THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

Blazing Walls, Blazing Brothers:
Monks and the Making of the Demon in the Pachomian Koinonia

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty of the

Center for the Study of Early Christianity

School of Arts and Sciences

Of The Catholic University of America

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

By

Sidney Robert Banks, Jr.

Washington, D. C.

2011

Blazing Walls, Blazing Brothers:

Monks and the Making of the Demon in the Pachomian Koinonia

Sidney Robert Banks, Jr., Ph.D.

Director: Philip Rousseau, D.Phil.

This dissertation contributes to the study of late antique demonology and the development of Christian monasticism in fourth century Egypt. In particular, I explore the relationship between the development of the Pachomian Koinonia and the belief its members held about demons. While there has been no previous publication devoted to this relationship, David Brakke has included a chapter on Pachomian demonology in his book *Demons and the Making of the Monk: Spiritual Combat in Early Christianity*. I differ with Brakke in two general ways. First, I place greater emphasis upon the fact that demons in Late Antique Egypt were not only threats to a person's thoughts, but also to physical bodies. Second, I place greater emphasis upon what communal life added to a monk's struggle against demonic attacks both upon his body and upon his mind.

In order to carry out this task, I have made a close examination of Coptic, Greek, and Latin Pachomian texts, clearly identified in the first chapter. I have also made an analysis of other texts to place the Pachomian material in the wider cultural context of fourth century Egypt. Using this material, I describe what demons were believed to be and what they were believed to be capable of doing by people living in that time and place. I then explore what role communal life played in the Pachomian attempt to resist the demons.

I conclude that the communal life shared by the Pachomian monks was a source of protection against demonic attack. In the third chapter, I show that the presence of experienced monks protected the less experienced from violent demonic attack. In the fourth chapter, I show that communal life also protected the monk from demonic assaults upon his thoughts.

This dissertation by Sidney R. Banks, Jr. fulfills the dissertation requirement for the doctoral degree in _____ approved by Philip Rousseau, D.Phil., as Director, and by Janet Timbie, Ph.D., and David Frankfurter, Ph.D. as Readers.

_____
Philip Rousseau, D.Phil., Director

_____
Janet Timbie, Ph.D., Reader

_____
David Frankfurter, Ph.D., Reader

For

Sidney R. Banks, Sr., Minerva Banks, Raymond Riddick, and Heidi Bunting

Table of Contents

Introduction

       In the fourth century, a new religious movement arose in the Thebaid region of

Egypt. A young man named Pachomius embraced the religion of the Christians who had

compassion on him when he was being transported along the Nile as a military conscript.

This young man would become one of the most important figures in the history of

Christian monasticism. After his release, he founded not a single monastery, but

(eventually) a federation of monasteries. This Koinonia (or "community") of

monasteries, although it was a new movement, emerged in an already ancient civilization

with established beliefs and fears about unfriendly beings; beliefs and fears that the

Christians would adopt into their spiritual universe as demons. In this work, I explore the

relationship between the growth of this movement and the beliefs its members had about

demons.

       This study is necessary because, despite the immense subsequent importance of

Christian monasticism for Egypt and many other regions of the world, there has been no

previous publication devoted to this topic. There have been works on demons that

include the Pachomians in a wider collection of ascetics. Most recent of these is the book

Demons and the Making of the Monk: Spiritual Combat in Early Christianity by David

Brakke. He includes one chapter on the Pachomians. Much needs to be added to his

work. While his chapter on the Pachomians is valuable, I differ with him in two general

ways. First, I place greater emphasis upon the fact that demons in fourth century Egypt

were threats not only to a person's thoughts, but also to their bodies. Brakke does not completely overlook this, but says very little about it. He focuses primarily upon the threat demons posed to a person's thoughts, building upon his chapter on Evagrius that precedes the Pachomian chapter. Second, I place greater emphasis upon what communal life added to a Pachomian monk's struggle against demonic attacks both upon his body and upon his mind. The cenobitic life made the Pachomians different from many of the ascetics discussed by Brakke. This prompts the question of what specific relationship may have developed between precisely this communal way of life and their beliefs about demons.

In Chapter 1, I identify what I regard as the most relevant and reliable texts for the study of Pachomian demonology, and explain my choice. There is no Pachomian text dedicated exclusively to beliefs about demons. There is, however, an assortment of texts written by or about the Pachomians that can shed light on these beliefs. Most accounts about demons in these texts are found in the works of hagiography, but useful information can also be gleaned from surviving rules, letters, personal memoirs, and didactic writings.

In Chapter 2, I seek to describe what demons were believed to be and what they were believed to be able to do by generations of Greeks and Egyptians in Egypt prior to the foundation of the Koinonia. I do this in part to justify my emphasis upon demons that performed acts of physical violence. I find that both Greek and Egyptian traditions believed in the existence of hostile spiritual forces that could harm humans in various

ways, including physical violence. In Egypt, they were particularly associated with the desert (not necessarily the deep desert, but outside of the arable land near the Nile), and tombs. Certain animals were also associated with the spiritual forces of evil and chaos. The Christians in Egypt depicted demons very similarly. This is vividly seen in the works about Christian ascetics in which demons make frequent appearances. The demons are not merely intellectual forces seeking to influence the thoughts of their victims, but were violent weapon-bearing thugs, who did not hesitate to assault their human victims physically and did real harm to their bodies. In these texts, demons also appear associated with animals long feared by their ancestors for being somehow in league with the forces of evil and chaos. The demons faced by the Pachomians and other monks in Egypt were of the same villainous type feared by their ancestors.

Christian ascetic texts that include accounts of demons cast certain monks as the primary adversaries of the demons. Some of these monks demonstrated their superiority over the demons by enduring their physical assaults. These monks were also able to protect and save others from the demons. They were able to exorcize demons from the possessed, and to remove the taint certain animals or regions (like the desert) bore because of their traditional association with evil.

Having shown that certain Christian monks were able to protect and save others from demons, in Chapter 3, I explore what advantage there was for a maturing monk from living in a community including numbers of these powerful monks. I find that, although the Pachomians believed the demons could physically attack humans, could

cause disease, and could control certain dangerous animals, there was safety in the community. On rare occasions, a leader might be physically attacked, but these attacks only proved his superiority to the demons. Maturing monks did not face these attacks. The demons could cause the monks to feel the symptoms of disease, but did not cause real disease. Only God could cause the monks to become ill. Moreover, the monks enjoyed protection from dangerous animals, including scorpions and crocodiles. This protection was connected to their membership in the community. Monks who abandoned the community, or were expelled from it, lost their protection from all of these threats. The protection stemmed from the presence of numbers of powerful monks who, like a human wall, were able to protect the other monks in their care from demonic violence. The protection was made more certain by the fact that there were numbers of them. When one died, the community did not lose its protection, because there were others in the human wall. Moreover, the system was self-regenerating. When one generation of fathers died, it would be replaced in turn by another generation of monks that had reached spiritual maturity in the Koinonia. Thus, the Koinonia offered an environment more secure from demonic violence than that offered by a single powerful monk or by a small number of them.

In Chapter 4, I show that the wall of humanity that surrounded a Pachomian monk also protected him from demonic assaults upon his thoughts. I present two general ways in which this happened. First, monks were protected from the incursion of evil thoughts by the development of the fruits of the Spirit. This development was prompted by the monks' observation and personal experience of the good examples set by the fathers and

brothers who constantly accompanied them. The possession of the fruits of the Spirit could bar the reception of evil thoughts in the mind of the monk. The practice of these virtues among one's neighbors could also help to drive evil thoughts from their minds as well. Second, unlike an anchorite, a Pachomian monk was constantly surrounded by monks who could not only set a good example, but could also notice any signs that he might be struggling with an evil thought. When the monks believed a brother had committed an offense, such as theft, they could bring him before the monastery's authorities for correction, but a monk did not have to commit such a blatant act to cause suspicion. The Pachomian *Rules* reveal the close attention paid to actions that might appear innocent, but might also be clues to an inner struggle with an evil thought in the mind of the monk. Once his struggle with a thought was exposed, the monk could receive correction and counseling from the more experienced. Unlike an anchorite then, whose battle with thoughts was primarily psychological, the Pachomian monk's struggle became a social event. This struggle was not hidden, since the close observation often revealed a monk's inner battles. It was also not fought alone. Not only was the monk surrounded by monks who were able to give him advice, but his thoughts were also influenced by the examples set by others.

It appears clear then that the communal nature of life in the Pachomian Koinonia offered great advantages to aspiring monks who feared the activity of demons, advantages that less communal forms of piety could not match. It is reasonable to suggest therefore that the desire to seek protection from demons was one motivating

factor for monks when they decided to join a Pachomian monastery and one reason for

the early development of cenobitic communities in Egypt.

Chapter One

Sources

ⲦⲚⲞⲨⲬⲈ ⲚⲀⲤⲚⲎⲞⲨ ⲦⲬⲰ ⲘⲘⲞⲤ
ⲚⲰⲦⲈⲚ ⲬⲈⲞⲨⲀⲚⲀⲄⲔⲈⲞⲚⲠⲈ
ⲞⲨⲞⲎ ⲞⲨⲆⲒⲔⲈⲞⲚ ⲚⲀⲚⲠⲈ
ⲈⲐⲢⲈⲚⲤⲪⲈⲚⲈⲤⲪⲒⲤⲒ
ⲒⲤⲬⲈⲚⲦⲀⲢⲬⲎ
ⲚⲈⲘⲦⲈⲤⲘⲈⲦⲦⲈⲖⲒⲞⲤ ⲦⲎⲢⲤ
ⲚⲈⲘⲚⲈⲤⲠⲞⲖⲎⲦⲒⲀ
ⲚⲈⲘⲚⲈⲤⲀⲤⲔⲎⲤⲒⲤ ⲦⲎⲢⲞⲨ
ⲈⲦⲀⲤⲀⲒⲦⲞⲨ ⲬⲈⲎⲒⲚⲀ
ⲚⲦⲈⲠⲈⲤⲈⲢⲪⲘⲈⲨⲒ ⲘⲞⲨⲚ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ
ⲎⲒⲬⲈⲚⲠⲔⲀⲎⲒ ⲔⲀⲦⲀⲪⲢⲎⲦ ⲞⲚ
ⲈⲦⲈⲤⲘⲎⲚ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ⲬⲈⲚⲚⲒⲪⲎⲞⲨⲒ
ⲚⲤⲎⲞⲨ ⲚⲒⲂⲈⲚ

–Bo 194 (CSCO 89 p 186)

I. Introduction

Under the leadership of the Koinonia's fourth Father, the movement had begun to show its age. Theodore, once the young and bright lieutenant of Pachomius and now the mature spiritual Father of the community, in the above quotation encouraged his monks to commit the memory of Pachomius to writing so that it remain among them on earth as it remained forever in Heaven. Texts followed, although the identity and nature of the earliest accounts remain points of contention. The bulk of the surviving dossier is composed of a collection of hagiographies in Coptic, Greek, Arabic, and Latin. In addition, community rules, letters, personal memoirs, and didactic writings have also survived in the same languages. Because none of these sources taken individually can be used to gain a precise and complete picture of life in the Koinonia, all of them must be used to draw the most reasonable conclusions. For the study of Pachomian demonology,

the Greek and Coptic hagiographies are extremely important, since they contain numerous stories written about demons. The *Rules* and the *Letter of Ammon* are also important for the insight they provide into the life and practice of the Koinonia. Finally, the surviving didactic works are also important because they reveal some of the things that were being taught there.

Hagiographic sources in one sense were not written to be historical records, but in another sense they were. Hagiographies were written partly as propaganda pieces for their protagonist(s); the writers wanted to convince their readers of the greatness and holiness of their leaders and of their way of life. That does not mean that works of hagiography do not contain any truth, but the purposes of the writers must be kept in mind. Collections of rules in some ways are also unrealistic. While some rules may present the details of daily life and activities, others describe infractions and resulting penalties. Thus, these works often present a one-sided and negative view of life in a Pachomian monastery. Letters and instructions, while quite valuable, were never intended to present a picture of daily life, but to address a specific issue or problem. Therefore, it is essential that all of these types of sources be considered in the attempt to arrive at the most reasonable conclusions about Pachomian beliefs about demons, or any other aspect of life in the Koinonia. Below, I will present in more detail the sources I consider most relevant for this study.

