

Peter Tóth

Syriac Versions of the »Historia Monachorum in Aegypto«
A preliminary investigation on the basis of the first chapter¹

The «Historia Monachorum in Aegypto» (*HMA*), is one of the most important hagiographical sources concerning Egyptian monasticism of the late fourth century. Although its historical value has often been doubted and criticized, the influence the work, especially through its translations, is of the greatest importance in the Western tradition as well as in Oriental Christian literature. The *HMA* contains a narrative of seven monks travelling from Jerusalem to Egypt, visiting and thus introducing the most famous solitaries of the end of the fourth century (395), which is generally accepted as the date of the work. The journey starts from the South, from the town Assiut, and ends with a visit made to the monastic settlements of Lower Egypt, while anecdotes are told about the fathers visited and edifying sayings and curious miracles are recorded.

Some fifteen years after its creation, the *HMA*, was translated into Latin, by one of the most famous and prolific translators of Latin Christian literature, Tyrannius Rufinus, who was known especially for his translations of Origen.² Similarly to his other renderings, the text of the *Historia Monachorum* in his Latin translation contains so many discrepancies in comparison to the original Greek that for centuries it was considered to be the original form of the work, and the Greek text was simply thought to be a translation. However, the investigations made by Cuthbert Butler at the end of the nineteenth century and after him, those of André-Jean Festugière in the 1950's, convincingly proved that the text of Rufinus is a translation of a Greek original, but his Greek Vorlage in some places could have been completely different from the Greek text we know from manuscripts of the tenth century and later.

During the twentieth century several attempts were made to explain the reasons for the discrepancies between the text of Rufinus and the Greek text we

1 The first draft of this paper was a part of my PhD thesis, for the revision of which I am greatly indebted to Dr Monika Pesthy, who made very useful corrections and suggestions. Later it was Dr S. P. Brock who has done me the favour of going through of this re-worked version, his comments and observations should be gratefully acknowledged.

2 Rufinus died in 411, therefore the translation must have been made before this year, around 403/4, in the opinion of Hammond-Bammel. See: C. P. HAMMOND, "The last ten years of Rufinus' life and the date of his move South from Aquileia", in *Journal of Theological Studies* 28 (1977), p. 372-429: 397-400.

know from the edition of Festugière. Some scholars argued that it was Rufinus who re-worked the Greek text, to make it more accessible for his Roman audience and to raise it to a higher literary level.³ Others thought that it was Rufinus' theological concerns which underlay the alterations of the Latin text, and that his translation can best be interpreted as an apologetic tool for Origenist propaganda which makes the famous ascetics of Egypt teach ideas similar to those of the 'Origenist' monks expelled from Egypt in 399 by the patriarch Theophilus.⁴

Some scholars, however, believed that, beside this theological approach, one also has to use textual criticism to explain the discrepancies between the Latin and the Greek versions. It was put forward already by Festugière that some of the peculiarities of Rufinus' Latin version were due to the particular Greek text he used for his translation which is now lost, but its specific features appear in some readings of a particular group of Greek manuscripts he called 'manuscripts aberrants'.⁵ Caroline Hammond-Bammel, in her last study of 1996, goes even further. She argues that it is rather the Latin which seems to preserve the original of the work while the Greek we now have is corrupted, and it might have been revised by anti-Origenist scribes, just as has been previously observed in the case of some other monastic works, as for example the *Historia Lausiaca* of Palladius.⁶ These 'correctors' – argues Bammel – wanted to eliminate from the work all the ideas and names they considered dangerous for their orthodoxy, so it is only the translation of Rufinus, along with some readings preserved by the Greek 'manuscripts aberrants', which seem to preserve some features of this lost original.⁷

All the above mentioned hypotheses, however, have one feature in common: they all stress the importance of research on other early translations of the text as possible control material for these views, although they themselves make only a little use of them. Even the first editor of the Greek *HMA* Erwin Preuschen has

3 On the style of Rufinus' translations see among others: H. HOPPE, "Rufin als Übersetzer", in *Studi dedicati alla memoria di Paolo Ubaldi*, Milano, 1937, p. 133-50 and F. WINKELMANN, *Einige Bemerkungen zu den Aussagen des Rufinus von Aquileia und des Hieronymus über ihre Übersetzungstheorie und -methode*, in *Kyriakon. Festschrift Johannes Quasten II*, Münster, 1973, p. 532-547, and recently C. LO CICERO, "Come romanizzare Basilio ancora sul vertere di Rufino", *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione classica*, 130 (2002), p. 40-75.

4 So e.g. A. GUILLAUMONT, *Les 'Képhalaia Gnostica' d'Évagre le Pontique et l'histoire de l'origénisme chez les Grecs et chez les Syriens*, Paris, 1962, p. 73. note 105 where he writes: 'Rufin fait exposer par Jean la théorie évagrienne de la prière pure' or HAMMOND, "The Last Ten Years", p. 397, who calls the work 'a piece of gentle propaganda in favour of the Origenian monks' along with A. DE VOGUÉ, *Histoire littéraire du mouvement monastique dans l'Antiquité*, III, Paris, 1996, p. 270-275 where the links of the Rufinian *HMA* with the Evagrian tradition are emphasized.

5 A. J. FESTUGIÈRE, "Le problème littéraire de l'Historia Monachorum", *Hermes*, 83 (1955), p. 257-84: 270-279.

6 See: G. BUNGE, "Palladiana I.: Introduction aux fragments coptes de l'Histoire Lausiaque", *Studia Monastica* 32 (1990), p. 79-129.

7 C. P. BAMMEL, "Problems of the Historia Monachorum", *Journal of Theological Studies*, 47 (1996), p. 100-101.

emphasized the role of these early translations, and by the end of the 20th century, Eva Schulz-Flügel and Hammond-Bammel have considered the edition and examination of these early versions as one of the greatest tasks of future scholarship on the *HMA*.⁸

Indeed, in addition to Greek and Latin, there exist Coptic,⁹ Georgian,¹⁰ Slavonic,¹¹ Armenian,¹² and Arabic¹³ translations, and also four different Syriac versions which are preserved in manuscripts of the sixth century. This suggests that these Syriac versions may possibly originate at least in the end of the fifth or the beginning of the sixth century, that is some hundred years after the composition of the original Greek of the *HMA*. Nevertheless, except for a relatively late recension of the first Syriac translation, re-edited and re-worked by ‘Enanisho’^c in the 7th century as the third book of his compilation, the so-called *Paradise of the Holy Fathers*, none of these four versions have been edited or investigated. In what follows, then, an attempt will be made to examine the four recensions and the character of their text, and a comparison of the Syriac material with the Greek and the Latin texts will be presented.

Of the twenty-six chapters of the *HMA* in its Greek version it is the first one which I selected as a sample for the following examination. This was because it seemed more practical to approach the problem by taking one single chapter as the starting point instead of examining the whole work in its entirety. For the first chapter, which speaks about a visit to John of Lycopolis, is preserved in every (Greek, Latin and all four Syriac) versions of the work. Moreover, the hero of this particular chapter, John of Lycopolis was considered by the Latin translator in his introduction as ‘the foundation of the whole work and an example of all the virtues, who alone is more than sufficient for stimulating the pious and God-fearing souls towards the summit of the virtues and the peaks of perfection’.¹⁴ More im-

8 E. SCHULZ-FLÜGEL, *Tyrannius Rufinus Historia Monachorum sive De vitis sanctorum patrum. (Patristische Texte und Untersuchungen, 34)* Walter de Gruyter, 1990, p. 29 (cited below as SCHULZ-FLÜGEL and page number) puts the edition of the Syriac version to the first place among the tasks of the researches on *HMA*.

9 Only the translation of the first chapter on John of Lycopolis is known, see: P. DEVOS, “Fragments coptes de l’*Historia Monachorum*”, *Analecta Bollandiana*, 87 (1969), p. 417-440.

10 See: SCHULZ-FLÜGEL, p. X and 23-24.

11 The Slavonic translation of the *HMA* is preserved in a larger monastic collection named ‘Egyptian Paterikon’, of which only some excerpts are yet edited, see: *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси XI-XII века*, Saint-Petersburg, 1999, p. 306-311 (for the edition) and *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси*, Вып. 1, Leningrad, 1987, p. 302-308 (for further information on manuscripts and editions).

12 *Vitae Patrum*, I, Venetiis, 1855, p. 207-270. See: E. PREUSCHEN, *Palladius und Rufinus, ein Beitrag zur Quellenkunde des ältesten Mönchtums*, Giessen, 1897, p. 160-61.

13 S. RUBENSON, “Arabic sources for the theology of early monastic movement in Egypt”, *Parole de l’Orient*, 16 (1990/91), p. 35-36.

14 ‘*fundamentum nostri operis et exemplum bonorum omnium..., qui vere etiam solus satis superque sufficiat religiosas et deo devotas mentes ad virtutum culmen erigere et ad perfectionis fastigia concitare.*’ SCHULZ-FLÜGEL, p. 247, lines 1-4.

portantly for this study, the story of John of Lycopolis is one of those chapters whose text was elaborated in the most different ways by the various versions. It is in this very piece that the most interesting differences are to be observed between the Greek and the Latin versions in terms of structure as well as in its theological content.¹⁵ Furthermore, this chapter is one of the few sections of the work for which the Syriac translation exists in all four recensions.¹⁶ However, as the text of this chapter is one of the longest sections of the work, it seemed more practical to identify a certain portion of it which can serve as a test for examining the different versions. So I have chosen one particular passage for further analysis, that is the first part of the hermit's speech delivered to his visitors, which records his teaching on pure prayer.¹⁷ Furthermore, this particular passage of the Latin translation appears there in a very different form. It seemed, then, worthwhile to examine this shorter textual unit in the Syriac versions in order to check whether these, which also represent a very early stage in the history of the text, can throw any light on the origins of the 'additions' of Rufinus.

1.) Previous work on the Syriac versions

The fact that Syriac translations of the *HMA* exist was known already in the mid-nineteenth century, but the main source they were known from was a relatively late monastic compilation, the so-called *Paradise of the Holy Fathers*. A huge corpus containing Syriac translations of the most important texts on Egyptian monasticism, namely the *Historia Lausiaca*, the *Apophthegmata Patrum* and the *HMA*. The *Paradise* was compiled in the second half of the seventh century by an East Syrian monk called 'Enanisho', who inserted almost the entire *HMA* into his voluminous compilation as its third book.¹⁸ For a long time it was only the Syriac texts of this monumental collection which served as the main sources for research for the study of the Syriac tradition of the *Vita Antonii* (*VA*) or the *Historia Lausiaca* (*HL*), as well as of the *Apophthegmata Patrum* (*AP*) and also of the *HMA*.

It was only in the second half of the nineteenth century, after the publication of the catalogues of the Syriac manuscripts of the British Museum in the 1870's, that a new approach was taken to find the possible sources of 'Enanisho's *Paradise* in

15 As was already stressed by Festugière and Schulz-Flügel. See: FESTUGIÈRE, "Le problème littéraire" (n. 5.), p. 270-271 and SCHULZ-FLÜGEL, p. 55-56.

16 What is more – as we shall see – it is only HMA I. §§ 19-27 for which there exist further manuscripts of Syriac **R3** in addition to the otherwise unique codex of the recension.

17 HMA I. § 18-31 in the Greek (A. J. FESTUGIÈRE, *Historia Monachorum in Aegypto. Édition critique du texte grec et traduction annotée*, (*Subsidia Hagiographica*, 53), Bruxelles, 1971, p. 15-20, cited further as FESTUGIÈRE and page number) and HMA I. 2,11-3,33 in the Latin (SCHULZ-FLÜGEL, p. 255-262).

18 On the content of the third book of the *Paradise*, see below pp. 67-68.

the early Syriac manuscripts of the 5th-7th century acquired in Egypt. The first attempts to analyse the monastic content of these manuscripts were made in the last decades of the 19th century, covering almost all these monastic texts inserted into the *Paradise* from the *AP*¹⁹ to the *VA*,²⁰ including the *HMA*, too.

The first survey of the Syriac translations of the *HMA*, then, was made also in that very period. In 1897, the first editor of the Greek *HMA*, Erwin Preuschen, in connection with the textual history and the manuscript-tradition of the Greek text had already made several valuable remarks concerning the Oriental versions of the work. He surveyed the manuscripts preserving Syriac versions of the *HMA* and distinguished four different translations in them.²¹ Although Preuschen did not make a detailed description of the character of these four recensions and hasn't listed all the available manuscripts of the single recensions, his classification of the manuscript evidence into four different Syriac translations is still accepted by scholarship.

