

RUSKIN'S CORRESPONDENCE WITH MISS BLANCHE ATKINSON ¹

By MARGARET E. SPENCE, M.A., Ph.D.

LECTURER IN THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL

WHEN John Ruskin wrote the first of his *Fors Clavigera* letters on New Year's Day 1871 he addressed it specifically to the workmen and labourers of Great Britain. This letter, like its ninety-five successors, was written in a warm, friendly spirit striking a closely personal note that invited reply. Accordingly, in February of the following year, he announced his intention to reserve at the end of each *Fors* letter a page for correspondence. The habit of replying to points in *Fors* letters grew and by January 1873 he was able to write that he had received "quite a little mailcartful of consolation, reproof and advice".² The following spring he decided to address some of his letters to his young lady readers, and thenceforward the young lady had an accepted place in *Fors*. It may therefore be assumed that many ladies of all ages were numbered among *Fors* regular readers and that this fact gave Ruskin considerable satisfaction. He was acutely aware, and really rather proud, of the flutter he could raise in female society; he knew that the ladies, young and old, listened eagerly to his counsel, be it on dress, education or religion. *Sesame and Lilies* and *The Ethics of the Dust* stand as monuments to this feminine interest, as do also certain letters in *Fors Clavigera*. In fact, the *Fors* letters often served as a means of introduction to their distinguished author.

One young lady who used *Fors* in this way was Miss Blanche Atkinson, the unhappy, somewhat frustrated daughter of a prosperous Liverpool soap manufacturer. Blanche, irked by the social convention that kept her idle at home, was an avid

¹ Grateful acknowledgement is made to the Ruskin Trustees and to their publisher, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., for permission to include extracts from various unpublished letters quoted in this article.

² *Fors* 3, xxv. 4 (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd.).

reader of *Fors.* Encouraged by the friendliness of the letters, no less than by the plea for financial help for his proposed Guild of St. George, she posted in March 1873 her first subscription along with a note of appreciation of his work. And so the correspondence began. During the first three years of their friendship she received a hundred letters from him ; forty others were written between the years 1876 and, probably, 1886. These letters, treasured by Blanche during her lifetime, later carefully preserved first by Mrs. Talbot, then by Canon Rawnsley—both well-loved and loyal Companions of the Guild of St. George—and now gifted to the John Rylands Library by Canon Rawnsley's widow, tell a fascinating story of the friendship between a great Victorian man of letters and an unhappy young woman of twenty-six.

Blanche was quick to confide in Ruskin, to tell him of her dull, rather difficult life at home with her mother, aggressive father, quarrelsome sister and brothers and, at hand, if not at home, an argumentative and materially minded brother-in-law. It is obvious from Ruskin's letters to her that she longed for a very different kind of life and, at the same time, felt guilty about her feelings of discontent. Ruskin, whose ready sympathy was drawn by her unhappiness, was gratified by her " pretty confiding letter " ¹ and, in a confidence born maybe of his own experience of domestic dispute, he gave her comfort and advice. He urged her to ignore the people on the touchline of her life who condemned her fits of depression, and instead to accept cheerfully, as a good Christian, the burden of her present unhappiness and to concentrate on the sufferings of others. He instinctively understood the barrier that divided Blanche and her father : when she attacked her father's view that his approval was the determining factor in the spending of his money, Ruskin hastened to defend the rights of the money-earner. At the same time he tried to develop in her a less rebellious and a more sympathetic attitude towards parental authority ; the sad memory of his own father and of his own misunderstanding of him may have prompted him to give her the following advice :

Fathers are intensely grateful for *real* love. They scarcely ever know what it

¹ Rylands Eng. MS. 1162/2 (27.3.73).

is they want—unless they get it. They think they want the children's good—and obedience—and all the rest of it. The one thing they do want, is honest love.¹

He strove to make her realize that obedience to her father was a sacred duty, that her immediate task was to study him and so come to know him as an individual with virtues to be admired and weaknesses to be accepted. Ruskin clearly suspected harshness and moral tyranny to be among her father's weaknesses, but his advice was calculated to avoid friction and sometimes it was curt, even cruel :

Girls in their father's houses must just bear what's wrong, as the cats and dogs do—always keeping in their own mind about it, nevertheless.²

As he saw it, the immediate challenge of life for Blanche was to be met in her own home and not, as she hoped, in outside service to his Guild of St. George. It was characteristic of him to tell her that for the moment she could meet that challenge at the dinner table by attempting to set a standard of rational conversation among her women friends, or in the matter of simple but elegant dressing ; it was equally characteristic that he should condemn hospital, charitable or other social work and urge in their place set periods of daily study.

That these letters gave comfort, interest and even purpose to Blanche's dreary life is as obvious as it is true, but what is harder to understand is the measure of comfort they gave to Ruskin himself. When their correspondence was only a few weeks old, he wrote at the end of a letter :

Goodbye for a little while now—but your letters help me so you may write—when you like—only I can't possibly answer always—though.³

Possibly he was helped by her admiration of his work and of himself, maybe he found satisfaction in his conviction that he could help Blanche to face her domestic difficulties, or—and this may well be the real reason—his intense interest in women was nourished by the formulative influence he could exert on her. Blanche was clay in his hands, a loyal and devoted admirer, anxious but not always able to carry out his advice on the management of her social life in Liverpool. When her resolution flagged and she felt unequal to the task he had set her, she sent

¹ Rylands Eng. MS. 1162/4 (3.4.73).

² *Ibid.* 104 (n.d.).

³ *Ibid.* 5 (n.d.).

him pathetic excuses and appeals for his forgiveness. The increasing prosperity of her father brought a wider social life for the family, and for Blanche a greater opportunity of accepting invitations to bazaars, dinners and parties. She told Ruskin all about these invitations ; no incident in her life seemed to be too trivial to record, be it the loss of a new muff, an argument with her sister, or a dream in which he appeared to her. Dreams were no trivial matter to Ruskin, and he explained carefully in his reply that he had a great reverence for dreams and was eager to know every detail of hers. His questions obviously caused Blanche great embarrassment, for at the top of his letter she wrote this note in pencil :

I had foolishly told him of a dream I had about him—in which for a long time he was invisible—and that when at last I saw him he was “ horrid ” and he never forgot it and I could not explain.¹

It was almost as if he were apprehensive of his appearance in her dreams for several months later he was still questioning her :

It's a great relief to my mind to know you've got a photograph of me. I'm really not as bad as that and it's no wonder you've ugly dreams of me and no good ones. All the same I'm quite like a girl for curiosity to know what that dream was.²

He could not influence her there, but his influence proved more potent on the subject of Church bazaars. Her mention in the spring of 1873 about a forthcoming bazaar incensed Ruskin who promptly advised her to stay at home and not waste her time on such activity. In confusion and despair the demurring Blanche explained that her absence would be noted by her friends and members of the congregation, and that an awkward situation would arise at home as well as at church. Clearly she expected that he would consent to her visit, but instead came a hasty letter from London dated 15 May, in which he wrote :

. . . if I'm in time, I absolutely forbid you to go to that bazaar—or spend a farthing at it.—It is merely a vile method of sneaking robbery. If a clergyman can't build his own home—let him live in a ditch—or hold his false tongue at least from begging, and learn to do something useful.

The more “ remarks ” your refusal draws, the better : provided you don't do it for that purpose. Do right and let people say and things go as they will.³

¹ Rylands Eng. MS. 1162/14 (8.6.73). ² Ibid. 50 (n.d.) ³ Ibid. 9 (15.5.73).

It was not easy to be one of Ruskin's pupils, but doubtless Blanche avoided the bazaar and suffered, for his sake, the rebukes she feared. Even more difficult for her was the rôle he wanted her to play when on shopping expeditions with wealthy friends. He expected her to attempt to sublimate their shopping instincts by persuading them to allocate the money they proposed to pay for a model garment to a worthier cause. Ruskin realized of course that her request would bring only refusal, but he seemed to feel that the making of the request would be salutary for both Blanche and her friends. She reacted to his challenge like a knight to a crusade and set off to the shops intent on converting her friends to Ruskin's idea but at the crucial moment, the moment when a costly garment was about to be purchased, her resolution failed and she was unable to frame the request. She wrote dejectedly to Ruskin confessing her cowardice and expecting heavy censure, but instead she received a note of sympathetic understanding of her difficulty. It was inevitable that the subject of dress sense should arise in Ruskin's letters. He invited Blanche to tell him about her appearance, the colour and style of her hair, the kind of dress she wore, and he urged her, as he urged his women readers of *Fors* and many of his women friends, to make the most of her appearance. His advice was singularly sound :

Know your own best points—dress to show them modestly and honestly—not conceitedly—buy the best stuffs for wear or washing—obey fashion only to avoid being insolent or conspicuous—if it becomes monstrous (as in high heeled boots just now) defy it, showing reason why, if asked.¹

He reminded her that the well-dressed woman had good colour sense and wore neat but not costly clothes that were attractively trimmed with embroidery, ribbons or flowers.

The desire to please Ruskin in her studies, her observations on life, in her thoughts and feelings, grew with the letters. She even rather unwisely tried to represent him verbally and intellectually in her conversations with relatives and friends, many of whom seemed able easily to dispose of her arguments—especially her father's wealthy manufacturing acquaintances. Sometimes they succeeded in converting her to their view and Blanche,

¹ Rylands Eng. MS. 1162/3 (3.4.73).

dazzled by their forceful arguments, would write to Ruskin to explain the fallacy in his. At a dinner-party in the spring of 1875 she met a wealthy industrialist whose definition of progress so impressed her that she wrote at once to share her enlightenment with Ruskin. He made swift reply :

What a goose you are, in spite of all your cleverness.—Women are all alike, I find. Fancy letting yourself be talked over by your manufacturer host. Whatever he is of good—or well-meaning (and I've known the best manufacturers and merchants going)—he is a clown— $\frac{1}{3}$ educated—knowing nothing of art—literature—or true science and not much of honesty—'Better off' indeed! Does he suppose poor people are better off who have a good dinner and a bad God than those who have a bad dinner and a good God? ¹

Defeat in argument with her brother-in-law on the difficult subject of the material and intrinsic value of works of art sent her to her writing-desk to frame an appeal for help from Ruskin. He quickly came to her aid with useful advice. He suggested that she counter her brother-in-law's question by asking him to give the business-man's definition of value, to explain how it might be estimated, and how it might be illustrated in terms of the wealth of Liverpool. Blanche, we may imagine, lost no time in seeking out her brother-in-law.

Her gratitude to Ruskin increased with the correspondence and she longed to help him in some dramatic, practical way. Her offer to be his housemaid amused and gratified him, but did not surprise him, for he understood her feelings, and his carefully worded letter of refusal could have caused her no chagrin. On the other hand, some of his letters would seem almost to encourage her to hope that one day he would make use of her services. The following letter appears to indicate that he had some plans for her future :

You shall be as much of a cork-cutter—baker—or housemaid, as ever you like—some day soon—if only you will take care of your health at present, enjoy your Christmas with your riotous brothers and follow out the course of your own thoughts quietly and silently. ²

Naturally Blanche waited for the day and tried in 1874 to bring it nearer by again offering her services, this time to the Guild of St. George. Ruskin sent an emphatic reply from Florence :

I have your nice letter, and really believe that your own feeling is true, and that

¹ Rylands Eng. MS. 1162/77 (19.4.75).

² Ibid. 35 (n.d.)

you are ready for any call to good service.—But that call—if *at all* made by *me*—must be publicly in *Fors*—or in open lecturing ; it must never be said that I drove young women to enthusiastic folly—least of all disobedience to their father—in my private relation with them—what help I can give you in your home duties—I give by letter. If ever you take up any other—it must be—in answer only to public appeal.¹

This explanation was one which Ruskin had to give many times to too-enthusiastic young ladies who longed to fight for him, and he was at pains to explain to Blanche his disappointment that she, like so many others, failed to realize that he was seeking supporters to fight for the poor, not for himself.

Although Blanche's interest in the Guild of St. George undoubtedly arose from her interest in Ruskin, she was anxious to be recognized as a responsible member. When she asked to be enrolled as a Companion in April 1873 the Guild numbered only eight members and twelve subscribers. Ruskin, afraid that she might be superstitious about being the thirteenth subscriber, wrote to warn her of her position on his list, but Blanche, whose fears centred solely on the possible publication of her name in the Guild's next financial statement, was not superstitious and accepted her rightful place. He wrote by return to assure her that only her number and the amount of her subscription would appear on his list. He reminded her in a letter that an essential condition of membership of the Guild was implicit obedience to its Master. He likened the work of the Guild to the work of a soldier fighting only for the good of mankind and not for the death of an enemy. The tone of the letter suggests that Blanche was debating points in the proposed constitution of the Guild, for he informed her bluntly that he was the Guild's colonel and that the one demand he had to make of his supporters was complete obedience. Discussion was to be found in *Fors*, but obedience was a fundamental Guild requirement. Several times in his letters to Blanche he expressed his great discontent at the slow response to his public appeals in *Fors* for support for his Guild. In July 1874 he wrote from Perugia gloomily about this undertaking to which in 1871 he had made over a tenth of his wealth ; his consciousness of increasing poverty and misery about him

¹ Rylands Eng. MS. 1162/66 (19.2.74).

made him discontented with his original plan to publicize in *Fors* his ideas about his Guild of St. George before taking any decisive step towards its actual formation. He suggested in his letter that he was contemplating the adoption of more sensational measures to meet the dire needs of the time. He blamed himself for his moderation and expressed the belief that more would rally to his cause were he to make heavier demands on them than merely to ask for a tenth of their fortune. This letter delighted Blanche, who longed to make a dramatic stand on behalf of the Guild of St. George, but she received no such call to action. Gradually, by waiting, she came to realize that there would be no specific call to her from the Master of the Guild, but that he would answer, when he could, her appeals for help and advice on her home duties and problems. Indeed he encouraged her to write openly to him, and he assured her that, as his pupil, her letters could be neither too familiar, nor too honest; he was careful to warn her that her honesty would at times incur his wrath as well as his pleasure.

Blanche seemed never to know when she was likely to please or to irritate him; there can be little doubt that each letter she wrote was designed to win a reply. *Fors* provided her with a useful pattern of his interests; from it she knew that he would react to questions about theology, morality, christianity, clergymen or the Guild. In her letters she told him about her parents' attempt to subjugate her spiritually, about her sister's secure religious convictions and her own bewildering doubts, and he, in turn, comforted her by likening the security of her sister's faith to a child's or a Brahmin's, and by helping her to meet attempts at parental spiritual dominion with the forceful sentence: It is as wrong to allow your father and mother to consume your soul as to eat your body.¹

She asked to be reassured about heaven and death and was tersely informed:

I can't comfort you about death—any more than I could a moth or a lamb. It is none of your business I should say to either.—Enjoy yourselves, and be thankful.²

Her questions on religious matters often won lengthy answers from him. He was anxious that she should not accept the Old

¹ Rylands Eng. MS. 1162/127 (n.d.).

² *Ibid.* 24 (3.9.73).

Testament story of God's anger and the resultant flood, but should realize that the choice of salvation or destruction rested with the individual. He was distressed by her adherence to the Pauline religion¹ and vowed in one letter to wean her from it. Blanche's rejoinder :

I don't intend to give up liking him [St. Paul] whatever you say.²

angered him and brought a three-week lull in the correspondence. In answer to her humble plea for a letter and for information about the virtue of the High Church people, Ruskin, in warmer mood, explained that they were amiable blockheads who failed to recognize where their true service to God lay. He pointed out that, so far as she was concerned, her service to God lay in mild acceptance of irksome domestic duties. He tolerantly agreed that St. Paul was to be one of the saints recognized by the Guild of St. George, but was emphatic that he was not to be the chief one. He tried unsuccessfully to temper her intense dislike of the unctuously self-righteous by explaining that the malady could arise from ignorance or even from self-deception. Sometimes, in bitterness and frustration (and maybe after reading *Fors*), she sent him fierce notes of deep resentment against the self-righteousness of some Liverpool churchgoers of her acquaintance. At an early stage in their friendship, the intensity of her feelings on this subject alarmed Ruskin, who sent her this advice :

You are *very* right in your feeling about Church—but don't let it drive you mad. Think quietly what the real result of it is—to the worldly people who go there. Carlyle says it is the wickedest thing they do. But I do not hold with him, for once. They do not enough understand what they are doing to make it wicked in that supreme degree—and many of them really suppose themselves doing a duty, if not to God to society.³

It may be that Blanche relied too much on the religious question as an answer-evoker in her letters to Ruskin, for an undated letter of the eighties shows that she was still pursuing the theme. In reply he informed her angrily that his religion was no concern of hers and that she had ignored the advice he had given her on her own religious difficulties.

