was natural to him to use this vehicle of thought. Palladius' love for his master led him to follow his example; but he had not his knowledge of Plato, or his ability, and at times the Dialogue is somewhat wearisome, and the form unsuitable to the subject. He cannot do two things at once----give a memoir of a good man, and compile a moral treatise; when he introduces long accounts of historical incidents, and, above all, the letter to Innocent (p. 10), he makes a wide departure from the methods followed in the Platonic dialogues which have a similar purpose to his own, such as the Apology of Socrates and Crito. We forget that we are reading a dialogue, and have a sense of annoyance when the deacon interrupts with his jejune questions and remarks. The titles of ancient writings are frequently |xvii unreliable. I take

it as probable that something of this sort occurred; the original heading was simply "An historical dialogue of Palladius"----that is, " by Palladius." Some copyist, noticing that the chief interlocutor was a bishop, and that "Palladius, Bishop of Helenopolis," was mentioned in the treatise, supposed that the indication of authorship was meant to identify the imaginary character in the Dialogue, and took upon himself to add the rest. Then a later scribe, who knew that Palladius, the author of the History, had been translated to Aspona, inserted the correction. The title "Golden-mouthed," at least, is unquestionably an addition; it took the place of "John" in common parlance at a later time----about the middle of the fifth century. This addition casts suspicion upon the rest of the heading. But why should Palladius of Helenopolis have been picked out as the interlocutor from all the Eastern bishops mentioned, unless there was a tradition, or more probably written evidence in the heading as it then stood, specially connecting a Palladius with the treatise, not as interlocutor, but as author? There certainly was such a tradition; in a list of eighteen persons who wrote on the life of Chrysostom, contained in a "very ancient codex" examined by Petavius, "Palladius, Bishop of Helenopolis," is included; Photius says that "Palladius was a bishop, and wrote of Chrysostom's doings in the form of a dialogue."

Palladius was by no means an uncommon name at the time; Dom Butler finds eleven persons who bore it. If the author was named Palladius, the question arises: Was this Palladius the Bishop of Helenopolis, the author also of the Lausiac History, or another man of the same name? Bigot goes so far as to suggest that another Palladius succeeded the Lausiac author at Helenopolis, and wrote the Dialogue. The learned Benedictine, Dom Cuthbert Butler, Abbot of Downside Abbey, to whom we owe an [xviii] edition of the Lausiac History (Cambridge, 1904) which for accurate scholarship and minute research ranks with the finest works of the kind ever issued, forms the conclusion that both writings have the same authorship (in his monograph *Authorship of the Dialogus de Vita Chrysostomi*, Rome, 1908). Bardenhewer says ¹ that " the author of the Lausiac History is easily identified with the biographer of Chrysostom," though, for reasons which he does not give, he adds that "he must not be confounded with the Bishop of Helenopolis." He had not the advantage of reading Dom Butler's work, which shows conclusively that the Lausiac History was written by this bishop.

Abbot Butler first weighs the evidence of style, and admits that there is a wide difference, not only in vocabulary, but also in use of phrases and manner of diction generally. We know that an author is usually rather proud of a telling word or phrase, and is apt to repeat it again and again; and every one has little tricks of expression, which are apt to occur all through his various works. About seventy words in Dom Butler's Index appear in the Dialogue; but many even of these are common in Patristic literature, and a great many curious words, as well as a great many characteristic expressions and phrases, are found in the one, not in the other. Mr. Clarke remarks that a distinguishing feature of Palladius ⁹ style is his incessant use of the particle *οὐ*; this is not the case in the Dialogue. The Dialogue abounds in grammatical mistakes; the author continually forgets the construction with which he began one of his long sentences, and changes the subject in its course. Few such errors occur in the simpler narratives of the History.¹⁰ The Dialogue has many more quotations from Scripture, even in proportion to its length (219, as against 50). This is partly because [xix] in the non-historical portions the author is justifying Chrysostom's actions by scriptural precedent; but while the quotations in the History are brief, in the Dialogue they are sometimes very lengthy. Only eight are common to both treatises, though in two other cases

words from the same context are quoted to the same effect. On the other hand, Butler tells us that Dr. Zöckler speaks of "the essential similarity of style," 11 and that Dr. Preuschen considers the dissimilarity not sufficient to disprove common authorship. The reader of one constantly meets with strange words, or uses of words, or phrases, which recall the other; he feels that the writer who devised, or appropriated, one set of words or expressions was capable of doing so with the other. If we do not find so many "tricks of expression" as we should expect, we certainly find a large number.

Butler prints side by side thirteen such noteworthy phrases, showing a remarkable amount of similarity. I have collected about seventy more, which may be found through the key-words given in my Index I.; many other verbal coincidences might be added. Further, Butler brings out a still more striking point: that both authors (if they be two) use the same expressions about the same persons and things. I think that any reader who takes the trouble to compare, not only the words and usages of words, but the phrases and passages in which they occur, in the respective treatises, will see how unlikely it is that two separate authors should have used so many identical expressions and descriptions. Even one who does not know Greek will agree that so many characteristic phrases occurring alike in *Coriolanus* and in *Cymbeline* would be a strong argument for identity of authorship.

Style, however, is largely a matter of taste; Abbot Butler's scholarly instinct leads him to attach more weight to the comparative use of Scripture texts. In both treatises the quotations are made freely, more particularly in the Dialogue, variations being introduced which are not found in any existing MS. It must not be supposed that ancient writers habitually "verified their references." There was no Authorized Version in those days, and the discovery of a number of passages in the cumbrous roll-volumes of manuscript Scriptures, undivided into chapters and verses, without the help of a concordance, would require great time and trouble. We have to compare the use of Scripture by ancient writers with that of a preacher, rather than with that of a writer, of to-day. But we know that the monks, of whom Palladius was one, devoted much of their time to committing the sacred writings to memory (pp. 131, 149); many knew whole books by heart (Pall., L. H., xi., xxvi., xxxvii.). Quotations may thus be regarded as tolerably well representing MS. texts; at least, it is generally more or less clear when a variation is due to defective memory, when to difference in the original documents. Thus our author gets into trouble over his quotation from Ezek. xxxiv., in which he evidently trusted to his memory; the two long passages from Deut. xxxiii. and Ezek. ix. present but slight variations from the text, and one of these (Deut. xxxiii. 16, 17) is of such a nature as to suggest that it was found in the text the author used.

