

MALCOLM CHOAT

PAPNOUTHIOS IN *SB* I 2266: NEW MAN OR NEW PATRON?

aus: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 133 (2000) 157–162

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



PAPNOUTHIOS IN *SB I 2266*: NEW MAN OR NEW PATRON?\*

*SB I 2266*<sup>1</sup> is a letter on papyrus dating to the mid-fourth century, written by a certain Justinus to a holy man, Papnouthios. It was edited by Deissmann in his first volume of papyri from Heidelberg in 1905,<sup>2</sup> later appearing in the collections of Christian letters by Ghedini and Naldini.<sup>3</sup> Although the letter is virtually complete except for the opening greetings, a lacuna at the end of line 6 has produced difficulties of interpretation. Although the right emendation (with a small variation which shall be noted) has been proposed, not only has this not been widely noticed, but its implications have not been explored. It is the purpose of this note to comment on these.

The text runs as follows:<sup>4</sup>

	-----	
	η. [. . . γρα]φῆν[α]ι π[ρὸς τὴν]	... to write to
	σὴν χρ[ησιμ]ότηταν, κύριέ μου	your clemency, my beloved
	ἀγαπῆτέ· πιστεύομεν γὰρ	lord. For we believe that
	τὴν πολιτίαν[σ]ου ἐν οὐρανῶ.	your citizenship is in heaven.
5	ἐγὶθεν θεοροῦμέν σε τὸν	Hence we regard you as
	δεσπότην καὶ κενὸν ἀ[ ]ρωπ.	master and new ...
	ἵνα οὐκ μὴ πολλὰ γράφω κα[ί]τι	In order that I not play the fool
	φλυραρήσω, ἐν γὰρ [πο]λλῇ	through multiplying words – for in
	λαλιᾷ οὐκ ἐκφεύξοντ[αι]	many words they shall not escape
10	<τ>ῆ<ν> ἀμαρτίη(ν), παρακαλῶ [ο]ῦν,	sin – thus I beseech you,
	δέσποτα, ἵνα μνημον[ε]ύης	master, to remember
	μοι εἰς τὰς ἀγίας σου εὐχὰς ἵ-	me in your holy prayers in order
	να δυνηθῶμεν μέρος τῶν <ἀμ->	that I might be able (to have) a share
	αρτιῶν καθαρίσεως. εἰς γὰρ	in the cleansing of sins. For I am
15	ἡμεῖς τῶν ἀμαρτουλῶν. παρακα-	one of the sinners. I beg that
	λῶ καταξίωσον δέξασθαι	you deem it worthy to accept
	τὸ μικρὸν ἐλέου διὰ τοῦ ἀδελ-	the little (gift) of oil through our
	φοῦ ἡμῶν Μαγαρίου. πολλὰ	brother Makarios. I give many
	προσαγορεύ<ω> πάντες τοὺς ἀ-	greetings to all our
20	δελφούς ἡμῶν ἐν κ(υρί)ῳ. ἔρρω-	brothers in the Lord. May
	μένον σε ἡ θεί-	divine providence
	α πρόνοι<α> διαφυλάξαι[ι]	guard you in health
	ἐπὶ μέγιστον χρό-	for a great number of
	νον ἐν κ(υρί)ῳ Χ(ριστ)ῶ,	years in the Lord Christ,
25	κύριε ἀγαπητ[έ].	beloved lord.

\* An earlier version of this paper was presented at a seminar at Macquarie University on the occasion of a visit by Paul Weaver. I would like to thank the participants for their comments, especially Dr T. V. Evans, Dr C. E. V. Nixon and Emeritus Professor E. A. Judge.

<sup>1</sup> The text has also been commonly referred to as *P. Heid. I 6*.

<sup>2</sup> *Die Septuaginta-Papyri*, ed. A. Deissmann (Heidelberg, 1905 = *Pap. Heid. I*) no. 6.

<sup>3</sup> G. Ghedini, *Lettere cristiane dai papiri greci del III e del IV secolo* (Milan, 1923) no. 25; M. Naldini, *Il cristianesimo in Egitto* (2nd ed.; Florence, 1998) no. 41 with pp. 439–40; The text is also reproduced in A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, trans. L. R. M. Strachen (4th ed. 1923; rp. Michigan, 1978) no. 23, and C. Wessely, *Les plus anciens monuments du christianisme*, I (Paris, 1906) 139ff.