II.   Hagiography

1.   Greek Lives

The story of Pachomius traveled to the West partially by means of Greek hagiographies. Among the extant documents, G_1 is the most primitive. It has been preserved in three manuscripts. The Florentine *Biblioteca Laurentiana* XI. 9 manuscript was copied in 1021 in the Italian monastery of Apiro. *Atheniensis* 1015 from the National Library of Athens was also copied in the eleventh century in a monastery in Macedonia. Finally, the fragmentary *Ambrosianus* D. 69 *Sup* from Milan dates to the 14th century. Each manuscript contained not only G_1 but also the *Letter of Ammon* and a collection of accounts called "Paralipomena" by the Bollandists.

In 1680, Papebroch, relying upon the Florentine and Milan manuscripts, produced the first edited text of these manuscripts supplemented by a text of G_2.[1] In 1932, Halkin published a second Bollandist text, which was also based upon the Florentine and Milanese texts,[2] and later, he also published the text of the Athenian manuscript.[3] The Athenian and Milanese manuscripts display differences in style and wording compared to the Florentine text. This must be kept in mind but should not be exaggerated. Goehring

---

[1] *Acta sanctorum Maii III* (Antwerp: Cnobarum, 1680).

[2] François Halkin, *Sancti Pachomii Vitae Graecae, Subsidia hagiographica* 19 (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1932). The impact of the lack of the use of the Athenian text was lessened by the fact that the Milan text appears to have been the same as that in the National Library of Athens.

[3] Halkin, *Le corpus athénien de saint Pachome, Cahiers d'Orientalisme* 2 (Genève: Cramer, 1982).

concluded that the more polished text of the Milanese and Athenian manuscripts

represents a revision made to the more vulgar manuscripts represented by the Florentine,

but although the latter may represent an earlier stage in the manuscript tradition, the

former may at times preserve more accurate readings.[4] Therefore, I will use both texts

edited by Halkin in this work. In my references, I use the paragraph numbering shared by

both texts and note when I am referring to the older text.

There are several other surviving Greek hagiographies that will not play an important

role in my work due to their dependency upon other works. The most important of these

are G_2 and a similar Greek work (D) that survives in a Latin translation made by a monk

named Dionysius Exiguus.[5] Amélineau and Grützmacher[6] believed these works were

dependent upon Coptic works, but others, including Ladeuze and Veilleux,[7] have argued

that they depend ultimately upon G_1 and the *Paralipomena*. Scholars have also argued

---

[4] James Goehring, *The Letter of Ammon and Pachomian Monasticism* (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1986): 42-59.

[5] G_2 text published by F. Halkin, *Sancti Pachomii vitae Graecae*, *Subsidia hagiographica* 19 (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1932): 166-271. Dionysius' text published by H. van Cranenburgh, *La vie latine de saint Pachôme traduite du grec par Denys le Petit, édition critique, Subsidia hagiographica* 46 (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1969).

[6] E. Amélineau, *Monuments pour server à l'histoire de l'Égypte chrétienne au IVe siècle. Histoire de Saint Pakhôme et de ses communautés. Documents coptes et arabes inédits, publiés et traduits par É. Amélineau (ADMG 17):* 2 Vol. (Paris: 1889): x-xix; G. Grützmacher, *Pachomios und das älteste Klosterleben. Ein Beitrag zur Mönchsgeschichte* (Leipzig: Mohr, 1896): 8-11.

[7] P. Ladeuze, *Étude sur le cénobitisme pakhômien pendant le IVe siècle et la première moitié du Ve* (Louvain and Paris: 1898): 6-13, 26-27; Armand Veilleux, *La liturgie dans le cénobitisme pachômien au quatrième siècle,* Studia Anselmiana 57 (Rome: Herder, 1968): 24-31. Veilleux provides a chart on pp 25-26 illustrating the correlations between G_2 on the one hand, and G_1 and the *Paralipomena* on the other.

whether G_2 or D used each other as a source, and whether the accounts also found in the *Paralipomena* were taken from there or from a similar collection, but this does not affect the dependent nature of these works.[8] Other Greek lives have also been found to be dependent on earlier works.[9]

2. Paralipomena

Ascetica are collections of individual anecdotes not connected together into a flowing narrative. Termed "Paralipomena" by the Bollandists, a collection of such ascetica was attached to each of the three manuscripts containing G_1 and also exists in a Syriac translation.[10] As has been seen above, the *Paralipomena* may have been used by D and G_2, and so these texts also may provide an indirect witness to that one. Lefort provided a useful chart of both the similarities and differences among these texts.[11]

---

[8] Those believing D was dependent upon G_2 include Wilhelm Bousset, *Apothegmata: Studien zur Geschichte des ältesten Mönchtums* (Tübingen, 1923): 211-212; and Derwas Chitty, "Pachomian Sources Reconsidered." *JEH* 5 (1954): 56-59. Those believing G_2 was dependent upon D include J. Bousquet and F. Nau, *Histoire de saint Pacôme (Une redaction inedited des Ascetica) Texte grec des manuscripts Paris 881 et Chartres 1754 avec une traduction de la version syriaque et une analyse du manuscrit de Paris Suppl. grec 480*. In *Patrologie Orientale* IV, 5 (Paris, 1907): 416-418; and L. Th. Lefort, *Les vies coptes de Saint Pachôme et de ses premiers successeurs (Bibliothèque du Muséon 16)* (Louvain, 1953): xxvii-xxxviii.

[9] See the summary in Armand Veilleux, *Pachomian Koinonia* (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, Inc., 1980): 14-15; *La liturgie,* 32-34. G_4 is dependent upon G_1 and Palladius. G_5 is dependent upon G_3 and G_4. G_6 is dependent upon Palladius, *Paralipomena*, and G_2. Finally, G_7 is an abbreviation of G_2.

[10] Syriac text: E.A.W. Budge, *The Book of Paradise* (London, 1904).

[11] Lefort, *Les vies,* xxi.

Among the manuscripts of the *Paralipomena*, the Athenian, Milanese, and Syriac share a common order and contents, while the Florentine has a different order and some slight differences in content. In his study on the *Letter of Ammon*, Goehring made a comparison of the textual tradition of the Florentine manuscript with that of the Athenian, Milanese, and Syriac manuscripts. He found that the differences in order and content in the latter group were the result of a redaction of G_1, the *Paralipomena,* and the *Letter of Ammon*. The Florentine edition of these texts reflects an earlier version of these texts, and the remaining editions reflect a revised version of these texts that may have happened when they left Egypt. All three texts within this group were redacted, but the reordering of the *Paralipomena* stands out among the minor alterations seen in all three.[12]

Ladeuze believed these stories were originally written in Coptic, and then translated into Greek to supplement G_1. He found that the text bore a decidedly Coptic "color," because it had a pronounced taste for the supernatural and for more detailed and ornate presentations.[13] Lefort, on the other hand, felt these accounts were taken from a larger Greek collection of Pachomian ascetica. He pointed to two anecdotes (108-109) from a work entitled *De Oratione,* variously attributed to Nilus or Evagrius, introduced by the phrase τοὺς βίους τῶν Ταβεννησιωτῶν μοναχῶν. Lefort contended that one of these accounts was similar to Bo 99 (CSCO 89 p 124-125), G_1 101, D 50, and G_2 84, but that the other was similar only to Bo 98 (CSCO 89 p 122-124), Av 71, and Am 482, not to any Greek source. Therefore, the source of these two anecdotes was broader than the

---

[12] Goehring, *Letter,* 42-102.

[13] Ladeuze, 69-71.

Paralipomena and the entire Greek corpus. To this, Lefort added that the title of the

manuscript suggests that they are taken "from" a work entitled the *Asceticon*.[14] This

larger Greek work, Lefort suggested, was a source not only for the *Paralipomena* but also

for other Greek lives.[15]

Chitty believed the work alluded to by *De Oratione* was a collection including G_1, the

Paralipomena, and the *Letter of Ammon*.[16] He contended that only the first anecdote

from *De Oratione* was actually taken from "the lives of the Tabennesiote monks." He

found that one of the accounts, which Lefort connects to Bo 99 et al., was actually not so

similar to these texts. Chapter 109 concerned a brother who suffered no harm when

bitten by a snake. The Pachomian story concerned a monk who nearly died in agony

when stung by a scorpion. Chitty contended that the first account (108), while not in the

Greek lives, was found in the Greek *Letter of Ammon* (19). In fact, placing the relevant

portions of Bo 98, EpAm 19, and *De Or* 108 side by side, Chitty found that the two

Greek texts were the most similar to each other, while the Coptic account was at best a

---

[14] The Athenian manuscript reads. Ἐκ τῶν Ἀσκητικῶν περὶ τῶν κεφάλαια ιδ

[15] Lefort, *Les vies,* xix-xxvii. For one opposing view, see P. Peeters, *Le dossier copte de s. Pachôme et ses rapports avec la tradition grecque,* in *AnBoll* 64 (1946): 263-267.

[16] Chitty ("Sources," 47) also included the Rule, the Letters of Pachomius and Theodore, and the Book of Horsiesius in this body of texts.

"distant echo."[17] Although he did not make it explicit, the fact that the two Greek sources

share the peculiar detail about the monk hiding the snake beneath his feet is striking.

3. **Sahidic Lives**

The Coptic lives of Pachomius, as well as those in Arabic, were first published by

Amélineau in 1889.[18] Contrary to the views of the Bollandists, Amélineau (followed by

Grützmacher[19]) held that the earliest *Life of Pachomius* was composed in Sahidic (his

"Theban Life") and that his Arabic text (Am) was the best surviving witness of that

earliest work. This "Theban Life" was extremely fragmentary. He believed another

Coptic work, the "Memphite Life" (now called the Bohairic Life), which survived much

more intact, was based upon the Sahidic work. The "Theban Life," however, was soon

recognized as not a single work, but as the remains of several Sahidic lives. These, along

with the Bohairic life (Bo), were published again in the 1930's by Lefort, who assigned

and arranged the Sahidic fragments among a number of Sahidic lives (S#).[20] In my work,

I will use Lefort's designations and chapter numbers alongside CSCO references for all

Coptic materials.

---

[17] Chitty, "Sources,"39-41. Chitty and Lefort also disagree with the identity of the monk in question. Chitty, following *EpAm*, identifies this monk as Theodore. Lefort, relying on the fact that some manuscripts merely call the monk ὁ ἀββᾶς, a title he feels must refer to Pachomius, identified him as the founder of the Koinonia.

[18] Amélineau (1889).

[19] Grützmacher, *Pachomios*.

[20] Lefort, *S. Pachomii vitae sahidice scriptae, CSCO* 99-100 (Louvain, 1933/34; reprint 1953).

As stated above, the Sahidic lives survive only in a very fragmentary state. The following appear to be the most significant lives identified by Lefort.[21]

Lefort believed the earliest surviving life of Pachomius was represented by the Sahidic text he identified as S_1. Its tone and style suggested an original composition rather than a compilation of accounts taken from other works. Only sixteen and one half manuscript pages survive, dealing primarily with Pachomius' early difficulty in forming a community of monks. Lefort believed that additional material for this life could be gleaned from the compilation S_3. He believed that S_1 did not make use of Greek lives, and, in fact, showed no relation to the Greek lives at all except as one might expect from two sources separated by intermediaries.[22] Chitty, on the contrary, found the differences between S_1 and similar accounts from G_1 were like those between the latter and the *Paralipomena*. He acknowledged the possibility that S_1 was based upon oral accounts, but pointed to the occurrence of "tell-tale" Greek words to suggest that the Coptic account could, in fact, be a "free elaboration" of the Greek text. Chitty was especially struck by a use of the Greek word πέρπερος.[23] Compare the use of this term in both texts when describing the rebuke from Pachomius' brother John because of Pachomius' attempt to enlarge their dwelling:

---

[21] For Lefort's description of more minor fragments, see *Les vies*, lxxxiii-lxxxvii.

[22] Lefort, *Les vies* lxxii.

[23] Chitty, "Sources," 74-75.