Other questions which she plied him with and which sometimes brought flashes of anger and irritation in reply were those

¹ Rylands Eng. MS. 1162/18 (27.7.73). ² Ibid. 20 (28.8.73). ³ Ibid. 17 (25.7.73).

which touched on social, political or economic matters. He never held back his wrath for he believed, as he told her, that if his anger were justified she would profit from it (and she did) and if it were not justified it would do her no harm. She irritated him most when she showed ignorance or misunderstanding of the views he expressed in *Fors*. She never really grasped his educational policy and certainly did not understand from her reading of *Fors* that Ruskin was opposed to the teaching of the three Rs in school. Her ignorance in this field made itself apparent in 1883 when Blanche with her friend and fellow Companion of the Guild, Mrs. Talbot, drew up a plan for the opening of a school. This project had a charitable rather than an educational origin, for it was intended primarily to provide a source of income for the wife and daughter of T. W. Bunney, one of the artists whom Ruskin employed on Guild work. A house was purchased and at first Ruskin was delighted with a paper written by Blanche on the proposed school; then he learned with horror that she proposed to include in the curriculum reading and arithmetic. Immediately he sent an angry letter to Mrs. Talbot on 7 January 1884 in which he protested in thick, black writing that he had forbidden the teaching of these subjects and added:

—Please don't let her interfere any more, she's incorrigibly stupid in many ways and be quiet till you hear from me again.¹

He was somewhat gentler in his letter to Blanche and contented himself merely with the following postscript as a rebuke:

Here is a little piece of 'amazement' to me, that *you* being one of the earliest Companions should never have read the most important 17th *Fors* and be still in the outside state of wishing children to be taught "the three Rs."²

Not long afterwards the plan, for some reason not explained in the letters, was abandoned and the house sold. On another occasion Ruskin consulted her about Guild affairs. He was anxious to provide assistance for a crippled, indigent Companion, Miss Elizabeth Bowden, or Lizzie, as he called her, and he set up an informal working committee consisting of Mrs. Talbot and two other Companions to consider her case. They were to

¹ Rylands Eng. MS. 1161/108 (15.12.76).

² *Ibid.* 1162/123 (23.12.83).

decide whether or not the financial help given to Lizzie by the Guild should include a sum of money towards the maintenance of a destitute, and, as it proved, delinquent orphan named Harriet, whom Lizzie cared for and tried to educate according to principles set out in *Fors*. After making these arrangements with Mrs. Talbot, he then wrote to Blanche asking her to offer to help Lizzie ; but clearly he regretted his action, for some days later he wrote again to inform her that the matter would be dealt with by three other Companions whom he had personally selected for the task, as he wanted them to know Lizzie and to decide on the wisest course to be adopted for her good. This decision was undoubtedly a great disappointment to Blanche, but she may have found some satisfaction in the knowledge that while the committee was able to give financial assistance to Lizzie, it proved wholly unable to reform the erring Harriet. It would appear that Ruskin was reluctant to allow Blanche to take part in any practical way in Guild affairs.

At the time of spurning Blanche's eager offer to help Lizzie, Ruskin was ill and tired. He obviously hoped that she would turn more to *Fors* and learn gradually to seek advice from his work rather than from himself ; but Blanche preferred consulting Ruskin, even if some of her questions brought only an angry command to re-read, or even to read *Fors*. But if some of her letters angered him, he welcomed others, especially those which usefully illustrated points he sought to make in *Fors*, and he consulted her about publishing extracts from them. At first Ruskin was worried in case this use of her letters might set up an unnatural feeling of restraint and prevent her from writing so freely to him, but eventually he decided that she ought to be delighted to help him in this way. Blanche, however, proved reluctant ; she was not anxious for Ruskin to share parts of her letters with his *Fors* readers, and she was emphatic that nothing should be published without her consent. Ruskin ignored her protests, and in *Fors*, Letter XXXV, he printed an extract from one of her letters and publicly proclaimed his " naughtiness " as he termed it, in not first seeking her permission. This extract, which covered over five pages of print, dealt with the squalor of slum life in industrial cities and the peculiar devastation of the

countryside (probably St. Helens) wrought by the extensive development of chemical industries. In it Blanche, reflecting on the misery of these deprived classes, expressed this naive wish, which in essence echoes Ruskin's own scheme for his Guild of St. George :

I should so much like to drag them all away from this wretched town [Liverpool] to some empty, new, beautiful and large country, and set them all to dig, and plant, and build ; and we could, I am sure, all be pure and honest once more.¹

Other extracts from her letters, which he printed in *Fors*, carried the same message and showed how desperately eager Blanche was to translate incidents of everyday life into palely Ruskinian language. She wrote of ragged town children who gazed with wonder and astonishment at some roses she carried ; she described her horror at the scene in Dolwydellan where work on a new railway brought havoc to the countryside, and she complained bitterly about the weather, the smoke-laden air and the overcast sky of industrial town and city. It is possible that Blanche was writing with sincerity, but her theme and her very complaints about the weather were familiar *Fors* topics ; either consciously or unconsciously she was again echoing Ruskin and hoping to win his approval. But in her account of the unrewarding life of service given by one of her father's devoted workmen, Blanche showed that at last her own social conscience had been awakened. She regretted that the man's whole life of toil had been spent in such sordid surroundings with never a day's real holiday ; more than that, she regretted that he should have been content to live and die in such surroundings and to expect no more of life. To Ruskin the story was, as he told her, " awful and lovely ",² but to Blanche it represented only a condemnation of Christian society. This anecdote shows, perhaps more clearly than any other, Ruskin's influence on Blanche. He had succeeded, as he hoped, in making her look at the world about her with compassionate eyes, instead of dwelling solely and self-pityingly on her own problems.

From the first, Ruskin set out to help Blanche. He realized that she was too intelligent to be satisfied with an aimless drawing-room existence, and so he concerned himself with her general

¹ *Fors* 3, xxxv. 16.

² Ryl. Eng. MS. 1162/102 (n.d.)

education and her reading interests. He encouraged her to develop out-of-door activities, to continue playing cricket, to garden, and to make an outside, as distinct from a textbook, study of botany. Her interest in the social conditions of the poor caused him to introduce her by letter to Octavia Hill, and he offered to introduce her, also by letter, to a friend who organized a local sketching club. He did not advise a study of art for, as he explained in a letter to her, Liverpool was not conducive to art, but he recommended visits to the museum of birds. Another recommendation he made was the study of history, beginning with the House of Lancaster. For this work he suggested the writing out every morning of a passage of history previously studied. He made clear to her the fact that everything demanding hand and practice was education, and he prescribed singing, piano-playing and embroidery work. Her taste in literature especially interested him: when she confessed that she found Spenser dull, he at once consoled her and advised her to concentrate primarily on the legend of Britomart. She followed his advice and was able to report some weeks later her enjoyment of *The Faerie Queen*. Influenced by *Fors*, she read Carlyle and Maria Edgeworth and won his whole-hearted approval. He was anxious that she should rate Miss Edgeworth correctly and stated in a letter:

all Miss Edgeworth has ever written is eternal and classic literature—Of the Eternal as much as Carlyle—as much as Homer.

Very wrong in somethings—and violent in others. But even more Good. Have you ever read "Helen"? Get it and read it as if it were printed in Gold.

and in a postscript he added:

The older I grow the more I enjoy Miss Edgeworth's child's books. Indeed their chief fault is that one can't understand them till one's 50.¹

It is curious that Ruskin drew such enjoyment from the novels of Maria Edgeworth and the problems that beset her heroines. It may be that in relaxation they became his detective novel, and that he enjoyed poring over the clues set out by Miss Edgeworth that were likely to lead to a greater understanding of the young girl. He certainly believed that Blanche could read her novels with profit. He was anxious that she should be familiar also with the

¹ Rylands Eng. MS. 1162/24 (30.9.73).

writings of Marmontel, and he recommended the slow reading of his *Memoirs* to be followed by careful reflection on them. He was chary about suggesting the works of contemporary writers other than Carlyle and Helps for, as he explained to her in a letter, only those two writers gave him pleasure, but he did go so far as to assure her that *Aurora Leigh* was entirely grand and good. On one occasion, probably in 1884, he sent her two books of poetry and asked her to review them for him. He did not name the author, but he showed something of his own feelings of discontent with contemporary writers by the following question which he posed at the end of his letter :

Does he [the poet] want to *do* anything or is it all whine and whimper and memories ?¹

Blanche was delighted one morning to receive a parcel from Ruskin containing a book by Sir Arthur Helps with the instructions to cut and read the book before sending it to him at Brantwood for his Christmas reading. This task gave her infinite pleasure and she quickly wrote asking for more work of this kind. He replied by sending another book, this time solely for her amusement. Immediately her joy vanished with the knowledge that he was thinking in terms of her amusement rather than of his need for her help. She wrote protesting that she did not want to cut the pages of books for amusement but only "if it was a little saving of trouble to him".² Ruskin, who perfectly understood her desire to serve him, sent her another book to read. He hoped that this stirring of her intellectual energy would help her to meet the attacks of depression which frequently assailed her. He encouraged her to tell him about her melancholia and her tears, or, as he called it in one letter, her "pretty crying".³ He was gratified by her confidences which intensified his conviction that he could help her. It is possible that this feeling of his at times served to confuse Blanche emotionally ; from Rome, for example, in the spring of 1874, he wrote forcefully :

How is the battle getting harder every day ? Do you find more foes outside—or

¹ Rylands Eng. MS. 1162/133 (n.d.)

² Ibid. 28 (12.11.73).

³ Ibid. 59 (19.5.74).

more difficulties within? My impression is lately that I can't lead you rightly until I make that my chief work in the world.¹

There can be little doubt that Blanche would misinterpret the rather ambiguous phrase about his chief work in the world, and that it would lead her to hope that his interest in her was greater than in fact it was. It is difficult to conjecture how far he was aware of Blanche's growing affection for him. The occasion of his first visit to her, in 1874, must have represented to Blanche almost a justification for her very existence. There were, of course, many plans and false alarms before they actually met. Ruskin was eager that the meeting should take place at her aunt's school in the village of Farnworth, six miles outside Warrington, where Blanche, following his advice, was recuperating after a quite serious illness. In preparation for the meeting Blanche had studied Ruskin's photograph and so, as he jocularly wrote, had seen the worst; she had also answered his careful questions about her appearance. As the time of the visit approached she grew fearful lest he should lose interest in her after the meeting, but Ruskin wrote to comfort her:

No—I won't patronise you—and we shall write just as we do now—I shall at least—you, I hope more comfortably.²

And then on 20 February 1874, she received his letter from Oxford telling her that he intended to pass through Warrington the following day on his way to Brantwood, and that he hoped to visit her that evening. The letter did not give her final assurance that the visit would take place, for Ruskin could not be sure of his plans until he had received his morning's post, but he arranged to send a message by telegraph if, by unhappy chance, circumstances should prevent his coming. Accordingly the arrangement was made that if by 11 a.m. she had not received his telegram she would know to expect him later that day. Blanche wrote an account of this visit many years later on the occasion of Ruskin's eighty-first birthday, and in it she recaptured some of her feelings on that very special day for her:

. . . at last the day came, the evening came, and he drove up to the door. It was growing dark, but there was a bright fire burning; and as the slight, stooping figure came towards me with both hands out, and my first glance rested on the

¹ Rylands Eng. MS. 1162/58 (7.5.74).

² Ibid. 45 (15.2.74).

curious eager face, with large mouth and bushy eyebrows, my heart sank. For the first moment I was startled. Could this be my hero? "Is it really you?" I said with a little gasp. "Yes, it's myself entirely" was the answer with an amused laugh. Then when he had talked and talked—when I had seen the flash of those deep-set steel-blue eyes, which seemed to look through and through me, and the radiance of the smile, and the ever-changing play of expression, I thought his face fascinating in its strange power and charm. Somehow, I had expected quick, decisive speech quick, impatient movements. Instead, the words came slowly and deliberately; the movements were slow and quiet. "I am not a good talker", he said. But no one else would say so who had ever listened to him. He would tell an anecdote of some difficulty he had got into, and laugh at himself, in an almost boyish manner—or at me, as the case might be. Once, I remember, I explained that I had never been abroad, and wanted to travel. "It would spoil you, if you did", he said gently. "Then I would like to be spoiled", said I; and he answered, "Yes, I knew you would say so" with that merry smile which was so delightful.¹

Ruskin, for his part, made these comments to Blanche on his visit in a letter she received the next day:

The great thing I found out was the really oppressive nature of your life and your aunts—in its—I grieve to admit—little usefulness in comparison of its devotion and strength. I thought your Aunt was very poor, keeping a village school: these finishing schools are much sadder work to my mind. I could not examine you thoroughly without frightening you too much and making you upset tea cups. I have scarcely any idea of you. I scarcely once fairly caught your eyes—and was besides myself, half in a dream all the time, and the more so because I was considering whether to tell you what it was about—and which I did not till just the end, you know.

—Well, we must each of us help the other, as much as we can—for truly my notion is that we both need it.²

Poor Blanche, it was unfortunate that she had a cold to wrestle with as well as her nerves, and obviously she did not draw much support from her Evangelical aunt, since she was unable to disguise the fact from either her niece or her distinguished visitor that she had a headache. It must be recollected that Ruskin suffered a great disappointment on arrival when he learned that the school to which he had sent Blanche to recuperate was an artificial finishing school and not—as he imagined—a tiny, rural Dame's school such as he knew in Coniston and described in *Christ's Folk in the Appenine*.³ It is evident from this and subsequent letters which he wrote to Blanche that the meeting

¹ Rylands Eng. MS. 1164/40, 48.

² Ibid. 1162/47 (22.2.74).

³ See *Christ's Folk in the Appenine* by Francesca Alexander, edited by John Ruskin, D.C.L. (George Allen, 1887), 128.

developed in him a therapeutic interest in her. He saw her as a lonely, unhappy young woman in need of comfort and help. He accepted her loneliness as inevitable ; indeed he tried to make her accept it as part of God's will and His special plan for her. After meeting her he realized more clearly than ever that she could draw no consolation from her home, family and relations, nor the town she lived in. He sensed her pent-up energy and devotion ready to be directed to any cause he recommended. He was afraid to press the needs of his Guild of St. George for fear that her enthusiasm would lead to folly and so instead, whenever possible, he gave her part-secretarial work to do for him. He enclosed with his first letter after his visit a bundle of unpublished manuscripts with instructions which greatly delighted her : she was to read them carefully, select any that she considered worthy of publication, copy them out neatly and forward the copies to him. After careful study of the manuscripts, Blanche selected an essay from them for publication. She copied it out very neatly as he requested, posted it to him at his Coniston address and was thankful to learn some days later that he valued her work and her judgement, and that he planned to use the material she had selected in one of his Oxford lectures. For reward she was allowed to keep the manuscripts which she read again and again with intense pleasure and excitement. She found the task of helping to make an index for two volumes of *Fors* letters less satisfying because she was required to work from printed pages and not from his own handwriting. She wrote to Ruskin to explain that the work would be " so different if it were in your own writing ",¹ but Ruskin, writing somewhat coldly from Herne Hill, refused to understand and merely quoted her phrase in a postscript and asked her to explain its meaning.

Ruskin requested Blanche to make this index early in January 1875. By his precise instruction she was required to index all the placenames mentioned. It was a lengthy piece of work which demanded serious concentration and it was not completed until May, when it was dispatched to Ruskin who reported its safe arrival. While he agreed that the index was, on first sight, good, he made somewhat grudging comment on it and added that he

¹ Ryl. Eng. MS. 1162/78 (30.4.75).

would enrich it before sending it to his printer. Nevertheless, he invited her, many years later, to help him with the index of the last volumes of *Fors*. The impersonal nature of this work gave her little satisfaction; the filing or, to use Ruskin's term, the registration of certain of his letters came nearer to the kind of work she enjoyed and she helped him in this way for many years. Ruskin gave her the most detailed instructions about the method to be adopted: boxed shelves were to be set up in her room if she had no other suitable accommodation for the letters; each letter was to be put into a strong envelope on which was to be clearly written the name of the sender, the subject of the letter and the date. Sometimes he required her to copy out in a book of ruled quarto paper certain passages from the letters, some were to be copied out and the originals burned, and some letters that he especially valued were simply entrusted to her care with the request that copies be made for his use. Although Blanche was delighted at the prospect of such work, she was also nervous in case she mislaid or lost any of these letters. Her mother had similar fears and felt that he was placing a "dreadful responsibility" on her daughter, but Ruskin merely laughed at the excitement his suggestion had caused and assured the family that without Blanche's help the letters would be burned, not filed. The fact that she knew nothing of the people who wrote the letters and so might file them wrongly also worried her, but again Ruskin swept aside her fears.

As years advanced and the burden of his daily post became excessive, he was greatly relieved to have her help in this matter. He enjoyed sharing some letters with her; as late as 1884 he sent two letters to her which he had received from the Hon. Mrs. Cowper Temple and her husband. The reason why he wanted Blanche to see Mrs. Cowper Temple's letter was probably because it referred to an unhappy young girl whom Ruskin described as another faithful disciple. In his letter he indicated his intention to send her the entire collection of Dr. Dawtrey Drewitt's letters to be copied out and returned. These letters evidently gave him great pleasure and when, some weeks later, he sent the collection to Blanche, he instructed her to number them carefully and to make an alphabetical list of the animals mentioned therein.