<sup>4</sup> The text given here is based on that of Naldini, except that the word at the end of l. 6 has been left unresolved and some subsequent emendations have been noted. I have checked it against a photograph kindly supplied by the Universität Heidelberg.

τῷ κυρίῳ μου καὶ ἀγαπητῷ ἀδελφῷ Παπνουθίῳ χρηστοφόρῳ παρ' Ἰουστίνου

To my lord and beloved brother Papnouthios Christbearer, from Justinus.

1 ἦ[ν ἔδει ed. pr. 3 l. ἀγαπητέ 4 l. πολιτείαν, ἐν 5 l. ἐκεῖθεν θεωροῦμεν 7 l. καινόν l. κοινόν Wessely α[.]ρωπ  
 . : <τ>ά[τ]ρω[να] Deissmann <τ>άτρωνα Naldini ἄ<ν>[θ]ρωπ[ον] Schubart ατρωπο[ν l. ἄνθρωπον Kramer & Shelton  
 9 l. φλυαρήσω 10 pap. ἀμαρτίῃ l. ἀμαρτίαν l. αἱ ἀμαρτίαι Naldini 12 l. μου 13 sc. ἔχειν, λαβεῖν *vel sim.* l. τῶν  
 15 l. εἰμι τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν 17 l. ἐλαίου 18 l. Μακαρίου 19 l. προσαγορεύ<ω> πάντα 20 pap. κῶ 21–22 l.  
 θεία 22 pap. πρόνοι δι<sup>α</sup>φύλάξαι[ι], Sijpesteijn, see *BL* 9, 236 πρόνοια φύλάξαι[ι] ed. pr 24 pap. κῶ χῶ 26  
 Χρηστοφόρ[ου] ed. pr.

Overall, the sense of the letter is clear. It is written by one Justinus to his ‘lord and beloved brother’ Papnouthios. It is perhaps one of the most overtly Christian fourth-century letters, containing the name of Christ (24), relatively rare in fourth-century papyrus letters,<sup>5</sup> *nomina sacra* for κύριος and Χριστός (20, 24), and, in several places, phraseology reminiscent or directly reflective of both the New and Old Testament.<sup>6</sup> From the manner in which Justinus addresses Papnouthios the latter is clearly regarded as an exceptionally holy individual: the assertion that Papnouthios’ ‘citizenship is in heaven’ (4), the request to be remembered in Papnouthios’ prayers (11–12) and the title given to Papnouthios, Χρηστοφόρος, ‘Christbearer’ (26),<sup>7</sup> combine to suggest that Papnouthios is a monk of high standing. H. I. Bell’s suggested identification of him with the Papnouthios who receives *P. Lond.* VI 1923–1929 (see *P. Lond.* VI, pp. 101–2) has been accepted by all commentators.<sup>8</sup> Both men were clearly regarded as extremely holy monks, and they are both given the same epithet, Χρηστοφόρος.<sup>9</sup> As regards Justinus, the deference he displays towards Papnouthios suggests he is a lay Christian.<sup>10</sup>

The focus here is on the end of line 6, which ends a clause begun in the previous line. The difficulties are presented by the last word: Deissmann saw α[.]ρωπ[.], and (for reasons to be discussed below) resolved this as πάτρωνα. The only alternative suggestion was provided by Schubart,<sup>11</sup> followed recently by Bärbel Kramer and John Shelton: ἄνθρωπον.<sup>12</sup>

Despite the difficulties of the reading, the restoration πάτρωνα has been retained by nearly every commentator on this papyrus since Deissmann,<sup>13</sup> giving the sense of ‘hence we regard you as master and new patron’. Naldini’s acceptance of this reading in his *Il cristianesimo*, the most accessible and best known edition, has meant that the reading has found its way into general discussions of monasticism.<sup>14</sup> However, not only is this reading palaeographically unlikely, but the examples of the

<sup>5</sup> See e.g. *P. Lond.* VI 1919.14,15,17; 1921.10; 1926.4; *P. Oxy.* LVI 3862.7; *SB* VI 9605.5.