S₁ (CSCO 99 p 1) ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ̄ ⲛⲁϥ ⲛ̄ϭⲓⲡⲉϥⲥⲟⲛ ϩ̄ⲛ̄ⲟⲩϭⲱⲛⲧ̄ ϫⲉⲁⲗⲟⲕ · ⲉⲕⲟ̄ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲣⲡⲉⲣⲟⲥ	G₁ 15 (Florentine)[24] εἶπεν αὐτῷ · Παῦσαι **πέρπερος** ὤν

Given the multilingual nature of the Koinonia, the use of this common term does not

seem so striking. In fact, the term ⲣ̄ⲡⲉⲣⲡⲉⲣⲟⲥ is found in 1 Cor. 13: 4 in the Sahidic

New Testament. Therefore, this appears to have been a word Sahidic speakers would

have known. Nevertheless, its use here in both texts may suggest at least a distant

relationship or perhaps some common oral source for both accounts. In any event, it is

certainly a weak example upon which to argue for dependency on a Greek text.

Lefort described S₂ as a collection of stories displaying Pachomius' spiritual gifts

and powers. He did not feel that the presence of so much miraculous material was a sign

that the text belonged to a later stage in the tradition. He pointed to the store of

miraculous stories apparently drawn upon by Athanasius in his *Life of Antony* that must

have emerged soon after Antony's death.[25] He argued for the primitive nature of S₂ by

presenting several examples where the text appears to have provided material used in

other lives, including the Arabic, Greek (G₁, G₂, D), Sahidic (S₃, S₄, S₅, S₇), and

Bohairic.[26] Chitty countered in a fashion similar to his approach to S₁. In the cases

---

[24] This section is missing in the Athenian text.

[25] Lefort, *Les vies, lxxii*-iii. Bousset (258-260) saw an early aretology as a source used by Athanasius in his *Vita Antonii*, but contrasted this with the writers of the Pachomian lives who had access to more firsthand accounts of their subject.

[26] Lefort, *Les vies,* lxxii-iii.

where Lefort saw a dependence of Greek accounts upon S_2, Chitty suggested that the Coptic was again a "free elaboration" of the Greek. Moreover, he found that the stress upon the miraculous was so dissimilar to the concerns of G_1 that both could not be primitive, and he saw no reason to suppose that G_1 was not the more primitive text. In addition, he also questioned whether S_2 was really separate from S_1, but he did not elaborate.[27] Veilleux also questioned the primitive nature of S_2. He considered S_2 a compilation that could be dependent upon texts from the textual group SBo.[28]

S_{20}, S_{10}, and S_{11}, Lefort believed, came from a common recension. He believed these texts were sources used in particular by the later Arabic lives, but also, indirectly, by G_1 and Bo. What set these texts apart was that nearly half of the surviving texts concerned Theodore, the Koinonia's fourth leader, not Pachomius. This was not merely a *Life of Pachomius*, but rather a *Life of Pachomius and Theodore*, and probably the earliest such account. Lefort connected it to the account of both monks requested by the archbishop Theophilus in his letter to Horsiesius in S_{21}.[29] If so, this would be another of the most primitive accounts.[30] Chitty, on the other hand, believed that the text commissioned by Theophilus was G_1. Therefore, he explained those sections of the Greek life that Lefort identified as being dependent on this Coptic life as further

---

[27] Chitty, "Sources," 75.

[28] Veilleux, *La liturgie*, 41-43. See pages 11-12 below.

[29] W. E. Crum, *Der Papyruscodex saec. VI-VII der Phillippsbibliothek in Cheltenham. Koptische theologische Schriften. Schriften der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft in Strassburg* 18. (Strassburg: Trübner, 1915): 12-21.

[30] Lefort, *Les vies,* lxxviii-v.

examples of a "free elaboration" by the Coptic writer of the Greek account.[31] Veilleux

did not see this as a recension of a single composition, but instead held that these lives

represented the fusing of an earlier life of Pachomius with an added life of Theodore and

could have been a source for the latter compilations of these two lives such as G_1 and the

SBo group.[32]

S_8 contains what Lefort believed might be the opening of S_1. The first two pages

are also found in S_3. The third and fourth pages correspond to Bo 4-6 (CSCO 89 p 2-4)

and vaguely to G_1 3, D 3, and G_2 5. [33]

S_3 once formed a compilation of some four hundred pages, of which only thirty-

four have been identified. The use of this compilation to supplement S_1 has already been

mentioned above, as has its inclusion of the first two pages of S_8. In addition, Lefort

believed that S_{3a} and S_{3b} might stem from the same Coptic scriptorium or perhaps even

the same hand. The first of these is nearly identical to Bo 89, 102-105 (CSCO 89 p 101-

106, 128-138). The second formed a collection of homilies that seemed to have been a

second volume to S_3.[34] Veilleux agreed that S_3 reproduced much of S_1. He held that it

---

[31] Chitty, "Sources," 75.

[32] Veilleux, *La liturgie,* 43.

[33] Lefort, *Les vies,* lxxv-vi.

[34] Lefort, *Les vies,* lxxvi-vii.

was the result of a fusion of S_1 and a Sahidic life from the group SBo. He has provided a

table illustrating the parallels between S_3, S_1, and SBo.[35]

4. Bohairic Life

The textual tradition most fully represented by the Bohairic Life (Bo) is also

represented by a number of earlier Sahidic lives as well as later Arabic lives (see below).

Indeed, Lefort wrote that this recension "qui a relativement le moins souffert dans sa

transmission manuscrite est aussi celle qui est attestée par le plus grand nombre de

témoins du texte."[36] Veilleux termed this textual group SBo. Some of these accounts,

such as Av (see below) and S_7, end with the death of Pachomius, while others continue

through the careers of Horsiesius and Theodore. Veilleux held that the earliest life of

Pachomius ended with his death and the later material was added as an appendix in some

manuscripts.[37]

The overall similarity of this tradition represented by SBo to G_1 is obvious, although

there are many differences in detail. Lefort held that G_1 represented an abridgement of

this tradition.[38] Chitty felt that this tradition as well as even the most primitive Sahidic

accounts appeared to be dependent upon G_1.[39]

---

[35] Veilleux, *La liturgie* 43-47.

[36] Lefort, *Les vies,* lxxvii-viii.

[37] Veilleux, *La liturgie,* 38-40.

[38] Lefort, *Les vies,* lxxvii-lxxxii.

[39] Chitty, "Sources," 76.

5. Arabic Lives

Unlike Amélineau and Bousset,[40] neither Ladeuze nor Lefort believed the Arabic

lives were good witnesses to the most primitive traditions.[41] Ladeuze saw in the Arabic

lives a further development of the Coptic lives' colorful and imaginative retelling of the

accounts the writers found in G_1. Nevertheless, these lives have been useful because they

can be compared to Coptic and Greek texts to which they seem to be related.

Several Greek and Coptic Pachomian lives also survive in Arabic translation.

Important among these are the Arabic codex no. 172 of the Vatican Library (Av), which

is a translation of a Sahidic text from the group SBo, and MS 261 of the Bibliothèque

Nationale in Paris (Ap), which is a translation of G^3. Av can be compared to other texts

within SBo and has been used to fill in lacunas in the Coptic texts.[42] The value of a text

such as Ap is that it provides not only an additional witness to G^3, but also to the sources

used by G^3, including a text of G_1.[43]

Another Arabic life (Ag) is preserved in MS 116 of the Universitätsbibliothek

Göttingen and bears great similarities to G_1 and SBo. In 1889, Amélineau published an

Arabic life (Am) based upon MS Or. 4523 in the British Museum, which was an 1816

---

[40] Bousset freely used the Arabic texts to correct the *Tendenz* of G_1.

[41] Lefort, *Les vies,* xviii; Ladeuze 52-69, 85-97.

[42] For instance Av provides the only witness to Bo 111-112.

[43] Veilleux, *La liturgie*, 49-52; Lefort, *Les vies,* xv-xviii.

copy of an original from the monastery of St. Antony.[44] This text is a compilation of a

text very similar to Ag and an Arabic translation of G^3.

Veilleux sees in Ag a combination of two hypothetical texts: a simple life of

Pachomius (*Vita Brevis*- VBr) and a life of Theodore (*Vita Theodori*- VTh). Dividing Ag

into three sections, Veilleux finds that the first and final sections follow the order of G_1

and SBo closely. The middle section, on the other hand, is composed of accounts that are

scattered throughout the Greek and Coptic texts. Veilleux hypothesized that the first and

final sections reflect the original VBr. This text was split in two and an account stressing

the importance of Theodore was inserted into the middle. This middle section reflects

VTh. G_1 and SBo represent a later stage of development in which VTh was more

thoroughly blended with VBr. [45] Veilleux's conclusions were soon challenged by de

Vogüé.[46]

Although the Arabic lives clearly have value for the study of Greek and Coptic

Pachomian literature, given their derivative nature and the late date of their provenance,[47]

---

[44] Amélineau (1889).

[45] Veilleux, *La liturgie*, 53-68; "Le problem des Vies de Saint Pachôme," *RAM* 42 (1966): 293. Veilleux offers a detailed comparison of Ag with G_1 and SBo in *La Liturgie*, 69-107.

[46] Adalbert de Vogüé, "La vie arabe de saint Pachôme et ses deux sources presumes," *AnBoll* 91 (1973): 379-390.

[47] Ladeuze was willing to allow a date closer to the Arab Conquest as opposed to the much later dates (13th-14th centuries) suggested by Amélineau and Grützmacher. Veilleux (*La liturgie*, 50ff) dates these texts to the 14th century and later.

any departure of the Arabic text from its identified sources must be held highly suspect. For this reason, they will not play a large role in my work.

6. History of Debate Over Greek and Coptic Lives

The Greek and Coptic lives then will be the most important hagiographies for my work, but the question of which linguistic tradition is more primitive or valuable remains open. As briefly introduced above, the view of the Bollandist Papebroch that G_1 was composed by a Greek monk contemporaneous with the events described was challenged by Amélineau, who believed that the first life was composed in Sahidic in the mid 360s by Theodore's "frères interprètes" of Bo 196 (CSCO 89 p 190-191).[48] In his view, a Greek version may have also been produced at that time but has not survived. He went on to date the Bohairic text, which he considered an abbreviated and tendentious version of its Sahidic predecessor, to the first half of the fifth century. G_1 and the Greek text used by Dionysius Exiguus (discussed below) were also later corrupt abridgements either of that early Sahidic life or of the lost Greek translation. Finally, he contended that an Arabic life was produced in Upper Egypt in the 13th or 14th century, which faithfully translated the early Sahidic. Unlike the fragmentary remains of the Sahidic corpus, Amélineau's Arabic life was the most complete and therefore the best witness to its Sahidic source.[49]

---

[48] ⲚⲒⲤⲚⲎⲞⲨ ⲆⲈ ⲈⲦⲞⲒ ⲚⲈⲢⲘⲎⲚⲈⲨⲦⲎⲤ (Bo 196 CSCO 89 p 191).

[49] Amélineau (1889): xxv-lxviii.

While stimulating an expanded interest in the Coptic and Arabic texts, Amélineau's conclusions did not gain universal acceptance. In 1896, for instance, in a review of Grützmacher's *Pachomios*, in which the writer had expressed similar sentiments, Hans Achelis expressed continued support for the Greek text. He argued that there was valuable material to be found in each tradition.[50] In 1898, Amélineau's conclusions were overturned completely by the work of Paulin Ladeuze. He reasserted the view that the original Pachomian *vita* was composed in Greek and that this work was G_1. He recognized the obvious relationship between G_1 and several Coptic lives. The Greek work shares not only accounts similar to those found in some Coptic lives, but also an ordering and expressions similar to what is found in those works. Yet, he felt that this was due to a dependence of the Coptic lives upon the Greek original. [51]

Reliance upon these texts to provide accurate information about their provenance is a dangerous proposition. A reader of the *Life of Antony* might gain the impression that it is entirely the work of Athanasius, but even this has been called into question.[52] Nevertheless, the heart of Ladeuze's argument is what the lives say about themselves. The writers of G_1 mentioned no other *vita*, which they could have used as a source. They

---

[50] Hans Achelis, "Revue: Grützmacher, *Pachomios und das älteste Klosterleben," ThLZ* 9 (1896): 240-244. In 1929, Bousset (253-255) would arrive at a similar conclusion that valuable material could be found in each tradition, not just whichever was the earliest.