Ruskin found satisfaction in setting these tasks for Blanche ; he believed that he was thus training her in orderly habits. But Blanche liked better the following reason he gave in an earlier letter for choosing her to help him with this work :

It's just a thing that I can't let anybody do but a girl whom I can trust ; and though I can trust several that I know—they're none of them quite strong enough for the severe work of reading the things to see where they go.¹

She always liked to feel that he had greater regard for her than for any other young lady of his acquaintance ; indeed she confessed to feelings of jealousy only to receive this mild protest :

But my dear child—how can I sometimes help making friends of girls, as well as boys—How can I help knowing that I could make one or two happy, if I chose, when I see that they are happy when they are with me ? I needn't have *said* so to you—it would have looked less conceited—but I am simply frank with you.

What would you like me to do—to think—to say ?²

Quite clearly what she wanted him to do was to name her as the favourite of them all, but constantly he gave her indication of the true situation. In one of his early letters he wrote :

Put it out of your head that I don't know girls—I've studied them far more than anything else—to my bitter sorrow.³

Some weeks later he reminded her :

my only comfort in life is flirting, and my chief vexation now that I'm getting so old.⁴

Of the many adoring young ladies who were excited and delighted to receive his letters, flirtatious or educational (and Ruskin ever inclined to link the two in his programme designed for female education), Blanche was probably the one who had most need of his help. At first Ruskin was amused and gratified by her dependence on him, but in the summer of 1874, writing from Perugia, he showed some concern at the intensity of her feelings :

I have your sorrowful letter and scarcely know whether to be glad or sorry, that my little bits of answers are of so much value to you. I am very glad for my own sake that they are, for one likes to be cared for—but I wish you could get into the conviction of the real truth that your letters are of value and great interest to me, whether I answer or not ; and go on talking as a daughter would to her father if she

¹ Rylands Eng. MS. 1162/35. (n.d.)

² *Ibid.* 83 (n.d.)

³ *Ibid.* 24 (30.9.73).

⁴ *Ibid.* 29 (n.d.)

knew he were listening—though he made no reply for a while, with pleasure to herself also.¹

In the summer of the following year, in July 1875, Ruskin met Blanche for a second time. On this occasion, as on the last, Blanche was unwell; indeed she was recuperating in the Lake District and she wrote to Ruskin to invite him to visit her and to meet Annie Cross, the friend with whom she was staying. Ruskin was delighted to learn that she was in the neighbourhood and after making several plans that had to be cancelled because of unexpected visitors at Brantwood, he at last reached Skelwith and had tea with Blanche and her friend. Towards the end of August he invited them to spend a day with him and he arranged for them to stay the night at Brantwood. This arrangement was not easily made, for again he was beset by visitors, but at length the visit took place. As on their first meeting, Ruskin was worried about Blanche's health; this time he was concerned about her high colour, her obvious weariness and her depression. He sent her three books to help to change her attitude of mind and was relieved to learn that the local doctor had reported satisfactorily on her general condition and insisted merely on a further period of rest. Blanche was apologetic about the fatigue that left her so dull at the tea-party and Ruskin, to comfort her, wrote:

I am sure that when you are well again, you will be a diamond of your own Blanche brightness, and that the dimness was merely because you were tired and ill.²

When she did not reply to this compliment he grew worried, and a few days later he wrote again to ask her to write to him and to send a message to her friend Annie. That message must have depressed Blanche infinitely for it made abundantly clear the fact that while at the tea-party Ruskin was conscious of her ill-health, he was, at the same time, obviously full of admiration for her friend Annie—her appearance, her powers of conversation no less than of silence, and her grace and lightness of movement. From Blanche's point of view the second meeting with Ruskin was apparently no more successful than the first. In a letter to her many years later he made this comment on it:

You will never be satisfied with anything I write; for I talked to you two hours in

¹ Rylands Eng. MS. 1162/62 (22.7.74).

² Ibid. 92 (19.8.75).

Langdale and found I might just as well have talked to one of the fern leaves at the door. You were just the same at the end as at the beginning.

You can only find out things I believe in your own way—and must be left to do so—whatever questions you want answered, which 50 volumes would not answer.¹

It may be that their next and last meeting referred to in these letters was a happier occasion; the correspondence shows that Ruskin planned a hasty visit to Liverpool on his way to Coniston from Oxford, probably in 1884. He wrote with enthusiasm of his plan:

I mean to come and see you on my way to Coniston—about a fortnight from this time—but I can only get a glimpse—for I am prepared to go North now—only I must see you for an hour—Is there anything likely to take you away from home—because I hate being disappointed or I wouldn't have told you and come by surprise.²

In his second letter about this proposed visit he wrote asking Blanche to find an inn close to her home in Edge Lane and to ask her father and brothers to make no reference in the city to his intended visit, for he did not want to be delayed by other friends in Liverpool at that time. She must have found some satisfaction in the knowledge that his sole purpose in visiting Liverpool was to spend the afternoon with her and not with any other of his friends. Unfortunately there is no letter to show whether or not his visit took place.

These meetings with Blanche intensified Ruskin's awareness of what he termed her morbid sensibility. Some months after their first meeting he wrote:

Before going to my work this morning I must ask you how you ever came to write such a worse than naughty sentence as this 'Whether I waste time or not whether my character improves or degrades is of no importance except to myself and—well I don't know if it matters much even to myself.'

This is so wrong—so morbid and so unlike you that I feel greatly shocked and alarmed at it. It means that your surroundings are oppressing your mind as bad air the body.

The best thing for you to do will be to receive them as a form of persecution to be cheerfully borne for God's sake—and to begin a thorough test of the truth of Christianity in the main, by praying steadily and with assurance for relief from them. Write me a line in answer to *poste restante* Lucca.³

He confessed his anxiety about her to Mrs. Talbot in 1877:

¹ Rylands Eng. MS. 1162/139 (n.d.) ² *Ibid.* 130 (n.d.) ³ *Ibid.* 68 (12.9.74).

Blanche is very ill herself without knowing it, poor thing, and her whole mind is warped from what it was.¹

Usually when she was ill he wrote quietly sympathetic letters encouraging her to lay aside her anxieties and concentrate solely on getting well again so that she would be able to support him in his work for the Guild. But her confession during an illness in the autumn of 1875 that she enjoyed reading J. S. Mill brought a series of cold notes from Ruskin and this statement which greatly alarmed her :

I simply feel more and more that I can do you no good and am wasting my time on you.²

Blanche sent an anguished appeal and received the following cold, rather cruel reply :

Cowley Rectory
27 October 75.

My dearest Blanche,

I am deeply grieved to have received your letter too late to reply at once (it has had traverses to make) and now to find so sorrowful words in it—and the more because I can't do away with your misunderstanding of me—I never have been otherwise than your friend for one moment—and the things, which made me angry were in no wise the cause of my change in manner of writing, but simply the feeling that I could be of no use. That feeling I have still.—All that I could say or do, would not convince you of the difference between anger or displeasure—and ceasing to speak when I find my sayings unserviceable. Do not agitate your mind about such things. If your illness increases, you will soon have new friends better than the old ones,—if it diminishes—be sure you may have the old ones when ever they are likely to be of use to you and that I am

Ever affectionately Yours
J. Ruskin³

But when, in less irritated mood, he reflected on his possible influence on Blanche, Ruskin realized that he was virtually a liberalizing force in her life and that he had given her a new confidence in herself. There can be little doubt that the controlling aim in his relationship with her was his desire to help her to adjust herself happily to the world about her. It may be that the price she had to pay for this adjustment was emotionally high—she always hoped for more affection than she received—but she gained from the friendship new interests in life, in people

¹ Rylands Eng. MS. 1161/42 (18.2.77).

² Ibid. 1162/95 (n.d.)

³ Ibid. 96 (27.10.75).

and in writing. Ruskin's publication of extracts from her letters inspired her to greater literary effort. As early in their friendship as 1874 she sought his advice on the matter and was delighted to receive a letter of approval and encouragement from him. In 1883 he again wrote to encourage her, this time to comment favourably on an article she had written for mill-workers. Towards the end of the year he made further reference to her literary powers and criticized a certain hardness in her work ; he suggested that she should send him a short story on a pleasant subject so that he could properly assess her ability. No letter exists to show if the story were in fact written, but publishers' records prove that in 1891 a novel by Blanche Atkinson entitled *They have their Reward* was published by George Allen, Ruskin's own publisher. Four years later another novel by Blanche Atkinson entitled *A common place Girl* was published by A. & C. Black, and at the beginning of this century some of her stories for children were also published.

Blanche, therefore, drew much from the friendship. True, she was in love with Ruskin, but many young ladies who received his letters seem to have been in a similar state. They realized that they could draw heavily on his attention and interest ; they knew that he looked for long, friendly letters from them. In a letter to one of his younger friends, a schoolgirl, he wrote :

*You ought to have no end of things to tell me what you've been learning and what you've been repeating or what dresses you've been wearing—what wreaths you've been gathering.*¹

Such letters provided him with amusement and, in an ephemeral way, interest ; they could make him feel useful, gay, even young, but few of the young ladies with whom he corresponded could really help him. Blanche proved an exception ; he regarded her, as he told her, as a " true and inalienable friend ".² At times he was able to ease his wearied mind and spirit by sending her sad accounts of his tragic love for Rosie La Touche. His letters give a vivid picture of the familiar, pathetic story. He was anxious that Blanche should realize that he never encouraged the young Rosie to disobey her parents until they had already taken the fatal

¹ Guild of St. George : Ruskin Collection (2.12.81).

² Ryl. Eng. MS. 1162/97.

step of lying to her and making her believe evil of him and so, as he argued, fatally disturbing her brain. He told of the message he had received in Venice when she had broken away from her parents and was eager to make her peace with him, and he described the joy when they were together again, that so soon turned to grief :

[Rosie] gave me one day of perfect happiness—and then left me—not *now* leaving me but in a sad spiritual way—as a vowed nun might—shrinking *madly*—I speak literally—from any other love but her love of God.¹

Blanche evidently wanted to know more of his day of perfect happiness for he continued :

The perfect day was when I had perfect assurance in my own mind she was going to take me—and she herself was quite happy in park with me on a radiant day in August—and playing to me in the drawing room—and the other people in the house keeping out of our way.²

He wrote freely to Blanche about his feelings of anguish and about Rosie's merciless cruelty in her madness, which was, he believed, indirectly an outcome of her religious fervour that believed in the purifying powers of pain. In this same letter he made a rare comment on his marriage—obviously in answer to a discreet reference made by Blanche :

Of the other matters which you are not going to ask about—it is indeed only necessary for you to know that it was only a sorrowful and hateful passage of life—not in the least a permanent mischief (except in collateral power over this last). No man of real worth can love what is unworthy, enough to be ruined, or even permanently hurt by discovering that it is so. —But when the great and right love of what is wholly worthy of love is changed into grief—there is an end.³

He wanted Blanche to realize that since 1858 pain was the constant accompaniment of his life and work ; that the only reward for his toil that he sought was Rosie's caress, which she never gave, though sometimes she praised him. He was able in his letters at times to report that she was making satisfactory progress, but he was never able to report that her attitude towards him had changed. As might be expected, Blanche protested strongly at Rosie's treatment of him and vowed never to forgive her, but Ruskin bore no such resentment for, as he explained to Blanche, his chance of happiness with Rosie had been destroyed by her

¹ Rylands Eng. MS. 1162/34 (n.d.)

² *Ibid.* 36 (n.d.)

³ *Ibid.*

intense belief in a future life. And when Blanche still blamed her he tried in simple language to account for his need of her :
 Crossing the hills, yesterday, I found myself about 1 o'clock in want of a sandwich. I happened to have one in my pocket—ate it and got on—if I hadn't had it, I couldn't have got on—it would have been no use for any pious person to tell me I was making a God of my sandwich—and that God would be jealous of its importance on my mind.

I simply needed my mutton and mustard—or I couldn't have done my work.—I only look upon Rosie as a sandwich—but I can't get on without her. She is not the moon, nor is she an idol—but an amusing child—with grey eyes which happens to be precisely the thing that I can't do without—I *do* after a fashion but badly.¹

A month later, in April 1874, he happily reported to Blanche that Rosie had sent a note to his cousin, Joan Severn, in which she prayed for the safety of all travellers. Ruskin took this prayer as evidence that she was thinking of him, for he was setting off on a journey at the time the note was written and it was her custom never to refer directly to him by name. He described the excessive strain of the previous winter, when he took time from his work at Oxford to visit Rosie's sick-room, and he wrote with evident pride of the occasion when her distracted parents called on him for help in the hope that he would be able to quieten her. In January 1875 he could report only that Rosie was insane and slowly wasting away ; she no longer submitted to the ministrations of others and even in the matter of diet would have only her own way and lived mostly on soda-water and plum cake. In May 1875 he learned of her death and at once wrote to Blanche. His letter expressed no overwhelming grief, but rather amazement that it was possible for him to be reading tranquilly at 7 a.m., the time of her death, and be unaware of it. As a postscript he added pathetically that, of course, she left no message.

It is significant that Ruskin immediately wrote to Blanche on learning of Rosie's death. He had come to rely on her and to need her sympathy. He felt that Blanche deserved such confidence because of her intense faith in him, but possibly he gave her the real reason when he wrote :

And the intense relief it is to me, to speak a little to anyone who *can* be rightly sorry for me.²

Undoubtedly she was rightly sorry for him. He clearly believed

¹ Rylands Eng. MS. 1162/53 (9.3.74).

² *Ibid.* 34 (n.d.)

that she would understand that Rose La Touche could never be replaced in his affections. He accepted Blanche's unhappiness as he accepted his own. It may well be that his own experience of misery helped him to gauge correctly her unhappiness, even if he did not diagnose its cause. Their friendship was cemented by a mutual need and by her misery, no less than by her powers to irritate him. As late as 1884 he sent her the following letter with the familiar scolding note in it :

I don't know if you have the least idea of it—but the fact is that on every occasion on which we have *differed* in opinion you have *always* thought yourself wiser than I am. It is not merely about your own business—but in the most naive way, you have over and over again given me advice about my own books—and coolly told me what to write and what not. You are without exception the proudest and sauciest girl I ever knew—but also one of the best.

Now, whether you believe it or not—this is the fact—that you know hardly more about your own duties than about my books.¹

Later still he vigorously complained :

You are tiresome with these barometrical variations—one day insisting on my being a hero—and the next, hoping I mayn't turn out a rogue.²

The last letter of all in this collection in the Rylands Library indicates that Blanche was still looking for his letters, still terrified of being cast aside. This short note of comfort which he wrote must have made clear even to the persistent, unhappy, hopeful Blanche that all was over now and that she must look to *Fors Clavigera* and not to John Ruskin for strength and interest in life :

Boulogne
25th Aug.

My dearest Blanche

I have not given you up a bit but I simply cannot write private letters at present, nor read them—the diabolic horrors of public life increase so fast—in accelerating pace that I must fight with my whole strength and indulge neither myself nor my friends with private talk. Read *Fors* carefully & do all you can understand. What you can't never mind.

Ever affly. as ever
J. Ruskin

I like your last note v. much, and am thankful you are better.³

Atropos or—as Ruskin preferred—the Third *Fors*⁴ ruled that she should return to obscurity and to *Fors Clavigera*, the source of their friendship.

¹ Rylands Eng. MS. 1162/127 (n.d.) ² *Ibid.* 138 (n.d.) ³ *Ibid.* 140.

⁴ See *Fors* 5, lix. 304.

COPTIC BIBLICAL TEXTS PUBLISHED AFTER VASCHALDE'S LISTS

By WALTER C. TILL, DR. PHIL.

READER IN COPTIC IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER;
TIT. AO. PROFESSOR IN EGYPTOLOGY (VIENNA)

THE Faculty of Theology of Manchester University had hoped to issue a memorial volume in honour of the late Professor T. W. Manson, its Rylands Professor of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis. The volume was intended to contain contributions from the members of the Faculty. This unfortunately proved impracticable. Hence I am specially grateful to Professor E. Robertson, the editor of the *BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY*, for accepting the following article as a small tribute to Professor Manson from one who owed him much.

Professor Manson's interests and range of knowledge were wide and they included Coptic. He realized the importance of the Coptic versions of the Bible for its textual criticism and he himself was a competent Coptic scholar. It was largely owing to his initiative that the University of Manchester established a Senior Lectureship in Coptic of which I had the honour to be the first holder. I should like here to express my appreciation of the kindness and help I always received from him.

The Coptic versions of the Bible are for the most part preserved only in fragments which are scattered in collections all over the world; they have been published in many books and articles. A. Vaschalde performed the useful task of compiling lists of all published Coptic Biblical texts in such a way that anyone could easily find any particular Biblical passage in the printed editions. His lists were published under the title of "Ce qui a été publié des versions coptes de la Bible" in *Revue Biblique* (Paris, 1919-22) for the Sahidic versions, in *Le Muséon* 43 (Louvain, 1930) and 45 (1932) for the Bohairic texts, and *ibid.* 46 (1933) for Fayyumic and Achmimic.