<sup>6</sup> See the discussion below, p. 162.

<sup>7</sup> Line 26. In Greek papyri the title occurs apart from here only in *P. Lond.* VI 1926 and *P. Neph.* 11. For the related phrase in Coptic, εΤΦΟΡΕΙ ΜΠΕΧΣ, see *O. CrumST* 175.14; 328.3–4; 361.8; cf. *P. Neph.* p. 70, n. 7, with additional references.

<sup>8</sup> See e.g., H. Hauben, The Melitian ‘Church of the Martyrs’. Christian Dissenters in Ancient Egypt, *Ancient History in a Modern University*, edd. T. W. Hillard et al. (Sydney, 1998) vol. 2, 329–49, at 330 n. 8.

<sup>9</sup> The suggestion by B. Kramer and J. Shelton in their introduction to the Melitian monastic archive of Nephros (*P. Neph.*) that Papnouthios was attached to the Melitian community at Hathor has been widely accepted, eg. J. E. Goehring, Monastic Diversity and Ideological Boundaries in Fourth-Century Christian Egypt, *JECS* 5 (1997) 61–83, at 389, n. 8; R. S. Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity* (Princeton, 1993) 308 with n. 274; H. Hauben, Jean Arkhaph, évêque de Memphis, dans la catalogue mélitien, *Philohistôr. Miscellanea in honorem Caroli Laga septuagenarii*, edd. A. Schoors and P. Van Deun (Leuven, 1994) 23–33, at 25 n. 16. However, the phraseological parallels adduced by Kramer and Shelton (*P. Neph.* p. 21–24) are not strong enough for any great probability to be attached to the suggestion that we are dealing here with a Melitian monk.

<sup>10</sup> The opinion also of J. G. Winter, *Life and Letters in the Papyri*, (Ann Arbor, 1933) 168.

<sup>11</sup> W. Schubart, *Ein Jahrtausend am Nil* (Berlin, 1923) no. 92 (pp. 124–25), in which he translated the reading which he had suggested to F. Preisigke, who included it in his edition in *SB* I 2266: κενὸν ἄ<ν>[θ]ρωπ[ον].

<sup>12</sup> *P. Neph.* p. 70, n. 6, reported in *BL* 9, 236.

<sup>13</sup> See the texts given by Ghedini, Wessely and Naldini (see above, n. 4); the translation of Winter, *Life and Letters*, 167–68, and the comments of G. Tibiletti, *Le lettere private nei papiri greci del III e IV secolo d.C. Tra paganesimo e cristianesimo* (Milan, 1979) 34.

<sup>14</sup> See D. Brakke, *Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism* (Oxford, 1995) 210–12.

use of *πάτρων* used to support the reading are inapplicable.