[51] Ladeuze, 28-32. Among numerous examples, Ladeuze compared the introduction of G_1 with Am 337-339, displaying their common terms and use of Scripture.

[52] Timothy Barnes, "Angel of Light or Mystic Initiate? The Problem of the Life of Antony," *Journal of Theological Studies* 37 (1986): 353-68.

suggested that prior to their work, it may have not been the right time to compose a *vita*, but that they saw the need to commit a life to writing in order to preserve the memory of their spiritual father.[53] Moreover, Ladeuze concluded that these writers were Egyptian Pachomian monks, given their "Copticized" Greek and knowledge of the Rules, and thus, he reasoned, they would not have ignored Coptic lives already known to their readers and certainly would not have presented their work as original if it were dependent on such lives. Also of great significance for Ladeuze was the fact that these writers used the first person, unlike Coptic accounts that refer in the third person to the writers of the original life[54]

Ladeuze believed that the Greek monks in the Koinonia were better suited culturally to write hagiography. He believed that Theodore, in the passage placed in the heading of this chapter, was attempting to overcome a reticence on the part of his Coptic monks to commit the memory of Pachomius to writing. In large part, this conclusion is supported by Ladeuze's interpretation of a "sigh." The text states that after he taught the brothers about the life of Pachomius, he would sigh or groan, while telling them to pay attention because the day was coming when there would no longer be anyone to recount these

---

[53] G$_1$ 98-99. ἀλλὰ τάχα οὔπω καιρὸς ἦν. ὅτε δὲ εἴδομεν ὅτι χρεία ἐστίν, ἵνα μὴ τέλεον ἐπιλαθώμεθα ὧν ἠκούσαμεν περὶ τοῦ τελείου μονάζοντος πατρὸς ἡμῶν μετὰ τοὺς ἁγίους πάντας, ἐγράψαμεν ὀλίγα ἐκ πολλῶν (98).

[54] Ladeuze 32-45. Ladeuze's confidence in the writers of G$_1$ stood in sharp contrast to Grützmacher (19) who felt that the Greek writers were merely taking credit for the work of others.

things to them.[55] Ladeuze interpreted this sighing as an indicator that Theodore was frustrated by his lack of ability to overcome the objections of his Coptic monks to the writing of biography. The brothers who acted as interpreters for the Greek-speaking monks did not share these objections, or at least not to the same extent.

These interpreters, Ladeuze argued, were often Alexandrian, like Theodore the Alexandrian, or at least monks whose first language was Greek. In this, Ladeuze discounted the idea of Coptic monks learning Greek- a rather surprising contention since the lives report that Pachomius himself made an effort to learn Greek and one can easily imagine other Coptic monks within the Koinonia doing the same in a benevolent desire to reach out to Greek-speaking monks.[56] Nevertheless, Ladeuze argued that these Greek monks were probably better educated and more sophisticated than their Coptic counterparts. In addition they were already familiar with the genre of hagiography and particularly inspired by Athanasius' *Life of Antony*.[57] Ladeuze seems to display here a bias against Coptic writers, a reflection of the bias against non-Hellenic cultural achievement frequently observed in writers of the last few centuries and particularly in the French colonial era. It is ironic that, as seen below, Ladeuze would proceed to criticize the Coptic writers for writing more detailed and lively accounts. If the Copts

---

[55] Bo 196 (CSCO 89 p 191) ⲉⲑⲃⲉⲭⲉⲙⲉⲛⲉⲛⲥⲁⲑⲣⲉϥⲕⲏⲛ ⲉϥⲥⲁϫⲓ ⲛⲉⲙⲱⲟⲩ ⲉⲑⲃⲏⲧϥ ⲟⲩⲟϩ ⲉϥⲧⲁⲓⲟ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ ⲛⲉⲙⲛⲉϥⲃⲏⲓⲥⲓ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ϫⲉⲡⲉⲛⲓⲱⲧ ⲑⲉⲟⲇⲱⲣⲟⲥ ⲛⲁϥϥⲓⲁϩⲟⲙ ⲉϥϫⲱ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲛⲓⲥⲛⲏⲟⲩ ϫⲉⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲉⲛ ⲉⲛⲓⲥⲁϫⲓ ⲉϯϫⲱ ⲙ̄ⲙⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲱⲧⲉⲛ

[56] G₁ 95 καὶ (Pachomius) ἐσπούδασεν ἑλληνιστὶ μαθεῖν χάριτι Θεοῦ, ἵνα εὕρῃ τὸ πῶς παραμυθήσασθαι αὐτὸν πολλάκις. Also, Bo 89 (CSCO 89 p 101-106).

[57] Ladeuze, 32-45.

were so slow to grasp the idea of writing hagiography, it seems odd that they became

adept at it so quickly.

Ladeuze discounted an objection to the primitive nature of G_1 first made by Tillemont

in the seventeenth century,[58] and which would later be reasserted by Lefort.[59] Tillemont

found that the Greek of G_1 was obscure and even "barbarous." He believed that this was

so because it was based upon a previous Coptic work. Ladeuze found the "barbarity" of

G_1's Greek to be less impressive. The Greek writers lived in a larger Coptic-speaking

milieu within the Koinonia. Therefore, it should not be surprising that the Greek of these

bilingual monks might appear to contain "Copticisms." Moreover, he reminded his

readers that late antique Egypt was a long way from classical Athens. He pointed to

work showing that such "Copticisms" could also be found in Greek and Latin inscriptions

elsewhere in Egypt. [60] Thus, the state of these classical languages in Egypt generally

made the "Copticisms" of G_1 less significant.[61]

Once the Greek life was written, according to Ladeuze, the Coptic monks overcame

their resistance to writing hagiography and began to produce their own works. In doing

so, they borrowed the framework of G_1. Sharing the bias of Ladeuze, Bousset wrote that

---

[58] L. S. Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles*, 16 vols (Paris, 1693-1712); rev. ed. with Tillemont's corrections and additional notes by Jacques le Mineur (Paris, 1701-1714): v 9 pp 132, 170f.

[59] See page 27 below.

[60] M. Letronne, *Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines de l'Égypte* (Paris, 1848).

[61] Also see A. –J. Festugière, *Les Moines d'Orient, IV/2: La première Vie grecque de saint Pachôme. Introduction critique et traduction* (Paris, 1965): 125-157.

the Copts lacked the *Formtalent* of the Greeks in writing hagiography and thus were

limited to building upon the older framework.[62] This would explain the similarities and

the dissimilarities between the Coptic lives and G_1 as the Copts borrowed the outline but

made their own modifications and additions within it.[63]

Ladeuze believed the Coptic works were longer and often clearer because they were

subsequent developments of the original G_1. For example, Ladeuze pointed to Bo 5

(CSCO 89 p 2-3) as a clear insertion of new material into the original text preserved by

G_1 3. It seemed to him to be an insertion because the Greek and Coptic accounts follow

one another closely except for this chapter 5, and chapter 6 (p 3-4) of Bo seems to be a

commentary upon the events of chapter 4 (p 2), ignoring the events of chapter 5.[64]

Ladeuze granted that some Coptic accounts seemed clearer than G_1. For instance, the

story of Mauo (G_1 76, Bo 68 (CSCO 89 p 69-71), Am 427-430) is given a more detailed

and comprehensible treatment in the Bohairic text. Yet, Ladeuze contended that the

Coptic writers merely cleaned up the Greek account and that the state of the Greek

---

[62] Bousset, 225-226.

[63] Ladeuze, 32-45.

[64] The first account concerned the young Pachomius being chased away from a temple by its priests because he angered the demons. The second account explains that the demons did not cause the priests to do this because they knew Pachomius' future, but merely despised the fact that he hated evil.

account was evidence of the fact that the writers did not have these Coptic accounts already before them.[65]

In addition, the Coptic authors of the lives, according to Ladeuze, were eager to insert their taste for the miraculous, not only to make the text more interesting, but also to praise their subject and place him among the ranks of recognized holy persons. Moreover, Coptic authors included explanatory details, often to teach dogmatic and moral lessons or to provide additional edification for their monks.[66]

Of the many examples offered by Ladeuze, a few will suffice. G_1 93 recounts the revelation to Pachomius and Theodore of the way a soul leaves the body at death. According to Ladeuze, the Coptic writers, dissatisfied at the lack of detail surrounding this mysterious vision as presented in G_1, elaborated the account for their readers. The Greek text states that the two monks never revealed exactly what they saw, save for bits and pieces when useful for edification. Thus, G_1 does not offer details of this mysterious vision. Yet, Coptic writers followed who seemed to know all about this vision. Bo 82 (CSCO 89 p 87-93) does not merely state that Pachomius and Theodore saw angels come down to baptize a monk prior to his death, but also adds a description of the way the angels, chosen in correlation to the worthiness of the dying monk, come down and escort the soul of the monk to heaven.

---

[65] Ladeuze 32-45.

[66] Ladeuze, 84-103.

Sometimes, Ladeuze contended, Coptic writers would alter accounts and then include both the altered and an earlier version of the same account in their work. Ladeuze found that the similarities of the following two accounts were due to an imaginative retelling of the first account and the survival of both versions in the Coptic text.[67] In Bo 74 (CSCO 78-79), Pachomius instructs Theodore to investigate talking in the bakery. It is not clear how Pachomius knows about this, but he does not have all the details, since he is not even aware of the number of monks who had spoken. Theodore discovers the offenders, reports back to Pachomius, and Pachomius advises that the monks be more careful to follow his rules in the future. This account is followed by mention of the fact that Pachomius would send Theodore around to visit the monasteries in his place and that the two of them fulfilled the same service. Bo 77 (CSCO 89 p 82-83) presents a similar but elaborated account. Here, following a detailed explanation of the rule against talking in the bakery, Pachomius is informed by an angel of talking in the bakery. Again, Theodore is sent to investigate. In this account, however, Theodore's negligence is blamed for the offense. Nevertheless, this account too is followed by a reference to Theodore's increasing authority within the Koinonia as the text details his transfer to Pbow to play Joshua to Pachomius' Moses.

Although Ladeuze's arguments for an original Greek *vita* were widely accepted, skepticism remained against G_1 being that original work. For instance, Bousset, who also stressed the value of the Arabic texts, suggested that there may have been an older Greek *vita* behind G_1, and even if there was not, the text did not provide the most reliable

---

[67] Ladeuze 85-97.

picture of life in the early Koinonia. He argued that G_1 was shaped by a strong *Tendenz*

of its writers to emphasize positive relations with the Church and the role of the Bible,

and to deemphasize charismatic leadership and the miraculous. Thus, even if G_1 was the

earliest, this did not make it the most accurate portrayal of Pachomian tradition.

Therefore, the Coptic and Arabic lives should be employed to correct the *Tendenz* of the

Greek text.[68]

Lefort rejected the view that the earliest *vita* was written in Greek. He held that the

earliest accounts were in Sahidic and that S_1 in particular, supplemented by parts of the

compilation S_3, was the oldest surviving piece of Pachomian hagiography.[69] G_1 was a

late compilation based upon Coptic sources. Lefort's conclusions would spark a lengthy

debate with Chitty.

To support his contention that G_1 was dependent upon Coptic predecessors, Lefort

overturned two positions taken by Ladeuze. First, he pointed to the "Copticisms" already

noted by Ladeuze and others. Lefort believed these were evidence that the Greek text

was copied from Coptic originals.[70] Chitty defended Ladeuze's position by arguing that

similarities with certain Coptic accounts could be explained by Coptic translation of a

---

[68] Bousset 225-260. Bousset often sees similar tendencies in the Coptic lives only to a lesser extent. More recently Graham Gould ("Pachomian Sources Revisited" *Studia Patristica* 30 (Leuven: Peeters, 1997): 215-217) has also questioned the extent to which G_1 has emphasized positive relations with the Church more than Bo has done.

[69] Primarily see Lefort's introduction to his *Les vies*.