In the apparatus criticus for his Greek text he often refers to these Syriac recensions, but it is only the Syriac *HMA* of the *Paradise* which he uses and marks with the siglum *s*.²² For Preuschen the most important contribution of the Syriac translation to the reconstruction of the textual history of the work was the observation that the sequence of chapters in a particular branch of the Syriac tradition corresponds to that of the Latin version of Rufinus, and not the one preserved in the majority of the Greek manuscripts. He considered this phenomenon as an unquestionable argument for his view that Rufinus' version was the original and that the extant Greek text is only a translation of the Latin. The Syriac material was, therefore, his most important proof for this hypothesis but instead of a detailed comparative analysis of the two versions, he used only the sequence of the chapters as a device to identify the textual traditions represented by the various groups of manuscripts, a method applied quite often also by later scholars who dealt with the question.

For example, while describing the peculiarities of a particular Greek manuscript (*P*⁵) which differs significantly from the other Greek codices and has the same sequence of chapters as the text of Rufinus, he writes that some features of the text in *P*⁵ are strikingly affirmed by 'the Syriac translation'.²³ However, he never goes into the details of these alleged similarities nor does he specify which 'Syriac translation' is the one resembling the text in his manuscript *P*⁵. It is in the

19 W. BOUSSET, *Apophthegmata. Studien zur Geschichte der ältesten Mönchtums*, Tübingen, 1923, p. 26-34.

20 F. SCHULTESS, *Probe einer syrischen Version der Vita S. Antonii*, Leipzig, 1894.

21 PREUSCHEN, *Palladius und Rufinus* (n. 12), p. 154-159.

22 For example in his notes to *HMA VIII-XXVII*. However, as it appears from his notes for the first seven chapters he did not compare his Greek with the Syriac versions.

23 PREUSCHEN, *Palladius und Rufinus* (n. 12), p. 167: 'an zahlreicher Stellen werden seine (sc. *P*⁵) Sonderbarkeiten von der syrischen Übersetzung in auffalender Weise bestätigt'.

same context that he refers – this time in a more precise way – to the second Syriac recension (**R2**) which has the same sequence of chapters as P⁵ and the Latin of Rufinus.²⁴ In the conclusion of his examination of a textual problem in the first and second Syriac translations, he writes, ‘that the result seems to be certain, that the Greek text is secondary and can only be considered as a recasted version of the original Latin text’.²⁵ And when he noticed that in one group of the Syriac manuscripts the *HMA* was preserved under the name of Jerome, he considered this fact as the ultimate proof for the Western origin of the work, arguing that, fully aware of the Western origin of the work, the Syrians attributed the text to Jerome, the only Western writer they actually knew.²⁶

However, in spite of this conclusion, which some years later was refuted by Cuthbert Butler and again by André-Jean Festugière, Preuschen’s classification of the Syriac versions has been unanimously accepted. Moreover, even his method of using the sequence of the chapters as an indication of a particular textual tradition has proved to be correct in the light of further research on the Syriac tradition. In addition to these observations, as a proof of the significant role of the early translations for the textual history of the work, Preuschen has even made a ‘sample-edition’ of a small chapter (*HMA* XX/§§ 1-4) according to its first (**R1**) and second (**R2**) Syriac versions, at the end of his book.²⁷

In the same year that Preuschen’s edition came out, another study, Cuthbert Butler’s edition of Palladius’s *Historia Lausiaca*, was published. Butler’s main concern, when writing on the text-history of the *HL*, was to prove that the original form of Palladius’ work was a shorter recension preserved independently in the manuscripts. He considered the longer version of the work as a rework of the original Palladian material, which was the result of a simple mixture of the original text of the *HL* with material taken over from another completely different work, that is, from the *HMA*. In connection with this view, he had to deal also with the problems of the *HMA*. In contrast to Preuschen’s hypothesis, he argued that the original of the *HMA* was not the Latin, but the Greek text, and Rufinus’ version is nothing but a special translation of the Greek. In opposition to Preuschen’s arguments based mainly on historical observations, he supported his view with numerous textual arguments. In the course of his argumentation Butler, just as Preuschen had done it before, has also touched on the problem of the Syriac tradi-

24 PREUSCHEN, *Palladius und Rufinus* (n. 12), p. 156.

25 PREUSCHEN, *Palladius und Rufinus* (n. 12), p. 196: ‘...scheint sich mir mit Sicherheit zu ergeben, dass die griechische Form sekundär ist und nur als eine Bearbeitung des lateinischen Originales zu gelten hat.’

26 PREUSCHEN, *Palladius und Rufinus* (n. 12), p. 172-173, where he writes: ‘Der Name ist falsch; an der Sache aber wird eben dies richtig sein, dass damit die lateinische Form als die ursprüngliche bezeugt werden soll.’

27 PREUSCHEN, *Palladius und Rufinus* (n. 12), p. 131-132. However, the text edited here is unfortunately one of the shortest chapter of the work containing nothing curious or peculiar which could be used for identifying the character and critical value of a particular recension.

tion. Without going into any details, he examined the case of one particular chapter of the *HMA*, the one about the monks in Nitria (*HMA XX*), which was elaborated in a very different manner by the Greek and Latin versions of the work.

For this purpose Butler made a short list of the manuscripts containing the Syriac translations of the *HMA* and made some very brief comments on the content of the single manuscripts.²⁸ Similarly to Preuschen's results, Butler also came to the conclusion that there were four different recensions of the work in the Syriac tradition, but he labelled the single recensions differently from Preuschen's classification.²⁹ Instead of a detailed examination of the contents of the manuscripts, he restricted his attention only to the chapter about the Nitrian fathers and concluded that in all Syriac translations it seemed to correspond to the Greek and not to the Latin version.³⁰ Therefore, he argued, instead of the Latin, as stated by Preuschen, it was the Greek which should be regarded as the original form of the *HMA*. This hypothesis was thought to be so convincing that his theory about the origin of the *HMA* became the common opinion in later scholarship which was confirmed by the detailed linguistic analysis of the Greek text by André-Jean Festugière in 1955.³¹

However, in terms of the Syriac versions Butler's merit, beside compiling his list of the most important Syriac manuscripts, was that he drew attention to the importance of the Syriac translations and made some useful remarks concerning them. Butler was the first to recognize that the form of the Syriac *HMA* incorporated in 'Enanisho's *Paradise of the Holy Fathers* is only a later re-working of the first Syriac translation (**R1**) of the work, which seems to prove that it might have been the most popular and wide-spread Syriac version of the *HMA* in the Syriac tradition. But what is even more, unlike Preuschen's treatment of the question, he tried to investigate the internal relationship of the Syriac translations, too. Although his method was just to examine the sequence of chapters in the various forms of the Syriac tradition, he attempted to place the single translations within the textual history of the work as a whole. By judging the critical value of the particular forms of the text, Butler placed the Latin of Rufinus at quite an early stage in the text-history and even the Syriac translations were given a distinguished place. Especially in the case of the second Syriac translation, the importance of which had already been emphasized by Preuschen.³² Butler placed this recension '... a step higher in the pedigree than *syr.* I., because *syr.* II. agrees with *lat.*

28 Such as 'first half, very incomplete' or 'extracts', see: C. BUTLER, *The Lausiac History of Palladius*, I, (*Texts and Studies*, VI/1), Cambridge University Press. 1898, p. 267.

29 He lists Preuschen's 'dritte Übersetzung' as 'Version II', and the 'zweite Übersetzung' as 'Version III'. See his table: *Ibid.*

30 *Ibid.*: 'In all three Syriac versions the Nitrian portion of the work agrees with the greek, not with the Latin'.

31 FESTUGIÈRE, "Le problème littéraire" (n. 5.), p. 257-258.

32 See note 26 above.

[sc. that of Rufinus] and Sozomen in placing Elias after Helles'.³³ The fact – he argues – that the second Syriac translation preserves the same chapter-sequence as the Latin text, suggests that it preserves a more ancient, that is, a more original form of the text than the so-called 'vulgate-form' reconstructed on the basis of the extant Greek manuscripts. According to Butler's view, then, 'a revision should have been made, and it should have so completely supplanted the original form of the work that this latter survives only in the Latin version and in a few stray citations'.³⁴

However, it is important, to note that Butler's 'syr II', which he describes as a special recension having the same chapter-sequence as Rufinus' version, is not identical to the 'zweite Übersetzung' of Preuschen which according to the German scholar is also unique, for it preserves the same chapter-sequence as Rufinus.³⁵ Curiously, however, in spite of this curious misunderstanding, both scholars were right. For Preuschen's second version (my **R2** and Butler's 'Version III') – as we shall see – preserves exactly the same sequence as Butler's second (my **R3** and Preuschen's 'dritte'). Consequently, both **R2** and **R3** have the same chapter-sequence as the Latin. The only problem is that Butler, just like Preuschen before him, did not make a detailed examination of the manuscript Add. 14650, listed as a witness to the third recension of Preuschen and to the second by Butler, which preserves the same sequence as the Latin and – as we shall see – seems to be the earliest Syriac version of the work. In the light of this confusion of manuscripts, then, Butler's 'pedigree' of the textual history of the *HMA* appears to be rather unsatisfactory, since we have actually two Syriac translations with the chapter-sequence of the Latin and he, relying exclusively on the witness of the chapter-sequence, has put only "syr. II a step higher in the pedigree". Curiously, however, his theory about an early revision of the work, although it did not make any impact on later scholarship, in the mirror of the investigations by Caroline Hammond seems to be confirmed.

The significance of the Syriac versions, very much highlighted in Butler's book, was apparently recognized by subsequent scholarship as well. Later surveys about the textual history of the *HMA* have simply followed Butler's and Preuschen's conclusions concerning the four Syriac recensions, and it was their – sometimes contradictory and misleading – observations which were incorporated into the most important reference works containing information about the *HMA*, such as the BHO (BHO 843), the inventory of Baumstark³⁶ or more recently the CPG

33 BUTLER, *The Lausiatic History* (n. 28), p. 270.

34 BUTLER, *The Lausiatic History* (n. 28), p. 270.

35 According to Preuschen the manuscripts of the 'zweite Übersetzung' are Add. 14.609 and Add. 14.646. which are listed by Butler under the heading 'Version III, while Preuschen's 'dritte' is preserved in Add. 14.650 which is listed by Butler as Version II.

36 A. BAUMSTARK, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur*, Bonn, 1922, p. 92.

(CPG 5620). There have not been any attempts made to pursue the research further.

The only scholar who after the studies by Preuschen and Butler dealt with the problem of the Syriac *HMA* was René Draguet who, in his monumental edition of the Syriac material of the *HL*, touched upon the question of the Syriac tradition of the *HMA*, too.³⁷ Dealing with the textual history of the Syriac *HL* Draguet made a detailed analysis of the *Paradise* of ‘Enanisho’ and its ‘contenu Lausiacque’,³⁸ and managed to identify the particular Syriac version of the *HL* which could have served as the source of the *Paradise*. In this specific branch of the textual tradition, as shown by Draguet, the text of the *HL* is mingled with two other monastic texts, that of the *HMA* and the *Life of St Paul of Thebes* by Jerome, of which the latter often stands immediately before the *HMA*.³⁹ The *Vita Pauli* has a famous closing passage in which the author, Jerome himself, asks for the prayers of those who read his work, saying ‘Whoever you are who read this, please remember the wretched Jerome’.⁴⁰

In some manuscripts this particular sentence was detached from its proper place at the end of the *Vita Pauli* and was attached to the beginning of the next item, that is the prologue of the *HMA* which, having acquired this sentence as a kind of foreword, was consequently also considered as a work of Jerome.⁴¹ It was this mistake of the transmission, then, adopted later by the *Paradise*, which, as Draguet argues, served as the source for the tradition concerning the authorship of Jerome, so widespread in later Syriac monastic literature.⁴² The attribution of the *HMA* to Jerome in the Syriac tradition, then, in contrast to Preuschen’s arguments, has nothing to do with an alleged ‘Western’ origin of the text but it derives from a corruption in the manuscripts.

Beside the solution to the problem of Jerome’s authorship, however, it is also a great merit of Draguet’s work that he elaborated a methodology for the edition of the various forms of the Syriac material of the *HL*. This system, along with his markings of the different translations (as **R1**; **R2**; **R3**; **R4**) and of the different monastic collections (as RecXVIII to be discussed later and others), turned out to

37 R. DRAGUET, *Les formes syriaques de la matiere de l’Histoire Lausiacque*, I-II, (*Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium*, 389, 398), Louvain, 1978.