Support for the combination *δεσπότης καὶ πάτρων* was found by Deissmann and Naldini in several of the letters in the archive of Abinnaeus,<sup>15</sup> and another fourth century letter, *P. Lond.* III 982,<sup>16</sup> in which the combination *δεσπότης καὶ πάτρων* appears. The addressees of 9 other letters from the fourth to the sixth centuries are also called *δεσπότης καὶ πάτρων*. But what sort of parallels do these provide? They show that the combination was used by Christian letter writers for their correspondents, although not all the letters bearing this phrase are securely Christian; some have no religious content whatsoever. However, it is more important to consider what sort of people were actually addressed as *πάτρων* in late-antique Egypt. Although from the first century BC to the end of the second century AD the word occurs in the papyri overwhelmingly with the sense of the patron of a freedman, by late antiquity it seems to have lost any technical sense.<sup>17</sup> In letters from the fourth and fifth centuries (the only late-antique documents in which the term is found) *πάτρων* seems to have had its sense diluted to that of a mere term of respect.<sup>18</sup> Still, who was called *πάτρων*? Abinnaeus, the mid fourth-century military commander in the Fayum, is commonly called *πάτρων* by his correspondents.<sup>19</sup> The ‘master and patron’ addressed in *P. Lond.* III 982 (the other letter cited in support of the proposed restoration of SB I 2266) is a *προτεύων*, a village official.<sup>20</sup> The *πάτρων* Nechos, to whom the villagers of Euhermeria write in *P. Ross. Georg.* III 8, was a powerful local landowner;<sup>21</sup> likewise the addressee of SPP XX 111.<sup>22</sup> In *P. Ath. Xyla* 16 and *P. Princ.* II 104 the *πάτρωνες* are the writers’ employers. The *πάτρων* Sarapammon is a business associate of the Ammonius who writes *P. Oxy.* XLVIII 3420. The writer of *P. Oxy.* LI 3646 greets his correspondent as ‘lord patron son’, out of deference rather than in recognition of a formal relationship.<sup>23</sup> SB VIII 9683 is a letter written by a monk, but his *πάτρων* Heron to whom he writes seems to have been a military officer acting as protector and sponsor.<sup>24</sup> The editor of this letter took the phrase *δεσπότης καὶ πάτρων* (l. 1–2) as indicating definitively that he was a secular benefactor.<sup>25</sup> The ‘beloved sisters’ whom the writer of *P. Kell.* V Copt. 31 addresses as patron were seemingly important members of the Manichaean community in Kellis, but not monks.<sup>26</sup> In only one letter, *P. Lond.* VI 1916, are *πάτρωνες* indisputably monks; the *ἀγαπητοὶ πάτρ[ωνες]* addressed in l. 9 are Paieous, Dioscorus, Hierax, Souros, and ‘all the brothers with you’, i.e. the monks of the monastic community at Hathor. The editor’s only comment on the word was to refer to *P. Lond.* III 982 and SB I 2266,<sup>27</sup> neither of which clarifies matters. However, given the lacuna in the text, and the fact that monks do not seem to be securely called *πάτρωνες* elsewhere in the papyri, *πάτρ[ες]* may be a better restoration there.

<sup>15</sup> Deissmann, *Die Septuaginta-Papyri*, 98; Naldini, *Il cristianesimo*, 194.

<sup>16</sup> See now the re-edition of J. R. Rea, Letter of a Recruit: P. Lond. III 982 Revisited, *ZPE* 115 (1997) 189–93.

<sup>17</sup> See the comments of J. R. Rea, in *CPR* V 19, 18–19n.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>19</sup> *P. Abinn.* 28.1–2; 29.1, 25; 31.1; 34.1–2; 35.33; 37.1.

<sup>20</sup> Rea, Letter of a Recruit: P. Lond. III 982 Revisited, 190.

<sup>21</sup> On this letter see now P. van Minnen, Patronage in Fourth-century Egypt. A Note on *P. Ross. Georg.* III 8, *JJP* 29 (1997) 67–73.

<sup>22</sup> On the Ausonius involved in this letter see R. S. Bagnall, Count Ausonius, *Tyche* 7(1992) 9–13.

<sup>23</sup> See the editor’s note *ad loc.*

<sup>24</sup> See the ed. pr., H. Zilliacus, The Stolen Anchor, *Commentationes in Honorem Edward Linkomies Sexagenarii* (Helsinki, 1954) 199–208, at 200; cf. 205.

<sup>25</sup> Zilliacus suggested he was the *πάγκαρχος*, although noted the possibility of reading *κεντρ[ι]ονι* after Heron’s name at the end of line 2 (The Stolen Anchor, 205). From the plate, *κεντ* seems likely, and is difficult to reconcile with any other title; for the use of the Latin loan-word, see e.g. *O. Douch* III 186.3 (IV–V). That the troublemaker who Heron is asked to deal with is a soldier (*στρατιωτῶν* (l. *στρατιωτῶν*), 4) supports the restoration, as do the greetings sent to the tribune at l. 26.

<sup>26</sup> *P. Kell.* V Copt. 31.17; cf the editor’s note *ad loc.*, suggesting the sense of ‘benefactor’ may be appropriate.

<sup>27</sup> H. I. Bell, ed., *P. Lond.* VI 1916, see the note to l. 9 on p. 79.