Dom Butler points out that in both treatises St. Matt. xi. 18 is combined with St. Matt. xxi. 32, and that in each case the quotation is prefaced with "in reproach." Also that St. Mark ii. 16 is combined with St. Matt. ix. 11; both in a manner which has no MS. support or literary parallel. Both quote 1 St. John ii. 18, with the remark that "it was the last hour 400 years ago." It is almost incredible that this should be mere coincidence.

Here again I have carried Dom Butler's argument further. An examination of the O.T. quotations in the two treatises shows that where such variations

occur from the text of the LXX known as "B" (which Dr. Swete considers nearest the original version) as are obviously not due to lapse of memory, but are confirmed by MSS. which we

possess, these variations are all found in one, or both, of the MSS. known as "Aleph" or "A."

12 It would certainly be strange that, with the multiplication of copies of the Septuagint which must have taken place by A.D. 400, two different writers should have stumbled upon the same texts.¹³ It is specially remarkable that in one text (Ecclus. viii. 9) inaccurately quoted from memory in both treatises, exactly the same alteration of words, and exactly the same alteration of order, appears in both. Is not this just what we find in the habitual misquotations in which a preacher of to-day is found to persist?

Again, the author of the Dialogue, like Palladius of Helenopolis, has seen Egyptian temples (p. 36); he has conversed with Hierax (p. 145); he is one of the forty bishops who struggled on Chrysostom's side; he is full of admiration for monks; he knows the same people---Isidore, Ammon, Dioscorus, Chronius, Macarius, Olympias.¹⁴ Finally, the knowledge of Palladius' doings shown by the writer is extraordinary, if he was other than Palladius himself. In four passages he gives a vivid and minute account of incidents in which "Palladius of Helenopolis" is stated to have taken part: the deputation to Constantinople (p. 29), the incidents connected with the Synod of The Oak

[xxii (p. 66 ff.), the mission to Ephesus (p. 125 ff.), and the journey of the Eastern bishops (p. 178), which continues the narrative of the deputation. Only the account of the death-bed scene approaches these; details of this he would easily obtain. And he not only uses the same literary devices as in the History (such as "a soldier told me," "they say,"----p. 178----"it is said") when recording incidents of which he was an eyewitness; but once (p. 29) he forgets that he is writing anonymously, and passes, like the author of the History, from indirect to direct narration, as St. Luke does in the Acts. We note that in both treatises proverbs and sententious observations are frequent, and that in both an inordinate amount of space is devoted to food and drink---or abstinence from them.

It is, of course, possible that some later writer "edited" the original work. It may be fanciful to suggest that pains seem to be taken to avoid the use of the particle "therefore," as though the author, or his editor, had deliberately substituted other connecting words; the particle appears at times in several sentences together, as if the self-imposed rule had been forgotten. But we may account for the difference of style which has led some to deny to the author of the History the authorship of the Dialogue, by considerations of the difference of subject, the lapse of time, and the likelihood of his employment of an amanuensis.

There is no need to argue the probability that the smaller work preceded the greater, since the design of both is stated to be the same----to edify readers by setting before them high examples of the Christian life. When the author found that the brief records of the History proved of interest and value, he would naturally try to do the same thing on a larger scale with the life of a single man, the most eminent Christian of the day. He could not write a lengthy treatise at Syene, if only for the want of "prime parchment" (p. 173), and is not likely to have done so during his stay in Galatia, with his mind

[xxiii distracted by current events, and his uncertainty as to his future. The reference to Theophilus (who died in 412) on p. 190 does not necessarily imply that he was still alive; on the other hand, the mention of a collection of Chrysostom's writings, especially of his letters (p. 100), seems to

demand a certain lapse of time.

Palladius wrote his History, as we saw, when he was about fifty-three years old. He had gone about, like Herodotus, with a notebook----mental, if not material----from which he afterwards drew his narratives and tales. Probably he had often rehearsed them in conversation, as men do, to fellow-travellers, and to little knots of friends interested in the monkish life, in the winter evenings, and wrote them down much as he had told them by word of mouth. Hence the "simple and natural air" of which Tillemont speaks. But in the Dialogue he is setting himself a more serious task. He is aiming at the standard set him by his models, Plato and Chrysostom himself; the author of a chatty volume of reminiscences naturally adopts a more grandiose style when making a solid contribution to literature. But he had not the gifts to do this successfully; he falls into the "more affected style of a man who has some taint of naughty rhetoric" 15 (Tillemont). His mind had been widened, and his vocabulary enlarged, by his intercourse with men, since the days when, as a monk, he had conned over the materials of his History; but the expressions which he had used of his friends were still connected with them in his mind. But more. He had lived a hard life; after thirteen years of ascetic toil as a monk, he had travelled through Palestine, to Constantinople, visited Rome, suffered on Chrysostom's behalf, endured a trying journey to Syene, and there spent six years in exile. What had been the effect of these years of hardship upon his health, and especially upon his eyes, in the sand and glare of Egypt? |xxiv

We have spoken of the kind of grammatical errors which are frequent in the Dialogue; are they not just such as might be expected to occur if a man who was more or less accustomed to writing for himself was dictating to an amanuensis? Not being able to see his sentences as they rolled from his pen, his thoughts wandering while the scribe committed them to paper, he would be very likely to fall into such mistakes. In several places where the text needs correction, the slips seem to be due to mishearing as much as to mis-copying; in one passage especially (p. 108) the words are thrown down almost at random, as if the reciter had gone too fast.

"My conclusion," Dom Butler is good enough to write to me, "has been accepted by the great majority of the critics, though a Dutch professor, Aengenvoort, has contested it." I venture to hope that the additional evidence which I have collected may have the same effect upon the Dutch professor as the arguments of the imaginary bishop in support of the scholarly divine whom he held in honour had upon the deacon. "But if any one can speak more truthfully," by tracing the vocabulary of the author elsewhere in Patristic literature,¹⁶ "I will welcome him as a corrector of error and a lover of the brethren." In any case, the author is so clearly a contemporary, and in many cases a careful eye-witness, of the events which he narrates, that his work may be regarded as a reliable authority for the life of the saint.¹⁷ V. The Present Edition