However, since Vaschalde's lists appeared many more parts

of the Coptic Bible have been edited and I thought it would be a good thing to compile a supplementary list, one dealing with those editions of Coptic Biblical texts that have appeared since his lists were made or are not mentioned there. This should be useful to all who are interested in the Coptic versions of the Bible and seems an appropriate tribute to one who himself did so much for such studies.

It is unnecessary to explain here why, in compiling the list, I do not follow Vaschalde's system in all details.

I cannot hope to have covered all publications but I hope I have not missed many. I regret very much that I cannot cover the many quotations from the Bible that are found in Coptic literature. Nor did Vaschalde pretend to cover all these but only those noted by the editors of the various texts which contained them. Much remains still to be done in this field.

Only printed editions are mentioned in the following list. I omit all texts published only on plates, and all unpublished texts. But I mention editions of which I hope that they will soon be issued.

I owe much valuable information to the Reverend R. Kasser (Combas, France), Professor J. Simon, S. I. (Rome), and Dr. R. McL. Wilson (St. Andrews) and I offer them my best thanks for their very kind and much appreciated help.

Abbreviations used in the following list. The number after the abbreviation indicates, unless otherwise denoted, the page on which the passage referred to is found.

Amundsen, Chr. pap. = L. Amundsen, "Christian papyri from the Oslo collection", *Symbolae Osloenses*, 24 (Oslo, 1945), 121-40. This publication has not been available to me.

Crum, ST = W. E. Crum, *Short texts from Coptic ostraca and papyri*. London, 1921.

Crum, WS = W. E. Crum and H. I. Bell, *Wadi Sarga*. Coptica iii. Copenhagen, 1922.

Donadoni, S Thr = S. Donadoni, "Una pergamena saidica dei Thrênôî di Geremia", *Archiv orientální* 20 (Praha, 1952), 400-406.

Kahle, Bal = Paul E. Kahle, *Bala'izah*, Oxford, 1954 (two volumes).

Lefort, Frgm. A = L. Th. Lefort, "Fragments bibliques en dialecte akhmîmique," *Le Muséon*, 66 (Louvain, 1953), 1-30.

Lefort, Luc A = L. Th. Lefort, "Fragments de S. Luc en akhmîmique", *Le Muséon*, 62 (Louvain, 1949), 199-205, two plates.

Lefort, MS. Louv = L. Th. Lefort, *Les manuscrits coptes de l'université de Louvain*. I. *Texts littéraires* (Louvain, 1940).

- Munier, ANT = H. Munier, "Recueil de manuscrits de l'Ancient et du Nouveau Testament", *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire*, 12 (Cairo, 1916), 243-257. This edition contains, apart from the passages from Genesis and the Apocalypse mentioned below, also a lectionary with parts from Psalm 101, Luke, Acts, Rom. 4. I have not seen this edition.
- Munier, MLC = H. Munier, "Mélange de littérature copte", I: *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte*, 19 (Cairo, 1919) 225-241. II: *ibid.* 21 (1921) 77-88.
- Shier, S OT = Louse A. Shier, "Old Testament texts on vellum", in William H. Worrell, *Coptic texts in the University of Michigan collection. University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic series*, vol. 46 (Ann Arbor, 1942), pp. 25-167.
- Thompson, Cpt vers = Sir Herbert Thompson, *The Coptic version of the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles in the Sahidic dialect* (Cambridge, 1932).
- Till, Bibl. JRL. = "Coptic Biblical fragments in the John Rylands Library," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 34 (Manchester, 1952), 432-58.
- Till, F NT = "Fajjumische Bruchstücke des Neuen Testamentes", *Le Muséon*, 51 (Louvain, 1938), 227-38.
- Till, Kl.B.Frg. = "Kleine koptische Bibelfragmente", *Biblica*, 20 (Rome, 1939), 241-63; 361-86.
- Till, Perg. theol. = *Koptische Pergamente theologischen Inhalts, I. Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien* (Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer), Neue Serie, 2 (Wien, 1934).
- Till-Sanz, Od. = W. Till und P. Sanz, *Eine griechisch-koptische Odenhandschrift. Monumenta biblica et ecclesiastica*, 5 (Rome, 1939).
- Till, S AT = "Sahidische Fragmente des Alten Testamentes", *Le Muséon*, 50 (Louvain, 1937), 175-237.
- Till, Wien F = "Wiener Faijumica", *Le Muséon*, 49 (1936), 169-217.
- Wessely, S PB = C. Wessely, *Sahidische Papyrusfragmente der paulinischen Briefe. Sitzungsberichte der kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophisch-historische Klasse*, 174/5. Wien 1914.
- Wessely, Stud 11 = C. Wessely, *Griechische und koptische Texte theologischen Inhalts, 2. Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde*, 11 (Leipzig, 1911).
- Wessely, Stud 12 = the same, vol. 3 (Leipzig, 1912).
- Wessely, Stud 18 = the same, vol. 5 (Leipzig, 1917).
- Worrell, F Ep = W. H. Worrell, "Fayumic fragments of the Epistles," *Bulletin de la Société d'archéologie copte*, 6 (Cairo, 1940), 127-39.
- Worrell, Freer = W. H. Worrell, *The Coptic manuscripts in the Freer Collection. University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series*, vol. 10. New York-London, 1923.

Sahidic

Addition to Vaschalde's abbreviations: Pey = B. Peyron, *Psalterii copto-thebani specimen* (etc.) = *Memorie della Regia Accademia delle Scienze di Torino* 1876, ser. ii, tom. 28, Scienze morali, pp. 117 ff.

Genesis

- 3, 2-14 Lefort, MS. Louv. 4 f.
 3, 22 Crum, ST no. 1
 17, 11-13. 27 Lefort, MS. Louv. 7 f.
 18, 1. 2. 6-9. 23-26. 29-32 Lefort, MS. Louv. 8 f.
 19, 12-15. 17-20. 34-36 Lefort, MS. Louv. 9 f.
 20, 1-4 Lefort, MS. Louv. 10
 21, 1-4. 8-12. 26-29. 32-34 Lefort, MS. Louv. 10 f.
 21, 28-22, 6 Kahle, Bal 293-5
 22, 1. 13-15. 18-20 Lefort, MS. Louv. 11 f.
 23, 13-16. 18-20 Lefort, MS. Louv. 12 f.
 24, 1. 14. 15. 19-22. 38-40. 43. 44. 60-62. 66. 67 Lefort, MS. Louv. 13 f.
 24, 38. 46. 47 Till, S AT 176 f.
 24, 65-25, 17 Shier, S OT 40-42
 25, 1. 2. 19-21. 24-27 Lefort, MS. Louv. 14 f.
 26, 8-10. 14-16. 29-32 Lefort, MS. Louv. 15 f.
 27, 1-4. 21-23. 27-29. 41. 42. 46 Lefort, MS. Louv. 16 f.
 28, 1. 2. 14-16. 20-22 Lefort, MS. Louv. 17 f.
 29, 11-16 Kahle, Bal 296
 29, 13-15. 19-22 Lefort, MS. Louv. 18
 30, 3-6. 9-14. 29-31. 33-35 Lefort, MS. Louv. 19 f.
 31, 3-6. 9-12. 26-29. 32. 33. 45-47. 49-53 Lefort, MS. Louv. 20 f.
 32, 11-13. 16-18. 33 Lefort, MS. Louv. 22
 33, 1. 2. 5-8 Lefort, MS. Louv. 22 f.
 34, 3-6. 9-11. 24-26. 30. 31 Lefort, MS. Louv. 23 f.
 35, 12-14. 17-20 Lefort, MS. Louv. 24
 36, 7-11. 15-17. 35-38. 40-43 Lefort, MS. Louv. 25 f.
 36, 17-39 Munier, ANT
 37, 13-16. 19-22. 35. 36 Lefort, MS. Louv. 26
 38, 1. 4-8. 20-23. 25-27 Lefort, MS. Louv. 27
 39, 9-11. 14-16 Lefort, MS. Louv. 28
 40, 5-21 Munier, ANT
 40, 6-8. 12-14 Lefort, MS. Louv. 28 f.
 41, 4-6. 9-12. 26-28. 31-34. 48-50. 53-55 Lefort, MS. Louv. 29 f.
 42, 14-16. 20-22. 36-38 Lefort, MS. Louv. 30 f.
 42, 20-23. 32-35 Till, S AT 177-9
 42, 34-43, 23 Till, Perg. theol. 1-4
 43, 2-5. 17-19. 22-25 Lefort, MS. Louv. 31 f.
 44, 2-4. 7-10. 22-25. 27-30 Lefort, MS. Louv. 32 f.
 45, 8. 9. 12-14. 28 Lefort, MS. Louv. 33f.
 45, 9. 19. 20 Till, S AT 179
 46, 1. 2. 5-7. 20-22. 27-29 Lefort, MS. Louv. 34 f.
 47, 5-7. 11. 12. 22-24. 26-28 Lefort, MS. Louv. 35 f.
 48, 10-12. 15. 16 Lefort, MS. Louv. 36
 49, 6-9. 11-14. 30. 31 Lefort, MS. Louv. 37
 50, 3. 4. 17. 18. 22-24 Lefort, MS. Louv. 37 f.
 50, 9-15 Shier, S OT 42 f.

Exodus

- 1, 1-6. 19-22 Lefort, MS. Louv. 38
 2, 5. 6. 18. 19. 23. 24 Lefort, MS. Louv. 39
 3, 12. 13. 15. 16 Lefort, MS. Louv. 40
 4, 6. 10. 23-25. 29. 30 Lefort, MS. Louv. 40
 5, 12. 13. 17. 18 Lefort, MS. Louv. 41
 23, 15. 20 Till, S AT 180

Leviticus

- 21, 17-24¹ Lefort, MS. Louv. 43
 22, 1-8¹ Lefort, MS. Louv. 44
 25, 47. 53-55 Till, S AT 180 f.

¹ Published first by E. Amélineau in *Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes*, 8 (1886). It was never in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris as Vaschalde supposed.

Numbers

- 4, 48-5, 13 Till, Perg. theol. 4-6
 6, 25-27 Stefanski-Lichtheim, *Coptic Ostraca from Medinet Habu. The University of Chicago, Oriental Institute Publications*, 71 (Chicago, 1952), no. 1.
 13, 24-26 Till, S AT 181 f.
 14, 9. 10 Till, S AT 182
 19, 12. 14. 15 Till, S AT 183
 22, 38-41 Till, S AT 184
 23, 3. 4 Till, S AT 184

Deuteronomy

- 7, 26-8, 8 Lefort, MS. Louv. 46
 8, 1-8 Kahle, Bal 299 f.
 9, 24-10, 4 Lefort, MS. Louv. 47 f.
 10, 11-11, 2 Till, Perg. theol. 6 (collation)
 16, 19-22 Till, S AT 185
 17, 1-3. 5. 6. Till, S AT 186
 32, 2-39. 43 Till-Sanz, Od 51-67

Joshua

- 1, 2-6 Till, Perg. theol. 12 f.

Judges

- 16, 17. 18. 20. 21 Till, S AT 187
 20, 4-15 Till, S AT 188-90

Ruth

- 1, 1-4, 22 Shier, S OT 44-68
 3, 14-4, 3 Till, S AT 190-2

I Samuel

J. Drescher is preparing the edition of the complete text of I and II Samuel from a manuscript of the Pierpont Morgan collection. I understand that the Société d'Archéologie copte in Cairo intends to publish this edition.

2, 1. 3. 4. 8-10 Till-Sanz, Od 67-9

2, 24-30 Kahle, Bal 302 f.

3, 6-9 Kahle, Bal 304

6, 14-21 Kahle, Bal 304-7

14, 3. 5. 7. 10. 11 Kahle, Bal 307

14, 47. 49-15, 2 Lefort, MS. Louv. 50

15, 13. 15. 17. 19. 20 Kahle, Bal 308

15, 21-24. 26. 29. 30 Lefort, MS. Louv. 51 f.

17, 11-13. 40-42. 48-51. 54	} L. Dieu, "Le texte copte sahidique des livres de Samuel", <i>Le Muséon</i> , 59 (Louvain, 1946, Mélanges L. Th. Lefort), 446-447.
18, 6-17. 21. 22. 28. 29	
19, 1	

19, 3-9 Till, Perg. theol. 14 f.

21, 13-22, 6 Kahle, Bal 309 f.

24, 12. 15. 17-20 Kahle, Bal 311

29, 3-9 Kahle, Bal 312-14

II Samuel

11, 1-5. 8-10. 12. 13. 15-20 Till, S AT 192-4

13, 28-34. 36-14, 6 Till, S AT 195-7

I Kings

1, 51-2, 5 Kahle, Bal 315 f.

2, 1-4 Kahle, Bal 317

17, 5. 6. 12 Till, S AT 197

20, 4, Kahle, Bal 317

21, 16-18. 21. 23-26. 30. 31 Till, S AT 198-200

22, 39-54 Kahle, Bal 318-21

II Kings

2, 6 Till, Kl B Frg. 245

14, 17-22. 24. 25. 27-29 Kahle, Bal 322-4

17, 13-23 Kahle, Bal 324-6

II Chronicles

5, 14 Till, Perg. theol. 13

6, 3-8 Till, Perg. theol. 13 f.

34, 29-31 Till, Perg. theol. 15

Psalms

1, 1 Crum, ST no. 2

1, 1. 2 Crum, ST no. 3

4, 8. 9; 5 title Crum, ST no. 4

5, 13-6, 3 Till, S AT 201

- 6, 9-11 Till, S AT 201
 8, 2-9, 2 Till, S AT 210 f.
 16, 1-6 Lefort, MS. Louv. 54
 17, 20-26 Lefort, MS. Louv. 54
 17, 40-45 Lefort, MS. Louv. 55
 18, 5-10 Lefort, MS. Louv. 55
 18, 8 (?) Crum, ST no. 10
 18, 36-41 Till, S AT 203 f.
 21, 25-27 Crum, ST no. 5
 22, 15-17 Till, S AT 204
 22, 24, 25 Till, S AT 205
 26, 12-14 } P. W. Ernštedt (= Peter Jernstedt), *Koptské teksty Gosudar-*
 27, 1-9 } *stvennovo Ermitaža. Akademiya Nauk SSSR (Moscow-Lenin-*
 28, 1 (title) } *grad, 1959), 132-134.*
 30, 1-6 A. Wikgren, "Two ostraca fragments of the Septuagint Psalter", *Journal*
of Near Eastern Studies, 5 (Chicago, 1945), 183
 32, 8, 9. Crum, ST no. 6
 40, 13 Crum, ST no. 7
 41 title Crum, ST no. 7
 43, 25-44, 8 Worrell, Freer 107 f.
 46, 1-7 Worrell, Freer 108 f.
 59, 8-60, 1 Till, Bibl. JRL. 433 f.
 60, 16-24 Till, Bibl. JRL. 434 f.
 62, 8-63, 11 Till, S AT 202 f.
 63, 7, 8 Till, S AT 205
 64, 2, 3 Till, S AT 205 f.
 67, 2 Wessely, Stud. 12, No. 166
 70, 16-24 Till, Bibl. JRL. 434 f.
 71, 1-11 Till, Bibl. JRL. 435 f.
 76, 6-9 Till, S AT 206
 77, 8-10 Till, S AT 206
 77, 65-69 Wessely, Stud. 18, p. 17
 80, 3 Till, Kl B Frg. 247
 87, 5-12 Kahle, Bal 328
 87, 16-88, 4 Kahle, Bal 328 f.
 94, 22-95, 1 Till, S AT 212
 103, 14-20 Till, SAT 207
 104, 10-15 Till, S AT 207 f.
 106, 34-36, 45, 46 Till, S AT 208
 110, 9, 10 Kahle, Bal 329 f.
 111, 6, 7 Kahle, Bal 330
 118, 10, 11 H. Kortenbeutel-A. Böhlig, "Ostrakon mit griechisch-koptischem
 Psalmtext", *Aegyptus*, 15 (Milan, 1935), 415
 118, 149-152, 158-160, 171, 172 Lefort, MS. Louv. 56-8
 135, 20-136, 2 Till, S AT 209
 136, 14-16 Till, S AT 209
 139, 1-5 Lefort, MS. Louv. 58
 147, 6-148, 4 Kahle, Bal 330 f.

Proverbs

The complete text has been edited by G. P. G. Sobhy, *The book of the Proverbs of Solomon in the dialect of Upper Egypt* (Cairo, 1927). The same text has been edited in a scientific edition with critical notes by William H. Worrell, *The Proverbs of Solomon in Sahidic Coptic according to the Chicago manuscript. The University of Chicago, Oriental Institute Publications*, 12 (Chicago, 1931).

R. Kasser has edited a text of the Proverbs of considerable interest. Not only is the dialect peculiar but the script also shows archaic features which this manuscript does not share with any other Coptic manuscript known as far. It looks rather like "Old Coptic". *Papyrus Bodmer VI* (Proverbs I 1-XXI 4). *Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium, Scriptores coptici*. The Sahidic text (influenced by Achmimic) comprises : Proverbs 1, 1-2, 9 ; 2, 20-15, 23 ; 15, 29-18, 1 ; 18, 9-20, 9 ; 20, 25-21, 4.