One of the roles monks fulfilled in relation to Christian communities in Late Antiquity was that of ‘spiritual patron’.<sup>28</sup> This paradigm is seen particularly in the letter of Serapion of Thmuis to the disciples of Antony,<sup>29</sup> although it is perhaps less prominent in the *Life of Antony* attributed to Athanasius.<sup>30</sup> The Papnouthios with whom our monk has usually been identified was certainly seen in this light by those who wrote to him.<sup>31</sup> Moreover, following the rise of monasticism monks took on many of the responsibilities and functions which had been carried out in previous centuries by secular patrons, such as intercession before civil authorities for their dependants.<sup>32</sup> In a sense, then, they can be looked on as ‘patrons’, in the same way as late-antique bishops and clergy can. However this general historical process does not seem to have resulted in a situation where monks were regularly called ‘patrons’. Leaving aside the text under discussion here, only one doubtful papyrological instance presents itself (*P. Lond.* VI 1916). The corresponding Greek term προεστώς is used in both Greek and Coptic as a term for a leader of a monastic community,<sup>33</sup> but the Latin loan-word πάτρων seems not to be used of them. This is not to declare it impossible that Justinus would address Papnouthios in this way, but it should sound a note of warning that it seems without parallel.

In fact such discussion is beside the point, because the reading πάτρωνα is palaeographically impossible. Deissmann arrived at the conclusion that this was to be read largely because he could conceive of no other possibility to explain α[.]ρωπ[.]<sup>34</sup> He explained the problems by proposing that Justinus intended to write πάτρων, left out the initial *pi*, and, on realising this halfway through the word, simply wrote a *pi* there. This proposal is unsatisfactory: Justinus’ use of interlinear correction after omitting the *alpha* and *phi* of διαφυλάξαι in l. 22 indicates he would have employed this had he left out the *pi* of πάτρων. It is true that Justinus left off the first two letters of the word ἀμαρτιῶν at the end of line 13, but as the first letter he wrote is the same as the first letter of the word as intended, this is a different case. Naldini tried to avoid half the problem by reading the last fully surviving letter not as *pi* but as *nu*. However, in this he was clearly mistaken. The letter in question cannot be a *nu*, as Justinus regularly writes *nu* in three strokes that resemble in no way the letter which stands at the end of line 6. It is clearly a *pi*, as comparison with Justinus’ other writings of *pi* shows, especially the *pi* of παρακαλῶ in line 15.

Examination of the photograph reveals that ατρωπ [ should be read. The best sense that could be obtained from this is that proposed long ago by Schubart,<sup>35</sup> ἄνθρωπον. This has recently been modified by Kramer and Shelton in light of the impossibility of reading a *theta* between the *alpha* and the *rho*. They read ατρωπο[ν (l. ἄνθρωπον),<sup>36</sup> with the *nu* having dropped out and the *theta* assimilating to *tau*.<sup>37</sup>

<sup>28</sup> See the discussion in Brakke, *Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism*, 208–213. Cf. P. Brown, The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity, *JRS* 61 (1971) 80–101.

<sup>29</sup> Ed. R. Draguet, Une lettre de Sérapion de Thmuis aux disciples d’Antoine (A.D. 356) en version syriaque et arménienne, *Le Muséon* 64 (1951) 1–25.

<sup>30</sup> Brakke, *Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism*, 208–213.

<sup>31</sup> *P. Lond.* VI 1923–1929.

<sup>32</sup> See in particular in late fourth-century archive of Apa Johannes, in *P. Herm.* 7–10, 17, *SB XVIII* 13612, *P. Ryl. Copt.* 268–76, on which, see P. van Minnen, The Roots of Egyptian Christianity, *APF* 40 (1994) 71–85. See also the letters written to the Melitian monk Paieous, *P. Lond.* VI 1913–22 (330–340), and, in general, the discussion of Brown cited above at n. 28.

<sup>33</sup> See the papyrological references in F. Preisigke and E. Kiessling (edd.), *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden*, vol. 3 (1931) 406 (all from the sixth and following centuries); see also *O. Mich. Copt.* I 11 (VI?), a letter from πεπρωστως ἡγιοπος ετογδαδ ἀπα φοιρανῶν. For a fourth century example see *P. Lond.* VI 1913 (334) l. 2: τοῖς προεστῶσ[ι] μονῆς μοναχῶν (l. μοναχῶν).