I have followed Bigot's text, as given by Migne (Patr. Gr., vol. xlvi.), though where Migne offers a |xxv good emendation or conjecture, I have not scrupled to avail myself of it, without necessarily calling attention to the matter in the notes. The notes are somewhat more full than those generally given in this series of translations. It is my hope that the attraction of St. Chrysostom's name, and the simplicity of a biography as compared with a theological treatise, may secure a wider circle of readers from among those who do not make theology and Church antiquities their special study. I have therefore given some information upon points of history and Church life which such readers may not have leisure to investigate for themselves. I have referred to other writers of the time,

where their records amplify, or explain, events in the Dialogue, and given a certain number of quotations from Chrysostom's writings, to show how far the author's thoughts were directly influenced by them. Also I have given references to the Lausiaca History----not by any means so fully as would be possible, but to keep in the reader's mind the question of authorship, by showing a few of the resemblances which justify the assignment of both treatises to the same author. The numbers at the top of the page refer to the pages in Migne's text. I have provided headings for the chapters and for divisions within the chapters for the convenience of the English reader. An excellent Life of Chrysostom was published by Dean Stephens (John Murray, 1880), which supersedes an earlier Life by Neander (1848). St. Jean Chrysostome, by Aimé Puech (Paris: Lecoffre, 1913), a slighter work, combines French insight with French grace of style and phrase, while Dom Chr. Baur has published (Louvain, 1907) a "very complete and conscientious" study of Saint Jean Chrysostome et ses œuvres dans l'histoire littéraire.

[Footnotes renumbered and moved to the end] 1. 1 See especially pp. 154, 113.

2. 1 Socrates, Hist. Eccl., vi. 3. Sozomen has a similar judgment.

3. 2 It is interesting to consider how far he was carried away by the malign influence of Archdeacon Serapion upon his impetuous disposition.

4. 3 "Chrysostomos. "

5. 1 The Homilies on Acts, the Psalms and the Epistles to the Colossians and Thessalonians are of this period.

6. 1 The statement in D.C.B., that John sent his "grateful thanks" to Pinianus, Palladius' host at Rome (L. H., lxi. 5), is incorrect. The thanks are sent (Chrys. Epp. 157-160) to the four bishops of the delegation. The letters and the History both confirm the accounts given in the Dialogue of the visit to Rome and its sequel.

7. 2 Pall., L. H., xxxv. 12.

8. 3 vii. 36.

9. 1 Patrology (Shahan's Transl.), p. 381.

10. 2 But cf. Pall., L. H., Prologue, thirty-eight lines without a full-stop.

11. 1 This is especially noticeable in the passages in the Dialogue which deal with the life of monks, the subject of the History. Dr. Reitzenstein agrees with Dr. Zöckler.

12. 1 Cambridge Companion to the Bible, p. 31; Oxford Helps to the Study of the Bible, p. 25.

13. 2 I do not mean that the writer or writers must have possessed actual copies of either of the MSS. mentioned; there were doubtless many other copies of the original translation, with more or less numerous variations. For instance, two quotations are made----Ps. cxix. 51 and Prov. xi. 4----which are omitted in "B." Both occur in "A"; but the first, at least, must have been in many other copies, as without them the eight verses of the stanza would have been deficient.

14. 3 In both treatises acquaintance is shown with the writings of Evagrius, one of Palladius' companions in the desert.

15. 1 Dom Butler finds some trace of this in the History. The seeds of naughtiness were awaiting development.

16. 1 There are many parallel expressions in Isidore of Pelusium, or whose authorship something more might be said.

17. 2 Since this book was in print, Abbot Butler has again dealt with the question of unity of authorship, with greater fulness and detail, in an article in The Journal of Theological Studies for January 1921, which all Greek scholars interested in the subject should by all means study. This text was transcribed by Roger Pearse, 2006. All material on this page is in the public domain - copy freely.

Greek text is rendered using unicode.

Early Church Fathers - Additional Texts

The Lausiatic History - Introduction

Palladius, The Lausiatic History (1918) pp.1-34.

Introduction.

TRANSLATIONS OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE. SERIES I

GREEK TEXTS THE LAUSIATIC HISTORY OF PALLADIUS By W.K.LOWTHER CLARKE B.D.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

London The Macmillan Company .New York First published 1918

PREFACE MY interest in monasticism was first awakened in 1904, when I was a theological student at Cambridge, by the publication of the second volume of Abbot Cuthbert Butler's Lausiatic History of Palladius. The appearance of a new work of scholarship, however excellent, would have meant little to me at that time, but my imagination was struck by the dinner which the theological teachers at Cambridge combined to give the author in honour of the completion of his arduous task. Somehow I had not associated monks with dinnerparties, and they appeared to me henceforward in a more human and attractive guise. In 1908 I began to study monasticism, taking Abbot Butler's works as my guide, and have never since lost interest in the subject. During the past year I have tried, during the few leisure hours which were alone possible under war conditions, to forget the tragedies of the time by making a translation of the Lausiatic History. I do not know whether an ordinary critical text, where an editor merely gives the finishing touches to the labour of his predecessors, is copyright so far as the right of making a translation is concerned. But in this case the text belongs to Abbot Butler in a special way, since before him all was chaos. I am grateful therefore to him, and the Cambridge University Press his publisher, for readily granting [viii] permission to make the present version. There is nothing original in my book; if it succeeds in popularising the work of the Abbot of Downside, on whom the mantle of the great Benedictine scholars of old has descended, my purpose is accomplished. To a lesser extent I am indebted to M. Lucot's excellent edition and translation. Occasionally he seems to me to have missed the meaning, but his French clarity of vision has frequently given me the clue to the right English rendering.

Finally I must express my gratitude to the Society of which I have the honour to be Secretary for undertaking the publication of this work at a time when it might have been tempted to postpone all such projects until a more convenient season.

May 1918.