[70] In particular, Lefort (*Les vies* xliv-xlv) compared G_1 122-123 to S_{3b} (CSCO 100 p 303-306).

"Copticized" Greek text, as well as by Lefort's contention of a poor Greek translation of Coptic originals.[71]

Second, Lefort argued that Coptic versions of certain stories were longer and clearer than the Greek versions because the Greek writers had abbreviated (sometimes in a clumsy manner) their Coptic sources. Thus, when he compared the accounts of the expulsion of monks early in the history of the movement in G_1 38 with that of S_1 supplemented by S_3, he found that the more detailed and lively Coptic accounts constituted the source thinly summarized by the compiler of G_1.[72] Chitty, on the other hand, echoed Ladeuze's approach when he contended that the Coptic account was "a picturesque account rather reminding us of the stories in the Asc(eticon)." The "brevity and obscurities" of the Greek account were not due to its being a poor, summarizing translation from a Coptic text, but to the general style of this "inexpert writer."[73] Moreover, it is likely that, as he said elsewhere,[74] the Greek writer was better understood by his contemporaries than by later readers. It is possible that a Coptic writer felt the

---

[71] See Chitty, "Sources," 70-71. On mistakes made by bilingual writers in Coptic Egypt see Sarah Clackson, "Coptic or Greek? Bilingualism in the Papyri," in *The Multilingual Experience in Egypt: From the Ptolemies to the ʿAbbāsids*, edited by Arietta Papaconstantinou (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2010): 85-86.

[72] Lefort, *Les vies,* xxxix-xl. Lefort finds the Coptic account a "récit si vivant, si réaliste et en même temps si humain." He concludes, "Il ne peut y avoir le moindre doute que la rédaction de G_1 n'offre qu'un pâle résumé, dont les termes eux-mêmes ne deviennent vraiment intelligible qu'après lecture du long exposé de S_1-S_3."

[73] Chitty, "Sources," 67.

[74] Chitty, "Sources," 67.

need to expand this account for readers who may not have been as aware of the full

events as the Greek writer may presume.[75]

In another example, Lefort referred to the story of Mauo. He found the Greek

account too obscure. More lucid was the account in S_{10} (CSCO 99 p 66ff) and Am 427ff,

in which a monk guilty of pederasty was sent to Pachomius for judgement after the latter

had delivered a homily warning his monks against touching each other. For Lefort, this

better explained the outrage of Mauo against Pachomius, followed by his repentance after

he realizes that the monk he had presumed to be honorable was in fact a pederast. Chitty

was not convinced and found that G_1 72-75 was sufficient to explain the details of chapter

76.[76] The preceding Greek chapters contain a theme of watchfulness against the

influence of demons, while in chapter 76, Mauo's fault was that he did not appreciate the

cunning of the demons.[77] Like Ladeuze and unlike Bousset, Chitty found the

preoccupation with pederasty in S_{10} and Am, a preoccupation lacking not only in G_1 but

also in the Coptic Bo and S_4, to be suspicious.[78]

---

[75] It has not been taken for granted by later writers that the S_1 account describes the same events as that of G_1 and Bo. For a more recent consideration see Graham Gould, "Pachomian Sources Revisited," 208-211.

[76] Chitty, "Sources," 68-69.

[77] G_1 76 ἀγνοῶν τε τὴν τῶν ἐχθρῶν πανουργίαν καθ᾽ ἡμῶν

[78] Chitty, "Sources," 69; Ladeuze, 92-93; Bousset, 249-250. Ladeuze felt that the Arabic material reflected an advanced stage of Coptic imagination applied to the original text of G_1 while Bousset trusted that Am preserved the most original account and that G_1 as well as Bo had suppressed the sexual details of the account. Also, compare to Lefort's (xli-xlii) argument about G_1 84 and Chitty's response ("Sources," 69-70). Lefort uses S_{10} (page 35 of his translation) and Am 435 to cast the account of the temptation of Tithoes as another case of

Lefort believed that G_1 not only was dependent on Coptic sources, but also was a compilation. He felt that only G_1 1-53 could be a single composition. The remaining chapters formed a jumbled compilation.[79] In his opinion, many of these chapters overemphasize other monks within the Koinonia, particularly Theodore. Moreover, the *vita* continues long after the death of Pachomius, despite being entitled a *Life of Pachomius*.[80] These two points do not seem compelling. It may be rare for a *vita* to extend beyond the death of its honoree or to include prominent roles for other monks, but it is not unknown.

One might consider the later lives of Euthymius[81] and Sabas[82] by Cyril of Scythopolis, each of which continue well after the deaths of their primary subjects. Cyril's *Life of Sabas* continues until the Second Council of Constantinople, revealing the writer's larger interest in the struggle for orthodoxy. Yet, despite the extra material, Cyril did not doubt that he was writing lives of Euthymius and Sabas. Near the end of his work

pederasty (cf. Bousset 249-250). In this case, Chitty ("Sources," 69-70), after comparing G_1 to G^3 (which speaks of τὸ πάθος τῆς πορνείας following the temptation to eat the food of the sick), admits that there likely was a sexual aspect rather than mere gluttony that was dropped out of the G_1 text. The sexual aspect is lacking from both the Florentine and the Athenian manuscripts.

[79] Lefort, *Les vies,* xxxix "…la masse des récits constitue un fouillis où ni la logique ni la chronologie n'eurent à intervener."

[80] Lefort, *Les vies,* xxxix

[81] ΚΕΦΑΛΑΙΑ ΤΗΣ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ ΕΥΘΥΜΙΟΥ ΣΥΓΓΡΑΦΗΣ. Text for both of these lives by Cyril taken from E. Schwartz, *Kyrillos von Skythopolis*, *Texte und Untersuchungen* 49.2 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1939): 3-200.

[82] ΒΙΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΟΣΙΟΥ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΗΜΩΝ ΣΑΒΑ. The work ends with Βίος τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάβα.

on Euthymius, he recounted that he was miraculously granted the ability to compose

these works by Euthymius and Sabas themselves in a vision, and he went on to describe

these works very particularly as accounts of the lives of these two saints.[83] If Cyril

expanded his lives of Euthymius and Sabas to include events and concerns beyond their

life-times, is it not possible that the writers of Pachomian hagiography might have also

done something similar and extended their *Life of Pachomius* to portray a wider view of

the early history of the Koinonia?[84] Chitty questioned whether the original work was

properly called a "Life of Pachomius" but rather should be called a "Life of Pachomius

and Theodore."[85]

Lefort saw other reasons to believe the Greek text was a compilation. Returning to

the story of Mauo, he translated the opening of this chapter of G_1 to include the phrase

"pour juger *un autre cas* de vol." Lefort gave the text as ἐν αἰτίᾳ ἑτέρᾳ κλοπῆς κρῖναι.[86]

Chitty corrected Lefort's reading of the Florentine text to read ἐν αἰτίᾳ κλοπῆς ἑτέρας

---

[83] καὶ οὕτω τῇ τοιαύτῃ χάριτι τὸν περὶ Εὐθυμίου τοῦ μεγάλου διεξῆλθον λόγον, ἐπειγόμενος τῇ τοιαύτῃ χάριτι ἐπερειδόμενος τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν πληρῶσαι καὶ τὰ περὶ τῆς τοῦ οὐρανοπολίτου Σάβα πολιτείας τε καὶ διαγωγῆς ἐν δευτέρῳ διηγήσασθαι λόγῳ. (84.21-25). Also see John Binns, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994, reprint 1996): 37. Binns writes that although writing lives of these saints, Cyril was guided by a wider concern for the struggle against heresy. Thus, both lives end, not with the death of their respective saints, but with the defeat of heretics.

[84] Chitty ("Sources," 65) agrees that "(t)he earliest writer is more likely to have been concerned with the whole history of the community rather than with its founder alone."

[85] Chitty, "Sources," 65. Chitty refers to the 6th-7th century Cheltenham Papyrus (S$_{21}$) that refers to a "Life of Pachomius and Theodore." Text cited in note 29.

[86] Lefort, *Les vies,* xli.

κρῖναι. Yet, this did not dispose of Lefort's point. What happened to the other account(s) suggested by the title? Chitty responded with an explanation he admitted might be "far-fetched." He suggested that the G₁ writer was copying from a Coptic source (but not a *vita*) and accidentally transliterated the Coptic ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥⲕⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓ and that became corrected to ἐτέρας κρῖναι.[87] Whatever the explanation, the problem appears to have been noticed by the writers of the Athenian manuscript of G₁, where the text has been corrected to read ἐν αἰτία κλοπῆς, ὥστε παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ κριθῆναι. In any event, it is unexpected that the writer of G₁, at least attempting to portray his work as a composition, should have left such a clear clue to its form as a compilation.[88]

Lefort added a very strong point to his argument when he revealed that G₁ spells several proper names in different ways in different places. That would suggest the writers were copying from multiple texts that each spelled certain words differently. Thus, the monastery of Pbow appears as both Πρόου and as Παβαῦ.[89] Yet, in this case

---

[87] Chitty, "Sources," 68-69. Sahidic Coptic normally uses the singular imperative form of Greek verbs. One would thus expect to see ⲕⲣⲓⲛⲉ and not ⲕⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓ. This fact detracts from Chitty's theory.

[88] Compare to Lefort's (*Les vies,* xli-xlii) less convincing argument about G₁ 84 and Chitty's response ("Sources," 69-70). Lefort found the Florentine manuscript's introduction (ἦν δέ τις ἀθλητὴς ἄλλος) to be odd, an indication of "le coup de ciseaux du compilateur," since "aucune autre histoire d'ascète ne precede celle-ci." The weakness of this argument about a work so replete with such "athletes" is self-evident. Chitty only needed to point back one more chapter to 82 to find another such athlete to explain this reference to "another athlete." It is interesting, however, that this ἄλλος does not appear in the Athenian manuscript. Perhaps a writer in this tradition found the placement of this modifier as odd as would Lefort.

[89] Lefort, *Les vies,* xxxix. Lefort also mentions Paphnoute= Παφνούθης and Παφνούτιος; Psentaese= Ψενθάης, Ψενθάησις, and Ψενθάησιος; Psahref= Ψαρφεῖν, Ψάρφιος, and Ναφερσαεῖς (this last Chitty charges is a completely different Coptic

Πρόου[90] only occurs twice in the Florentine text and is elsewhere only Παβαῦ in that

text.[91] Moreover, I have found that the Athenian text only uses Παβαῦ.[92] As for this

form Παβαῦ, Chitty agreed with Lefort that the "forme sahidique authentique" was

ⲡⲃⲟⲟⲩ but adds that the Sahidic life S₄ contains the spelling ⲡⲃⲁⲩ so the similar Greek

form Παβαῦ: is not quite so alien to the Coptic as it may first appear. As for the other

examples mentioned by Lefort, Chitty attributed them to scribal errors and a typically

haphazard transliteration of Coptic names, producing variants of little significance, also

seen in related collections of papyri edited by Bell as *Jews and Christians in Egypt*.[93]

Thus, while Lefort had raised a valid point, he himself admitted that this alone does not

prove G₁ to be a compilation.[94]

Finally, Lefort believed that G₁ was also a rather late work. Lefort alluded to G₁ 94:

λέγομεν δὲ τὸν ἀρχιεπίσκοπον, οὐ μόνον τὸν τότε ἁγιώτατον Ἀ θ α ν ά σ ι ο ν, ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ

ἀεὶ ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀρχιερατικοῦ θρόνου. The use of τότε clearly indicated a

---

name, citing Crum's *Coptic Dictionary* 240a and 544b); Tsmine=
Τισμηναί, Τομηνέ, and Τομήν.

[90] Chitty ("Sources," 66) suggests that Πβόου was probably the original
behind Πρόου.

[91] Chitty, "Sources," 66.

[92] F. Halkin, *Le corpus athénien de saint Pachome, Cahiers
d'Orientalisme* 2 (Genève: Cramer, 1982): 11-72.

[93] Chitty, "Sources," 66.