14, 29-32 Till, Kl B Frg. 246

15, 1-4 Till, Kl B Frg. 246 f.

27, 9-22 Till, S AT 213 f.

29, 28-32. 39-41. 48. 49 Munier, MLC 226

Ecclesiastes

1, 1-12, 14 Shier, S OT 68-125

1, 7-16 Till, Bibl. JRL. 436-438

7, 1-3. 8-12. 16-19. 26. 27 Lefort, MS. Louv. 60-2

8, 9-9, 2 Till, Perg. theol. 11 f. (collation)

The Song of Songs

1, 1-8, 14 Shier, S OT 125-55

Job

The complete Sahidic text, with the exception of 39, 8-40, 8, has been edited by E. Amélineau, "The Sahidic translation of the book of Job", in *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, 9 (1893).

15, 25-28. 34-16, 1 Till, S AT 215

24, 19-25, 3 Worrell, Freer 110 f.

27, 10-19 Worrell, Freer 111 f.

31, 11-13. 15. 16 Kahle, Bal 403 ; cf. Polotsky in *Orientalia*, NS 26 (1957), 347.

Wisdom of Solomon

11, 4-10. 12-15 E. M. Husselman, "A palimpsest fragment from Egypt", *Studi in onore di Aristide Calderini e Roberto Paribeni*, 2 (Milan, 1957), 458f.

Jesus ben Sirach (Ecclesiasticus)

1, 5-13. 16-20 Till, Bibl. JRL. 439 f.

18, 18-20. 29-31 Till, Bibl. JRL. 441

23, 19. 20. 28-30 Till, Bibl. JRL. 441 f.

45, 9. 10. 13-15 Till, S AT 216

Tobias

1, 7-20 L. Saint-Paul Girard, "Un fragment inédit du Livre de Tobie", *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire*, 22 (1923), 116 f.

Hosea

2, 9-5, 1 W. Grossouw, "Un fragment sahidique d'Osée", *Le Muséon*, 47 (Louvain, 1934), 190-201.

Micah

4, 8-5, 5 Till, Perg. theol. 8-10

Obadiah

5-17 Till, Perg. theol. 10 f.

Jonah

2, 3-10 Till-Sanz, Od 71-5

Habakkuk

1, 1-3. 5-11. 13. 14 Till, S AT 217-19
2, 5 Till, S AT 218 f.

Ishaia

1, 3. 4. 6. 7. 9 Lefort, MS. Louv. 67 f.
7, 10-16 Lefort, MS. Louv. 68
14, 22-25. 27-29 Till, S AT 219 f.
14, 31-15, 8 Till, S AT 220-2
16, 2-10 Till, S AT 221-3
25, 1-7. 10 Till-Sanz, Od 75-79
26, 1-4. 11-20 Till-Sanz, Od 79-85
38, 9-15. 18-20 Till-Sanz, Od 85-9
52, 14-53, 4 Kahle, Bal 332 f.

Jeremiah

4, 22-5, 10 Shier, S OT 156-60
18, 18-19, 6 Till, S AT 224 f.
32, 22-37 Till, Perg. theol. 7 f.
39, 2-6 Till, S AT 226
51, 25-52, 1 Shier, S OT 160-4
52, 3-7. 31-34 Shier, S OT 164-6

Lamentations

1, 20-2, 1 Till, Perg. theol. 12
2, 21-3, 1 Till, Bibl. JRL. 442-4
2, 19-3, 4. 6-18 Donadoni, S Thr 403 f.
3, 5-8. 13-17. 19-23 Till, Bibl. JRL. 442-4
4, 2-20 Wessely, Stud 18, pp. 20 f.

4, 5-8. 10-12. 14-19 Donadoni, S Thr 405 f.
4, 12-5, 19 Till, S AT 227-230

Letter of Jeremiah

15-18. 20. 21. 24-26 Till, S AT 230-232

Baruch

1, 1. 2. 4. 5 Shier, S OT 167
3, 6-30 W. Till, "Ein sahidisches Baruchfragment", *Le Muséon*, 46 (1933), 35-41.

Ezekiel

20, 41-49 Lefort, MS. Louv. 70 f.
29, 8-10. 20-30, 1 Till, Bibl. JRL. 445
46, 23-47, 2 Till, S AT 232 f.
47, 4-8 Till, S AT 233

Daniel

3, 26-45. 52-54 Till-Sanz, Od 97-109
5, 6-10 Till, S AT 237
12, 7-9 Till, Bibl. JRL. 446

Susanna

28-38 Till, S AT 234-236

Manasseh

1-15 Till-Sanz, Od 91-97

New Testament

After Vaschalde's list of the Sahidic versions of the Bible was completed the rest of G. Horner's edition of the Sahidic NT was published: *The Coptic version of the New Testament in the Southern dialect otherwise called Sahidic and Thebaic*.
vol. iv (Oxford 1920): Romans, I and II Corinthians.
vol. v (Oxford 1920): The rest of the Pauline Epistles.
vol. vi (Oxford 1922): The Acts of the Apostles.
vol. vii (Oxford 1924): The Catholic Epistles and the Apocalypse.

Matthew

2, 6. 7. 9. 12. 13. 15. 16 Till, Kl B Frg. 247 f.
2, 16-18 Till, Kl B Frg. 248
3, 13-16 Wessely, Stud. 18, p. 18
4, 3. 4 Till, Kl B Frg. 248
5, 17-19 Kahle, Bal 400 f.
6, 10-12. 19. 20 Till, Kl B Frg. 248 f.
6, 29. 30 Till, Kl B Frg. 249
7, 1. 2 Till, Kl B Frg. 249
8, 14. 15. 30. 31 Till, Kl B Frg. 250
8, 19. 20. 23. 24. 26. 29 Till, Kl B Frg. 250 f.

9, 6. 17 Till, Kl B Frg. 251

9, 13-21 { R. Engelbach, "Fragment of the Gospel of Saint Matthew in Coptic
10, 5-16 { (Sahidic dialect)", *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte*,
21 (Cairo, 1921), 118-122.

10, 14-21 Kahle, Bal 334 f.

10, 23-25 Till, Kl B Frg. 251

10, 23-30. 32-35. 37-41 Kahle, Bal 336-338

11, 5 Till, Kl B Frg. 251

14, 21. 22. 25-27. 30. 31. 36 } G. Garrido, "Un nouveau papyrus de l'Évangile
16, 8. 12. 15. 16. 20 } de saint Mathieu en copte sahidique," *Les*
Cahiers coptes, 15 (Cairo, 1957), 5-16, and "Hall-
azgo de un papiro del Nuevo Testamento en copto
sahidico," *Estudios Bíblicos*, 17 (1958), 107-8.
I have not seen these publications.

16, 9-18 Till, Kl B Frg. 252 f.

17, 1. 4 Till, Kl B Frg. 253

17, 20. 24. 25 Kahle, Bal 339

19, 8-10. 12. 14-20 Till, Kl B Frg. 253 f.

21, 41. 42. 45. 46 Kahle, Bal 338

22, 13. 14. 17. 18 Till, Kl B Frg. 254 f.

22, 30-32. 39-43 Till, Kl B Frg. 255

24, 24. 32. 47-49 Till, Kl B Frg. 256

24, 51-25, 1 Till, Kl B Frg. 256

25, 5. 6. 9. 10 Till, Kl B Frg. 256 f.

26, 29. 30. 33. 34. 45. 48. 49 Till, Kl B Frg. 257

26, 45-48. 52-55. 58-60 Till, Kl B Frg. 258 f.

27, 10. 11. 24 Till, Kl B Frg. 259

27, 31. 32. 39. 45. 50. 51 Till, Kl B Frg. 259 f.

27, 47-28, 4 Till, Kl B Frg. 260-2

27, 63. 64 Till, Bibl. JRL. 446

28, 2-5 Till, Bibl. JRL. 447

28, 5-8. 10. 12. 13 Till, Kl B Frg. 262 f.

28, 11. 18-20 Till, Kl B Frg. 263

28, 20 Kahle, Bal 338

Mark

1, 1-3. 27-31 Munier, MLC 81 f.

1, 5-9 Till, Kl B Frg. 361

1, 6 Till, Kl B Frg. 361

4, 15-17. 20-24. 27. 28 Till, Kl B Frg. 362

12, 6. 7. 18. 19 Till, Kl B Frg. 363

15, 19. 20. 24-27 Till, Kl B Frg. 363

15, 21. 22. 31. 32 Till, Kl B Frg. 363 f.

Luke

1, 46-51 Till-Sanz, Od 111

6, 27. 29-33 Lefort, MS. Louv. 81

7, 8. 9. 18. 19. 26. 27 Till, Kl B Frg. 364

- 8, 28. 29. 37. 38 Till, Kl B Frg. 365
 9, 41. 42. 53 Till, Kl B Frg. 365
 14, 18. 19. 27 Till, Kl B Frg. 365 f.
 15, 3. 4. 13 Till, Kl B Frg. 366
 15, 4-13 Lefort, MS. Louv. 82 f.
 16, 13. 15-17. 19-22. 25. 26 Till, Kl B Frg. 366 f.
 17, 15-29 Kahle, Bal 340 f.
 18, 9-11. 25-28 Till, Kl B Frg. 367 f.
 19, 30-46 Kahle, Bal 342 f.

John

There are two manuscripts in the collection of Chester Beatty (now in Dublin) containing the Sahidic version of the Gospel of St. John. A collation of their texts is to be found in Thompson, *Cpt vers*, 251-256. Crum, *WS* 30-32 contains collations of John 1, 20-3, 2; 4, 39-47; 20, 31-21, 2; 21, 7-25.

- 1, 12. 15 Till, Kl B Frg. 368
 2, 24-3, 15 Kahle, Bal 344-7
 3, 32. 33 Till, Kl B Frg. 368
 4, 9 Till, Kl B Frg. 368
 4, 15 (?) seems to me more probable than 13, 8a (Vaschalde). Wessely, *Stud* 12, No. 177
 6, 11. 24. 47. 48. 65-68. 71 Till, Kl B Frg. 369 f.
 7, 1-3. 8-12. 17. 18 Till, Kl B Frg. 369 f.
 7, 6-10. 12. 17. 20-22 Till, Kl B Frg. 370-372
 7, 7 Till, Kl B Frg. 372
 7, 23-26. 28. 32. 33. 35-37 Till, Kl B Frg. 372 f.
 11, 32. 33. 36-39 Till, Kl B Frg. 374
 11, 48. 49. 54. 55 Till, Kl B Frg. 374
 12, 36. 37. 41. 42 Till, Kl B Frg. 375
 13, 38-14, 3 Lefort, MS. Louv. 84
 14, 8-10. 14-17. 21-23 Lefort, MS. Louv. 84 f.
 15, 14-22. 24-26 Kahle, Bal 348-350
 17, 13-15. 19-21. 23. 24. 26-18, 1 Till, *Perg. theol.* 15 (collation)
 20, 15-19. 28-21, 2 Till, *Perg. theol.* 16 (collation)

Acts

- Complete text : Thompson, *Cpt vers* 1-85
 1, 25. 26 Till, Kl B Frg. 375
 2, 4. 7. 10. 11 Till, Kl B Frg. 375
 2, 40-3, 5 Till, *Perg. theol.* 16 (collation)
 3, 1-21 Till, *Perg. theol.* 16 f. (collation)
 3, 19-4, 17 Till, *Perg. theol.* 17 f. (collation)
 4, 20-33 Till, *Perg. theol.* 18 (collation)
 7, 18. 19 Till, Kl B Frg. 376
 8, 39. 40 Till, *Bibl. JRL.* 447
 9, 1. 6-8 Till, *Bibl. JRL.* 447 f.
 10, 39-45 Lefort, MS. Louv. 86
 10, 39-41. 45-47 Till, *Bibl. JRL.* 448

- 10, 43. 44. 47 Till, Bibl. JRL. 449
 11, 2. 3. 5. 6. 9. 10. 13 Till, Bibl. JRL. 449
 13, 34-38 Till, Bibl. JRL. 450
 20, 23-21, 3 Till, Perg. theol. 19 (collation)
 23, 10 Wessely, Stud. 11, p. 71 *supra* (not identified in the edition)
 28, 26-31 Crum, WS 32 (collation)

Carl Wessely, *Die Wiener Handschrift der sahidischen Acta Apostolorum* (Sitzungsberichte der kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, 172/2, Wien 1913) contains the following passages :

- 2, 35. 36. 41. 42. 47 pp. 29 f.
 3, 5. 6. 11. 12. 26 pp. 30 f.
 4, 1. 7. 8. 24. 29. 30. 33. 34 pp. 31 f.
 5, 3. 9. 13-15. 20. 21. 25-27. 31-34. 36. 37. 41. 42 pp. 33-36
 6, 5. 9. 10. 14. 15 pp. 36 f.
 7, 1. 2. 5. 6. 10. 11. 16-18. 23-25. 29. 30. 35. 40. 41. 44. 45. 51. 52. 57. 58 pp. 37-42
 8, 1-3. 9. 10. 14-16. 22-24. 27-29. 32-34. 39. 40 pp. 42-45
 9, 1. 4-7. 11-13. 17-19. 21-23. 28-31. 34-36. 39-41 pp. 45-50
 10, 2-4. 7-10. 15-18. 22. 23. 25-29. 31-33. 37-39. 42-44. 48 pp. 51-56
 11, 1-4. 7-11. 14-22. 25-27 pp. 56-60
 12, 1-5. 7-9. 11-13. 16-25 pp. 60-64
 13, 2-5. 8-11. 13-15. 18-22. 25-27. 31-34. 37-41. 43-46. 48-52 pp. 64-70
 14, 3-6. 10-13. 15-18. 20-23. 27. 28 pp. 70-74
 15, 1-6. 8-12. 16-20. 22. 23. 26-29. 33-37. 39-41 pp. 74-79
 16, 1. 2. 4-9. 11-18. 20-23. 26-29. 33-36. 38-40 pp. 79-85
 17, 1. 2. 4-6. 10-12. 15-17. 21-23. 25-28. 31-34 pp. 85-89
 18, 2-5. 8-11. 14-17. 19-22. 25-27 pp. 89-93
 19, 2-6. 9-11. 13-16. 19-22. 25-27. 29-33. 35-38 pp. 93-98
 20, 1-4. 7-9. 12-15. 18-20. 24-27. 30-32. 36-38 pp. 98-102
 21, 1. 4-7. 11. 12. 16-19. 21-24. 26-28. 32-34. 37-39 pp. 102-107
 22, 2-4. 7-10. 12-15. 19-22. 25-27. 30 pp. 107-110
 23, 1. 5. 6. 9-11. 14. 15. 19-21. 24-27. 31-34 pp. 111-114
 24, 2-4. 10-12. 16-19. 23. 24. 27 pp. 115-117
 25, 1-3. 7-9. 12-14. 18. 19. 23. 24 pp. 117-119
 26, 2. 3. 7. 8. 24 pp. 119 f.

Romans

Complete text : Thompson, Cpt vers 89-118.

- 1, 1-6. 10-13. 17-20 Till, Bibl. JRL. 451-453
 1, 30. 31 Wessely, S PB 12
 2, 4 Wessely, S PB 12
 3, 13-5, 9 Ad. Hebbelynck, "Fragment Borgia de l'Épître aux Romains en copte sahidique", *Le Muséon*, 35 (Louvain, 1922), 196-201
 3, 23-25 Wessely, S PB 13
 3, 29-4, 1 Wessely, S PB 13 f.
 4, 9-6, 4 Wessely, S PB 14-23
 5, 13. 14 Crum, ST no. 13
 7, 7-11. 15-18. 21-24 Wessely, S PB 24-26
 8, 3-5. 10. 11. 27-29 Wessely, S PB 26-28

- 9, 30-10, 3 Till, Kl B Frg. 376 f.
 10, 6-10 Till, Kl B Frg. 376 f.
 11, 15-17. 22 Wessely, S PB 28
 11, 30-12, 7 Till, Kl B Frg. 377 f.
 16, 18-27 Lefort, MS. Louv. 87 f.