<sup>34</sup> Deissmann, *Die Septuaginta-Papyri*, 98.

<sup>35</sup> See above, n. 11.

<sup>36</sup> *P. Neph.* p. 70, n. 6.

<sup>37</sup> For the loss of medial *nu* before a dental see F. T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, vol. 1, *Phonology* (Milan, 1975) III.C.a.2 (p. 116); for the interchange of *theta* and *tau* before or after a

Deissmann had already considered this resolution, and rejected it, because there was not enough space for ἄ[νθ]ρωπο[ν].<sup>38</sup> His problems with the first lacuna can be solved orthographically, but inspection of the photograph indicates that he was correct in stating that there was insufficient space for a *nu* after the last visible traces in line 6. However, this does not rule out the resolution ἄνθρωπον. In line 10, Justinus leaves off the final *nu* of ἁμαρτία (as well as writing ἡ instead of τήν for the article).<sup>39</sup> Naldini preferred to correct to αἱ ἁμαρτίαι, but the supralinear stroke above the final *eta* of ἁμαρτία should be interpreted as a mark of abbreviation for *nu*;<sup>40</sup> <τ>ἡ<ν> ἁμαρτία<ν> (l. ἁμαρτίαν) would be closer to Proverbs 10.19,<sup>41</sup> which Justinus follows closely here, indicating we should retain the reading of Deissmann.<sup>42</sup> As it seems impossible to read a *nu* at the end of line 6, it is likely that Justinus either used a similar abbreviation here, or left off the final *nu*, and that we should read ἀτρωπο (l. ἄνθρωπον) here.<sup>43</sup>

Justinus, then, addressed Papnouthios as ‘new man’, rather than ‘new patron’. Monks were the spiritual ‘patrons’ of Egyptian Christianity, but this letter cannot be used to provide evidence that they were called πάτρων.<sup>44</sup> However, by hailing Papnouthios as a ‘new man’, Justinus is not using the phrase as a monastic title. Rather, Justinus is referring to the important theological concept of ‘putting on the new man in place of the old’. Developed in the letters of Paul,<sup>45</sup> it finds a place in many patristic discussions.<sup>46</sup> The theme was readily applicable to monasticism: monks were citizens of the new city in the desert,<sup>47</sup> who had ‘renewed themselves’ and ‘put on the new man’ when they began their ascetic lives.<sup>48</sup> Justinus’ use of the phrase should be understood within the context of the consistent use of, allusion to, and quotation from scripture which he makes throughout the letter. Scriptural citations in

liquid or nasal, Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri*, I.D.c.2 (p. 90).

<sup>38</sup> *Die Septuaginta-Papyri*, p. 98.

<sup>39</sup> <τ>ἡ<ν> ἁμαρτία<ν> is the reading of Deissmann in the ed.pr. Justinus was in the habit of omitting final letters, see also προσαγωρεύ<ω> in l. 19 and πρόνοι<α> in 22.

<sup>40</sup> See eg. SB XII 10800.23 (III/IV), *P. Bour.* 25.7 (IV), *P. Lond.* VI 1927.5, 7, 32, 33, 42, 50, 54, 59; for the practice in literary texts, see eg. *P. Mich.* XVIII 764 (II/III) I 22.

<sup>41</sup> Ll. 8–10: ἐν γὰρ πολλῇ λαλιᾷ οὐκ ἐκφεύξοντ[αι] <τ>ἡ<ν> ἁμαρτία<ν>; cf. Prov. 10.19: ἐκ πολυλογίας οὐκ ἐκφεύξει ἁμαρτία.

<sup>42</sup> B. F. Harris, *Biblical Echoes and Reminiscences in Christian Papyri*, *Proc. XIV Int. Congr. Pap.* (London, 1975) 155–160, at 156.

<sup>43</sup> I cannot see a mark of abbreviation above the *omicron* at the end of l. 6, although the papyrus is damaged. For the loss of final *nu* see Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri*, III.A.1, esp. a and d (pp. 111–12). For an example see *P. Nag Hamm.* 70.13–14 (mid-IV).

<sup>44</sup> As it is, for instance in Brakke, *Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism*, 212. See also Tibiletti, *Lettere private*, 34, whose comments need to be adjusted in this light.