[94] Lefort, *Les vies,* xxxix. "Mais pour affirmer catégoriquement que G₁
est une compilation il nous faut trouver autre chose que des indices
plus ou moins significatifs."

composition after the death of Athanasius (AD 373).[95] Chitty agreed and added that it

could only have been written after Horsiesius had ruled for χρόνον πολύν, as chapter 149

states.[96] Yet, Lefort contended that τότε suggested that the *vita* was composed not just

later, but "fort longtemps après la mort d'Athanase." Lefort's reasoning does not seem to

justify such an interpretation.[97]

Lefort attempted to date G_1 even later with his analysis of the use of the term

μαργώνιον in G_1 107. This term is unknown in Greek otherwise, except for a single

occurrence in John Moschus' *Spiritual Meadow*.[98] Lefort did not give the complete

reference, but I have found the term in chapter 125 of that work, the story of Abba

Sergius, who gives a lion blessed bread from his μαργώνιον in return for the lion leaving

the road so he could pass with his mules.[99] In G_1 107, two angels come to console

Theodore, who is in penance after his sin of vainglory during Pachomius' illness. One

begins to praise Theodore, while the other objects that Theodore has not yet attained the

measure of the μαργώνιον. He then adds a parable about a hired hand who complies with

a series of unusual commands from his employer, including collecting chaff with his

---

[95] Lefort, *Les vies,* xlvii-xlviii.

[96] Chitty, "Sources," 73. Chitty favors a dating to the episcopacy of Theophilus.

[97] Lefort compares ὡς ἦν τότε of the Florentine manuscript of G_1 145 with κατὰ τὸ παλαιὸν ἔθος of the Athenian. The fact that the Athenian ms. uses a different phrase here does not necessitate that it equals that of the Florentine in meaning.

[98] Lefort, *Les vies,* xlviii-l.

[99] Τότε ὁ ἀββᾶς Σέργιος λαβὼν ἐκ τοῦ μαργονίου αὐτοῦ μίαν εὐλογίαν. Text: *PG* 87.3.

μαργώνιον. The same term is also found in the Bohairic life.[100] Lefort contended that

this word was borrowed from Arabic as a result of the cultural contact after the Muslim

conquest of Egypt in the 7th century. In the *vita*, it referred to an "instrument servant à

mesurer et transporter le grain, *une corbeille*," but in Moschus, "il s'agit du *panier* (à

provisions), *sac* ou *besace*."[101] Since Abba Sergius was from Sinaï, Lefort contended

that he picked up the word from the Arabic environment.[102] This is a very dangerous

contention since it is ultimately John Moschus using the word, not Sergius. Chitty was

not convinced that the term, eventually in use along the Nile, could not have been in use

well prior to the Arab invasion. In fact, Chitty even questioned whether the word is

necessarily of Arabic origin. Having discounted a theory of a Syriac origin, Chitty

suggests that μαργώνιον stemmed from the Greek μόργος, defined by Liddell and Scott

as "the body of a wicker cart used for carrying straw and chaff." The -ώνιον ending was

added to this as a diminutive.[103] Chitty did not suggest this to be conclusive, but made

the point that the origin of this word as used in G_1 (and Bo) is not certain.[104]

Scholarship since Lefort and Chitty has primarily sought not to denigrate the value of

either the Greek or the Coptic corpus, but to emphasize the importance of both

---

[100] *Bo* 94 (CSCO 89 p 116) [ⲁⲗⲗ]ⲁ ⲁⲕϣⲁⲛⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲭⲉⲁϥϥⲟⲅ ⲉⲡ[ϣ]ⲓ ⲛ̄ϥⲁ†ⲙⲁⲣⲕⲱⲛⲓ

[101] Lefort, *Les vies,* xlix. John Wortley translates this term as "pack" in his translation *John Moschos: The Spiritual Meadow* (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1992): 102.

[102] Lefort, *Les vies,* xlix. Lefort wrote that "les ascètes du Sinaï sont en plein pays arabe."

[103] Chitty, "Sources," 74.

[104] Also see Peeters, *Le dossier*, 272-276.

collections as earlier writers such as Achelis and Bousset had done prior to the dispute between those two scholars.[105] In 1965, Festugière defended G_1's value. Although it was a compilation, he believed it was an accurate representation of its sources and thus was useful alongside the earliest Coptic fragments and Coptic compilations. Both Greek and Coptic texts contained later traditions alongside more primitive accounts.[106] Shortly thereafter Veilleux disagreed with Chitty's belief in the superiority of G_1 and his reliance upon this text alone at the expense of the Coptic and Arabic texts, but he also thought Lefort's criticisms of G_1 were exaggerated. Although following Lefort's conclusion that G_1 was a compilation, he states that, except for some of the Coptic fragments, all of the components of the Pachomian corpus, regardless of the language, shared the same "caractère composite." The task for the Pachomian historian is not to argue that any one source contains the most primitive version of all its accounts, but to analyze and compare all the surviving versions of each account.[107] In the 1980s, Goehring agreed with Veilleux that except for some Coptic fragments, all of the surviving texts were compilations. The earliest accounts that served as sources for these compilations are not extant. Oral traditions also had a "vast influence" upon the compilations and these traditions were not identical for Greek- and Coptic-speaking monks resulting in some variations. All of the accounts reflect to some extent primitive written or oral accounts.

---

[105] Of course neither Lefort nor Chitty completely dismissed the value of the corpus of either language, but this might seem to have been lost in the heavy emphasis each laid upon their preferred corpus.

[106] Festugière, 1-157.

[107] Veilleux, *La liturgie,* 18-21.

"The quality of glass in each tradition must be examined to determine which mirror offers the truest reflection of the primitive tradition at that particular point."[108]

Given the above discussion, two conclusions may be offered. First, after the work of Lefort, Pachomian historians can no longer be certain (with Ladeuze) that the primitive *Life of Pachomius* was written in Greek, or, if it was, that G_1 represents that work. Second, the same historians cannot simply assert the opposite. Although most historians have followed Lefort, Chitty's objections have merit.

The question of primacy, moreover, has been undercut by the growing realization of the composite nature of almost all of the Pachomian vitae, including both Bo and G_1, and of the importance of authentic oral traditions that may have been added to accounts at various stages in the development of the *vitae*, as they exist at the present. Therefore, modern historians must not show too much preference for any one Pachomian *vita*, but must look at and carefully compare all of them. In my work below, I rely most heavily on G_1 and Bo, since these are mostly intact, but use the Sahidic lives for comparison and supplementation.

III.   Other Texts

1. The *Letter of Ammon*

As stated above, the manuscript collections published by Papebroch and Halkin that included G_1 and the *Paralipomena* also included a text called the *Letter of Ammon*. The text was published again with an introduction and commentary by Goehring in

---

[108] Goehring, *Letter,* 3-23.

1986.[109] The *Letter of Ammon* records the memories of Bishop Ammon of his time spent

in a Pachomian monastery decades earlier, which are sent in a letter to Theophilus,

probably the archbishop of Alexandria. While not a *vita*, the text has been rightly

characterized as an encomium in honor of Theodore, the fourth father of the Koinonia.[110]

The *Letter of Ammon* escaped the rough treatment that Amélineau and

Grützmacher gave G_1.[111] Although cautioning against easy acceptance of secondary or

reported material within the text, neither doubted its authenticity. Ladeuze agreed,

accepting the great value of the text as a first-hand account of life in a Pachomian

monastery during the formative years of Theodore's leadership, but cautioning against

accepting material of which Ammon did not claim to be an eyewitness.[112]

Lefort was more skeptical. He first contended that the Theophilus, to whom this

letter was addressed, need not be the archbishop and, in fact, was not likely to have been.

In the Florentine manuscript, the name of Theophilus is not contained in the title but only

in the short letter from Theophilus back to Ammon at the end of the work, and there was

no indication that he was the archbishop. In the introduction to the Athenian manuscript,

Lefort read πρός τινα Θεόφιλον. Lefort doubted the archbishop would have been called

---

[109] Goehring, *Letter*.

[110] Goehring, *Letter*, 107.

[111] See Amélineau (1889): xlv; Grützmacher, 13.

[112] Ladeuze, 108-111. "Avec ces reserves, et elles ne s'appliquent guère aux passages relatives aux institutions cénobitiques, nous ne répugnons pas à accorder à la letter d'Ammon, témoin oculaire ou auriculaire immediate, la même confiance que MM. Amélineau et Grützmacher." (111)

"a certain Theophilus."[113] Yet, Halkin's text was addressed simply to a "friend of God,"

who was identified as Theophilus in the postscripted letter. Goehring finds that this

Theophilus probably was the archbishop.[114] He points to the use of honorific titles

throughout the letter, for instance his closing reference δέσποτα ἁγιώτατε ἀδελφέ.[115] He

also points to the interest Theophilus is known to have had in the Pachomians. In

particular, he refers to correspondence between the archbishop and the Pachomians,

including a letter to Horsiesius requesting a copy of the Life of Pachomius and

Theodore,[116] and to Theophilus' settlement of "Tabennesiote" monks at Canopus.[117]

    Moreover, Lefort doubted that the writer of this work had been a Pachomian

monk. If the writer had been one, Lefort found it odd that he would use the expression

Παχούμιός τις, which appeared in both the Florentine and the Athenian manuscripts.[118]

It seemed to Lefort that Ammon was not very familiar with Pachomius and viewed him

more remotely than one might expect of a man who was a Pachomian monk only six

years after Pachomius' death.[119] That is true, but it also seems unlikely that someone

---

[113] Lefort, *Les vies,* li-lii.

[114] Goehring, *Letter,* 118-119, 183-184 n. 124. 1-2.

[115] *EpAm* 36.

[116] See Crum, *Papyruscodex*, 12-17, 65-72; Lefort, *Les vies*, 389-395.

[117] Jerome, Preface to the Pachomian Rules, 1.

[118] *EpAm* 9.

[119] Lefort, *Les vies,* lix.

going to the effort to produce such a well-researched forgery would be only remotely familiar with Pachomius.

Is it possible that too much is being read into Ammon's use of τις with Pachomius and equally for his possible use of the same term with Theophilus? Goehring does not find the use of this wording to be surprising. He writes that this construction was used merely to indicate the entry of a new character into the narrative, and did not imply a lack of familiarity with that character on the part of the writer. It was used not only in this reference to Pachomius but also in references to Theodore and several other monks. It was also used to introduce Pachomius in chapter 2 of G_1,[120] and to refer to Theodore in the *Paralipomena*'s account of his first instruction.[121]

Lefort was also concerned about the presence of extended quotations in the work. Ammon presented a large amount of supposedly verbatim quotes from monastic leaders. Lefort questioned the accuracy of the bishop's memory after so many years and suggested he must have been using either written sources or his own imagination for these quotations.[122] The same charge can rightly be made against Herodotus and Thucydides. Such lengthy quotations were an accepted component of both histories and

---

[120] Goehring, *Letter*, 116, 183-184 n. 124.1-2, 211 n. 130.1.

[121] Of course, one might object that the use of τις with Theodore in the *Paralipomena* reflected that at the time of the event, Theodore was only "a certain Theodore." In that case, one could equally contend that the use of τις with Pachomius reflected the language chosen by Ausonius or Elourion to introduce a figure about whom Ammon, *at the time of his entry to the community*, knew little.

[122] Lefort, *Les vies,* liii. "Nous pouvons difficilement croire qu'Ammon tire tout cela de sa mémoire; ou bien il fait de la literature, ou bien il refraîchit sa mémoire *avec* des documents antérieurs."

hagiographies. They were intended not necessarily to express the actual words once spoken, but to express the nature of their speaker or to present more vividly a general understanding of the kind of things that were once said. Of course, it is also possible that Ammon did refer to written documents for some of these accounts, not to present what he actually heard, but to present the kinds of things his subject was known to have said. As Lefort noted, either is a possibility. It does not indicate that the work is a forgery any more than the work of other historians or hagiographers.

Lefort was also skeptical about the details of Ammon's personal experiences. For instance, he suggested that Ammon borrowed the story of the entry of Theodore the Alexandrian into the Koinonia (as described in Bo, S_4, S_5 89[CSCO 89 p 101-106, CSCO 99 p 162-163, 248-251]) to describe his own entry in *EpAm* 2.[123] Ammon might not remember the exact words of a sermon of Theodore, but one would expect him to remember something about his own entry into the monastery. In defense of the *Letter of Ammon*, Chitty suggested that perhaps the Coptic account of Theodore borrowed elements from the Greek account of the conversion of Ammon.[124] On the other hand, Goehring notes that the similarity between the two accounts is not so striking.[125] Only the Sahidic versions make Theodore the same age as Ammon, seventeen. Bo says Theodore was twenty-seven. Yet, granting seventeen to be the correct age for both, it is a coincidence but not evidence of anything more. These were not the only two young men

---

[123] Lefort, *Les vies,* liii-iv.