38 DRAGUET, *Les formes syriaques*, I, (CSCO 389), p. 44*-113* and in one of his articles: R. DRAGUET, “Fragments de l’ambrosienne à restituer aux manuscrits syriaques Sinai 46 et 16”, in *Biblical and patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey*, Fribourg, 1963, p. 167-178.

39 So e. g. in his manuscript E (Add. 12173, f. 58vb), cf. DRAGUET, *Les formes syriaques*, I, (CSCO 389), p. 26*-30*.

40 PL 23, 28C: ‘Obsecro, quicumque haec legis, ut Hieronymi peccatoris memineris.’

41 The connection between the two texts was so close that sometimes even independent copies of the *Vita Pauli* can contain the first lines of the prologue of the *HMA*. So e. g. in BL Add 14650, f. 23va where some lines of the prologue of the *HMA* were attached to the closing sentence of the *Vita Pauli*.

42 DRAGUET, *Les formes syriaques*, I, (CSCO 389), p. 61*-64*.

be very useful in connection with the Syriac versions of the *HMA*, too. Therefore, it is on the basis of the classification of the four recensions by Preuschen and Butler, and of the technical and editorial methods used by Draguet for the edition of the Syriac *HL*, that I have made the following survey of the Syriac versions of the *HMA*.

2.) The first Syriac translation (**R1**)

The first translation (**R1**) is the most widespread form of the *HMA* in the Syriac tradition, as attested by the fact that this was the one used in the 7th century by ʿEnanishoʿ in compiling the third book of his *Paradise of the Holy Fathers*. It has a vast manuscript tradition, especially in the period after the compilation of the *Paradise* in the seventh century. There are five different groups (**R1a-e**) of the manuscripts of this recension to be distinguished, and each of them is linked to a particular monastic collection containing – in addition to the *HMA* – selections from the *AP* and the *HL*.

R1a: The whole text of the *HMA* connected with a selection from the *AP* preceding it. Manuscript: **A:** London: BL: Add. 17176 (AD 532), ff. 2ra-57vb.

R1b: Various extracts from the text of **R1a**.

Manuscript: **I:** London: BL: Add. 12175 (AD 534?), ff. 200va-210vb; content: Prologue, HMA I, VIII, IX, X, XI, XIV.

R1c: An expanded version of the collection thoroughly described and analysed by Draguet, who called it ‘*Collection of Eighteen Narratives*’ (Recueil de Dix-huit histoires or *RecXVIII*)⁴³ which, after the ‘eighteen narratives’ themselves, contains a large selection from the *HL* along with a series of chapters taken from the *HMA*. Its content is as follows: Prologue and HMA I. (only §§ 1-12; 59; 64-65), VII, III, IV, V, VI, VIII (only §§ 1; 35-47), IX, XII, XV-XVIII, XX, XXI (only §§ 1-4, 13-14, 17), XXII (only §§ 1-7), XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI and the Epilogue.

Manuscripts: **E:** London: BL: Add. 12173 (6th c.), ff. 58vb-73rb; **G:** London: BL: Add. 14579 (AD 913), ff. 79vb-81rb (the Prologue transposed to the very beginning of the collection itself) and 148rb-165ra; London: BL: Add. 14648 (6th c.), ff. 48r-58v (only fragments: from chapter IX onwards); Sinai Syr. 23 (6th c.), ff. 65ra-73rb.

R1d: The third book of ʿEnanishoʿs *Paradise of the holy fathers* compiled in all probability on the basis of a collection very similar to **R1c**, but not completely identical to it.⁴⁴ **R1d** contains some supplementary passages, not present in **R1c**,

43 Ibid.

44 The most convincing proof of this hypothesis is that HMA X-XI (=Par. III/16-17 according to the numbering used in the edition of Bedjan) are inserted into the *Paradise* from **R4**, which is preserved only in the ‘*Collection of Eighteen Narratives*’ in its first part, among the eighteen narra-

but clearly deriving from another attestation of **R1**⁴⁵ and there are some chapters (HMA XXI, XXIII, XXIV) which are present in **R1c**, but missing in the *Paradise*.⁴⁶ However, the origin of the *HMA* in the *Paradise* still requires further investigation.

Editions: P. BEDJAN, *Acta martyrum et sanctorum Syriace*, VII, Paris, 1897, p. 329-441; E. A. W. BUDGE, *Lady Meux Ms No 6: The Paradise of the Holy Fathers*, 2, London, 1904, 351-407. Manuscripts: DRAGUET, *Les formes syriaques*, I, (CSCO 389), p. 44*-113*.

R1e: Various, mainly later selections from the *Paradise*.

For example, London: BL: Add. 12174 (AD 1197), ff. 190rb-200vb; Paris: BN syr. 195, ff. 164v-174v; Paris: BN syr. 236, ff. 355-359; Berlin: Syr. Sachau 161, ff. 8-9 and many others.

2. A.) Character of the translation

The character of the first Syriac translation, due to the relatively homogenous condition of its text, and in light of the original Greek and the other Syriac translations, can be quite satisfactorily described. With the aid of the criteria observed by Sebastian Brock concerning the evolution of Syriac translation techniques, the age of a particular Syriac translation and its relationship to other translations of the same work can be more or less securely described.⁴⁷

tives as number 15-16 (on problems of **R4** see below p. 93-94.). Consequently these chapters are not present among the selections from the **R1** of the *HMA* following the 'eighteen narratives', because in that case it would have been considered as a repetition. Therefore 'Enanisho' – who probably wanted to provide the most comprehensive collection – seeing that these chapters are contained only among the 'eighteen narratives', took them over from there and put them at the end of the *HMA*-section of his collection. This is obvious even from the edition of Bedjan: *Acta Sanctorum et Martyrum Syriace* VII, Lipsiae, 1897, p. 410-426, where they are present at the end of the series of chapters from the *HMA*. This is also the reason why their position in the *Paradise* does not correspond to the general sequence of chapters in the *HMA*.

45 Such passages are the remaining parts of the first chapter which is included in its entirety in the *Paradise* although present only partially in **R1c**. Similar is the case of the chapter on Abba Or (HMA II=Par. III/3) and the one on Paphnutius (HMA XIV=Par. III/12), which are missing in **R1c**, but present in the *Paradise*, which contains them at their proper places according to the sequence of chapters preserved in **R1a**.

46 These are probably eliminations done by 'Enanisho', to avoid repetitions of chapters already contained in the *HL*. For proofs of such intentional editorial work, see the notes found by Draguet in some manuscripts of the *Paradise*: DRAGUET, *Les formes syriaques*, I, (CSCO 389), p. 64* and 89*.

47 Especially: S. P. BROCK, "Towards a history of Syriac translation technique", in *III Symposium Syriacum (OCA, 221 (1983))*, p. 1-14; S. P. BROCK, "Aspects of translation technique in antiquity", in *Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 20 (1979), p. 69-87; S. P. BROCK, "Diachronic aspects of Syriac word formation: an aid for dating anonymous texts", in *V. Symposium Syriacum (OCA, 236 (1990))*, p. 321-30, and for special problems: S. P. BROCK, "Limitations of Syriac in representing Greek", in B. METZGER, *The Early Versions of the New Testament*, Oxford, 1977, p. 83-98; S. P. BROCK, "Basil's Homily on Deut. xv 9: some remarks on the Syriac manuscript tradition", in J. DUMMER (ed.), *Texte und Textkritik: einer Aufsatzsammlung (TU 133 (1987))*,

On the basis of these criteria outlined by Brock, then, the text of **R1** can be placed at the turning point of the first two periods of the history of Syriac translation technique: that of the first (4th-5th century) and of the second (6th century). The translator of **R1** apparently tries to follow the sense of the Greek text; he rarely misses the correct sense of the original, and if he does, it is generally not his mistake, but there probably stood some misreading or miswriting in his Greek Vorlage.⁴⁸ Sometimes his Syriac can reflect even the subtle sense of the original.⁴⁹ He often makes use of hendiadys just to preserve all the possible senses of the original Greek.⁵⁰ The unit of text from which his translation takes its starting point is generally the sentence: each Greek sentence has usually one Syriac equivalent in the translation, and the words of a sentence are sometimes mirrored one by one in the the corresponding Syriac passage.⁵¹ The translation of the Greek particles seems to be more or less consistent: the Greek γὰρ and δε are usually rendered by their Syriac counterparts, but this formal equivalence is not a fixed norm, for sometimes the renderings are reversed.

The attitude of **R1** towards Biblical quotations varies from case to case. In the early phase of Syriac translation practice, as is observed by Brock, the most frequent method of quoting Scripture was to borrow the quoted passage from the already existing Syriac translations.⁵² This practice was so widespread and natural in the early period that previously existing translations were taken over even in such cases when they evidently contradicted the sense implied by the context of the translated source-text.⁵³ Later, some time in the early sixth century, a new practice began. Instead of borrowing from the old translations, the translator simply re-translates these problematic Biblical citations, trying to mirror the context of the

p. 57-66, and S. P. BROCK, *The Syriac Version of the Pseudo-Nonnus Mythological Scholia*, Cambridge, 1971, p. 34-44.

48 As in HMA I. § 26 (FESTUGIÈRE, p. 18, lines 157-158.) where 'its [sc. of the world's] pleasing' was read as 'men's pleasing' because of a possible reading of αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀρέσκειαν as ἀνθρώπου τὴν ἀρέσκειαν. See the edition of the passage in the appendix.

49 As for example in the case of the Greek ἱερατείας ὑπόκρισις in HMA I. § 25 which was taken as 'conceit of priesthood' (ܐܘܬܘܩܪܐܬܐ ܐܘܬܘܩܪܐ) in contrast to the interpretation of the word in all other Syriac versions and also in the Latin as 'affectation to priesthood'. See the edition of the Syriac versions of this passage in the appendix.

50 As in HMA I. § 22 (FESTUGIÈRE, p. 17, lines 138-139.) where the Greek 'those being so conceited and arriving at the summit of the virtues' (τινὲς γὰρ οὕτω θαρρήσαντες καὶ πρὸς αὐτῷ τῷ ὕψει τῶν ἀρετῶν γεγυγότες) is rendered as 'those being so conceited and convinced that they arrived at the summit of the virtues' (ܐܘܬܘܩܪܐܬܐ ܐܘܬܘܩܪܐܬܐ ܥܠܘܬܐ: A, f. 7vb.). Thus mirroring the twofold sense 'be conceited' and 'be convinced' of the Greek θαρρήσαντες. Or in HMA I § 25 in the appendix with examples for the rendition of ἐπαίρεσθε with a double and of καταφέρηται with a triple translation. See the edition of the passage in the Appendix.

51 As e. g. HMA I § 24 (FESTUGIÈRE, p. 18, lines 157-158.): εἰ μὴ ὡς κατασκοπήσοντες τὴν ἐλευθερίαν. ἡμῶν εἰσεληλύθατε which is very faithfully translated as ܐܘܬܘܩܪܐܬܐ ܥܠܘܬܐ ܥܠܘܬܐ (A, f. 8ra.).

52 BROCK, "Towards a history" (n. 47), p. 9.

53 Cf. BROCK, "Limitations of Syriac" (n. 47), p. 96-98.

also translated in this period, that is at a time when the Syriac Evagrius, which was to become one of the deepest influences on the formation of the Syriac ascetic terminology, had not yet been created or become widely known in the Syriac tradition. This all points to some time in the last decades of the fifth and the first of the sixth century, but definitely before 534, the date of the earliest manuscript of **R1**.

2. B.) **R1** and the Greek *HMA*

If, then, the dating of **R1** to the 5/6th century is accepted, this early date of the text, along with the fact that it is a relatively close translation of the Greek, makes the text of **R1** a useful comparative tool for the critical examination of the Greek *HMA*, especially because the Syriac **R1** would then be almost five hundred years older than the earliest Greek manuscripts of the work.

In comparison with the Greek tradition, then, the main importance of **R1** consists in the fact that it draws attention to the group called ‘manuscripts aberrants’ by Festugière. Although **R1** usually follows the readings and chapter-sequence of the popular (‘vulgate’) form of the work marked as *xy* by Festugière,⁶⁷ especially in *y*, there are still some differences. In such cases **R1** reflects the features of some ‘aberrants’, mainly those of the manuscript *C*² of Festugière.⁶⁸ This suggests a possible connection between the two families, namely the ‘vulgate’ and the ‘aberrants,’ and shows that it was probably only later that the different textual traditions were separated. On the basis of the common presence of their features in **R1**, a stage in the history of the text is to be presumed where the text, which was later divided into many recensions, was much more homogenous. **R1**, then, can be considered as an early witness to the Greek *xy* form of the text, and it will play a useful role in a new edition of the Greek ‘vulgate’ text, but for the solution of the problems raised by the relationship between the Greek and the Latin versions, it does not offer significant support.⁶⁹

67 The sequence of the chapters in **R1** is that of the Greek ‘vulgate version’ as it is obvious from the manuscript *A* of **R1a** and from the *Paradise* (**R1d**) itself. All of them contain the chapter on Elijah (HMA VII) in its due place along with the story of Pithyrion and Eulogius (HMA XV-XVI).