I Corinthians

- Complete text : Thompson, Cpt vers 119-47
 1, 4. 8. 9. 11. 14. 15. 21. 25. 27 Till, Bibl. JRL. 454 f.
 5, 6-8 Kahle, Bal 353
 6, 3-5 Kahle, Bal 353
 6, 7-10 Lefort, MS. Louv. 89
 6, 19-7, 13 Kahle, Bal 353-5
 7, 3-29 Wessely, S PB 29-33
 7, 17-19. 22. 23 Kahle, Bal 356
 7, 38-8, 1 Kahle, Bal 356 f.
 8, 3-11 Kahle, Bal 356-8
 13, 2-14, 12 Lefort, MS. Louv. 90-93
 13, 9-13 Till, Kl B Frg. 379
 14, 3-7 Till, Kl B Frg. 379

II Corinthians

- Complete text : Thompson, Cpt vers 147-66
 3, 16. 17 Kahle, Bal 358
 4, 2. 5. 8 Kahle, Bal 358 f.
 11, 3. 4. 26 Till, Kl B Frg. 380

Galatians

- Complete text : Thompson, Cpt vers 188-197
 5, 18-20. 26 Till, Bibl. JRL. 455
 6, 1 Till, Bibl. JRL. 455

Ephesians

- Complete text : Thompson, Cpt vers 198-207
 2, 11. 13 Kahle, Bal 388 f.
 3, 10-21 Wessely, S PB 36-38
 4, 1-7. 24 Wessely, S PB 39 f.
 5, 5 Wessely, S PB 41

Philippians

- Complete text : Thompson, Cpt vers 207-214
 1, 10-25. 28-30 Wessely, S PB 41-45
 1, 27-2, 1 Lefort, MS. Louv. 93 f.
 1, 27-2, 10 Kahle, Bal 368-70
 1, 29. 30 Kahle, Bal 364
 2, 12 Kahle, Bal 364

3, 7-20 Kahle Bal 371 f.

4, 8. 9 Till, Kl. B Frg. 382

Colossians

Complete text : Thompson, Cpt vers 215-21

1, 1-12 Kahle, Bal 373 f.

1, 24-2, 7 Kahle, Bal 364-6

4, 1-3. 5-9. 11. 12 Kahle, Bal 375 f.

4, 14. 15 Till, Kl B Frg. 382

I Thessalonians

Complete text : Thompson, Cpt vers 222-8

1, 5-2, 3 Lefort, MS. Louv. 95 f.

II Thessalonians

Complete text : Thompson, Cpt vers 228-31

I Timothy

Complete text : Thompson, Cpt vers 231-9

4, 12-5, 2 Kahle, Bal 383 f.

5, 4. 10. 11. 13-18 Kahle, Bal 383-5

5, 11-13. 16. 17 Till, Kl B Frg. 382 f.

II Timothy

Complete text : Thompson, Cpt vers 239-44

4, 20-22 Kahle, Bal 380

Titus

Complete text : Thompson, Cpt vers 244-7

1, 1-6 Kahle, Bal 380-2

1, 9-2, 14 Kahle, Bal 385-7

1, 11. 12. 16-2, 1 Wessely, S PB 49

2, 5. 6. 10 Wessely, S PB 50

3, 8. 13. 14 Till, Kl B Frg. 383

Philemon

Complete text : Thompson, Cpt vers 248 f

1. 2. 5-7 Till, Kl B Frg. 383 f.

2. 3. 6. Till, Kl B Frg. 384

Hebrews

Complete text : Thompson, Cpt vers 166-88

6, 17-7, 9 Kahle, Bal 359-361

7, 17-21 Till, Bibl. JRL. 456

9, 19-10, 1 Kahle, Bal 362 f.

9, 22-10, 1 Till, Kl B Frg. 380 f.

10, 4-16 Till, Kl B Frg. 381

James

- 3, 1-3 Lefort, MS. Louv. 97
 3, 14. 15. 17. 18 Kahle, Bal 394
 4, 3. 5. 6 Kahle, Bal 395 f.

I Peter

- 1, 1-11 Crum, ST no. 14
 1, 21. 22 Wessely, Stud. 12, No. 171
 2, 1-9 Lefort, MS. Louv. 98-100
 2, 20. 21 Crum, WS 43
 2, 21-3, 1 Kahle, Bal 390 f.
 3, 3. 4 Kahle, Bal 392 f.
 3, 9. 11. 12. 14. 16. 17 Lefort, MS. Louv. 101

II Peter

- 2, 10-17 Till, Bibl. JRL. 456-8

I John

- 2, 8-10 Kahle, Bal 397
 2, 11-15 Kahle, Bal 393 f.

Apocalypse

- 1, 1-8 { L. Th. Lefort, "Le prologue de l'Apocalypse en sahidique", *Le Muséon*, 54 (Louvain, 1941), 107-110 (text on page 109).
 1, 1-6. 10. 11. 19. 20 } L. Th. Lefort, "Une étrange recension de l'Apocalypse",
 2, 1 } *Le Muséon*, 43 (Louvain, 1930), 2 f.
 1, 3-5. 8-13 Kahle, Bal 398 f.
 2, 18-3, 3 Munier, ANT
 6, 5-7, 1 Munier, ANT
 12, 12 Wessely, Stud. 12, No. 164
 18, 23-19, 10 Till, Perg. theol. 19 f.
 19, 20-20, 9 Wessely, Stud. 18, pp. 119 f. Not identified in the edition.
 22, 6-8. 17. 18 Till, Kl B Frg. 384 f.
 22, 12 (?) Till, Kl B Frg. 385

Bohairic

The orthodox Coptic society "Abnaa el-Kanisa" (Sons of the Church) is publishing the Bohairic text of the Pentateuch. So far as I know, Genesis and Exodus have been issued with the title *The Holy Book. The Old Testament* (in Coptic), Cairo, 1939. It is a magnificent edition of the Coptic text with a new Arabic translation. The Bohairic books of the New Testament have been published by the same society, in 1934, with the title *The Book of the New Testament* (in Coptic). No Arabic translation is added. These editions are intended for the religious use of Copts. They do not present the text of a particular manuscript and have no critical notes. Another Egyptian edition of the Bohairic New Testament is *The Holy Book. The New Testament. The first part: The four Gospels* (in Coptic). It has been published by a commission of the

Coptic orthodox Clerical School (Cairo, 1935) with an Arabic translation and critical notes.

Parts of the Bohairic Old Testament have been edited in the following publications.

W. E. Crum, *Coptic manuscripts brought from the Fayyum* (London, 1893) (= Vaschalde's : Crum 6), 13-15 : Exodus 15, 1-16 ; Daniel 3, 64-82. 86. 88.

Yassa Abd al-Masih, "The hymn of the Three Children in the furnace", *Bulletin de la Société d'archéologie copte*, 12 (Cairo, 1949), 8-11 : Daniel 3, 52-88.

O.H.E. Burmester, "The Bohairic Pericope of III Kingdoms xviii 36-39", *The Journal of Theological Studies*, 36 (1935), 159.

O. H. E. Burmester, "The Bohairic pericopae of Wisdom and Sirach", *Biblica*, 15 (Rome, 1934), 451-465 (introduction) ; 16 (1935) 35-57 (text) ; *ibid.* 141-174 (notes). This edition contains the following passages :

Wisdom 1, 1-9	Sirach 4, 20-5, 2
2, 12-22	12, 13-13, 1
5, 1-7. 1-11. 13	22, 7-18
7, 24-30	23, 7-14
Sirach 1, 1-19. 20-30	24, 1-11
2, 1-9	Song of Songs 4, 14-5, 10

Parts of both the Old and the New Testament have been edited by E. M. Husselman : "A Bohairic school text on papyrus", *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 6 (Chicago, 1947), 129-151. It contains Job 1, 1 and Romans 1, 1-8. 13-15. Parts of the Bohairic New Testament are edited by W. P. Hatch, "Six Coptic fragments of the New Testament from Nitria", *The Harvard Theological Review*, 26 (1923), 99-108, containing parts of Matthew, Luke, John, Acts, and James. I have not seen this publication.

H. G. Evelyn White, *Texts from the Monastery of Saint Macarius* (The Monasteries of Wadi n'Natrûn, part i. The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Egyptian Expedition. New York, 1926) contains collations of the Bohairic version of the following passages : Exodus 34, 29-35 ; 35, 1-10 ; 39, 30 f. + 36, 8 f. 35-38 + 38, 9-18, and I Corinthians 14, 20-28.

A. Mallon, *Grammaire copte*, 4^e édition (M. Malinine) (Beyrouth, 1956), *Chrestomathie* 37-43, contains the complete Bohairic text of Jonah from a Paris manuscript

A collation of John 10, 12-18; 11, 6-15 is to be found in Till, *Perg. theol.* 30.

There is one edition of Bohairic Biblical manuscripts of outstanding importance because the manuscript is as early as the fourth century whilst the bulk of the Bohairic manuscripts are not earlier than the ninth. This large manuscript has been edited by Rodolphe Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer III, Évangile de Jean et Genèse I-IV, 2 en bohairique. Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium*, 177, *Scriptores coptici*, 25 (Louvain, 1958). It contains

Genesis 1, 1-4, 2 pp. 47-52

John 1, 1. 2. 9. 14. 15. 18-21. 24. 25. 45, p. 1

John 2, 9. 11. 15. 16, p. 1

John 3, 33, p. 1

John 4, 5-15. 20-54, pp. 1-4

John 4, 20-21, 25, pp. 4-46

Important for its early age is also a small Bohairic fragment which Paul E. Kahle has edited in "A biblical fragment of the fourth to fifth century in Semi-Bohairic", *Le Muséon*, 63 (Louvain, 1950), 147-57. It contains Philippians 3, 19-4, 9 and has been re-edited in Kahle, *Bal* 377-9.

Fayyumic

A. Kropp has promised an edition of a manuscript containing parts of the Fayyumic version of the Song of Songs, Lamentations, and Ecclesiastes.

Psalms

1, 1 Till, Perg. theol. 29 (re-edited)
34, 16-19. 22-26 Till, Wien F 179 f.

Jeremiah

22, 20-23, 2 Till, Perg. theol. 21-3
23, 5. 6 Till, Perg. theol. 24
26, 8-10. 24-26 Till, Wien F 173 f.
27, 2-20 Till, Wien F 174-7
38, 3. 4. 8. 12. 16 Till, Wien F 177 f.

Susanna

54. 55. 63. 64 Till, Wien F 181
63. 64 Till, Wien F 182

Daniel

1, 1-4 Till, Wien F 182 f.
2, 47-49 Till, Wien F 184
3, 1-3 Till, Wien F 185
3, 79-85. 88-92 Till, Wien F 186 f.

New Testament

R. McL. Wilson is preparing an edition of all known fragments of the Fayyumic New Testament.

Matthew

1, 15-20 Till, F NT 237 f. (or 1, 10-12. 18-20? P. E. Kahle)
15, 13. 14. 17. 19 Till, Perg. theol. 26 f. (re-edited)
17, 6. 7. 11. 12 Till, Wien F 191 (identified by P. E. Kahle)
18, 22 Till, Wien F 211 (identified by P. E. Kahle)

Mark

4, 15-17. 20-22. 26-29. 32-34 Till, Wien F 188 f.
6, 16. 17. 28-30 Till, Perg. theol. 28 (re-edited)
15, 29-31. 33. 34 Till, Perg. theol. 29
15, 43-16, 7 Till, F NT 233 f.

John

- 2, 25-3, 2 Till, Wien F 210 (identified by P. E. Kahle)
 4, 3-14 Till, F NT 229 f.
 9, 19. 20. 24 Till, Wien F 190
 13, 38-14, 3. 7-10. 13-17. 21-23 Lefort, MS. Louv. 83-85
 16, 25-27. 32. 33 Till, Wien F 192 f.
 16, 32 Till, Wien F 190
 17, 4. 5. 9. 10. 13. 14 Till, Wien F. 190 f.

Acts

- 7, 14-28 Kahle, Bal 286-88 (re-edited)
 9, 28-39 Kahle, Bal 289 f. (re-edited)

Romans

- 5, 15-18 Till, Wien F 197 f.
 11, 30-35 Till, Bibl. JRL. 453 f.
 12, 1-3 Till, Bibl. JRL. 454
 14, 13. 14 Till, Wien F 198 f.

I Corinthians

- 15, 29. 32 Till, Wien F 201 (identified by P. E. Kahle)
 15, 43-47. 57-16, 2 Till, Wien F 200, partly edited at first : Till, Perg. theol. 25

Galatians

- 6, 13-18 Worrell, F Ep 129

Ephesians

- 1, 3-7. 10-14. 18-22 Worrell, F Ep 130-2
 6, 19-24 Worrell, F Ep 133

Philippians

- 1, 2-6. 9-11. 17-22 Worrell, F Ep 134-136

Hebrews

- 10, 26-32 Till, Wien F 203 f.
 11, 21-32 Worrell, F Ep 138 f.

James

- 1, 21-26 Till, Wien F 195 f. (identified by P. E. Kahle)

I Peter

- 2, 11-13. 20-23 Till, Wien F 194
 5, 2-8 Till, Wien F 196 f.

II Timothy

- 3, 15-17 Till, Wien F 201 f.
 4, 2. 3. 6. 7. 8-10 Till, Wien F 201 f.

Achmimic

Exodus

15, 14-21. 24-16, 19 Lefort, Frg. A 4-9

23, 20-32 Lefort, Frg. A 10-12

24, 2. 3 Lefort Frg. A 12

Psalms

46, 3-10 W. E. Crum, "Un psaume en dialecte d'Akhmim", *Mémoires de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire*, 67 (Cairo, 1934), 73-76.

Proverbs

Complete text in A. Böhlig, *Der achmimische Proverbientext nach Ms. Berol. orient. oct. 987. Teil I: Text und Rekonstruktion der sahidischen Vorlage. Studien zur Erforschung des christlichen Aegyptens*, 3 (München, 1958).

The Minor Prophets

The text of those parts of the manuscript which are in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (the larger part is in Vienna) has been re-edited by M. Malinine in "Version achmimique des Petits Prophètes", *Coptic studies in honor of Walter Ewing Crum* (= *Bulletin of the Byzantine Institute*, ii) (Boston, 1950), pp. 365-415. This edition contains :

Joel 1, 14-2, 19 pp. 370-2

Amos 8, 11-9, 15 pp. 372-4

Micah 1, 1-2, 11 ; 5, 8-6, 1 pp. 374-7

Obadiah 13-21 pp. 377 f.

Jonah 1, 1-4, 2 pp. 379-82

Nahum 3, 8-14 pp. 382 f.

Habakkuk 1, 1-7 ; 2, 2-17 pp. 383-5

Zechariah 1, 1-6 ; 4, 6-7, 14 pp. 385-91

Daniel

3, 50-55 Amundsen, Chr. pap

Matthew

11, 25-30 Amundsen, Chr. pap

Luke

The passages quoted between brackets here have been re-edited in the other publication.

(12, 27. 28. 37) Lefort, Luc. A 203

12, 27-34. 37-44. 49-53 Lefort, Frg. A 21-4

13, 1-3 Lefort, Frg. A 24 f.

17, 27-18, 11 Lefort, Frg. A 25-8

(17, 34-18, 2) Lefort, Luc. A 203 f.

(18, 8-11) Lefort, Luc. A 204

James

5, 17. 18. 20 W. Till, "Ein achmimisches Jakobusbrieffragment", *Le Muséon*, 51 (Louvain, 1938), 69-71

There are some quotations in W. Till, *Osterbrief und Predigt in achmimischem Dialekt, Studien zur Epigraphik und Papyruskunde*, ii/1 (Leipzig, 1931). These are:

Psalms 10, 1 II, 16 f.	Luke 10, 19 II, 28 f.
72, 7 II, 33 f.	I Corinthians 15, 55 II, 25 f.
80, 2. 3. II, 11-14	Galathians 5, 19 III, 29 f.
Song 2, 10-12 III, 2-4	Colossians 3, 2 III, 9 f.
Isaiah 52, 1 III, 22	3, 9. 10 III, 28 f.
60, 1 II, 6 f.	James 4, 8 II, 3 f.
Matthew 22, 4 III, 12 f.	

Subachmimic (Assioutic)

Almost the whole of the text of the Gospel of St. John has been edited by Sir Herbert Thompson, *The Gospel of St. John according to the earliest Coptic manuscript. British School of Archaeology in Egypt and Egyptian Research Account. Twenty-ninth year, 1923* (London, 1924). This edition comprises the following passages :

John 2, 12-3, 21
 John 4, 6-7, 11
 John 7, 28-19, 41
 John 20, 4-8. 13-27.

Appendix

I owe many thanks to Mr. Martin Bodmer (Geneva) and the Rev. Rodolphe Kasser (Combas) for having given me the following information and permission to publish it in this article. There are some more early manuscripts in the collections of Mr. Bodmer and the University of Mississippi (U.S.A.) containing biblical texts in Sahidic. Mr. Kasser is preparing an edition of them which is to be published in the *Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium, Scriptorum coptici*. The manuscripts comprise the following biblical texts:

Exodus 1, 1-15, 21 (vellum)	
Deuteronomy 1, 12-17 ; 1, 19-9, 26. (papyrus)	
Joshua 6, 16-25 ; 7, 6-11, 23 ; 22, 1-2 ; 22, 19-23, 7 ; 23, 15-24, 23 (papyrus)	
Song of Songs 1, 4-3, 1 ; 4, 2-6, 9 ; 7, 10-8, 12 (vellum)	
Isaiah 47, 1-51, 17 ; 52, 4-56, 24 (papyrus)	
Jeremiah 40, 3-52, 34	} (vellum)
Lamentations 1, 1-5, 22	
Letter of Jeremiah 1, 1-72	} (vellum)
Baruch 1, 1-5, 5	
Matthew 14, 28-28, 20	} (vellum)
Romans 1, 1-25	
II Maccabees 5, 27-7, 41	} (papyrus)
I Peter 1, 1-5, 14	
Jonah 1, 1-4, 11	

NEW PLAYS OF MENANDER

By E. G. TURNER, M.A., F.B.A.