[ix

CONTENTS

PREFACE vii

INTRODUCTION 15 I. THE AUTHOR AND HIS BOOK 15 II. THE TEXT OF THE HISTORY 17 III. EARLY MONASTICISM 20 IV. HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE BOOK 24 V. ITS SPIRITUAL VALUE 26 VI. THE PRESENT EDITION 32 VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY 33 VIII. LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS 34 TEXT: INTRODUCTORY PIECES 35

PROLOGUE 39

I. ISIDORE . 47 II. DOROTHEUS 48 III. POTAMAENA 50

IV. DIDYMUS 51

V. ALEXANDRA 53 VI. THE RICH VIRGIN 54 VII. THE MONKS OF NITRIA 57 VIII. AMOUN OF NITRIA 59

IX. OR 61 |x

X. PAMBO 62

XI. AMMONIUS 64 XII. BENJAMIN 66 XIII. APOLLONIUS 67 XIV. PAESIUS AND ISAIAS 67 XV. MACARIUS THE YOUNGER 69 XVI. NATHANAEL 70 XVII. MACARIUS OF EGYPT 73 XVIII. MACARIUS OF ALEXANDRIA 77 XIX. MOSES THE ROBBER 86

XX. PAUL 90 XXI. EULOGIUS AND THE CRIPPLE 91 XXII. PAUL THE SIMPLE 96 XXIII. PACHON 101 XXIV. STEPHEN 103

XXV. VALENS 104

XXVI. HERON 106 XXVII. PTOLEMY 107 XXVIII. A VIRGIN WHO FELL 108

XXIX. ELIAS 109 XXX. DOROTHEUS 110 XXXI. PIAMOUN 111 XXXII. PACHOMIUS AND THE TABENNESIOTS 112 XXXIII. THE TABENNESIOT NUNS 116 XXXIV. THE NUN WHO FEIGNED MADNESS 118 XXXV. JOHN OF LYCOPOLIS 120 XXXVI. POSIDONIUS 125 XXXVII. SARAPION THE SINDONITE 127 XXXVIII. EVAGRIUS 132 XXXIX. PIOR 138 |xi

XL. EPHRAIM 139 XLI. HOLY WOMEN 141

XLII JULIAN 142 XLIII. ADOLIUS 143 XLIV. INNOCENT 144 XLV. PHILOROMUS 145 XLVI. MELANIA THE ELDER 147 XLVII. CHRONIUS AND PAPHNUTIUS 149 XLVIII. ELPIDIUS 154 XLIX. SISINNIUS 156

L. GADDANAS 156

LI. ELIAS 157

LII. SABAS 157 LIII. ABRAMIUS 157 LIV. MELANIA THE ELDER 158 LV. SILVANIA (MELANIA continued) 160 LVI. OLYMPIAS 161 LVII. CANDIDA 162 LVIII. THE MONKS OF ANTINOË 163 LIX. AMMA TALIS AND TAOR 165 LX. COLLYTHUS 166 LXI. MELANIA THE YOUNGER 167 LXII. PAMMACHIUS 169 LXIII. THE VIRGIN AND ATHANASIUS 169 LXIV. JULIANA 171 LXV. HIPPOLYTUS 171 LXVI. VERUS THE EX-COUNT 173 LXVII. MAGNA 174 LXVIII. THE COMPASSIONATE MONK 174 LXIX. THE NUN WHO FELL 175 |xii LXX. A READER UNJUSTLY ACCUSED 176 LXXI. THE BROTHER WHO IS WITH THE WRITER 178 INDICES (i) GENERAL 181 (ii) PERSONS MENTIONED IN THE TEXT 183 (iii) REFERENCES TO ANCIENT WRITERS

[Blank page]

HITHER, and with one accord Sing the servants of the Lord:

Sing each great ascetic sire;

Antony shall lead the choir.

.

.

. . .

Egypt, hail, thou faithful strand!

Hail, thou holy Libyan land!

Nurturing for the realm on high Such a glorious company!

. By what skill of mortal tongue Shall your wondrous acts be sung?

All the conflicts of the soul, All your struggles to the goal; And your virtue's prize immense, And your victories over sense, How perpetual watch ye kept Over passions, prayed and wept;

Yea, like very angels came, Visible in earthly frame.

Hymn for the Friday before Quinquagesima. St. Theophanes. Translated by J. M. Neale.

INTRODUCTION I. THE AUTHOR AND HIS BOOK IN the fourth and fifth centuries of our era Egypt had come to be regarded with great reverence throughout Christendom as a Holy Land of piety. Pilgrims came from all parts to visit the saints who lived there, and several wrote descriptions of what they saw and heard, which are among the most interesting documents of the early Church. Palestine was so near that it was usually included in their tour; the glamour of its sacred sites, which remains with us still when that of Egypt has faded into oblivion, was already potent. But Palestine was clearly second to Egypt in the affections of the pilgrims. The prevailing sentiment was expressed by Chrysostom with admirable clearness (Hom. in Matt. viii.). It was eminently appropriate, he explains, that the child Jesus should be taken to Egypt to escape Herod. Palestine persecutes Him, Egypt receives Him. This typifies the position Egypt was to occupy in the development of the Church. The land which had oppressed the children of Israel, had known a Pharaoh, had worshipped cats, was destined to be more fervent than any other, to have its towns and even its deserts peopled by armies of saints living the life of angels, and to boast the greatest, after the apostles, of all saints, the famous Antony.

Palladius, the author of our book, who was destined |16

to be Chrysostom's devoted adherent, made a pilgrimage to this holy land, like so many others, and stayed there many years. The following is an outline of his life, with the dates as established by Butler.

He was born in Galatia in 363 or 364, and dedicated himself to the monastic life in 386 or a little later. In 388 he went to Alexandria; as Paul went up to Jerusalem to see Peter, James, and John, so, he says in the Prologue, did he go to Egypt to see the saints for himself. About 390 he passed on to Nitria, and a year later to a district in the desert known as Cellia from the multitude of its cells, where he spent nine years, first with Macarius and then with Evagrius. At the end of the time, his health having broken down, he went to Palestine in search of a cooler climate. In 400 he was consecrated bishop of Helenopolis in Bithynia, and soon became involved in the controversies which centred round St. John Chrysostom. The year 405 found him in Rome, whither he had gone to plead the cause of Chrysostom, his fidelity to whom resulted in his exile in the following year to Syene and the Thebaid, where he gained first-hand knowledge of another part of Egypt. In 412-413 he was restored, after a sojourn among the monks of the Mount of Olives. His great work was written in 419-420 and was called the Lausiatic History, being composed for Lausus, chamberlain at the court of Theodosius II. Palladius was also in all probability the author of the Dialogue on the Life of Chrysostom. He died some time in the decade 420-430. The character of the man stands out clearly in the History, He was sincere, simple-minded and not a little credulous. His deep religious fervour, of the ascetic type, needless to say, appears throughout the book, and especially in the concluding chapter, which almost attains eloquence. But he had a fund of good sense, so we learn from the Prologue, which predisposes us to a favourable judgment on the rest of the book. What could be saner, for example, than his summing up of the question of teetotalism: "To drink wine with reason is better than to drink water with pride" (Prol. 10)? We need not attach much importance to the accusation of Origenism which has been the slur on his reputation. If he admired Origen, that great and original thinker, it will hardly redound to his discredit to-day. And he was in good company in his own day. Saints such as Basil, the two Gregories and Chrysostom shared his tendencies; if Chrysostom the master is forgiven his Origenism, Palladius the disciple may be forgiven also.