68 See the examples in the Appendix.

69 The similarities between **R1d** (the *Paradise*) and the Latin of Rufinus observed by Schulz-Flügel (SCHULZ-FLÜGEL, p. 48. num 1-2.) are based upon the English translation of Budge’s edition which in comparison with that of Bedjan has serious lacunae, not to mention the above stressed differences between **R1a-c** and **R1d**. Therefore the observations of Schulz-Flügel must be rechecked against a good text of **R1a-c** and **R1d**. Because the omissions of **R1d** highlighted by her are similar to those in the Latin can be omissions only of the text of Budge, while Schulz-Flügel’s notes on HMA X are not concerned with **R1**, but with **R4**, because this chapter is contained in the *Paradise* in its **R4** version and not in **R1**, as it was observed above, n. 44.

3.) The second Syriac translation (**R2**)

R2 is the second most popular Syriac translation of the *HMA*. So far there are four manuscripts identified as preserving this version. Among these four, two preserve almost the whole text of the work, while the other two contain only selections from it.

R2a: The text of the *HMA* connected with the Syriac version of the *Vita Antonii*.⁷⁰

Manuscripts: **B:** London: BL: Add. 14609 (AD 587(?)), ff. 44rb-90va; Contents: HMA I, II, IV, V, VI, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, VII, XV, XVI, XIII, XIV, XVII, XVIII, XIX, XX (excerpt), XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, (HMA III, XX §§ 16-18 (Evagrius), XXVI (John of Diolcus) and the Epilogue are missing). **W:** London: BL: Add. 14646 (VI. c.), ff. 83ra-133vb; contents: HMA I-XII in the above sequence and the first sentence of HMA VII, the following is missing due to a damage in the manuscript.

R2b: Selections made from **R2a**. **R2b**

Manuscripts: **H:** London: BL: Add. 14732 (XIII. c.), 159ra-166rb (only HMA I); London: BL: Add. 14597 (AD 569), ff. 122va-136vb (HMA III, IV, V, VIII, IX, XIX). This second manuscript was listed by Butler among the witnesses to **R4**⁷¹ but, as it is obvious from its texts, it belongs to **R2**. A part of this manuscript (ff. 122va-123ra: HMA III (Amun)) was edited by Nau,⁷² and this text almost completely agrees with the corresponding passage in manuscript **B**. At some places, however, the text of this manuscripts differs from that preserved by the members of the group **R2a** as it either adds or abbreviates some passages of the narratives. These differences might have led Butler to the assumption that the manuscript was a witness to **R4**.

After collating the manuscripts of **R2**, it became obvious that the entire text of the *HMA* has not been preserved in this recension. In manuscript **B**, the most complete codex of the recension, there are four chapters (HMA III, XX §§ 16-18 (Evagrius), XXVI (John of Diolcus) and the Epilogue) missing. One of these (HMA III on Amun) seems to be preserved in the other two manuscripts (Add. 14646, ff. 102v-103r and in Add. 14597, ff. 122b-123ra), while the text of the other four chapters, if ever existed, might have been completely lost.

Moreover, the text of **R2** seems to be less homogenous and coherent than that of **R1**. In comparison with manuscript **B**, the others have many differences in word-order as well as in the inner structure and lemmas. Even the text of **B**, the most comprehensive and ancient manuscript of the recension, seems to have some

70 Cf. R. DRAGUET, *La vie primitive de S. Antoine conservée en Syriaque*, (*Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium*, 417-418), Louvain, 1980, p. 9*-13*.

71 BUTLER, *The Lausiac History* (n. 28), p. 267.

72 F. NAU, *Ammonas successeur de Saint Antoine. Textes grecques et syriaques*, (*Patrologia Orientalis*, 11/4), Paris, 1916, p. 124-130.

mistakes and miswritings. Despite of these shortcomings, however, the text itself allows us to formulate some remarks concerning the character and possible date of the translation.

3. A.) Character of the translation

Relying on the criteria observed by Sebastian Brock and used above for the description of **R1**, the text of **R2** seems to be a bit later than **R1**. **R2** appears to be more source-oriented than **R1**. Although it was observed already in connection with **R1** that its translator often tries to mirror his Vorlage very accurately, this intention of reproducing the features of the original becomes even more obvious in the text of **R2**. Even in the first chapter we can find places where the translator has managed to translate some very problematic grammatical phenomena of the original Greek into Syriac. For example, he successfully translates an *acc. cum inf.* construction in § 20,⁷³ while in § 25 he remarkably renders a complicated Greek nominal structure in Syriac.⁷⁴

Even in the case of the translation of Greek particles **R2** seems to be more consistent than **R1**. The Greek $\mu\eta$ is reflected in almost every places by the same Syriac word (ܡܗܘܢܐ),⁷⁵ just as the Greek $\omicron\upsilon\tilde{\nu}$ is generally translated with its usual Syriac counterpart ܘܢܘܢܐ.⁷⁶ The Greek pronouns $\tau\iota\varsigma$, $\tau\iota$ are also systematically mirrored and distinguished in the translation⁷⁷ and sometimes even the word order of the Greek original can be clearly recognized in the Syriac.⁷⁸ Adjectival forms⁷⁹ and foreign words⁸⁰ are also used more frequently than in the text of **R1**.

However, even in **R2** there appear some features similar to those observed by Brock in connection with the earlier Syriac translation technique. In the case of Scriptural citations, for example, the translator generally makes use of the

73 HMA I, § 25 (FESTUGIÈRE, p. 17, lines 151-152.): $\tau\acute{o}$ νομίζεσθαι εἶναι δικαίους, which in **R2** appears as follows: ܡܗܘܢܐ ܡܗܘܢܐ ܡܗܘܢܐ ܡܗܘܢܐ ܡܗܘܢܐ. See the edition in the appendix.

74 It is HMA I, § 20 (FESTUGIÈRE, p. 16, line 125.) where $\tau\acute{\iota}$ θαυμαστόν ὁψόμενοι is rendered as ܡܗܘܢܐ ܡܗܘܢܐ ܡܗܘܢܐ ܡܗܘܢܐ.

75 Cf. e. g. in § 25 in the appendix.

76 As e. g. in § 28, see the text in the Appendix.

77 If it refers to a person, it is ܡܗܘܢܐ which is used (as e. g. in the translation of HMA I, § 22; § 31), and if to an object, it is ܡܗܘܢܐ (e. g. in HMA I, § 22 and § 26).

78 Cf. e. g. HMA I § 22 (FESTUGIÈRE, p. 17, line 135: $\mu\eta$ ὡς $\tau\iota$ καλὸν) where even the order of the particles is the same as in the Greek (Cf. B, f. 48ra: ܡܗܘܢܐ ܡܗܘܢܐ ܡܗܘܢܐ ܡܗܘܢܐ) or HMA I § 26 (FESTUGIÈRE, p. 18, line 158: $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$ γὰρ $\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ πολλὰς ἐγχειρήσεις μερίζονται αὐτοῦ) which is mirrored in Syriac as ܡܗܘܢܐ ܡܗܘܢܐ ܡܗܘܢܐ ܡܗܘܢܐ (B, f. 49va.).

79 Cf. the rendering of the Greek ἀνθρώπινος (HMA I, § 25) as ܡܗܘܢܐ ܡܗܘܢܐ ܡܗܘܢܐ compared with its translation in **R1** (ܡܗܘܢܐ ܡܗܘܢܐ ܡܗܘܢܐ ܡܗܘܢܐ), or of the form σωματικός (ܡܗܘܢܐ), where **R1** uses the same *dalath + substantive* structure (ܡܗܘܢܐ) in HMA I, § 29.

80 Cf. the Syriac for κινδύνοϛ as ܡܗܘܢܐ instead of which **R1** and **R3** use the Syriac ܡܗܘܢܐ (HMA I, § 21).

Peshitta and I could not find any ‘re-translated’ Biblical passages. But, what is even more interesting, there are some places which seem to preserve readings from the Old Syriac Gospels.⁸¹ Moreover, in some cases even a special rendering of some Greek phrases occurs which, following the system elaborated by Brock, can be called ‘dynamic equivalence’, or more precisely ‘modulation’.⁸² This happens for example in HMA I. § 26 in the case of the translation of the Greek ἐκπέση πρὸς τὴν φθοράν (‘being fallen into destruction’) rendered by ‘being fallen into the pit of destruction’, which probably sounds more familiar in Syriac because of its resemblance to the phrase used in the Psalms.⁸³ A further example is in the case where the sentence ‘they have fallen down from the heights’ is rendered as ‘they have fallen down, so to say, from heaven to earth’.⁸⁴

The common presence of all these archaic features, along with the previously noted ‘text-oriented’ character of the translation, may suggest that **R2**, similarly to **R1**, dates from the same transitional period between an archaic and a later translation practice. But because of its handling of Scriptural citations – the general use of the *Peshitta* and a great number of resemblances with the Old Syriac – **R2** could even be a little bit earlier than **R1**. The ascetic vocabulary used by the translator of **R2**, however, seems to provide an even more exact date.

The translator of **R2** appears to be much more familiar with the general Syriac ascetic terminology than the one responsible for the text of **R1**. In **R2** the terminology seems to be much more systematic in use, as it shows some similarities with the translations of the Evagrian works. For example, **R2** has the usual Syriac counterpart of κενοδοξία in contrast with the seemingly random rendering of the term in **R1**,⁸⁵ the same is true for ἀπάθεια, too.⁸⁶ Moreover, in **R2** even such distinctive

81 See below (p. 79), concerning § 30 and in another place (HMA I, § 59: B, f. 55vb) in case of *Mt* 5, 13, or *Jn* 6, 56 (HMA VIII, § 56: B: f. 67vb).

82 See: BROCK, “Towards a history” (n. 47), p. 6-7.

83 ܒܠ ܕܥܣܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ in **R2** and ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ (*Ps* 40. 3) or ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ (*Ps* 7. 15) in the *Peshitta*. See the edition of this passage in the Appendix.

84 HMA I. § 22, where the Greek sounds as ἀφ’ ὑψηλοῦ ἐκπεπτόκασιν while the Syriac has ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ. ‘they have fallen down from on high as from heaven onto the earth’ in sharp contrast with the simple version of **R1** (ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ - ‘they have fallen down from on high’) or the more complicated version in **R3** (ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ - ‘they have fallen out and were brought down from the advantage of excellence’).

85 Κενοδοξία (HMA I. § 24) in **R2** is regularly ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ known from Evagrius (e. g. *Ep.* 8-9 / W. FRANKENBERG, *Evagrius Ponticus (Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, N. F. 13/2)*, Berlin, 1912, p. 572/ and passim), while in the corresponding passage of **R1** we find ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ to which I did not manage to find any parallel, while **R3** has (ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ) and **R4** is missing.

86 Ἀπάθεια (HMA I. § 29 and VIII. § 15= B, f. 64ra) is regularly rendered by **R2** as ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ which seems to be an earlier version of the term to be found also in the *S2* version of Evagrius (See: A. GUILLAUMONT, *Évagre le Pontique. Traité pratique*, II., p. 565) or in the earlier (*Sa*) version of the *Asceticon* of Abba Isaiah (see: R. DRAGUET, *Les cinq recensions de l’Asceticon syriaque de l’Abbé Isaïe (CSCO, 289)*, Louvain 1968, p. 247.). In **R1** it is translated by a paraphrase ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ, see above: n. 63. and the references below n. 93.

Evagrian phrases as the extremely frequent expression of ‘by the time of prayer’⁸⁷ or ‘vain is the labour of those’⁸⁸ are to be found. Furthermore such typical Evagrian technical terms as the ‘vision of God’,⁸⁹ the ‘knowledge of God’⁹⁰ or the more specific phrase ‘knowledge of existing things’,⁹¹ also occur. All these attest to the translator’s knowledge of their current Syriac renderings.