[124] Chitty, "Sources," 42.

[125]Goehring, Letter, 190-191.

in Alexandria deciding to become monks, in part due to the influence of Athanasius, and seventeen was as good an age as any. Moreover, Pachomian monks sent to Alexandria might be expected to return with new recruits to a monastic order that met with the approval of Athanasius. It is not so unusual, therefore, that Ammon's account of his entry should resemble that of others.

Despite the *Letter of Ammon's* usually reliable chronology,[126] Lefort mentioned several chronologically questionable accounts, one involving the age of Theodore when he was present at one of Pachomius' visions.[127] He wrote that rather than Theodore being only twenty-two, Ammon should have written that it was in his twenty-second year in the Koinonia.[128] Lefort seems to be correct, but that does not necessarily call the genuine character of the text into questions. Ammon certainly was not present at the vision. He was told this story second-hand. Perhaps he misunderstood; perhaps he poorly remembered.[129] This would actually seem to be the kind of mistake one would expect from one writing from memory rather than from research in Pachomian documents.[130]

---

[126] Goehring, *Letter,* 119-120; Chitty, "Sources," 43.

[127] *EpAm* 10, G$_1$ 88, Bo 73 (CSCO 89 p 75-78).

[128] Lefort, *Les vies,* lvi-lvii.

[129] Chitty ("Sources," 42) found that such chronological irregularities were "no evidence either way." He continued, "If Ammon is mistaken here (which is by no means certain), that kind of mistake might easily be made by Theodore's contemporaries."

[130] Goehring (*Letter,* 219) writes that given the particular details of Ammon's account, often contrary to the accounts of the vitae, the most likely explanation is that, "he is reporting a story that he heard from Ausonius and Elourion some 40 years before."

Similar objections by Lefort to second-hand material offered by Ammon face the same difficulty. If Ammon's account of Pachomius' vision on the heresies (*EpAm* 12)[131] does not appear to be the most primitive version when compared to the *Vitae* (G₁ 102, Bo 103 [CSCO 89 p 130-133]), is this evidence against the account being written by a bishop writing decades after hearing these accounts? Rather, it would seem to reinforce the character of the text as preserving the memories of a man writing years after the fact, instead of being the work of a forger writing from research in Pachomian writings. As Veilleux writes,[132] the same can be said for the fact that Ammon appears to have confused the twelve prayer tradition of Nitria with the six prayer tradition of the Pachomians in *EpAm* 22 or his use of unusual terminology for offices within the Koinonia.[133] This contamination of Ammon's memory is an important issue and reason for caution, but it does not suggest that the account is a fake.

Two other objections of Lefort deserve note because they suggest that Ammon clearly contradicts what we know from other sources in a more than casual way. First, he pointed to the fact that in *EpAm* 30 Theodore allowed Ammon to go and visit his mother, who was grieving because she believed her son was dead. Lefort saw this as a contradiction of Theodore's attitudes in the *vitae*.[134] Yet, the lives show that though

---

[131] For an account of the apparent development of the accounts of this vision, see James Goehring, "Pachomius' Vision of Heresy: The Development of a Pachomian Tradition," *Muséon* 95 (1982): 241-262.

[132] Veilleux, *La liturgie,* 298-305.

[133] Lefort, *Les vies,* lx.

[134] Lefort, *Les vies,* lx.

Theodore disapproved of such measures at least at one point, he is never presented, as

father of the Koinonia, as absolutely forbidding monks to do so. Goehring writes that

Theodore's experience under Pachomius and the demands of being the father of the

Koinonia caused him to adopt a more flexible position than he had displayed earlier in his

career.[135] Moreover, it is not even necessary to make such an argument since the text

does not actually suggest that Theodore has softened his position. Theodore did not

merely approve of the trip, but also advised Ammon to leave the Koinonia and join the

monks of Nitria. Had Theodore become convinced of the superiority of the Nitrian way

of life compared to his Koinonia? Certainly he had not. It is more likely that the mature

father Theodore looked upon this well-meaning young man wishing to comfort his

mother, and realized that perhaps he was not quite right for life in the Koinonia, but

neither was he right for the secular world. He made what seemed the most charitable

decision for this young monk.

Ammon also included an account attributed to Athanasius, who stated that when

he was in flight from the wrath of the Emperor Julian, he boarded a boat with

Pachomians, including Pammon and Theodore. In the course of their journey, Theodore

informed Athanasius that Julian had just been killed in Persia.[136] Lefort rightly called

this "un cliché hagiographique," for this visionary miracle is elsewhere attributed to

Didymus the Blind by Palladius[137] and to Julian Sabas by Theodoret.[138] As Lefort wrote,

---

[135] Goehring, *Letter,* 280 n. 152.28-29.

[136] *EpAm* 34.

[137] Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 4. 4.

if this story happened to be true in the case of Theodore, it would be an odd thing for the

vitae to leave out, particularly since it so intimately bound the archbishop to the

leadership of the Koinonia. Lefort continued to suggest that Ammon constructed this

account by combining the "cliché" with the account of Artemius searching for Athanasius

among the Pachomians.[139] Yet, there is no reason to suppose that Ammon has willfully

concocted this account. If Palladius and Theodoret could learn their version of the

account and believe it, the same can certainly be true for Ammon. He does not claim to

have heard this from a Pachomian source, but rather Athanasius. In addition, Athanasius

did not sit down with Ammon, look him in the eye, and relay this account, in a similar

fashion to Ammon's intimate conversations with Elourion and Ausonius. Ammon claims

to have heard the archbishop mention it in a sermon once so many years ago. Perhaps

Athanasius said something similar that he misheard or remembered inaccurately and

associated it in his mind with a fuller account elsewhere. In any event, the unreliability

of this one account is not strong enough to impeach the entire work.[140]

   If the text is a genuine account written by a former Pachomian monk, this does

not mean that it is always a reliable witness. It has already been mentioned that

---

[138] Theodoret, *Relig. Hist.* 2. 14.

[139] Lefort (*Les vies,* lvii-viii) mistakenly assigns the mission of Artemius to the reign of Julian rather than Constantius. Chitty ("Sources," 42) pointed out that Artemius was executed prior to Athanasius's flight from the persecution of Julian.

[140] Goehring (*Letter,* 290-291) leaves open the possibility that Ammon's story is correct after all. The fact that the lives do not mention it is answered by the possibility, suggest by Ladeuze (223-224), that the account of Athanasius' tour of the monasteries with Theodore should be associated with this flight from Julian.

Ammon's memory appears to have been contaminated by his later experiences as a monk and cleric in Lower Egypt. His interests as a bishop, in particular his concern for orthodoxy, have also colored his account.[141] It is true then that the text can only be used with caution when not supported by other Pachomian sources, but this does not mean that it can be safely set aside. The *vitae* are also colored by the interests and frailties of their writers. The *Letter of Ammon* should be included with the other works mentioned in this chapter in the attempt to gain the fullest and most accurate picture of life within a Pachomian monastery.

2. Rules

The Pachomians produced several collections of rules governing life in their monasteries. These rules would also influence the rules of non-Pachomian communities in Upper Egypt in both their content and their simple and direct style.[142] Four collections of rules have survived: *Praecepta, Praecepta et Instituta, Praecepta atque Iudicia,* and *Praecepta et Leges*. These collections survive complete in Latin, and in fragments in Coptic and Greek. Coptic fragments of these collections were published by Lefort beginning in 1919, culminating in a complete collection in 1956.[143] The Coptic texts were translated into Greek and preserved at the monastery of Metanoia near Alexandria,

---

[141] Goehring, *Letter,* 115-116.

[142] On the rules of Shenoute's White Monastery, see Bentley Layton, "Rules, Patterns, and the Exercise of Power in Shenoute's Monastery: The Problem of World Replacement and Identity Maintenance," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 15. 1 (2007): 45-73.

[143] Lefort, *Oeuvres de s. Pachôme et de ses disciples, CSCO* 159 (Louvain: 1956).

and Jerome translated these Greek texts into Latin in 404.[144] This *terminus ante quem*

enhances the value of these texts since Jerome's translation followed the death of

Horsiesius by not much more than a decade. Nevertheless, a decade after the death of

Horsiesius is well after the period covered by the Pachomian lives and it would be highly

speculative to suppose that all of these texts were present in any individual Pachomian

monastery.[145] In addition, the *ad hoc* nature of these collections has long been

recognized,[146] prompting some to question how many of these rules really stemmed from

the career of Pachomius.[147] Veilleux rightly notes that, when compared to the *vitae*, the

Rules seem to reflect a more evolved state of organization.[148] For instance, he points to

the mention of the six prayers custom in the *Rules*, but not in the lives,[149] and to the fact

that the roles and duties of offices within the monasteries are much more clearly and

extensively defined in the *Rules*. He also expresses concern about possible corruptions of

the Greek text that was kept in the Metanoia monastery.[150] More recently, however,

---

[144] Amand Boon, *Pachomiana Latina. Règle et épîtres de s. Pachôme, épître de s. Théodore et <<Liber>> de s. Orsiesius. Texte latin de s. Jérôme. Bibliothèque de la Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 7 (Louvain: Bureaux de la Revue, 1932).

[145] See Fidelis Ruppert, *Das pachomianische Mönchtum und die Anfänge klösterlichen Gehorsams* (Munsterschwarzach: Vier Türme, 1971): 233ff.

[146] Chitty, *The Desert a City* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1966): 21.

[147] Philip Rousseau, *Pachomius: The Making of a Community in Fourth-Century Egypt* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985, rpt 1999): 52-53.

[148] Veilleux, *La liturgie,* 129-130.

[149] Leaving aside G_1 58, in which, Veilleux writes, a later redactor added a reference to the six prayers directly from the Rules (130).

[150] Veilleux, *Pachomian Koinonia II*, 11; *La liturgie,* 122-123.

Christoph Joest has defended an early dating for many of these rules. In particular, he

argues that most of the *Praecepta* were written while Pachomius was still alive.[151]

I believe that the *Rules* can be used to show certain problems that became concerns in

the monasteries and how the communities generally attempted to handle these problems.

The fear of corruption of the Greek texts translated by Jerome might not be able to be

eliminated, but the early date of his translation provides some comfort and, besides, no

ancient text can be completely free from such fears. The collections in some cases may

reflect a state of affairs more evolved than that which existed in the lifetime of

Pachomius, but that does not mean they do not accurately reflect the trajectory of the

evolution of practice during his lifetime. Individual rules may have been written after

Pachomius' death, but they may reflect earlier belief and practice. Moreover, the

concerns addressed in the *Rules* do not appear to have been specific to any one monastery

and the monasteries did communicate with each other and meet with each other as a

group twice per year, so it is reasonable to believe the *Rules* generally reflect common

responses to the issues they address.

There are two views on the chronological development of these collections.

According to the first view, they were written one after the other. Those who hold this

view disagree on the order these collections were produced.[152] According to the second

---

[151] Christoph Joest, "Die *Praecepta* Pachoms. Untersuchung zu dem grössten Abschnitt der Pachom-Regeln," *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 13. 3 (2009): 430-451.

[152] For instance see M. M. Van Molle, "Essai de classement chronologique des premières règles de vie commune en chrétienté," *VS, Supplément* 84 (1968): 108-127; "Confrontation entre les Règles et la littérature

view, the texts evolved simultaneously. Those who hold this view stress the fact that the collections address different concerns.[153]

Another collection of rules has been attributed to Horsiesius. This collection was first attributed to Shenoute by Amélineau in 1888,[154] but Lefort identified it as Pachomian,[155] and Veilleux agrees that the language and style of the text reflect the other Pachomian collections of rules.[156] Lefort attributed the work to Horsiesius, but Veilleux suggests it may have been written after the death of Horsiesius.[157]

---

pachômienne postérieure," *VS, Supplément* 86 (1968): 394-424; "Aux origines de la vie communautaire chrétienne, quelques equivoques déterminantes pour l'avenir," *VS Supplément* 88 (1969): 101-121; "Vie commune et obeisance d'après les intuitions premières de Pachôme et Basile," *Le Supplément* 93 (1970): 196-225. Although noting the value of her contribution, Rousseau, *Pachomius,* 49-53) finds her conclusions that the *Praecepta atque Iudicia* were the earliest and the *Praecepta* were the latest to be untenable.