II. THE TEXT OF THE HISTORY

It has been the lot of many a scholar to grapple with the difficulties of an ancient text so successfully that the result of his labours has been accepted as substantially representing the original work of the author: few editors indeed can be credited with an achievement equal to that of Abbot Butler, who brought order out of confusion and rescued for the historian a document which had been regarded with the utmost suspicion. His conclusions were at once recognized as correct, and much that had been written on early monasticism became obsolete, based as it was on an erroneous estimate of the original authorities.¹ Butler was confronted by three main documents, each with its own textual history.

A. The document which was accepted till recently as the Lausiatic History, called by Butler the Long Recension. It appears in a Latin form in Rosweyde's *Vitae*

|¹⁸ *Patrum* (1615 and 1628), and includes the History of the Monks in Egypt (see C below). In 1624 a Greek text was published by du Duc purporting to be the original of Rosweyde's Latin, though in reality it was patched up from various sources. This is the text which, with some additions, is reprinted in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, xxxiv.

B. Butler's Short Recension, called originally *Paradisus Heraclidis*, printed by Rosweyde in his appendix.

C. The *Historia Monachorum in Aegypto*, which was till recently supposed to have been written in Latin by Rufinus, but turns out to be Rufinus' translation of a Greek original compiled by an anonymous writer and describing a visit paid by a party of seven, in which Rufinus was not included, to the Egyptian ascetics in 394-395. The Greek text has been edited by Preuschen, and a text of Rufinus' Latin version forms part of the Long Recension, as stated above.²

Tillemont long ago had seen the lines on which the problem was to be solved, but subsequent investigators dismissed his suggestion as impossible, and it was left for Butler to show with a wealth of argument the true relations of the documents. His solution is briefly this: A (the Long Recension) = B (the Short Recension) + C (*Historia Monachorum*). B is not an abridgment of A, nor is A Palladius' second edition of B. In Sozomen, who used the *Lausiaca History* (see *Hist. Eccl.* I. 13 f., III. 14, VI. 28 ff., etc.), there are clear traces of B, also of C, none whatever of A. The early versions, especially the Latin and Syriac, confirm these results. There is no reason¹⁹ to think that Palladius used Greek documents, or that he translated from the Coptic.

Having established this fact, that the Latin version in Rosweyde's appendix represents substantially the work of Palladius, Butler proceeds to discuss which is the best text of the Greek original of this. He finds that the MSS. are divided as follows:

- (i) The B group, giving the Short Recension as hitherto printed.
- (ii) A shorter and simpler text, which he calls the G group.
- (iii) An A group, which is composite of B and G.

Ruling out the A group according to the rules of textual criticism, as between B and G, he pronounces in favour of the latter, which is supported by Sozomen and the versions, and is superior intrinsically as well. B is a "metaphrastic" text, says Preuschen, and Butler styles it "rhetorical, turgid and overladen."

It remains to discover the best examples of the G text. Butler finds these in a MS. in the National Library at Paris (P) and one at Christ Church, Oxford (W). The latter was not available until more than half of the text, had been printed, and therefore to get Butler's mature judgment on the text of the earlier part a number of readings from W given in the appendix must be substituted for those of the text. The two MSS. are the offspring of a common ancestor. "It is clear that P and W have to serve as the basis of the text, pre-eminently W where it is extant." Other MSS. are used in the main to eliminate the eccentricities of P and W. Occasionally neither are extant, and the printed text is Butler's critical reconstruction from the other sources. ²⁰ III. EARLY MONASTICISM The story of Egyptian monasticism is inevitably an oft-told tale, and need not be repeated here, since summaries of it are readily accessible.³ All that will be attempted is the emphasising of some points that might be overlooked.

Asceticism was inherent in Christianity from the first;⁴ it could hardly have been otherwise among the disciples of Him Who had not where to lay His head. In 1 Corinthians St. Paul teaches that in view of the shortness of the time before the end the unmarried state is preferable to the married.⁵ St. John, convinced that it was the last hour, bade his little children keep themselves from idols, a command which in practice involved renunciation of the world.⁶ We are therefore not surprised to find asceticism a strong force in the early post-apostolic age. There was as yet no formal

separation from the world; devotees of both sexes lived at home and were described as bearing "the whole yoke of the Lord."⁷ When monasticism underwent its great development in the early part of the fourth century, it was but a making explicit of what had been implicit in the Church from its early days, and even, so it would seem, in the teaching and example of our Saviour.

Two questions may be asked at this point: Why did monasticism begin when it did? Why did Egypt witness its beginning rather than some other land such as Asia Minor, which was perhaps the most Christian part of the empire at that time? In answering the first question one would be inclined to attach importance to the tradition which connects the origin of monasticism with the Decian persecution (c. 250), when many Christians fled from the settled parts of Egypt to the surrounding deserts and remained there for some time (Dionysius of Alexandria ap. Eus. H.E. VI. 42). Some at least of these must have been living the ascetic life at home, which they would naturally continue in the desert under more rigorous conditions. When a later tradition affirms that certain of these remained in the desert permanently and became the first Christian hermits, it is intrinsically so probable that one is justified in concluding that the Decian persecution was the historic occasion which led to the origin of monasticism.⁸

Paradoxical as such an argument may seem at first sight, the cessation of persecutions may be adduced as a main cause of the great development of monasticism. The deliverance of the Church from this danger coincided with the adoption of Christianity as the State religion, the swamping of old landmarks by a flood of imperfectly instructed adherents, and the lowering of standards in the direction of worldliness. Monasticism in one of its aspects was the reaction of the sterner spirits against the secularisation of the fourth-century Church. Hitherto there had been an intermittent warfare of the State against the Church which expressed itself in persecution. When persecution ceased, a need was felt on the part of the Church for a "moral equivalent for war"; this the Church found in monasticism, which represented the Church militant against worldliness within.

If we turn to our second question, it is not hard to see

why Egypt, rather than some other country, was the motherland of monasticism. The solitudes of Asia Minor with their rigorous winter climate were not suitable places for ascetic experiments. Egypt, however, was ideal for this purpose. The climate was warm and practically rainless, the desert was never far away from the narrow strip of cultivable land, and the neighbouring mountain ranges abounded in natural caves.