<sup>45</sup> Eph. 4, 24: καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας; Eph. 2, 15: ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσει ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον ποιῶν εἰρήνην; Col. 3.9–10, throwing off the old man to put on the νέος ἄνθρωπος; cf. Romans 6.6; Titus 2, 10. For discussion of the theological concept, see G. Kittel, ed., *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, tr. G. W. Bromiley (Michigan, 1964) I, 365–66. For philosophical antecedents of Paul’s use of the imagery, see P. W. van der Horst, *Observations on a Pauline Expression*, *New Testament Studies* 19 (1972–73) 181–87.

<sup>46</sup> See for example among authors from Egypt Clement of Alexandria, *Protrepticus* XI 112,3 (SC 2, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. C. Mondésert, 1976), *Paedagogus* I, 6, 32.4 (SC 70, ed. H.-I. Marrou and M. Harl, 1960); Origen, Homily in Luke 23.3 (SC 87, ed. H. Crouzel, F. Fournier and P. Périchon, 1962); Athanasius, *Apol. c. Ar.* 2.46, 55, *Festal Letter* 2.4 (preserved in Syriac, trans. J. Payne-Smith in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, ser. 2, vol. 4 (ed. A. Robinson; rp. 1991) 511; the section is lost in the Coptic texts, see L.-Th. Lefort, ed., *S. Athanase. Lettres festales et pastorales en copte* (Louvain, 1955 = CSCO 150) p. 9. On Athanasius’ use of the concept of the ‘new man’ see C. Mills Badger Jr., *The New Man Created in God: Christology, Congregation and Asceticism in Athanasius of Alexandria* (Diss. Duke University, 1990) esp. 123–25, 157–58.

<sup>47</sup> See *Life of Antony*, 14.7 (ed. G. J. Bartelink, SC 400).

<sup>48</sup> See eg. the first Greek *Life of Pachomius*, 1 (ed. F. Halkin, *Sancti Pachomii Vitae Graecae* (Brussels, 1932); the 3<sup>rd</sup> Catechesis of Theodore (ed. L.-Th. Lefort, *Oeuvres de S. Pachôme et de ses disciples*, (Louvain, 1956 = CSCO 159) p. 45, cf. p. 51; Pachomius, ‘Instruction to a Spiteful Monk’ (ed. Lefort, CSCO 159) p. 12, cf. p. 21; cf. the Bohairic *Life of Pachomius*, 17 (ed. Lefort, p. 18).

fourth century papyrus letters are rare, and often little more than what might be called ‘reminiscences’,<sup>49</sup> such as the echo of Hebrews 1,3 and 2 Peter 1,9 in lines 13–14.<sup>50</sup> His rendering of Proverbs 10,19 in lines 8–10, however, probably warrants the term ‘citation’, as it is much closer to the Septuagint. However, Justinus’ use of Scripture goes beyond mere citation; he shows an awareness of two of the most important concepts in monastic spirituality. His echo of Phillipians 3,20 in line 4 indicates familiarity with the importance of πολιτεία, the monastic ‘way of life’ in Christian ascetic discourse.<sup>51</sup> His use of the phrase καινὸς ἄνθρωπος in line 6 should be seen in the same light; Justinus not only echoes the New Testament passages where the theme is developed,<sup>52</sup> but also addresses the monk by a title which demonstrates his knowledge of the importance of the theme of taking off the old and putting on the new in monastic spirituality.

This letter stands almost alone among fourth-century papyrus letters in displaying any evidence of theological and spiritual concerns on the part of the writer. In large part this is due to the nature of the documentation: the correspondence of daily life is not the place one would expect to find theological statements. ‘Arian’ leanings have been sought in some letters from Melitian circles,<sup>53</sup> but on the whole the arguments are inconclusive.<sup>54</sup> Justinus not only quotes scripture, but displays an appreciation of the manner in which it has been used and developed in monastic spirituality. Indeed, it could be argued from this that he is himself a monk, but this need not be so. Among the laity there were those with the education and contact with monasticism to generate such a letter. This letter should be seen as more than merely evidence for Egyptian monasticism in Egypt, and for the way in which monastic figures were viewed in this period. It retains its value in this regard, a value which is in no way lessened by the removal of πάτρων from the text. However, it has as much, if not more, importance as a demonstration of the penetration of scriptural vocabulary and theological concepts among the wider populace, and the way these concepts were applied in everyday correspondence.