PROFESSOR OF PAPHYROLOGY AND DIRECTOR OF THE INSTITUTE OF CLASSICAL STUDIES IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

THE most substantial contribution of the twentieth century to the study and appreciation of Greek literature has lain in its discovery of Greek papyri. The John Rylands Library has a notable collection of these treasures, which in miraculous manner have restored the very words of Greek writers often known only by repute and hearsay. Four texts in its collection are of Greek New Comedy. It is therefore fitting that Menander should come alive again in its precincts.¹

I have given as my title "New Plays of Menander", for I shall refer to two; and I can confidently predict that other plays than those of which I shall speak will shortly emerge. In 1938 Alfred Körte gave the world his third Teubner edition of the papyrus fragments; its second part, issued in 1954 and containing the book fragments, completed with sumptuous care by Andreas Thierfelder, might have seemed to close an era in Menandrian scholarship. Classical scholarship, however, whatever outsiders may think, is alive and on the move. The end of one chapter is the beginning of another. The work of Körte and Thierfelder is proving its worth as a sharp tool in the hands of those working on the new material.

I begin with a few words about a codex from Antinoopolis, which Dr. John Barns is to publish shortly in the second volume of *The Antinoopolis Papyri*. Nine pieces of fine parchment survive, written in a beautiful small hand of the fourth century. In one scene a slave, perhaps called Dromon, in a soliloquy wonders whether to take a risk in order to help forward his master's love affair. In another, master and slave discover a challenge (*πρόκλησις*) and a paper (*γραμματείδιον*) lying on the altar.

¹ A lecture given in the John Rylands Library on Wednesday, the 14th of January, 1959.

In a third, a character whose name is perhaps to be read Thras () (a soldier?), learns that a girl has borne a child, and hears the name of a young man Moschion. There are fragments of drinking scenes, of a slave being scolded for helping his master's intrigues. Dr. Barns suggests in his publication that these scraps come from Menander's play *Μισογύνης*, *The Misogynist*. In default of the presence in the parchment of an attested ancient fragment—the closest approximation is the reputed *γραμματείδιον* and the *πρόκλησις* (cf. Kö³ 278, 279)—his argument reassembles the fragments and testimonies, and shows how they could make a good Menandrian comedy. If this case has a weakness, it seems to me to be in the relatively minor role that is allotted to the *Misogynist*, the name-character of the comedy.

We would have liked to know more, for the *Misogynist* should be an excellent foil to the *Misanthrope*: which, as we know from the ancient Hypothesis, was an alternative title of the *Dyskolos*, the *Disagreeable* or *Irritable Man*. It is on this play that I propose to concentrate for the rest of this paper. It, too, is a papyrus text, one of the treasures of M. Martin Bodmer, the noted Swiss bibliophile. The *editio princeps*¹ was edited by Professor Victor Martin, Emeritus Professor of Greek in the University of Geneva, who should be remembered with honour in Manchester as co-editor of the second volume of the *Catalogue of the John Rylands Papyri*.

The papyrus itself is in codex form, and is complete in the sense that beginning and ending are marked, and no whole pages are missing. Tears at the ends or beginnings of lines, especially at the tops and bottoms of the pages, have caused a few passages to take on a patchy look. To judge from the handwriting, which can be studied in the admirable plates accompanying the edition, the text was copied between the middle and the end of the third century after Christ: the hand is a clear but not stylish capital, which slants markedly to the right. The scribe inserted a considerable number of punctuation marks and accents; added the names of characters at what he thought were their first entries

¹ *Papyrus Bodmer IV: Ménandre, Le Dyscolos* (Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1958). Cf. earlier V. Martin, *Museum Helveticum*, xv (1958), 209-14; P. Photiades, *Greece and Rome*, series 2, 5 (1958), 108-22.

or re-entries, thereafter marking alternation of speaker by double dot combined with paragraphus.

The scene is set in the countryside of Attica near the township of Phyle, forty miles north of Athens. To the spectator's left is the house of Cnemon, the name-character. Some distance away, not really next door, and on the spectator's right is the house of Gorgias, the Disagreeable Man's stepson. He lives there with his mother, who has herself found Cnemon unbearable to live with. In the centre of the stage is a shrine of Pan and the Nymphs, no doubt a grotto, whose opening is placed between and perhaps a little further back than the houses. Pan himself comes out of the grotto, and explains matters :

“ Imagine the place to be Phyle in Attica, and this shrine of the Nymphs, from which I have come out, to belong to the people of Phyle and such as can wrest a living from the rocks round here. It is a noted shrine. The land on my right is the home of Cnemon, a very unmannerly man, one disagreeable to all. He's no lover of crowds—crowds ! he's lived an age and never in his life said a pleasant word : *and never* started a conversation, unless (neighbour of mine that he is) he has had to pass me : and he has thought better of that at once, I know. Well, in spite of these ways of his, he married a widow-woman just after her previous partner died, and left a little son behind : she was his sparring-partner by day, and most of the night too. They had an *awful* life : a baby daughter arrived—worse and worse. When things got so that they couldn't go any further, and life turned hard and toilsome, the lady went back to the son of her former marriage. He has a little property quite close to here [the house on the left], which gives a poor livelihood to him, his mother, and one¹ trusty servant of his father's. He's a young man now, with sense beyond his years—experience has been his tutor. The old man lives alone with his daughter and an old woman to wait on him ; he gathers firewood, digs, and works without cease, and starting with his neighbours and his wife hates everyone from here right down to Cholargeis.

¹ l. 26, reading *εῖνα*. Any divergencies from the text of the Swiss edition are set out in *Bull. Inst. Class. Studies*, vol. vi (1959), and will not be further explained here.

The girl has turned out like her upbringing—not a bad notion in her head, a worshipper and careful minister to the Nymphs who wait on me. Her respect for us has won us over to take some care for her : and there's a young man, son of a very well-to-do father, owner of properties worth many talents, and a city dweller, who came out here with his huntsman—by chance I brought him to the spot and made him fall madly in love with her. There's the synopsis : if you want more, you will keep your eyes on the stage. It's high time, for I can see the young lover and his companion coming, deep in conversation."

This friend is the parasite in the play. He lives by playing up to his patron's whims. As recipient of Sostratus's confidences, he is drawing him out as the two approach : " Do you mean to tell me, Sostratus, you saw a free girl putting garlands on the Nymphs here, and fell in love with her instantly? " And when Sostratus says " Yes ", he continues his teasing " You mean to say you intended to go out and fall in love with someone? " The position is indeed serious enough ; if the girl is free, that is, a citizen (not a slave or a *hetaera*), there can be no question of an intrigue. The penalties are great in case of discovery, for the law protects the womenfolk of citizens ; and indeed their families give them little opportunity. Besides, she will be country-bred, unlikely to have a dowry. All of this Sostratus knows, but he is ready to marry the vision revealed to him, even on these terms, before he knows who she is. He has sent his huntsman Pyrrhias to find out about her and—a breach of manners this, as he realizes when he mentions it—to speak to her father or guardian. Why doesn't Pyrrhias come with an answer? At this very instant Pyrrhias arrives, out of breath, and quaking with fright. It is sometime before he can get out a coherent story : they are standing in front of a madman's house. When he knocked at the door earlier in order to carry out Sostratus's mission, an old woman referred him to her master. Pyrrhias approached with courteous enquiry—to be greeted with a " Villain, why are you on my land? " and a clod of earth aimed full in the face. When he could open his eyes again, the old man began to set about him with a stake, roaring " What business have you and I with

each other : don't you know the public road? ” And as he ran, Cnemon picked up sods, stones, drew wild pears out of his bosom to pelt his quarry, Pyrrhias the huntsman ! It was some two miles before the latter could shake him off. “ I'll come back tomorrow to make further enquiries ”, is the parting shot of the parasite, as he makes himself scarce, leaving Sostratus and his huntsman engaged in mutual recrimination.

Cnemon is now heard in the distance. No doubt the huntsman Pyrrhias hides somewhere, not wishing to be recognized, and we turn to watch the misanthrope's entrance. The build-up for it is not let down : he is grumbling away—“ What a lucky fellow the hero Perseus was on two counts : for one, he was airborne and didn't run into any of the crawlers on the ground ; secondly, because he had a nice little object for turning nuisances into stone. I wish I had it. There would be a plethora of statues hereabout. But as it is, life's not worth living ; chaps nowadays ¹ rush on to my land and chatter. I used to live by the roadside, then I gave up working all that part of my land because of the passers-by : but now they pursue me right up to the hill-tops ! What a crowd they are for breeding ! Good-lord—here's another fellow standing at my door ! ” So threatening, is his behaviour that Sostratus makes the excuse that he was waiting there by arrangement to meet a friend. Cnemon bellows back—“ If you want to meet anyone at my door, form them all up—build a seat, if you've any sense—why not a Parliament ? ”—enters the house and bangs the door. It looks like a dead end for Sostratus. He will go and consult his father's slave Getas, who may be able to give some advice. He is almost off the stage when the door opens and the girl of his dreams comes out : “ What a trouble I'm in now ” she says, “ what shall I do? Nurse was drawing water and has dropped the bucket in the well.” “ Father Zeus, Healer Apollo, friendly Dioscuri, what irresistible beauty ! ” cries Sostratus. “ My father as he went out told me to get him hot water ”, she continues. “ If he finds out about it, he'll beat her black and blue.” In her distress she appeals to the Nymphs ; she would like to draw from their spring, but is ashamed in case there are other worshippers in the shrine.

¹ l. 162, punctuate after ἦδη.

Sostratus appears, takes her pitcher and goes into the Nymphaeum. While he is away, a door is heard opening, and the girl is frightened: "Is that my father coming out? He'll beat me if he catches me out of doors." But no—it is the other house door that opens and disgorges the slave Daos, still talking to someone inside. His words are interrupted by "Take this," "Give it to me"; no doubt the pitcher is being passed back to the girl. "What does that fellow want?", says Daos, instantly suspicious. "Goodbye, look after your father", breathes Sostratus—does he manage a squeeze, too?—and sighs on parting. "Stop moaning", orders Pyrrhias, emerging from hiding after making a very quick change (this actor may also have played the girl), "go and tell Getas all about it as you intended to". They leave the stage to Daos. "I don't like it", he soliloquizes. "It's bad, a young man helping a girl. Curse Cnemon for keeping an innocent girl unprotected in a lonely place like this." He'll forestall the young fellow by telling the girl's half brother Gorgias—and he waddles off to do so.

By the opening of the next act we learn that Gorgias has been warned. He takes the duties of relationship seriously. If her father won't look after the girl, *he* will not imitate such an example. Yet how can they convince the old man? While they talk Sostratus reappears. He hasn't been able to find his would-be confidante, Getas, who has been sent for by his mistress to sacrifice somewhere in the country: he will take his courage in both hands and try his luck again at the misanthrope's door. But Gorgias and Daos have been eyeing Sostratus with the utmost suspicion, and Gorgias now lets loose an impetuous tirade: "All men in my view, whether prosperous or not, come to a full stop like this and suffer a change; the prosperous man continues to find his affairs remain steady and prosperous for just so long as he can bear fortune and do no wrong: but when he gets to that, after being borne forward on a good tide, he takes a change for the worse." [We shall not find this lecture tedious when we remember that it is delivered with passion by a farm labourer of twenty to another boy of the same age, who is his social superior.] "Those who are less well-endowed, if they do no ill for all their poverty, but nobly bear their destiny,

come to trust that at long last they can look to a better portion—well? ” [he can bear it no longer, but comes to the point]—“ well, even if you are ever so rich, don't rely on riches, and again, don't despise us poor men : present yourself to view as worthy to stay prosperous ! ” Sostratus mildly protests—Gorgias won't be put off : “ I think you're clearly guilty of a despicable scheme. You thought to seduce a free woman, and waited for an opportunity to perform a crime deserving many deaths.” “ It's not right ”, he goes on, “ for your idleness to prove ruinous to us hard-working folk. Wrong a poor man and he's the most disagreeable of mortals : for he really does become an object of pity ; and besides he takes his misfortunes as due to insult and not to his own failings.” Gorgias has said his say—and the congratulations of his slave¹ hinder still further Sostratus's protestations. But at last he can put his own position clearly : he loves the girl ; he has come to find her father or relative, for he will take her as wife without a dowry : and if his intentions are dishonourable, he appeals to Pan to strike him dumb on the spot : indeed he is thoroughly upset that Gorgias should form such an opinion of him. How should Gorgias resist such a disclaimer, especially as Pan gives no sign? They are friends at once, and Gorgias reveals that the girl is his half-sister. But her father—Gorgias once heard him declare he would not marry him to any bridegroom less misanthropic than himself—which means never. It were better to give up the plan. “ Heavens, man, have you never been in love ? ” is Sostratus's retort. “ No, for I may not : I am stopped by calculation without respite of my ever-present troubles.” But he will help his new friend, even over further difficulties : Cnemon hates the idle rich above his other hates, he will never allow one to come within speaking range. Let Sostratus take off his beautiful mantle or *χλαμῖς*, spit on his hands and dig, then he will be able to speak to Cnemon and the girl during their daily walk. Such is the power of love that Sostratus agrees, picks up the mattock and submits to a churlish slave's directions. No doubt to an Athenian audience the spectacle of this fastidious young man splitting his back with toil was not the least of the play's

¹ l. 300 is spoken by Daos to Getas.

happy touches. We see another in the entrance now of the slaves: they are a relief, they are comically ironic, and the strings of the plot tighten through their chatter. One we discover to be a cook coaxing a particularly recalcitrant sheep to the sacrifice, which they are to celebrate at the shrine: the other is that Getas of whom we have already heard.

We gather that Getas's mistress (Sostratus's mother), a superstitious lady, has dreamed that Pan was fastening shackles on her son's feet, and then told him to put on his leather apron and dig a neighbour's property. So Pan must be placated at his shrine. Sostratus's mother and family (and we are left to infer, his father) are on the road. The act ends.

Act three begins with Cnemon just going out and giving strict instructions that his door is to be opened to no one. But he is brought up short by the sacrifice going on at the shrine: the music of a flute accompanies the rite. "The nymphs are bad neighbours", he soliloquizes: "I shall move elsewhere." He returns indoors. We hear the voice of Getas, "You say the boiling pan's been forgotten? What'll we do now? Bother the god's neighbours, I suppose." In a walk punctuated by the call "slaves" he innocently knocks on Cnemon's door. We know what Cnemon will be like, Getas doesn't. "Don't bite me", he begs, after recovering from his surprise. "I'll eat you alive", roars Cnemon. "Boiling pan? Do you think I sacrifice bulls or do what you are doing?"¹ Getas stumps off, to be cursed roundly by the cook and given a lesson in manners.² "I work for thousands of people in Athens. Sometimes I have to bother their neighbours, but I get utensils from all. You've got to flatter if you want anything. Suppose an old man answers the door, I call him 'father' or 'dad', 'mother' if it's an old woman. If it's an in-between, I say 'president' or 'your reverence'; if it's a servant, 'Good sir' I say." But this familiarity with the ways of the world does not save Sicon when he knocks himself. Goaded to fury, Cnemon takes the

¹ For a Greek a sacrifice brought a good meal, often indeed a party. Cnemon was unlikely to spend his money on roast beef.

² See *B.I.C.S.* l.c. for the text of these lines.

whip to him, and shouts "I haven't got a pail or an axe or salt or vinegar or dittany¹ or anything." Shortly after Sostratus reappears: "Anyone short of trouble let him come hunting to Phyle. Oh my bottom, my back, my heels,—I ache all over. I went at it like a young man of parts, lifting my mattock high and digging deep . . . thinking it well worth while against the time when the old man and girl would pass by. . . . And then Gorgias spied me, looking at me working up and down like pump-handles: 'I don't think he'll come now', he said, 'we'll try again tomorrow!'" Sostratus then spies Getas and learns of the sacrificing party; his mother has already arrived, his father is expected. Good—he will invite Gorgias, and goes off to do it. And now the well takes a hand again. Cnemon's door opens and the old woman attendant cries out: "Misery, misery, misery! I wanted² to try to pull the bucket out of the well all by myself when the master was out of the way. I fastened a mattock on a rotten rope. It's just broken in my hands." Getas has little sympathy till he sees Cnemon coming up behind: "Fly, he'll murder you: or rather, stand up to him." "Where is the thief", roars Cnemon. "I didn't mean to drop it in", she whimpers. "Come inside, woman." "What will you do to me?" "I'll tie you up and let you down into the well." As he pushes her inside, Getas comments: "There's your true Attic peasant: he battles with rocks that bear no crop but thyme and sage-apple, knows pain, and gets no good of it." Sostratus (still in his digging clothes) goes on arguing with Gorgias, who is reluctant to accept his invitation.