Another reason may be suggested. The recent discoveries of papyri have thrown a flood of light upon the conditions of life in ancient Egypt. We can trace the ever-tightening hold of the Government upon the people and the process by which the peasants became *ascripti glebae*.⁹ The process was at work in other provinces, but Egypt was in the main docile,¹⁰ had been paternally governed since the days of the Ptolemies, and was of great importance as the granary of Italy. Accordingly the pressure of taxes and public burdens was greatest in Egypt, and the temptation to escape from them by running away became very strong. In the second and third centuries whole districts became depopulated by the flight of their inhabitants. Things became worse in the fourth century. In 312 the village of Theadelphia became "utterly deserted"; so did that of Philadelphia in 359. The peasants ran away from their intolerable burdens. The word used for their retreat (*anachoritis*) is the same as that which describes the monks (*anachoritic*), anchorites). What some did from economic, others could do from religious motives; doubtless in

some cases both causes operated.¹¹

|23

Such an explanation seems far more plausible than that which used to be given, according to which the pagan monasticism of Egypt was the model for the Christian institution. There is little to be said for such a theory, which is indeed now generally abandoned. The resemblance of the so-called monks of Sarapis to the later Christian monks is merely superficial.¹² The solitary life, begun in the desert as described above, was organised about 305 by St. Antony, who is justly reckoned as the founder of Christian monachism. Through the efforts of him and his disciples great colonies of monks arose, the most famous of which were at Nitria and Scete. The cells were grouped round a central church, where services were held on Saturday and Sunday, devotions otherwise being said in the individual cells. The main feature of this type of monasticism was its voluntary character; each monk lived his own life, and the monastery had a number of solitary lives lived in common rather than a true common life. The first coenobium, or monastery of the common life, was founded by Pachomius at Tabennisi sometime in the years 315-320. Here Palladius found a federation of monasteries constituting a true Order as understood subsequently in the West, with obedience to the Rule and the Superior as the main principle. There is no need to discuss the two systems here, since the reader will find both modes of life fully described in the text (see especially Chapters VII. and XXXII.). By the side of the monks there were nuns of various kinds. The purely solitary life was clearly inappropriate to women, though it was attempted, as may be seen |24 from the story of Alexandra, who lived alone in a tomb for ten years (Ch. V.). When women were gathered into a monastery, the presence of men was necessary if only to administer the sacraments. Convents of the Antonian type existed, but the true common life for women was found in the Pachomian nunneries, over the first of which Pachomius' sister was abbess. These were closely associated with the men's houses in a system of double monasteries, which formed an economic whole, the women, for example, making the men's clothes. This institution, carefully safeguarded as it was and providing protection for women in a rough age, fell into suspicion in the East and was forbidden by Justinian.

Little need be said about Palestine. The monastic life was introduced there early in the fourth century by Hilarion, a disciple of Antony; the original impulse continued, and the monasteries were mainly of the Antonian type.

IV. HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE BOOK No one would deny that Palladius reflects the age in which he lived, the more faithfully because of his simplicity and lack of originality. His casual allusions to Church observances are of great value. Note, for instance, the continued use of the Agape (XVI. 5), the importance attached to frequent communion, a five weeks' abstention being enough to deserve severe punishment (XVII. 9), the offering of the Eucharist for the dead (XXXIII. 4), the use of Holy Oil (XII. 1, XVIII. 11) and Holy Water (XVII. 9) to effect cures, the Invocation of Saints (LX. 2), the beginnings of the Rosary (XX. 1), and generally the great esteem in which the Bible was held, large portions being learned by heart. |25 But a novel may contain such historical data, and it has been claimed that Palladius' History is little better than a romance. We may disregard the earlier criticisms of this kind, since Abbot Butler has answered them satisfactorily, and confine ourselves to the most important of recent books on the subject, Reitzenstein's *Hellenistischen Wundererzählungen* (1906).¹³ He pays special attention to the Lausiac History,

and tries to prove that some at least of the stories are old literary motives formerly attached to pagan characters. Thus the tale of Sarapion Sindonita was originally told of some Cynic philosopher. It may be so, though the arguments are not cogent, only this scholar is too ready to assume a literary connection where none is needed. If the same stories were told of Egyptian peasants, heathen and Christian, the simplest explanation is that Egyptian peasants behaved in much the same way, whether before or after conversion. The common background of life and thought is sufficient to explain the similarity of the stories.

Palladius then tells what he saw and heard, his reminiscences in fact of what happened in some cases over twenty years previously. Under such conditions the element of exaggeration and distortion cannot be excluded. But there is no reason to doubt his good faith when he describes what he saw for himself. Where he reports hearsay he is naturally at the mercy of his informants. Those who told him that a virgin hid Athanasius in her house for six years (Ch. LXIII.) were giving the exaggerated popular version of what had happened many years ago.

There is one reason why Palladius' evidence has been distrusted which is not very creditable to

[26 nineteenth-century scholars, namely, his conviction that he had witnessed miraculous and supernatural events. It is coming to be recognised that a fifth-century Christian writer who did not believe in the miraculous would be a portent which required explanation. There would be little left of the history of the time if all the writers who believed in contemporary miracles were ruled out as unworthy of credence.

V. SPIRITUAL VALUE OF THE BOOK The modern reader has to contend with certain prejudices which hinder his proper appreciation of the people depicted in the Lausiatic History. To begin with, there is the preoccupation with sexual temptations, which will offend some. Not that this is unfamiliar to the reader of modern literature, where there is enough and to spare of such topics. But the Christian to-day, resting upon the accumulated experience of the Church, has learned that solitude is the worst possible condition for a man troubled with such temptations, and is apt to be impatient with the struggles of the solitaries. Doubtless the monks were often morbid in this matter, and it requires an effort of sympathetic imagination to do them justice. The background of their lives must not, however, be forgotten. Their point of view is readily intelligible when it is regarded as a necessary reaction from the incredible corruption of the pagan society of their day, with which even the Church was infected. Thus the women who boasted that they had not had a bath for years are not to be laughed at or reproached for dirtiness. Their conduct appears in a new light when compared with that of those who did take a bath, the Christian ladies of Alexandria who defied all modesty [27 in the public baths.¹⁴ They sacrificed physical cleanliness as a protest against moral uncleanness. And the monks who fought with their passions under the hot African sun and described their struggles with painful frankness were doing the right thing under conditions needlessly difficult. We who have a truer insight into the psychology of temptation must not reproach those who had not such knowledge.