However, it is also important to note that the influence of the Evagrian terminology comes apparently not from the ‘recension commune’ of the Syriac Evagrius, but from another, probably earlier Syriac version, marked *S2* by Antoine Guillaumont.⁹² This second Syriac version appears to use a less developed terminology than the ‘recension commune’, which Guillaumont calls *S1*, and it is this earlier monastic vocabulary manifested in the *S2* recension of the Syriac Evagrius which is reflected in **R2**, as is clearly shown by the characteristic translation of ἀπάθεια by the phrase ‘sanity of the soul’,⁹³ gnosis as ‘true knowledge’⁹⁴ or ‘ascesis’ as ‘fast’.⁹⁵

87 It is the Greek ἐν καιρῷ προσευχῆς, which is extremely frequent by Evagrius. The term itself although not present in the Greek of the HMA I § 25. However, the sense of the sentence ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ προσευχομένου is obviously ‘in time of prayer’ and this is rendered consequently by **R2** with the well-known Evagrian phrase (ܩܘܪܒܢܐ ܩܘܪܒܢܐ). The same as used in his *Epistle 17* (FRANKENBERG, *Evagrius Ponticus* (n. 85), p. 578), or in the Syriac translation of the *De oratione* (I. HAUSHERR, “Le De oratione d’Évagre le Pontique en syriaque et en arabe”, *OCP* 5 (1939), p. 13 (bis), and passim) or in his fragments on prayer (see: I. HAUSHERR, “Evagrii Pontici tria capita de oratione”, *OCA*, 30 (1933), p. 150). Otherwise this is the term which occurs in the *S2* version of the *Praktikos* as well. (*Prakt.* 12 – London: BL: Add. 14.616, f. 3r)

88 See e.g. Evagrius *De humilitate* (J. MUYLDERMANS, *Evagriana Syriaca. Textes inédits du British Museum et de la Vaticane édités et traduits. (Bibliothèque du Muséon, 31)*, Louvain, 1952, p. 111.), where the sentence (ܩܘܪܒܢܐ ܩܘܪܒܢܐ ܩܘܪܒܢܐ ܩܘܪܒܢܐ) is very similar to the one in **R2** (HMA I. § 25: ܩܘܪܒܢܐ ܩܘܪܒܢܐ ܩܘܪܒܢܐ ܩܘܪܒܢܐ).

89 HMA I. § 26 (FESTUGIÈRE, p. 18, line 160: οὐ δύναται ὀρεῖν τὸν θεόν.) which in **R1** is: ܩܘܪܒܢܐ ܩܘܪܒܢܐ ܩܘܪܒܢܐ ܩܘܪܒܢܐ, while in **R2** it is ܩܘܪܒܢܐ ܩܘܪܒܢܐ ܩܘܪܒܢܐ ܩܘܪܒܢܐ. See the Syriac versions for this passage in the Appendix.

90 Rendered by the well-known ܩܘܪܒܢܐ ܩܘܪܒܢܐ by **R2** in HMA I. §§ 18-30 twice, while in **R1** it occurs only once (HMA I. § 28 see the text in the Appendix) and it is completely missing in **R3**. The same is true concerning the term ‘true knowledge’ (ܩܘܪܒܢܐ ܩܘܪܒܢܐ), which occurs only in **R2** (HMA I. § 26 – see the text in the appendix) and which is also ‘especially common in Evagrius’ (S. P. BROCK, *Isaac of Niniveh (The Syrian). ‘The Second Part’. Chapters IV-XLI, (CSCO, 555)*, Lovanii, 1995, p. 26.). This latter term seems to be the current version for *gnosis* in the so-called *S2* version of the *Praktikos*, see: *Prakt.* 31. (London: BL: Add. 14.616, f. 9v); *Prakt.* 84 (London: BL: Add. 14.616, f. 20v, 21r). On *S2* see below, note 92.

91 See below on p. 80 HMA I. § 28.

92 On *S2* see: A. GUILLAUMONT, *Évagre le Pontique. Traité pratique*, I, p. 327-331 and on its terminology: A. GUILLAUMONT, *Évagre le Pontique. Traité pratique*, II, p. 734 and GUILLAUMONT, “Les versions syriaques” (n. 61), p. 35-41.

93 See the references in note 86 above. The term is the usual equivalent of *apatheia* in the whole text of the *S2* version of the *Praktikos*. See: *Prakt.* 33 (London: BL: Add. 14.616, f. 10r); *Prakt.* 53 (f. 15r); *Prakt.* 56 (f. 16r); *Prakt.* 58 (f. 17r); *Prakt.* 59 (f. 17v); *Prakt.* 60 (f. 17v); *Prakt.* 64 (f. 18r), where the ‘recension commune’ uses always the compound form: ܩܘܪܒܢܐ ܩܘܪܒܢܐ.

94 See above n. 90.

95 See above n. 62.

It seems probable, then, that **R2** was made at a period when the Evagrian translations, at least in their earlier *S2* version, were already known in Syriac literature and their special terminology had begun to make an impact on the formation of Syriac ascetic vocabulary, that is, some time in the first half of the sixth century. This was a time when the extremely popular *S1* recension of the Evagrian works had not yet overshadowed the traditions represented in *S2*. A period when the technique of more literal translation became more and more popular, but at the same time the traditions of the previous period of translation practices were still in current use, that is, probably in the first half of the sixth century, which is also supported by the date of the earliest manuscripts stemming from the second half of the century (Add. 14597: 569; *B*: 589(?); Add. 14646: 6th century).

3. B.) **R2** and the Greek *HMA*

The above dating of **R2** to the first half of the sixth century makes it an equally important tool for the critical examination of the Greek text. For the age of **R2** goes far beyond the oldest Greek manuscripts of the *HMA*, added to which is the fact that **R2** seems to preserve a quite literal translation, which allows for a more detailed comparison with the Greek tradition that may give important results.

Even the sequence of the chapters in **R2**, to which attention was already drawn by Preuschen and Butler, corresponds to that observed in the particular group of the Greek manuscripts marked as *p* by Preuschen and Festugière,⁹⁶ and this is the one also reflected in the Latin translation of Rufinus.⁹⁷ Indeed, if a deeper comparison is made between **R2** and the apparatus of Preuschen and Festugière, it emerges that **R2** provides numerous cases when its text exhibits particular features of this group, which as a proof of their ancient origin are present in the text of Rufinus, too.⁹⁸

However, the hypothetical Greek text behind the Syriac of **R2** cannot simply be placed in group *p*. There are numerous cases where **R2** differs considerably from the 'vulgate form'. These differences are not those of the *p* group, instead in sev-

96 FESTUGIÈRE, p. xli and c.

97 SCHULZ-FLÜGEL, p. 7.

98 As for example in the case of *HMA* I. § 43 where the group *p* has the exclamation 'you won' twice, along with the Latin (SCHULZ-FLÜGEL, p. 267, line 398) and **R2** (*B*, f. 53ra), while the Greek 'vulgate form' (FESTUGIÈRE *Historia Monachorum*, p. lxxi), together with **R1** (*A*, f. 11va) contains it only once [the corresponding places in **R3** and **R4** are unfortunately missing in the manuscripts]. The situation is the same in *HMA* I. § 25, where **R2** contains the typical addition (μη̄ ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀρεταῖς ἐπαίρεσθε) of *p* and *C*² (see FESTUGIÈRE, *Historia Monachorum*, p. 18.). See the Syriac texts for this last passage in the Appendix.

eral cases they are similar to the readings of another family, that of the ‘aberrants’, group *v*.⁹⁹

This fact seems very important, because the peculiarities of this branch of the Greek manuscripts were considered secondary by Schulz-Flügel. She argued that this was a relatively later group of the Greek manuscripts originating from a contamination, or rather from a ‘synchronization’ of the Greek tradition with the Latin translation of Rufinus.¹⁰⁰ The readings of **R2**, however, which show similarities to the group *v*, seem to prove that at least some of the peculiarities of *v* should have existed already in the sixth century when **R2** was made. Therefore group *v* cannot be considered as a simple late re-working of the Greek tradition and if it is a re-working at all, the alleged ‘synchronization’ must have happened already at a very early stage of the textual history of the *HMA*.¹⁰¹

3. C.) **R2** and the Latin of Rufinus

R2, then, as has already been observed in connection with **R1**, represents a mixed tradition, and together with **R1**, it attests to the early existence of some typical readings of the ‘manuscripts aberrants’ and it also witnesses to a stage in the text history of the *HMA* where the traditions, later sharply divided, were still together. Moreover, it is also an important feature of **R2** that in some passages its text seems to coincide with the Latin of Rufinus in such a particular way that the difference cannot be supported by readings of any known Greek manuscript.

Such passage is to be found in *HMA* I. § 30, where a citation from the Gospel forms the link between the Latin and Syriac **R2**. The particular passage reads as follows, first the Greek, then the Latin and finally the text of **R2** is cited.

99 Such as some omissions of the group *v* mirrored in **R2**, as e. g. in *HMA* I § 20 (FESTUGIÈRE, *Historia Monachorum*, p. 16, line 125) where the words ἀποκριθεὶς and Ἰωάννης are missing (*B*, f. 49rb) or in § 22 (FESTUGIÈRE, *Historia Monachorum*, p. 16, line 134) where the phrase ἀλλ’ ἄγε νῦν, φησὶν is omitted (*B*, f. 49rb) as in the manuscripts of the group *v*. Or in § 26, see the text in the Appendix.

100 SCHULZ-FLÜGEL, p. 28; 52-53; 61-62 and 78.

101 This hypothesis of Schulz-Flügel was already doubted by Hammonnd, see: HAMMOND-BAMMEL, “Problems of the *Historia Monachorum*” (n. 7), p. 101.

Therefore, he who has been granted a partial knowledge of God – for it is not possible for the whole of such knowledge to be received by anyone – also attains the knowledge of all other things (τῆς τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων γνώσεως).	If, then, one who – as far as it is possible for a man – has known God, he will acquire <i>the knowledge of all other things that exist</i> (<i>reliquorum quae sunt scientiam</i>).	He, therefore, who was granted to get even a partial knowledge of God, for no one is able to acquire the whole of it, attains also the knowledge of all the things that exist. (ܟܘܡܐ ܩܘܡܠܗܢ).
---	--	---

If we take a look at the Greek and Latin versions of the passage, the only difference which appears between the two is the addition of *‘quae sunt’* in the Latin, which at the same time transforms considerably the meaning of the text. The Greek simply says that the one who has come to the knowledge of God can have knowledge of ‘many *other* things’, while in the Latin he knows ‘everything which exists’. It is again in Evagrius, where we find the explanation for the additional meaning of the Latin. The phrase ‘knowledge of the things that exist’ (γνώσις τῶν γεγονότων) occurs frequently in the Evagrian texts, and he considers it as the knowledge of the causes of created things and calls it ‘the kingdom of heaven’.¹⁰⁸

The Syriac of this passage, then, seems to support the reading found in Rufinus’ Latin text. In **R2** we find the usual Syriac rendering of the Evagrian term, which is also confirmed by the text of **R3** to be analysed below. The readings of the Latin and the two Syriac versions, then, apparently attest that it is the ‘knowledge of those things which exist’ that could be the original. This seems to have stood before Rufinus and the translators of **R2** and **R3**, but it was omitted (probably – just as Caroline Hammond-Bammel has argued – because of its Evagrian-‘Origenist’ connotations) in the Greek tradition too early to survive in any of the existing manuscript groups of the Greek version. However, if this hypothesis is correct and the phrase above was omitted intentionally because of its suspicious theological character, one would expect some other cases, too, which would add support to the hypothesis of an alleged theological re-working of the Greek *HMA*.

And indeed, if one compares the readings of some passages in the Greek and in Syriac **R2**, an interesting method of expurgating the text can be observed. In many cases where the Syriac contains theological terms of similar importance, the Greek has only some neutral pronominal phrases. Thus, for example, in *HMA* I. § 23.

Greek	Syriac R2
μη̄ ἕτερός τις παρεισελθὼν λογισμὸς τὸν νοῦν ἐπ’ ἄλλο τι στρέφη	ܕܘܫܐ ܟܘܚܘܐ ܟܘܚܘܐ ܟܘܚܐ ܩܘܡܠܗܢ ܩܘܡܠܗܢ ܩܘܡܠܗܢ
HMA (G) I, § 23 (FESTUGIÈRE, p. 17, lines 142-143)	HMA(S^{R2}) I, § 23 (B, f. 49va.)