We are not done with the well. It gets its biggest success at the opening of the fourth act. The old woman reappears: "Help, help! Master's in the well. He went down after the bucket and the mattock and slipped in." Her audience consists of the cook and is far from sympathetic. "Me go down the well?—to fight with a dog in a well, as in the fable." Fortunately for Cnemon, Gorgias hears the outcry: followed by Sostratus he rushes into the house. The cook holds the stage while we wonder what is going on inside: "There *are* Gods,

¹ 1. 507, keeping ὀρίγανον from fr. 671 Ko.³.

² 1. 578-9, reading βουλομένη . . . ἐξελεῖν αὐτῆ.

by Dionysus. You sacrilegious rogue, you grudged a boiling pan when we were sacrificing : drink up your well so that you needn't give anyone water even." He thanks the Nymphs : " No one has ever hurt a cook and got away with it : our craft has a touch of the liturgical." His indignation against Cnemon mounts : " If the old fellow is to be saved at all, let him be crippled and lamed." Sostratus returns and puts us out of our suspense : Gorgias leaped into the well, he Sostratus—gilded youth—could only stand at the top and tell the girl not to beat her breasts, and when it was his job to haul up, he dropped the rope three times with looking at his sweetheart and wanting to kiss her. Supported by Gorgias, Cnemon now comes in, dripping wet, much shaken : his folk throng around him, and Myrrhine (Gorgias's mother, Cnemon's wife) comes too : Sostratus hangs about at the back. This is Cnemon's biggest speech. In a long monologue of trochaic tetrameters he passes his life in review. " I wanted to be self-sufficient (*αὐταρκής*) and ask nothing of anyone. But now that I stare a bitter and untended¹ end of life in the face I see I decided wrong then. A man² should designate and admit to his confidence a friend to stand by at any time. I was so far bemused as I scanned each man's life and his calculations of profit, that I thought none would ever show any regard for any other. That was what stood in my way ! At long last Gorgias by himself³ has put it to the test, with a most noble action. One who wouldn't let him approach his door, who never lifted a finger to help him in any way, never spoke to him or addressed a pleasant word to him—that's the man he's gladly saved, in spite of all. Where anyone else⁴ would have justified himself by saying ' You won't let me visit you—I won't come to you. You've never been any use to me :—I won't be any use to you now. . . . ' Well now—if I die (and I feel bad) or if I survive, I adopt you as my son [he addresses Gorgias] ; consider all my possessions

¹ l. 715, reading *ἄσκεπον*, suggested by T. B. L. Webster.

² l. 717, *δεικνύ[ύ]ναι δεῖ καὶ παριέναι τὸν ἐπικουρήσοντ' αἰεί*.

³ l. 722 *εἷς*.

⁴ l. 728-9 must at all costs be kept as part of Cnemon's speech. Read l. 727 *ἄλλος* and *κάδικαίωσ'* (so O. Szemerényi), and treat *οὐκ ἔῃς . . . σοι νῦν* as quoted justification.

as yours ; I entrust this girl to you, find a husband for her . . . you're guardian of your sister, portion her off worthily and give her half my property as dowry . . . now, daughter, put me to bed : I think it unmanly to speak more than the minimum, but I'll tell you a word about my life and character : if all men were just,¹ there'd be no law courts, there'd be no haling of each other off to prison, there'd be no war, and everyone would be content with a competence. But perhaps you like it as it is : act thus anyhow ; the vexatious old curmudgeon will soon be out of your way." While the barriers are down in this moment of revelation, Cnemon knows to move our attention. How long will the conversion last? Gorgias acts at once : he accepts the injunctions placed on him. Now to find the right husband for the girl. Cnemon wearily shakes his head—he is not to be bothered any further. "But here's a man on the spot." "Not a suitor, surely?" asks Cnemon. "My fellow-rescuer!" . As Sostratus steps forward [he is, you remember, still dressed as a farmer], Cnemon comments—"Sunburned and a farmer . . . not a loafer, or an idle fellow to stroll about all day", and he gives his consent and goes inside. When Sostratus remarks that he is sure his own father will agree, Gorgias pronounces solemnly : "I betroth her to you in the sight of all these here : and justly, Sostratus, since you didn't assume a character but came sincerely and ready to do anything to marry. For all your delicacy, you picked up a mattock, dug and laboured. That's the role in which a man shows how to make himself another's equal—when a rich man puts himself under a poor man's orders." The compliments and the lecture are brought to an end by the arrival of Sostratus's father, Callipides, one of the richest men in Athens. Have they had breakfast yet? "Go and tell him all about us", says Gorgias. "He'll be better tempered after feeding", says Sostratus, who goes inside with his father.

There is a whole act yet to pass, and our twentieth-century taste might regard the action as over. Not so the Greek. Sostratus must get his parents' consent too ; and he has a

¹ 1. 743 [εἰ δίκαιοι] shorter than [εἴπερ εὖ]νοι, but perhaps itself too long for the space.

further idea in his head. He will betroth his own sister to Gorgias and bring off a double event. Callipides proves surprisingly complaisant about the first request—he will accept Sostratus's chosen bride. But *two* poor kinsfolk—that's too much! Callipides is hardly prepared for the onset that follows: Sostratus has caught a taste for lecturing from Gorgias, and now delivers one to his father on the instability of wealth compared with the assets of friendship. It caught the fancy of the ancients and in Stobaeus's extract has rung down the ages. Callipides has no wish to stand up to such a tirade: "What I have amassed I don't want buried with me. It's all yours. Do you want to make a friend?—Try him and do it, and may good luck attend you! But don't preach to me!" But when they call Gorgias in, they find he has been listening at the door; his independent pride forbids him to resign himself to enjoyment of an unearned income, and it takes Callipides's bluntness—"You're a fool, though an honourable fool" to make him change his mind. We are reminded that, after Cnemon's recognition of him as son, Gorgias is no longer a poor man: and to the general amazement he can cap Callipides's offer of three talents dowry with a talent to endow Sostratus' bride. Details of the double betrothal settled, the wedding arrangements are set in motion: good wine, an all-night festival (*παννυχίς*), guests. Sostratus introduces the ladies from Cnemon's house to his mother, probably in the shrine of the Nymphs. But Cnemon himself won't come. "He begged us to take the Old Woman so that he might be quite alone." The old woman herself joins in, and adds her mite of pity: "You'll lie here alone, poor wretch, prisoner of your character"; and in a moment, when the festivities begin and the sound of a flute is heard, she suggests that someone else should sit with him. The slave Getas takes up the idea—he will "look after" (*θεραπεύω*) Cnemon all right! He is joined by the cook Sicon, and together they plan to tease the old man, left to their tender mercies. The last section of the play—a hundred lines of mocking iambic tetrameters—constitutes a sort of ballet or harlequinade, the "ragging of Cnemon". The plan is worked out by the fertile brain of the cook. He and Getas will together drag out Cnemon in his bed (for he cannot get up

unaided), and dance round him. A festal rhythm is tapped out by the cook :

παῖ παιδίον, παῖδες καλοὶ, παῖ παῖδες : οἶχομ' οἶμοι

“ Me lads, me lads, boys, boysie boys, me lads”, “ Now I’m a goner.” To this mocking jingle they encircle him as he lies helpless in mid-stage. They pretend to knock at his door, and ask for boiling-pans, sage-apple, seven tripods, twelve tables, nine rugs, hundred-foot curtains. They mimic his responses, make him call out for his old attendant and curse her absence. “ You shun a crowd, hate women, won’t allow yourself to be carried to join the sacrificers. You must bear it. No one will come to help you.” They force him to listen to a running commentary on the festivities, the drinking, the dancing ; and they bid him dance too. Only, it seems, when they get their way and he teeters a few steps across the stage do they relent and carry him back indoors. Then they themselves take their wreaths and torches to join in the merriment, while one steps forward to wind up the play with what must be Menander’s seal or *sphragis*¹ “ May Victory, laughter-loving daughter of a famous father, always smile on us ! ”

As we learn from the argument prefixed to the text, this prayer was granted. The play won first prize at the Lenaean festival when it was presented. And surely it is a winner ! Its gallery of characters, unity and speed of dramatic movement, wealth of comic invention, elegance yet simplicity of its dialogue, show a vigorous and resourceful playwright. On the stage it could hardly fail to be a roaring success.

The scholar will of course have a special interest in comparing it with the surviving fragments of the other plays, and revising his views both of them, and of the relationship of Plautus and Terence to Menander. First for its formal elements. The length of this first play of Menander to be known complete is a little more than 970 verses. The division into five Acts is clearly marked by the heading ΧΟΡΟΥ—the points at which

¹ These two verses (fr. 616 Kock), were assigned to the Epitrepontes by Wilamowitz. Since they are also found as the concluding couplet of an unpublished fragment of papyrus from Oxyrhynchus, the colophon of which carries the title *Μενάνδρου Θράττα* (an unknown play), it seems probable that Menander always made use of them to conclude his plays and put his own stamp on them.

interludes are sung by a chorus of tipsy revellers. This chorus is introduced at the end of the first act in the very same words as at the corresponding point (1.34) of the *Epitrepontes*—so conventionalized has this division become. Similarly conventionalized is the ending of the play *ἡ δ' εὐπάτειρα κτλ.* The Act divisions occur at lines 232, 436, 619, 783: the first Act is noticeably longer than the rest, the fourth noticeably shorter (164 verses): the most interesting surprise is the length of the last Act. As I have already noted, it adds little to the dramatic action, which was almost finished by the close of Act IV. This point is of material significance in the discussion of the surviving fragments of the *Samia* and seems to support Gomme's contention that they begin with Act II, not Act III (as Webster, Körte) or IV (Wilamowitz). The context of something like eighty lines of trochaic tetrameters and a hundred lines of iambic tetrameters (not so far recorded in Menander's verse) is also a point that calls for study. No doubt the "ballet" of the last Act has traditional elements in it. One remembers the *ἱερός γάμος* of the Old Comedy, the mockery of Lamachus in the *Acharnians*, the dancing exit of the *Wasps*. If our knowledge of Middle Comedy were greater, we might find such a scene to be a common closing formula. Other stock elements can be given their parallels from Middle Comedy: the cook who enters with a sheep round his neck, the parasite, even the well.

Another formal element that calls for study in detail is the prologue. It is an opening speech, not delayed till after a preliminary scene; since the events of the play are simple, there is no tangled skein of intrigue to unravel, and the chief attention is directed to the psychology of the characters, so that we recognize them at once, and build up an anticipatory picture. There is no need for the speaker to prophesy what is to happen. Since he is a God, Pan, he could, of course, do so. Miss Photiades has emphasized his divinity in her article, and claims that his intervention is to be taken in earnest: Pan is punishing Cnemon for neglect of his cult, and his role is as active as that of Aphrodite in Euripides's *Hippolytus*. This interpretation misreads the play. No precise instance of neglect of cult can be laid at Cnemon's door: his offence lies in his disposition, his *τρόπος*,

offensive equally to gods and men. The reason why the old woman deserts him at the last, and one of the charges brought by the slaves, is that he won't *join* his fellow-men in sacrifice, a sacrifice that is followed by a party. Pan does not instance any failure in Cnemon's attitude to himself that is not equally a failure towards the rest of mankind. Pan helps in the discomfiture of the Old Curmudgeon: but his fate is hardly a divine punishment.

In an anecdote told by Plutarch, *De Gloria Ath.* 4, Menander is made to reply to a friend who asked why he hadn't written his new play when the date for production was not far off: "I *have* finished it. The management of the plot is done. All that remains is to write the lines." Professor Martin quoting this anecdote has rightly called attention to the poet's distinction between management and *words*. The excellency of its management, its *economy* (*οἰκονομία*) is the overmastering impression given by a reading of the *Dyskolos*. "Management" means more than plot construction. The plot of the play could be described simply as "how the hero persuaded the father of the girl he loved to let him marry her by rescuing him from a well". "Management" implies the combination of character and incident to provide dramatic impetus that makes the action move forward. It is possible to isolate some elements of technique. One is variety: the action is spread over two or more simultaneous fields (the party engaged in sacrifice in front of the Nymphaeum, Sostratus quietly digging). We thus enjoy the different reactions of the participants to what is going on, and these reactions themselves set the next stage in motion. Another element is careful preparation: the audience's ideas and emotions are played on in advance. In the third line of the prologue, the Nymphaeum of Phyle is described as "a shrine of note". This is not merely an interesting fact, it is preparation for the presence of the whole of Sostratus's family at sacrifice in this out-of-the-way spot. An admirable crescendo leads to the first entry of the Old Curmudgeon; an even better one is found in the role played by the well. Instead of Cnemon's fall into it being a *deus ex machina* to bring the story to a happy end, it seems the most natural thing in the world. Another element

(and this is against the anecdote) is the language itself : not only is it simple yet elegant,¹ it is always dramatically pointed, dramatically rhetorical. No restoration here or elsewhere in Menander that fails to meet these criteria can be acceptable.

Another feature of the plot will already have presented itself forcibly, because of its contrast with other known plays : not only is its construction simple, it is almost aggressively moral. Here are no complicated situations of recognition, no long lost children born in dubious circumstances, no rapes presented as if they were every-day occurrences. The play need cause no lifting of eyebrows in a girls' school. Its treatment, moreover, illustrates admirably the restrictive effect of social conditions on the choice of topics for the stage. The heroine of this moral story is not even given a name—she is simply “the girl”—and she has no personality. She is the beauty, X; she could be the most vacuous of film stars and the play would not suffer. In contrast, therefore, to many plays, there are no improbable intrigues in regard to which we are asked to suspend disbelief. There is this much of improbability even in this plot, that we must believe a fastidious town-bred youth would be ready to accept as wife an entirely uneducated country girl. Of course in a society where the wives and daughters of citizens are closely chaperoned, and the only young ladies whom men can meet easily must belong to the demi-monde, one can hardly expect a young girl to make a satisfactory stage heroine.

If the play has a moral lesson, it lies in its preaching to the rich, the idle, the townspeople not to trample on the rights and feelings of the poor, hardworking country folk. It is done directly by exhortation in the mouth of Gorgias; still better is it suggested by the assumption of workman's togs by Sostratus in order to win his bride. Old Cnemon himself (not a poor man at all, for his property is worth two talents at least) has a bias in favour of the peasant proprietor, the *αὐτουργός*; and even Callipides is represented by his son as an ideal farmer.

Perhaps social strains lie behind this. The feeling of class

¹This is true in spite of the mannerism by which connecting particles (especially *δέ* and *γάρ*) are postponed in sentence openings.

division perhaps reflects the loss of citizenship in 321 B.C. by some nine thousand thetes¹ many of whom might well be farmers. Now the extract from the Didascalía quoted in the argument to the play gives the date of production as the archonship of Didymogenes—an archon who does not exist. It is suggested that Didymogenes is a mistake for Demogenes, who was archon in 317/16, at a time when Menander was in his twenty-sixth year. The correction fails to carry absolute conviction, since Didymogenes is a known name, and the archon list contemporary with Menander's later years has not been irreproachably reconstituted. 317 B.C., however is the year which saw Demetrius of Phalerum installed as governor of Athens, and certain passages would gain in force if interpreted as hits against his government.² If the date is right, one will be tempted to look for characteristics of Menander's early work in the play. Possibly the relative simplicity of construction, the prominence of fooling should be considered such.

But there is no obvious sign of immaturity in the play.³ It has the exuberance of interest found in all works of artistic creation. Yet no doubt its author's chief aim was to portray an irritable, quarrelsome, tiresome old man—τὸν ἐργώδη γέροντα, as he is characterized in the Epilogue. The effect of his unsociability on others is an integral part of that portrayal, so that in a sense the play is a study of social interdependence. At the base of Cnemon's twisted character lies an honourable if mistaken view of politics and morals. Men, it seemed to him, were so

¹ See Plutarch Phocion 28.7, Diodorus 18,18,5. The number of citizens was reduced to 9000. Either 12,000 (Plutarch) or 21,000 (Diodorus) were disfranchised (see on these figures, A. H. M. Jones, *Athenian Democracy* p. 76 and 149 n. 3).

² So L. A. Post regards l. 755 οὐ τρυφῶν οὐδ' οἶος ἀργὸς περιπατεῖν τὴν ἡμέραν as a smack at the Peripatos and at Demetrius, and l. 836-7 οὐκ ἔχων βούλει δοκεῖν [ἔχειν] as a reflection on his sumptuary legislation. A. Momigliano suggests that Menander's choice of theme and treatment in this moral play were officially inspired by Demetrius's policy of morality.

³ *Dyskolos* has neither the quantity (186 out of 341 verses in *Samia*, on Körte's count) nor the awkwardness of the monologues in the *Samia*. Was E. Diehl after all right in suggesting that the *Samia* preserves the Ὀργή? cf. *Samia* 168, 197. Four Menandrian comedies have double titles. Ὀργή ἢ Σαμία would be thinkable.

little admirable in their dealings with each other that self-sufficiency became an ideal. It is a moving revelation that excites our sympathy, and was no doubt intended to do so: it is due to Menander's wit that it was not also sentimentalized.