Macquarie University, Sydney

Malcolm Choat

<sup>49</sup> On Scriptural citation in papyrus letters see Harris, “Biblical Echoes”; Naldini, *Il cristianesimo*, 54–55; Tibiletti, *Lettere private*, 115–16; G. H. R. Horsley, *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*, vol. 2 (Sydney, 1982) 154–58.

<sup>50</sup> See the discussion in Harris, *Biblical Echoes*, 156, 158.

<sup>51</sup> The monks whom Antony inspired enrolled themselves ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς πολιτεῖαν (*Life of Antony*, 14.7); Besas wrote his *Life of Shenoute* in part to record his master’s πολιτεία (*Life of Shenoute*, 2; ed. J. Leipoldt, *Sinuthii Vita Bohairice* (Paris, 1906 = *CSCO* 41) p. 8). A visitor asks Parnouthios about his renowned πολιτεία in the *Historia Monachorum in Aegypto* 14.11 (ed. A.-J. Festugière (Brussels, 1961) p. 105); see also *Apophthegmata Patrum Aio* (*PG* 65.136.C); Poeman 68 (*PG* 65.357C). In the monastic papyri, see the praise of Parnouthios’ ‘glorious and revered way of life’ (ἐκκλη[ε]σεστάτην [σ]ου π[ο]λιτεῖαν (l. -εἰαν) καὶ σε[μ]νοτάτην) in *P. Lond.* VI 1927.30–31; cf. *P. Neph.* 14.7. On πολιτεία in a monastic context cf. G. Gould, *The Desert Fathers on Monastic Community* (Oxford, 1993) 174 with n. 33; the phrase ‘citizen of heaven’ is discussed by R. Merkelbach, *Der griechische Wortschatz und die Christen*, *ZPE* 18 (1975) 101–48, at 103–4 [= *Hestia und Erigone* (1996) 393–436, at 395–396].

<sup>52</sup> See above, n. 45.

<sup>53</sup> See the assertion of Kramer and Shelton (*P. Neph.* Intro., p. 21) that ὁ τῶν [ὅλων δεσπότης], restored in *P. Neph.* 5.24–26 and the use of the verb ἐπνεύω with reference to God in *P. Neph.* 6.8 are evidence of ‘Arian’ beliefs. See too the suggestion of Ghedini that ὁ π[α]ντοκ[ράτωρ] θεὸς καὶ ὁ Χρ[ι]στὸς αὐτοῦ in *P. Lond.* VI 1929.3 (probably to the same Parnouthios as the one under discussion here) displays a ‘sapore ariano’ (Ghedini, *Paganesimo e Cristianesimo nelle lettere papiracee greche dei primi secoli d. Cr.*, *Atti del IV Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia* (Milan, 1936) 333–50, at 343).

<sup>54</sup> ὁ τῶν ὅλων δεσπότης is not found in Christian scripture, and in only one other documentary papyrus (*P. Oxy.* VI 939, a letter whose writer is placed under suspicion of heresy by Kramer and Shelton on this basis). However, attestations among ‘orthodox’ patristic writers are not infrequent; see the Pseudo-Athanasian *Disputatio contra Arium* (*PG* 28.492.54); Eusebius of Caesarea (*H. E.* 10.4.9; *Vita Constantini* 3.53.3), as well as Origen, John Chrysostom and Theodoret of Cyrrhus (the latter two extensively). Cf. A. Camplani, *In margine alla storia dei Meliziani*, *Augustinianum* 30 (1990) 313–51, at 326. For ἐπνεύω used with reference to God, see e.g. Athanasius, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, *PG* 27.521.9; John Chrysostom, *In Joannem*, *PG* 59.358.19, *In Psalmum*, *PG* 55.573.31. As regards the proposal of Ghedini, while the phrase may indicate theological imprecision, it seems hardly strong enough to warrant the conclusion the author was ‘Arian’.