108 *Praktikos* 2: GUILLAUMONT, *Évagre le Pontique. Traité pratique*, II, p. 498. On the meaning of the phrase, see Guillaumont’s note: GUILLAUMONT, *Évagre le Pontique. Traité pratique* II, p. 499-501. For a detailed examination of the problem, see my “Lost in Translation: An Evagrian Term in the Different Versions of the *Historia Monachorum*”, G. HEIDL – R. SOMOS, *Origeniana Nona*, Leuven, 2009, p. 613-621.).

Lest any untoward thought thought insinuate itself into your mind and turn it towards <i>something else</i> .	Lest any alien thought emerge and your mind be occupied with <i>transitory things</i> .
---	---

Here, as we can see, the Greek has only a meaningless phrase ‘something else’, while the Syriac provides a much more accurate sense as it says ‘turn the mind towards *transitory things*’. A very similar case is found some lines later in § 27.

Greek	Syriac R2
δεῖ οὖν τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων σχολάσαι τὴν γνώμην τῶν τὸν θεὸν ἐπιζητούντων. HMA (G) I, § 27 (FESTUGIÈRE, p. 18, lines 165-166.)	ܡܠܟܝ ܟܠܝܢ ܡܫܥܝܬܝ ܕܥܡܝܢ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܡܫܥܝܬܝ ܕܥܡܝܢ ܟܠܗܘܢ HMA(S^{R2}) I, § 27 (B, f. 49vb.)
The will, then, of those who seek God must be free from all <i>other things</i> .	The mind of those who seek God should leave behind <i>everything that is visible</i> .

Here the Greek again reads very simply and contains only a colorless pronoun ‘must be free from all *other things*’, while **R2** preserves a much clearer sense ‘should leave behind all *visible things*’.

It is very strange, then, that the Greek seems to omit these otherwise very important and concrete adjectives, and provides only neutral pronouns in the place of these words which might have seemed suspicious for a scribe working after the great debates of the second Origenist Controversy in the sixth century. For, in all the above-mentioned cases the text is speaking about pure prayer, stating that its main condition is that nothing transitory or visible should be admitted into the mind when it is meditating on God. This is an idea which sounds similar to the Evagrian teaching on imageless prayer, an extremely debated question in the theological disputes in the late fourth century, by the end of which Evagrius’ opinion concerning it was judged ‘Origenist’.¹⁰⁹ The occurrence of some phrases characteristic of the Evagrian theology of prayer, then, could have been fairly sufficient to lead to an expurgation of the text attributing these ‘dangerous’ ideas to such an unquestioned authority of desert monasticism as John of Lycopolis. A similar process could have happened in the case of the term ‘the knowledge of those things that exist’, which could also sound a little too ‘Evagrian’ for a sixth-century scribe, so probably it was replaced by the more neutral ‘other’ as well.

R2, then, in addition to the fact that it provides an important tool for the critical examination of the Greek text of the *HMA* offers some readings shared with the so-called ‘manuscripts aberrants’, especially with their group *p* and *v*. Moreover, it seems to provide us with an important control material for some problems of the Latin text, too and sheds light to a curious, theological rewriting of the text

109 On the theory of imageless prayer see especially Elizabeth Clark’s book, according to whom the question of God’s image was a central problem of the first Origenist Controversy at the end of the fourth century. E. CLARK, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate*, Princeton, 1992, p. 43-84.

by replacing the theologically suspicious terms of the original with colorless and "innocent" pronouns.

4.) The third Syriac translation (**R3**)

The third Syriac translation of the *HMA* seems to be the rarest among all the Syriac versions of the work. There is only one single manuscript extant which preserves the whole text of **R3**, while a fragment from the first chapter, containing a short portion of the exhortation by John of Lycopolis to his visitors, is preserved in a letter attributed by the majority of its manuscripts to Macarius the Alexandrian, and by one single codex to John the Solitary.

R3a: The only manuscript which contains the whole work has preserved the *HMA* as part of a monastic collection containing, according to its colophon, '...the triumphs of the desert fathers, selected teachings of Mar Evagrius and stories of the fathers of the deserts of Egypt and the Thebaid...'. The first part, the so-called 'triumphs of the desert fathers' was – as emerges from the fragments at the beginning of the codex – a selection from the *AP*. The second part ('selected teachings of Mar Evagrius') consists of fragments (chapter 7) from his *Ad Eulogium* (CPG 2447), a short work, entitled as *De perfectione* (CPG 2476) which was preserved only in Syriac¹¹⁰ and of chapters 1-23 of the *Praktikos* (CPG 2430) in its third Syriac version (*S3*),¹¹¹ and a work entitled *De signis quietis*. (CPG 2469).¹¹² It is the third and last part of the manuscripts ('stories of the fathers') which contains the *HMA*. The manuscript, except for some lacunae caused by physical damage (between ff. 42-47, losing the end of HMA V; the whole of HMA VI and the §§ 1-5 of HMA VIII)¹¹³ has preserved the entire text of the work. Manuscript: C: London: BL: Add. 14650 (6th c.), ff. 30ra-68vb. The sequence of the chapters in the manuscript (HMA I; II, III, IV, V, §§ 1-5, VIII, § 5-, IX, X, XI, XII, VII, XV, XVI, XIII, XIV, XVII, XVIII, XIX, XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI, Epilogue) is obviously identical to that of the group *p* of the Greek 'aberrants' manuscripts, i. e. the same as the Latin and the Syriac **R2**.)

R3b: This textual form of the recension contains only a small portion of the work (HMA I. §§ 19-27) which was mingled with some extracts from the *Liber*

110 See: J. MUYLDERMANS, "Évagre le Pontique: Les Capita cognoscitua dans les versions syriaque et arménienne", *Le Muséon*, 47 (1934), p. 99-102.

111 Cp. A. GUILLAUMONT, *Évagre le Pontique. Traité pratique*, I, p. 331-334.

112 MUYLDERMANS, *Évagriana Syriaca* (n. 88), p. 120-122.

113 As an early substitute for the lost text, there were some folios bound to this part of the manuscripts which originally belonged to the beginning of the volume, for they contain a short series of the *Apophthegmata Patrum*.

Graduum (§ 29)¹¹⁴ and was preserved as the third letter of Macarius of Alexandria.

Manuscripts: W. STROTHMANN, *Die syrische Überlieferung der Schriften des Makarios, I*, (*Göttinger Orientforschungen*, I/21) Wiesbaden, 1981, p. 213. There are nine manuscripts known (S^V: Berlin Sachau 352 (13th century), ff. 104v-105v; S^B: Sharfet 38 (AD 1466); S^O: London: BL: Add. 14.637 (10th century), f. 24v; S^E: Vat. Syr. 122 (AD 769), ff. 266-269; S^F: London: BL: Add. 14.582 (AD 816), ff. 109v-112r; S^I: London: BL: Add. 18.184 (9th century), ff. 201v-202r; S^S: Vat. Syr. 126 (AD 1223), ff. 271r-273v; S^W: Mingana Syriac 330 (13th century), ff. 149v-153v; S^Z: Vat. Syr. 121 (AD 1576), ff. 110rb-111va. In all these manuscripts the text is attributed to Macarius. There is only one manuscript from the 13th century (Berlin Sachau 352); however, where the text remained under the name of John the Solitary, which seems – this time not erroneously as in the case of John of Apamea – to refer to John of Lycopolis,¹¹⁵ whose words are recorded in the first chapter of the *HMA*.¹¹⁶ Edition: S: W. STROTHMANN, *Makarios*, p. 213-220.

Among the Syriac versions of the *HMA* it is **R3** which shows the greatest uncertainty. The text of its unique manuscript seems to be corrupted in several places, and because of some damage of the parchment sometimes it is almost impossible to read the text. This damage must have occurred very early on, because a later hand tries to strengthen or supply the damaged places in the text.¹¹⁷ The reconstruction of the text of that short passage, for which the manuscripts of the *Third Letter of Macarius of Alexandria* provides useful parallels, is also problematic because the texts of its codices are also quite different. Nevertheless, the text of our manuscript *C* seems to stand closest to the readings shared by the manuscripts *HVF* of Strothmann, but especially *F* (Add. 14582), from AD 816.

Despite these textual difficulties, however, **R3** is a very interesting version, and, even if we focus our attention on *HMA I*, there are some important features of the text which are well worthy of attention.

4. A.) Character of the translation

On the basis of the criteria outlined by Sebastian Brock, **R3** seems to be the most archaic version among the extant four Syriac translations of the *HMA*, showing a

114 See the references by W. STROTHMANN, *Johannes von Apamea*, (*Patristische Texte und Studien*, 11), Walter de Gruyter, 1972, p. 38.

115 Cf. STROTHMANN, *Johannes von Apamea* (n. 114.), p. 37-38.

116 Strothmann in his edition of the letter in 1981 has managed to identify the passage as deriving from the *HMA* 'in freier Übersetzung, die nicht mit der von Ananjesus [s. c. 'Enanisho'] identisch ist' (STROTHMANN, *Johannes von Apamea* (n. 114.), p. 37-38). However, the last passages of the letter he published as a curious addition to the translation, although it is only the Syriac **R3** of the *HMA* which closely corresponds to the text in the manuscript *C* of the recension.

117 However, sometimes this 'correction' means a deformation of the original, so e. g. in the case of *HMA I*. § 43, where the text of the *Paradise* was copied in the place left blank. (*C*, f. 37va).

great number of features observed in connection with early Syriac translations. **R3** apparently shows an easily recognizable 'reader-oriented' character. The translator often adds comments to his translations in order to explain the meaning of the original. This expository character of **R3** is most conspicuous if we compare it with **R1**,¹¹⁸ for example in the case of the chapter on Evagrius (HMA XX. § 15).

Greek	Syriac R1	Syriac R3
τῶν Ἑλλήνων τοὺς φιλοσόφους ἀπεστόμιζεν HMA (G) XX, § 15 (FESTUGIÈRE, p. 123, line 83.)	ܟܪܘܡܠܝܬܐ ܟܪܘܥܝܘܬܐ ܟܘܢܐ HMA(S ^{R1}) XX, § 15 (A, f. 51va.)	ܟܘܢܐܐ ܟܘܨܬܐܐ ܟܘܥܡܠܘܬܐ ܟܘܠܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܝܨܪܝܚܐ ܡܫܘܥ ܡܫܘܬܘܬܐ HMA(S ^{R3}) XX, § 15 (A, f. 64rb.)
He shut the mouths of the Greek philosophers	He shut the mouths of the pagan philosophers.	He put the Greek philosophers and wise men to silence and astonished them with the teaching of his knowledge.

We can see how the translator of **R3** tries to explain the sense of the word 'philosopher' by the explanation that philosophers were 'the wise men of the Greeks'. As is evident from the passage above, the text of **R3** is much more complicated than the Greek original or its Syriac translation in **R1**. **R3** uses two or more Syriac phrases for one single Greek word. Thus, for example, where the Greek says that Evagrius 'shut the mouths of the heathen philosophers', **R3** gives a much longer version, a whole narrative about how 'he put the Greek philosophers and wise men to silence and he astonished them with the teaching of his knowledge'.

Sometimes the translator behind **R3** approaches the text on an obvious Biblical basis in the hope that with the Biblical references added it sounds more familiar to his intended readers. As for example in the case of HMA I. § 23, where the phrase 'lest an alien thought should come'¹¹⁹ is rendered with terms¹²⁰ borrowed possibly from Eph 4, 27.¹²¹ Sometimes there are whole passages transformed, for example, by changing the original narrative character to indirect speech, as, for example, in HMA I. § 29.

Greek	Syriac R1	Syriac R2	Syriac R3
Δεῖ τὸν θάνατον ὡς περ μετὰ θείῃ ἀγαθῆς ζωῆς περιμένειν καὶ	ܟܘܢ ܕܐܠܐ ܡܝܬܐ ܟܘܠܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܟܘܥܡܠܘܬܐ ܟܘܠܘܬܐ ܟܘܢ ܡܘܬܐ ܟܘܠܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܟܘܥܡܠܘܬܐ	ܟܘܢ ܐܡܘ ܟܘܠܐܐ ܟܘܠܘܬܐ ܕܘܠܘܟܘܬܐ ܟܘܠܘܬܐ ܟܘܢ ܟܘܥܡܠܘܬܐ ܟܘܠܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܟܘܥܡܠܘܬܐ	ܟܘܠܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܐ ܟܘܢ ܟܘܠܘܬܐ ܟܘܢ ܟܘܥܡܠܘܬܐ ܟܘܠܘܬܐ ܕܘܠܘܟܘܬܐ ܟܘܢ ܟܘܠܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܟܘܥܡܠܘܬܐ

118 The chapter on Evagrius is unfortunately missing in both **R2** and **R4**.
 119 FESTUGIÈRE, p. 17, lines 143-144.: μὴ ἕτερός τις παρεισελθὼν λογισμὸς)
 120 C, f. 35ra: ܟܘܢ ܕܐܠܐ ܟܘܠܘܬܐ ܟܘܢ ܕܐܠܐ ܟܘܠܘܬܐ ܟܘܢ ܕܐܠܐ ܟܘܠܘܬܐ ܟܘܢ.
 121 Eph 4, 27 (*Peshitta*): 'do not give place to evil' ܟܘܢ ܕܐܠܐ ܟܘܠܘܬܐ ܟܘܢ.