Again, the demonology of the Lausiatic History is at times grotesque to modern eyes. In his poem "St. Simon Stylites" Tennyson shows a just appreciation of this side of early monachism. His description of the saints is fully borne out by the records.

"Devils pluck'd my sleeve, Abaddon and Asmodeus caught at me.

I smote them with the cross; they swarmed again. In bed like monstrous apes they crushed my chest:

They flapped my light out as I read: I saw Their faces grow between me and my book: With colt-like whinny and with hoggish whine They burst my prayer."

But the heroic nature of the warfare is easily missed. The ascetic went into the desert knowing that the demons were awaiting him on their own ground. The evil spirits had a special fondness for waterless places; they took up their abode among the animals which frequented ruins.¹⁵ They were also identified with the heathen gods, whose monuments and pictorial representations were to be found in the Egyptian desert. It argued therefore no small degree of moral courage if the monk went out alone to join battle with these potent

[28 forces of evil. We forget the squalor and shabbiness of the Middle Ages in our admiration of the chivalry and devotion which dared and accomplished great things, and though we laugh at Don Quixote it is with a pang of regret that the age of chivalry is giving place to the centuries of materialism. Now the monks went into the desert of Egypt to fight their battles in a spirit of chivalry. Maybe they tilted at windmills sometimes, but let us never forget that the battle few won, that their life was a successful protest against corruption in the Church, and that they handed the lamp of spirituality down to posterity through ages which apart from them were truly dark.

Tennyson was right in much of his poem, but surely he was mistaken in making his typical ascetic speak in so uniformly penitential a vein. The great monks must have been very happy on the whole. Cold in winter, scorched in summer, always hungry, tortured by visions, yet they had the deep inward peace of knowing that they had obeyed the call and were doing God's Will. Dom Morin of Maredsous in Belgium, writing shortly before the Great War, pointed out that this is the special and inalienable happiness of the monk. "On pourra m'expulser, comme tant d'autres, des murs paisibles du cloître, on pourra me priver de toutes les consolations de la vie religieuse, on pourra disposer de moi de diverses façons imprévues; il est cependant une chose que jamais on ne pourra me ravir, c'est le bonheur d'obéir: celui-là, il m'accompagnera jusqu'à la mort."¹⁶ The monk in an Order obeyed the Rule and its living exponent, the Superior; the solitaries in the desert obeyed an inward monitor. But for both obedience [29 was the master-word, and in consequence beneath all their surface struggles they had a deep peace of the soul. Cardinal Newman's words about the Benedictines express better than anything else the true spirit of monasticism. "To the monk heaven was next door; he formed no plans, he had no cares; the ravens of his father Benedict were ever at his side. He 'went forth' in his youth 'to his work and to his labour' until the evening of life; if he lived a day longer, he did a day's work more; whether he lived many days or few, he laboured on to the end of them. He had no wish to see further in advance of his journey than where he was to make his next stage. He ploughed and sowed, he prayed, he meditated, he studied, he wrote, he taught, and then he died and went to heaven." ¹⁷

Some, while recognising the justice of what has been said above, will maintain that they are bound to pass an unfavourable judgment on a movement so anti-social and anti-national as monasticism. It is pitiful, they say, to see the elect spirits of their generation engaged in spiritual self-culture, a selfish endeavour to save their own souls. Why did they not marry and bring up children, throw themselves into the national life, and so strengthen the moral and economic fabric of the State that it might have had a fair chance of resisting the barbarian onslaught that was impending?

"I can never forgive monasticism this wrong to civilisation," said a distinguished Cambridge resident to me once. At the time I felt that the objection was unhistorical, a judging of the men of bygone days by standards which would have been meaningless to them, resembling the criticisms of monasticism which Charles Kingsley puts into the mouths of his characters in *Hypatia*. But the objection was, after all, raised at the

[30 time, for Eusebius deals with this very difficulty in a passage of great interest.¹⁸

Why, he asks, did the Old Testament Saints attach such importance to marriage and the begetting of children, while we neglect the duty? His answer is first that what was natural in the early days of the human race is unsuitable now when we are living in the last days----quoting St. Paul's words in 1 Corinthians vii. If the time was short in the apostle's day, how little is left now before the advent of the new order. Then in the Old Testament the bulk of mankind were living a life akin to that of the beasts, and so the few who served God were obliged to have families if the holy seed was to be preserved at all; whereas now there is such a multitude of Christians that some can be spared for the ascetic life. He goes on to speak of spiritual children begotten by these holy men, and points out that after all for the great majority of men the New Testament does enjoin marriage.

Surely we can accept Eusebius' conclusions. There will always be enough to obey the primitive human instincts which lead men and women to marriage; there will certainly be enough children born from these marriages to carry on the race, if the Christian teaching on marriage is honoured. So we can but rejoice, if out of the great number who remain unmarried some do so in order to live a life separated from the world and devoted to unseen things. Let us exercise a little common sense. At this distance of time who can pretend to care whether a few little Egyptians more or less were born in the fourth century, to live dim, undistinguished lives, cultivating the soil in order to fill the grain-ships with bread-stuffs for Rome, or later, Constantinople? But it makes a good deal of difference [31 to us that men and women were ready to forsake all for Christ and that the sweet savour of their example is still fragrant in our midst. Many of the monastic records are exquisitely beautiful. Take, for example, the deaths of two great nuns, Emmelia and Macrina, as described in the *Life of the latter*.¹⁹ Of Emmelia, the mother, it is said that "when she ceased to bless, she ceased to live." Of Macrina, her daughter: "As she approached her end, as if she discerned the beauty of the Bridegroom more clearly, she hastened towards the Beloved with the greater eagerness." Or we may quote from Palladius the answer given him by Macarius, when he complained that he was making no progress: "Say, for Christ's sake I am guarding the walls."²⁰ He means: Comfort yourself with the thought that the people of Egypt are living their life in the world, exposed to so many temptations; as a protecting wall between them and the enemy the monasteries are interposed; you with your prayers are helping to guard that wall. Is not this the real point at issue? If we believe in prayer as the noblest and most fruitful activity of man's nature, we shall probably be led to believe that God separates some to a life of prayer, and that the mass of mankind dwell in greater security, thanks to the protecting wall of the prayers of these separated ones. It is because the monks of Egypt put spiritual things first, albeit sometimes in an exaggerated and strained fashion, and believed in the life of prayer, that their example is of permanent value to Christendom.

Finally, it is a commonplace to say that we live in a materialistic age. Riches are the pathway to power

[32 and influence over the lives of others. The Church itself is infected by materialism, in that finance absorbs so much of its energies. Great philanthropists, ecclesiastical statesmen, and missionaries all need money to carry out their schemes of benefiting mankind. Of course there is a good side to this; over against our Lord's praises of poverty must be set His teaching about stewardship. Yet one suspects that English Christians have not so far learned all that is implied in His treatment of riches and poverty. And so it is a salutary experience to read the Lausiaca History and live for a while in an age of the Church when renunciation of all possessions was the surest road to fame and widespread influence for good.

VI. THE PRESENT EDITION

I have followed Butler's text throughout, including the readings from W given in the Appendix, which are in some cases to be substituted for those which appear in the body of the book. Where a different text is followed, for example a reading suggested by C. H. Turner, the deviation from Butler is indicated in the notes. The paragraph divisions are those of Butler, the sections into which the chapters are divided are Lucot's. In places I was confronted with language which could hardly be translated literally; Lucot manages to do so, but the traditions of English are different. To omit the passages would in some cases have spoiled the sense of a whole passage; besides, the book is intended for scholars, who have a right to know what the author said. I met the difficulty by toning down and employing euphemisms; the scholar will have no difficulty in seeing what is meant. I cannot pretend that the compromise is satisfactory. [33

I have aimed at the combination of accuracy, not necessarily identical with literalness, and an easily-read English style. Only those who have tried know how hard it is to combine the two. Palladius, though not a stylist, is a clear and forcible writer, and the task of translating him into English presents no special difficulty. A feature of his style is the incessant use of the particle *ou*].

VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY (See also list of abbreviations.) Butler, E. C., Chapter on "Monasticism" in *Cambridge Medieval History*, Vol. I. Cambridge, 1911.

Cabrol, F., art. on "Monasticism" in *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*

Vol. VIII, Edinburgh, 1915.

Clarke, W. K. L., *St. Basil the Great: A Study in Monasticism*. Cambridge, 1913.

Duchesne, L., Chapter on "Les Moines d'Orient" in *Histoire Ancienne de l'Église*, Vol. II. Paris, 1907.

Krottenthaler, S., *Des Palladius von Helenopolis Leben der heiligen Väter*

(German translation of Butler's text). München, 1912.

Ladeuze, F., *Le Cénobitisme Pachomien*. Louvain, 1897.

Leclercq, H., art. "Cénobitisme" in *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne*. Paris, 1910.

Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, The: Athanasius, Cassian, Socrates, Sozomen. Oxford, various

dates.

Zöckler, O., Askese and Monchtum. Frankfurt-a-M., 1897.

ABBREVIATIONS Budge = E. A. Wallis Budge, The Paradise of the Holy Fathers (Eng. trans, of the Syriac version). London, 1907.

Butler = E. C. Butler, The Lausiac History of Palladius, Vol. I. 1898; Vol. II. 1904. Cambridge.

D.C.B. = Dictionary of Christian Biography. E.R.E. = Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics.

Hist. Mon. ---- Historia Monachorum in Aegypto, Rufinus (?), Greek text in Preuschen, Palladius und Rufinus. Giessen, 1897.

Lucot = Palladius, Histoire Lausiaque (French trans. of Butler's text). Paris, 1912.

Turner ---- C. H. Turner, review of Butler's Lausiac History in Journal of Theological Studies. 1905.

(...)= matter not in the Greek added to complete the sense.

[...] = (generally) translation not of the actual Greek text but of Butler's critically reconstructed text; but see notes.

[Footnotes renumbered and moved to the end]

1. 1 I have thought it unnecessary for the purposes of this edition to discuss what may be termed the Weingarten school of criticism.

2. 1 Butler's arguments have not apparently won universal acceptance on this point, since Scott-Moncrieff, Paganism and Christianity in Egypt (1913), p. 215, maintained that there is no doubt Rufinus wrote the Greek original.

3. 1 See Butler, Lausiac History, I. 218-238, and Cambridge Medieval History, I. 521 f.; art "Monasticism" in Encycl. of Religion and Ethics; Duchesne, Histoire Ancienne de l'Église, II. 485 f.; Clarke, St. Basil the Great: a Study in Monasticism, pp. 26-42; Hannay, The Spirit and Origin of Christian Monasticism.

4. 2 See Clarke, op. cit., pp. 1-15.

5. 3 1 Cor. vii. 29 and the whole chapter.

6. 4 1 Jn. ii. 18, v. 21; see Tert. de Idol, passim.

7. 5 Didache 6; cf. 1 Clem. 38, Ign. ad Polyc. 5.

8. 1 See Eus. Comm. in Ps. lxxxiii. 4; Jerome, Vita Pauli; Soz. I. 12; and Butler, I. 230.

9. 1 The note in Lk. ii. 3, that all went to be enrolled, each to his own city, so far from being unhistorical, is a valuable record of the beginning of this process.

10. 2 In spite of turbulent outbreaks in the third century A.D. .

11. 3 See Mitteis- Wilcken, Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde, I.

i. 324 f.

12. 1 For the ka&toxi of Sarapis see Preuschen, Mönchtum und Sarapiskult (1903); Reitzenstein, Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionem

(1910), pp. 72-81; Sethe, Sarapis und die sogenannte ka&toxi des Sarapis (1913). The last book I have not seen.

13. 1 On inquiry in 1914 I learned that the book was out of print, and a revised edition was expected shortly.

14. 1 Clem. Al., Paed. III. 5; Cyprian, de Hab. Virg. 19.

15. 2 Cf. Lev. xvi. 10 f. R.V; Isa. xxxiv. 14, R.V. marg. (Lilith associated with the wild beasts); Mt. xii. 43.

16. 1 L'idéal monastique et la vie chrétienne des premiers jours (2nd éd. 1914), p. 33.

17. 1 Historical Sketches, II. 426.

18. 1 Demon. Evang. I. 9 (P. G. XXII. 77. f.).

19. 1 See my translation of Gregory of Nyssa's Vita S. Macrinae (London, 1916).

20. 2 XVIII. 29. This text was transcribed by Roger Pearse, 2003. All material on this page is in the public domain - copy freely.

Greek text is rendered using the Scholars Press SP Ionic font, free from here.

Early Church Fathers - Additional Texts

Grow in Your Walk with Christ

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
 - 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

www.sermonindex.net