<p>μη̄ προορᾶν ἀσθενείαν σωματικὴν καὶ μη̄ ἐμπιπλᾶν κᾶν τῶν τυξόντων γούν τὴν γαστέρα. HMA (G) I, § 29 (FESTUGIÈRE, p. 19, lines 174-177.)</p>	<p>ܠܘ ܕܘܡܘܢ ܩܘܠܝ ܘܡܘܬܘܢ ܩܘܠܝ ܕܘܡܘܬܘܢ ܩܘܠܝ ܕܘܡܘܬܘܢ ܩܘܠܝ ܕܘܡܘܬܘܢ ܩܘܠܝ ܕܘܡܘܬܘܢ ܩܘܠܝ HMA(S^{R1}) I, § 29 (A, f. 7vb.)</p>	<p>ܕܠܘܢ ܕܘܡܘܢ ܩܘܠܝ ܕܠܘܢ ܕܘܡܘܢ ܩܘܠܝ ܕܠܘܢ ܕܘܡܘܢ ܩܘܠܝ ܕܠܘܢ ܕܘܡܘܢ ܩܘܠܝ ܕܠܘܢ ܕܘܡܘܢ ܩܘܠܝ ܕܠܘܢ ܕܘܡܘܢ ܩܘܠܝ HMA(S^{R2}) I, § 29 (B, f. 49vb.)</p>	<p>ܕܠܘܢ ܕܘܡܘܢ ܩܘܠܝ ܕܠܘܢ ܕܘܡܘܢ ܩܘܠܝ ܕܠܘܢ ܕܘܡܘܢ ܩܘܠܝ ܕܠܘܢ ܕܘܡܘܢ ܩܘܠܝ ܕܠܘܢ ܕܘܡܘܢ ܩܘܠܝ ܕܠܘܢ ܕܘܡܘܢ ܩܘܠܝ HMA(S^{R3}) I, § 29 (C, f. 35rb.)</p>
<p>One should await death as a transition to a happy life and not look ahead to the feebleness of the body and ones should not fill the belly even with ordinary things</p>	<p>Every discerning man should await his decease from this world as if he would approach a happy life and should not put before his eyes the feebleness of body; nor should he fill his belly even with things which he has.</p>	<p>We should, then, my children, continuously await death as Christ who will lead us unto a happy life and should not imagine in our mind bodily feeblenesses and we should not fill our belly not even with what we have.</p>	<p>He related about himself how much he waits for the sleep of death, [because] it makes his soul happy and he looks on it without sorrow and receives it as a gift of life, because he does not have any fear or sorrow as other people have.</p>

Here we can see how much **R3** diverges from the Greek in comparison with the other Syriac versions which – except for some slight changes – give a more or less literal translation. Sometimes the translator of **R3** makes use of a comparison that makes his translation a new text seemingly independent of the original or its Syriac counterparts in **R1** and **R2**.¹²² A good example for this special expository character of the **R3** is to be found in HMA I. § 25-26a.¹²³

Greek	Syriac R3
<p>Never let be the memory of any of your relatives when one prays, or the recollection of some happy experience or of any other emotion, or even the remembrance of the world itself as a whole. Otherwise the entire undertaking becomes pointless when, in conversing with the Lord, one is seduced by opposing thoughts. § 26. Everyone who has not renounced the world fully and com-</p>	<p>Never let there come any family or kinsfolk of the transitory world in your heart by the time you pray to your Lord. Purify your hearts of all anxieties in order that your supplication may not be hindered in its request. Just as the servant does who, speaking with his master, recollects his mind from every wandering, so that he could answer readily to everything asked by his mas-</p>

122 On this feature typical of early translations cp. BROCK, “Basil’s Homily on Deut.” (n. 47), p. 63-64.

123 See the edition of this particular passage in all three (**R1**, **R2**, **R3**) Syriac versions in the Appendix at the end of this article.

case where the Syriac particle he uses coincides with the Greek,¹²⁸ while his other solutions seem completely independent from the original.

The same ‘reader-oriented’ character is attested also by the frequent use of ‘dynamic equivalences’ in rendering certain Greek phrases or ideas. For example, in several cases **R3** chooses a special Syriac phrase to render a Greek concept. The Greek ‘world’, for example, is changed to ‘this transitory world’ in the translation,¹²⁹ while the Greek ‘ascetic practice’ is expressed by the well-known early Syriac phrase for monasticism as ‘the beautiful life of the mourners’.¹³⁰ It is also because of this concern that some adjectives are rendered together with a Semitic complementary form ‘in our eyes’ or ‘in your eyes’, familiar from the Bible.¹³¹

Moreover **R3** shows some further features considered as peculiarities of early translations, such as the use of the same word (ܣܬܪܐ) for ‘life’ and ‘salvation’.¹³² The more archaic, longer form of the first person plural of the personal pronoun which also occurs several times in the text of **R3** in its manuscript *C*,¹³³ while in **R1** and **R2 I** could not find any occurrence of this longer form.¹³⁴

The Biblical quotations in **R3** seem to follow the *Peshitta* in the case of the New Testament, and do not betray any impact of the Old Syriac in the text. Citations from the Old Testament are treated similarly to the method used by **R2** inasmuch as it is the *Peshitta* which is quoted even in cases when the quoted verse does not completely fit into the context. Otherwise the quotations are treated quite freely in the translation, sometimes they are quoted differently from the one in the Greek original,¹³⁵ while there are some cases where they totally escape the attention of the translator.¹³⁶

128 E. g. in HMA I. § 31.

129 HMA I. § 25: ܘܗܘܐ ܗܘܢܐ ܗܘܢܐ. The one which occurs very often in the *Liber Graduum* (e. g. *Patr. Syr.* I/3, 32,20-21; 236,4; 317,16), see: BROCK, *Isaac of Niniveh* (n. 90), p. 135. See the Syriac texts for this passage in the Appendix.

130 As a translation of *περί ἀσκήσεως* in HMA I. § 29 (FESTUGIÈRE, p. 19, line 174.) as ܘܗܘܐ ܗܘܢܐ ܗܘܢܐ. On the term see: E. BECK, “Beitrag zur Terminologie des ältesten syrischen Mönchtums”, *Studia Anselmiana*, 38 (1956), p. 262-264.

131 HMA I. § 22, where the original ‘praiseworthy’ (ἐπαινον) is translated as ‘praiseworthy in your eyes’ (ܘܗܘܐ ܗܘܢܐ ܗܘܢܐ). Occurrences of the form in the Old Testament are among others: *Ps* 118, 23 or *Is* 49, 5; *Jer* 26, 14; *Zach* 11, 12. See also: S. P. BROCK, “Aspects of Translation Technique” (n. 47), p. 72.

132 As for example in the phrase in HMA I. § 22 ‘to attain salvation’ (ܘܗܘܐ ܗܘܢܐ ܗܘܢܐ) or in § 26 ‘God, our Saviour’ (ܘܗܘܐ ܗܘܢܐ ܗܘܢܐ). On the term of life see: O. KLEIN, *Syrisch-griechisches Wörterbuch zu den vier kanonischen Evangelien*, Giessen, 1916, p. 12-14. and F. KLIJN, “The Term ‘Life’ in Syriac Theology”, *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 5 (1952), p. 390-397.

133 As in § 29 and § 24 or *C*, f. 33vb (bis).

134 On the significance of this form of the pronoun see: BROCK, “Basil’s homily on Deut.” (n. 47), p. 64. and J. GRIBOMONT, *Histoire du texte des ascétiques de S. Basile*, Louvain, 1953, p. 109. note 7.

135 It is HMA I. § 29, where the Psalm 54 is cited in a longer form as in the Greek text.

136 In the Greek text of HMA I. § 24 the *Gal* 2, 4 (‘to spy out our liberty’) is alluded which was not recognized by **R3** (clearly misunderstanding the sentence as ‘to deprive our liberty of its zeal’), while in **R1** and **R2** the quotation is borrowed from the *Peshitta*.

As for the monastic terminology used in **R3**, the same ‘reader-oriented’ character can be observed, as in the case of some of its other features. This means that in translating a single Greek ascetic term, a ‘native Syriac’ phrase or concept is generally used. There are hardly any examples found which show the influence of the terminology of the Evagrian translations, elements of which were observed in connection with **R2**. A typical example of this ‘native Syriac terminology’ is the above-mentioned translation of ‘ascetic practice’ as ‘life of the mourner’,¹³⁷ but there are still several such cases. A further example is the translation of the concept of ‘spiritual fall’ by the phrase ‘to be captured by’,¹³⁸ which occurs in the same sense in the works of John the Solitary.¹³⁹ John’s works also offer parallel phrases for the idea of ‘being empty’, often used by **R3** in an ascetic context for being free from possessions,¹⁴⁰ but the origin of this expression may go back to the *Liber Graduum*,¹⁴¹ where we can find numerous examples for it.¹⁴² There is another expression which can also be explained by the aid of John’s terminology: a curious phrase used for the vision of the mind in the following context: ‘we can see God, our Savior by the hidden eye of our mind’.¹⁴³ The term for ‘the eye of the mind’ was already used by Ephrem, but it is Evagrius who makes frequent use of it.¹⁴⁴ In the Evagrian writings, however, it is generally an adjectival form which is especially favoured (νοερός ὀφθαλμός);¹⁴⁵ and this is usually mirrored by a similar adjectival expression in the Syriac translations.¹⁴⁶ **R3** appears to have the same idea as Evagrius for the vision of God in the mind, but it uses ܠܘܚܘܢ instead of ܠܘܥܢ of the Evagrian translations; with the addition of the adjective ‘hidden’. The phrase ‘hidden eye’ seems to echo the language of John the Solitary, who often

137 See above n. 130.

138 HMA I. § 22 (FESTUGIÈRE, p. 17, line 135: μή... ἰκανῶς ἔχειν δόξητε), where the Greek ‘do not think that it is enough’ is translated as ‘do not let your mind be captured by it’ (C, f. 34vb: ܘܠܘܚܘܢ ܠܘܥܢܘܢܐ).

139 A very similar expression occurs in one of his treatises: ܠܘܚܘܢ ܠܘܥܢܘܢܐ ܘܠܘܚܘܢ ܠܘܥܢܘܢܐ. See: L. G. RIGNELL, *Drei Traktate von Johannes dem Einsiedler (Johannes von Apameia)*, (Lund Universitets Årsskrift, N. F., Avd. 1, Bd. 54, Nr. 4), Lund, 1960, p. 4*.

140 HMA I. § 26: ‘let us be free of the possessions of transitory things’ (ܠܘܚܘܢ ܠܘܥܢܘܢܐ ܘܠܘܚܘܢ ܠܘܥܢܘܢܐ), see the edition of the Syriac versions of this passage in the appendix. Cf. John the Solitary in S. DEDERING, *Johannes von Lykopolis. Ein Dialog über die Seele und die Affekte des Menschen*, Leiden, 1936, p. 6-7 or RIGNELL, *Drei Traktate* (n. 139.), p. 4*.

141 S. P. BROCK, *The Syriac Fathers on Prayer and the Spiritual Life*, Kalamazoo, 1987, p. 79-80.

142 In *Patrologia Syriaca* 4, 285, 3-5; 313, 23-24 (ܠܘܚܘܢ ܠܘܥܢܘܢܐ ... ܠܘܚܘܢ ܠܘܥܢܘܢܐ) very similarly to the form used in **R3** (ܠܘܚܘܢ ܠܘܥܢܘܢܐ ܘܠܘܚܘܢ ܠܘܥܢܘܢܐ).

143 HMA I. § 26: ܠܘܚܘܢ ܠܘܥܢܘܢܐ ܘܠܘܚܘܢ ܠܘܥܢܘܢܐ. Cf. The edition of this passage is in the Appendix.

144 BROCK, *Isaac of Niniveh* (n. 90), p. 152.

145 E. g. Evagrius, *De oratione* 29 (PG 79, col. 1173A).

146 As in the Syriac translation of the above mentioned passage as ܠܘܚܘܢ ܠܘܥܢܘܢܐ I. HAUSHERR, “Le „De oratione” d’Évagre le Pontique en syriaque et en arabe”, *OCP*, 5 (1939), p. 15.

Even at first glance it is conspicuous how complicated is the way in which **R3** tries to translate the Greek; however it still seems obvious that the aforementioned Evagrian term, the 'knowledge of the things that exist' is present in **R3**, too, but in a more complicated form than in **R2**. Moreover, it is also interesting to note that in two places **R3** is similar to the Latin against the Greek. Instead of the Greek 'to see the mysteries of God' it has, together with the Latin ('mysteria Dei agnoscet'), 'to know the hidden mysteries of God'. At the same time it is also a common feature of the two versions that the note of the Greek that 'like the saints and makes signs' is equally missing both in **R3** and in the Latin of Rufinus.

It is very hard, then, to make a judgement on the critical value of **R3**. As was observed concerning its character, **R3** seems to be the most archaic translation among the Syriac versions so, representing an early stage in the textual history of the work, it could be very important for some problems of the textual history, too. However, if one compares it with the Greek and Latin texts, it becomes clear that very often it is **R3** itself which needs the support of the other versions in order to be interpreted in a satisfactory manner. Its text, therefore, can hardly be used as a trustworthy control material in connection with the Greek and Latin versions, although it does preserve some passages in where the tradition of the 'aberrants' seems to be manifested in the same manner as in its chapter-sequence. At the same time it also presents some slight (sometimes very obscure) similarities with the Latin of Rufinus, but it is especially in conjunction with the other Syriac versions that **R3** can be used most successfully as a useful *tertium comparationis*.

5.) The fourth Syriac translation

The fourth recension of the Syriac versions of the *HMA* was probably put in last place by Preuschen because of its fragmentary condition. There are only three chapters of the work which are preserved in **R4**. These are all connected with a special selection of stories from the *HMA* and the *HL* mentioned above in connection with **R1**, which was named 'Collection of Eighteen Narratives' (Recueil de dix-huit histoires or *RecXVIII*) by Draguet in his analysis of the Syriac tradition of the *HL*. The main part of this collection (thirteen stories) consists of chapters of the *HL* supplemented with the *Vita Pauli* of Jerome and three chapters from the *HMA* in an independent translation.¹⁵⁶ The three chapters (*HMA* I; X; XI) were listed by Preuschen as witnesses to the fourth recension,¹⁵⁷ but his statement was challenged by Butler. In his note on a manuscript of **R4** (London: BL: Add. 17177, listed below as *F*), he writes that Preuschen was wrong in supposing that the chapters deriving from the *HMA* belong to **R4**, because 'it is only the Life of John of Lycopolis, which immediately precedes them, that belongs to Version IV

¹⁵⁶ See above p. 67.

¹⁵⁷ PREUSCHEN, *Palladius und Rufinus* (n. 12.), p. 157.

(**R4**), whereas the others are from the first Syriac translation.¹⁵⁸ However, a comparison of these chapters with the corresponding ones in the manuscripts of **R1a-b** clearly proves that the texts in manuscript *F* belong to an independent recension, which is **R4** just as Preuschen had stated. The cause of Butler's error probably lies in the fact that it was this particular translation of HMA X and XI which he found among the *HMA*-sections of the *Paradise* of 'Enanisho', which he considered to belong to **R1** as a whole. Therefore it seemed obvious for him that these passages of the *Eighteen Narratives* (HMA X; XI), together with the other *HMA*-chapters in the *Paradise*, belong to **R1**, too. However, for the text of *HMA I* in the manuscript *F* was apparently different from the version of the *Paradise*, so it was only this single chapter what he took as witness to another, independent recension, that is **R4**. Nevertheless, if he had compared the texts of HMA X, XI in the manuscripts of **R1a-b** with their equivalents in manuscript *F*, he would have realized that they were completely different from each other and would have assumed that Preuschen was completely right in considering the whole *HMA*-section of *RecXVIII* as an independent translation, that is **R4**.

R4, then, has preserved portions from three chapters (HMA I; X; XI) in two different groups of manuscripts, all of which are connected with the '*Collection of Eighteen Narratives*'.

R4a: The material preserved in the original, shorter form of the *RecXVIII* containing only the eighteen stories without any supplements. The collection in this form has three chapters (I, §§ 1-21, 31; X; XI) of the *HMA* as Narrative 14; 15; 16.

Manuscripts: D: Sinai syr. 46, fol. 70ra-107vb (AD. 534); F: London: BL: Add. 17177, fol. 86rb-102vb. (6th c.)

R4b: The augmented form of the *RecXVIII*, supplemented with passages of the *HL* and chapters excerpted from the **R1** version of the *HMA* (**R1c**). Only chapters X and XI of **R4** are present in this group of the manuscripts, because they do not occur among the additional passages. However, the first chapter on John of Lycopolis, narrative 14 in the original form of the collection, being a part of the later supplement, was omitted here, in order to avoid repetition.

Manuscripts: E: London: BL: Add. 12173, fol. 51ra-54vb (6th c.); G: London: BL: Add. 14579, fol. 138ra-143va (AD 913) and Sinai syr. 23, fol. 55va-60vb.

Unfortunately the text of HMA I is very fragmentary in this translation, and the most important theological part (§§ 23-30) of the narrative, forming the main scope of the present paper, is missing in it, together with the second anecdote narrated by John of Lycopolis to his visitors. Therefore a critical evaluation of this recension should be based upon a deeper examination of the other two remaining chapters (the HMA X-XI) of the *HMA* which are extant in their entirety.

158 BUTLER, *The Lausiatic History* (n. 28.), p. 267, n. 1.

Nevertheless, it seems certain that **R4** is also quite an early translation, being already present in manuscripts stemming from the beginning of the sixth century (as *F* from AD 534) which was expanded by other additions of **R1c** which is already present in manuscripts of the sixth century.. It appears also probable that **R4**, along with the other pieces of the *RecXVIII*, is an independent Syriac translation of a Greek collection of narratives and the translator, in the case of the chapters deriving from the *HMA*, did not make use of any already existing translations of the work, but translated the whole text from the Greek again.¹⁵⁹

6.) Conclusions

The situation in the case of the Syriac versions of the *HMA*, then, as it emerges from this preliminary investigation is very similar to the case of the Syriac material of the *HL*. There are four different Syriac translations of the work, all of them stemming from a quite early period in comparison with the Greek manuscript tradition. Of these versions it is **R3** which seems to be the earliest one, possibly dating from the second half of the fifth century, whereas the other two (**R1** and **R2**) are apparently slightly later translations. **R1** is presumably from the late fifth and early sixth century, since its earliest manuscript is dated to 532 AD and **R2** probably comes from the early sixth century as its two oldest manuscripts are dated at 569 and 587. The position of **R4**, due to its very fragmentary condition, can hardly be exactly fixed, but it also seems an early translation, as the earliest manuscript is from 534 AD.

R3, being the earliest witness to the *HMA*, after the Latin of Rufinus made around 397 AD, ideally would be an important tool for dealing with the textual problems of the work. However, because of its very free and paraphrastic translation, only a little use can be made of it. Nevertheless, in so far as its text can be compared to the Greek, it contains some features which reflect readings deriving from group *v* of the 'aberrants', and also its sequence of chapters is the same as that of the group *p* of the 'aberrants' – thus it offers a proof of the early origin of these textual families. Furthermore, some similarities are found also with the Latin of Rufinus, drawing attention to the fact that further examination of **R3** can possibly grant some explanation for the 'additions' in Rufinus' text.

Of the remaining Syriac translations of the work, **R1** and **R2** are equally important, **R1** is an early witness to the 'vulgate' form of the text, preserving some readings also from the 'aberrants', but offering no parallel to the peculiarities of the Latin. However, as a quite close and faithful translation of the Greek, it should be

159 A similar phenomenon was observed by Muyltermans in the case of some Syriac collections of Evagrian writings, which are possibly new and independent translations of a particular Greek collection leading, then, to the birth of new Syriac recensions. See: MUYLDERMANS, *Evagriana Syriaca* (n. 88), p. 28.

used for a new critical edition of the Greek text, promised by Schulz-Flügel, and with the aid of its manuscripts it is an important source for the reconstruction of the origin and textual history of the *Paradise* of ʿEnanishoʿ, too.

The Syriac **R2** seems important in all the above-mentioned respects, but it also represents the main features of the so-called *p* group of the ‘aberrants’, provides a very early witness to this form of text and offers parallels to some readings in the Latin version, too. Moreover, even some theological ‘additions’ of the Latin which are absent in the Greek tradition, can be found in **R2**. With the aid of the Syriac **R2** an interesting method of expurgating the Greek text by substituting the suspicious theological terms with colorless pronouns can also be reconstructed. An observation which seems to confirm the view of Hammond Bammel concerning an early ‘reworking’ of the Greek text. Nevertheless, **R2** seems to be important also in connection with the history of Syriac translation-technique, for it preserves parallels to the terminology known from the so-called *S2* recension of the Evagrian translations, thus proving that this tradition of Syriac ascetic and monastic terminology was widely used by the translators at a certain stage of Syriac literary history.

Appendix
Sample Passages from the Syriac Versions of HMA I.

Table of Sigla

The Greek text

Critical edition:

A. J. FESTUGIÈRE, *Historia Monachorum in Aegypto. Édition critique du texte grec et traduction annotée*, (*Subsidia Hagiographica*, 53), Bruxelles, 1971, p. 17-19.

Manuscripts

‘Vulgate’ recension

Family *x*

*C*¹ Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale: Coislinianus 83 (9th c.), ff. 266r-322v.

Family *y*

L Leiden: Universiteitsbibliotheek: Vossianus Fol. 46 (9th c.), ff. 78v-115r

*P*³ Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale: Parisinus gr. 1600 (11th c.), ff. 141v-191v.

‘Aberrants’

Single manuscripts

*C*² Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale: Coislinianus 282 (11-12th c.), ff. 137v-149r.

*P*² Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale: Parisinus gr. 1628 (14th c.), ff. 144r-244v.

*P*⁵ Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale: Parisinus gr. 1627 (13th c.), ff. 180r-199v.

Family *v*

*V*¹ Vienna: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek: hist. gr. 84 (11th c.), ff. 89r-97r.

*V*² Vienna: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek: hist. gr. 9. (14th c.), ff. 213r-230v.

*P*⁰ Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale: Parisinus gr. 1532 (13th c.), p. 368-386.

Family *p*

*P*⁶ Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale: Parisinus gr. 1596 (11th c.), p. 162-215.

*P*⁷ Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale: Parisinus gr. 1597 (12-13th c.), ff. 53v-61r.

The Latin text

Critical edition

E. SCHULZ-FLÜGEL, *Tyrannius Rufinus Historia Monachorum sive De vitis sanctorum patrum*. (*Patristische Texte und Untersuchungen*, 34) Walter de Gruyter, 1990.

The Syriac text

R 1

R1a *A* London: BL: Add. 17176 (AD 532), ff. 7va-9vb.

R1b *I* London: BL: Add. 12175 (AD 534?), ff. 202ra-202vb.

R1d *P* *Paradise* = BEDJAN: *AMS*, VII), pp. 340-345.

Bu BUDGE, *Lady Meux*2, London, 1904, pp. 353-357.

R 2

- R2a** *B* London: BL: Add. 14609 (AD 587?), ff. 48vb-50vb.
W London: BL: Add. 14646 (6th c.), ff. 88v-89v.
R2b *H* London: BL: Add. 14732 (13th c.), ff. 161rb-162va.

R 3

- R3a** *C* London: BL: Add. 14650 (6th c.), ff. 34rb-35vb.
R3b *S* The critical edition of the Letter 3 of Macarius of Alexandria in
 W. STROTHMANN, *Makarios*, pp. 216-220.

Manuscripts of Strothmann

- S^V Berlin: Staatsbibliothek: Sachau 352 (13th century), ff. 104v-105v.
 S^B Sharfet 38 (AD 1466).
 S^E Rome: BAV: Vat. Syr. 122 (AD 769), ff. 266-269.
 S^F London: BL: Add. 14.582 (AD 816), ff. 109v-112r.
 S^I London: BL Add. 18.184 (9th century), ff. 201v-202r.
 S^S Rome: BAV: Vat. Syr. 126 (AD 1223), ff. 271r-273v.
 S^W Birmingham: University Library: Mingana Syriac 330 (13th century), ff. 149v-153v.