[153] As Veilleux (*Pachomian Koinonia II*, 10) describes the texts, the *Praecepta atque Iudicia* were a form of "Penitential," while the *Praecepta ac Leges* addressed the house synaxis and duties of the housemaster, and the *Praecepta et Instituta* seemed to be addressed to the housemaster, and finally the *Praecepta* seemed primarily to address the concerns of the superior of the monastery. Also see *La liturgie,* 126-128.

[154] E. Amélineau, *Monuments pour servir à l'histoire de l'Egypte chrétienne aux IVe, Ve, VIe et VIIe siècles, (Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission archéologique française au Caire- 4),* (Paris, 1895): 248-277.

[155] Lefort, *Oeuvres de s. Pachôme, CSCO 160.*

[156] Veilleux, *La liturgie,* 128-129.

[157] Veilleux, *Pachomian Koinonia II,* 12.

3. Other Works Attributed to Pachomius, Theodore, and Horsiesius

A number of sermons and letters of Pachomius, Theodore, and Horsiesius survive separately from those contained within the corpus of lives. Two instructions of Pachomius have survived in Coptic. The first, although wide-ranging, was primarily addressed to the situation of a monk who bore a grudge against another.[158] The second is a fragmentary Easter sermon also attributed to Pachomius.[159] Three fragmentary instructions of Theodore also survive in Coptic.[160] In addition, seven instructions attributed to Horsiesius also survive in Coptic fragments.[161] More significant for Horsiesius is the survival of the *Liber Orsiesii*, extant only in Jerome's Latin translation.[162] In this text, we see the result of the evolution of Pachomian cenobitic theory during the fourth century.

A number of letters attributed to these three leaders of the Koinonia also exist. Eleven letters of Pachomius have been preserved in Jerome's translation.[163] Several also survive in Greek and Coptic.[164] Some of these appear nearly indecipherable due to

---

[158] Lefort, *CSCO* 159, 1-24.

[159] Lefort, *CSCO* 159, 24-26.

[160] Lefort, *CSCO* 159, 37-60.

[161] Lefort, *CSCO* 159, 66-79.

[162] Boon, *Pachomiana Latina*, 109-147.

[163] Boon, *Pachomiana Latina,* 77-101.

[164] Hans Quecke, *Die Briefe Pachoms. Griechischer Text der handschrift W. 145 der Chester Beatty Library eingeleitet und herausgegeben von Hans Quecke. Anhang: Die koptischen Fragmente und Zitate des Pachombriefe. Textus Patristici et liturgici* 11 (Regensburg, 1975).

Pachomius' use of a mysterious alphabetical code.[165] Two letters of Theodore also

survive. The first, surviving in a Latin translation by Jerome, is a Festal Letter, inviting

all the monks to gather at Pbow for Easter.[166] The second, surviving in Coptic, is an

invitation for all the monks to come to the second great yearly gathering at Pbow.[167]

Finally, four letters of Horsiesius have survived in Coptic.[168]

IV.   Conclusion

Of all the works covered by this chapter, the Greek (including the *Paralipomena*) and

Coptic hagiographic corpus will be the most important for my work. This is due to the

simple fact that demons appear in these texts more than in any others addressed here. As

I stated in the introduction, hagiographies are not necessarily accurate depictions of daily

life in the Koinonia, but they do express things that were believed there. My concern is

for what the Pachomians believed. What were the theoretical frameworks within which

they placed the mundane daily events of their live? Hagiographies are suited for this

purpose.

---

[165] In an attempt to interpret this code, Christoph Joest has written several articles including: "Die Geheimschrift Pachoms. Versuch einer Entschlüsselung, mit Übersetzung und Deutung der Pachom-Briefe 9a und 9b." *Ostkirchliche Studien* 45 (1996): 268-289, and "Die pachomianische Geheimschrift im Spiegel der Hieronymus- Übersetzung. Mit dem Deutschen Text von Brief 11b des pachomianischen Schriftencorpus und dem Versuch einer Übertragung." *Muséon* 112 (1999): 21-46.

[166] Boon, *Pachomiana Latina*, 105-106.

[167] Quecke, "Ein Brief von einem Nachfolger Pachoms," *Orientalia* 44 (1975): 426-433.

[168] The text of two letters can be found in Lefort, *Oeuvres*, 63-66. For the remaining two see the French translation by Vogüe, "Epîtres inédites d'Horsièse et de Théodore." In *Commandements du Seigneur et Libération évangélique,* SA- 70 (Rome, 1977): 24-257 or the English by Veilleux, *Pachomian Koinonia III*, 157-165.

In addition to the *vitae*, the other works addressed in this chapter will also be useful. I believe that the *Letter of Ammon* truly is a memoir of a former Pachomian monk. There are reasons to be cautious about this text, but it would be irresponsible to discard it. I believe that the *Rules* provide both a partial picture of daily life and a picture of many concerns that arose with the Koinonia, as well as how the monasteries responded to them. The instructions and letters are also a valuable source, since they shed light on daily life, concerns, and belief in the monasteries.

None of these works were written specifically to explain what the Pachomians believed about demons. This fact alone leads one to wonder what those beliefs might have been. What these works do provide may be even more valuable for uncovering those beliefs. These works provide a collection of different but authentic witnesses to Pachomian belief, life and experience. By looking at what all of these texts say about demons, one can arrive not at what a single Pachomian believed about demons, but rather at what Pachomians in general appear to have believed.

Having identified the texts most important to my work, I will now turn my attention to the topic of demons. Any viewer of the *Exorcist* might have an idea about what a demon is, but what was a demon in Late Antique Egypt? Who were they and why were they feared? Were they merely unseen forces that lead humans to do bad things, or were they something more deadly?

Chapter Two

Fear and Hope

Vae tibi, Alexandria, quae pro Deo portenta veneraris. Vae tibi, ciuitas meretrix, in qua totius orbis daemonia confluxere. Quid nunc dictura es? Bestiae Christum loquuntur, et tu pro Deo portenta veneraris!

Antony in Jerome, *Vita Pauli* 8[1]

καὶ πᾶσιν εὔδηλόν ἐστι τοῖς ἐκεῖ ὡς δι' αὐτῶν ἔστηκεν ὁ κόσμος καὶ δι' αὐτοὺς παρὰ θεῷ ἔστηκεν καὶ τετίμηται ἡ ἀνθρωπίνη ζωή

Hist. Monach. pro. 9

I.   Introduction

This dissertation is about demons. I decided to write about this topic while biking on

a dark trail through the forest. I have a bad habit of biking after dark and parts of my

usual trail go through wooded and unlit areas in local parks. One moment I am coasting

past a well-lit baseball field, but then I turn the corner into eerie and still darkness. I

grumble about the weakness of my light and carefully search the trail before me for

branches of sufficient size to destabilize a bicycle. I hear the sound of snapping twigs

and rustling leaves. What was that? It was probably a squirrel or perhaps a deer, or was

it? I delight to imagine it is Irving's dreaded headless horseman. I must make it to the

---

[1] On Antony's "bestiae" and their metaphorical value, see also Paul B. Harvey, Jr., "Saints and Satyrs: Jerome the Scholar at Work" *Athenaeum* 86 (1998): 35-56; Patricia Cox Miller, "Jerome's Centaur: a Hyper-Icon of the Desert," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 4 (1996): 209-33; and A. H. Merrills, "Monks, Monsters, and Barbarians: Re-Defining the African Periphery in Late Antiquity," *JECS* 12: 2 (2004): 217-244. On the appearance of demons in the works of Jerome generally, see G. J. M. Bartelink, "Le diable et les démons dans les oeuvres de Jérôme," *Studia Patristica* 17 (1982): 463-469.

bridge a few miles ahead to escape him. If I unbridle my imagination, I can feel the hot

breath of the hellish steed upon my neck. I make it to the bridge with my head securely

attached, but still in the disquieting darkness. The only way out is a half mile of steep

incline. As I advance, I begin to see the dim light of a parking lot that promises a less

mysterious, but probably no safer, environment. I am conscious that I have just passed

through a different world, even if it was only different because I imagined it to be so.

The inhabitants of Late Antique Egypt believed in malevolent spiritual forces lurking

in the darkness, but they did not delight to do so. For them, creatures similar to the

headless horsemen were very real and could do very real harm.   While there were places

with which these beings were especially associated (tombs, the desert), avoiding these

places did not guarantee safety. Their headless horsemen could cross the bridge. They

needed to resort to other measures to defend themselves from these beings. How can the

foundation of Pachomius' monasteries be seen as a part of this popular struggle against

beings the Christians would call demons? Did life behind monastic walls offer any

protection?

Works on demonology and Christian asceticism from the classic article by Antoine

and Claire Guillaumont to the recent book by David Brakke have primarily taken a top

down approach.[2] They have focused on the views of well-educated Christian authors

such as Athanasius and Evagrius and have thus emphasized the role of demons as the

---

[2] Antoine and Claire Guillaumont, "Démon: III. Dans la plus ancienne littérature monastique," *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* 3, 189-212; David Brakke, *Demons and the Making of the Monk: Spiritual Combat in Early Christianity* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2006).

planters of evil thoughts in the minds of monks struggling to purify themselves of the

passions, and subordinated their role as bringers of physical violence and death.[3] In this

chapter, I pursue a different approach. I will attempt to look at the issue from the bottom

up. What were the traditional and popular views of malevolent spiritual forces held in

Egypt in the centuries leading up to the career of Pachomius? What follows will show

that these forces were not merely threats to one's thoughts, but also to one's physical

body. This violent aspect cannot be dismissed, because these traditional fears did not

vanish with the rise of Christianity. They still appear quite vividly in the pages of

Christian hagiography and other texts about ascetics.

I also wish to depict briefly the role of Christian holy men in alleviating popular fears

about demons. The primary sources will again be works describing the feats and

miraculous abilities of these holy men. How were they believed to be able to respond to

the violent threat posed by the demons that will be presented below? Having considered

these popular beliefs about demons and Christian monks, I will be prepared to proceed in

the next chapter to discuss the unique role played by the Koinonia in the popular struggle

against demons.

II.   Fear

The Church did not need to convince the population of Egypt of the existence of

malevolent spiritual beings. Both Greek and Egyptian traditions already accounted for

---

[3] Evagrius believed physical attacks were reserved for anchorites who had overcome the demons' attempts to influence their thoughts. See the discussion by Guillaumont, "Démon: III," 190ff; Brakke, *Demons,* 48ff; Kevin Corrigan, *Evagrius and Gregory* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2009): chapter 5.

the existence and activity of such beings. They were not merely intangible forces of temptation, but were quite tangible forces of physical violence and intimidation.

1. Egyptian Tradition

In Ancient Egypt, the physical and spiritual universes not only reflected but also blended with each other. The Egyptians saw the world as a fragile miracle of order surrounded and threatened by chaos (a dark and watery non-existence). Both the gods and man shared the mission of protecting this creation and resisting the forces of chaos.[4] This struggle was not merely theoretical. The Egyptians only needed to look up to be reminded of the constant struggle waged by the gods to protect the ordered world. The sun was the god Re, who slipped beneath the horizon each evening in his barque and made his nightly journey through the underworld, where he overcame the attacks of the demon Apophis to reemerge triumphant the following dawn. The Egyptians could also

---

[4] Erik Hornung, *Conceptions of God in Ancient Egypt: The One and the Many,* trans. John Baines (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1982; London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1983): 172-180; Rosalie David, *Religion and Magic in Ancient Egypt* (London: Penguin Books, 2002): 81-82, 89, 271, 330; Françoise Dunand in Françoise Dunand and Christiane Zivie-Coche, *God and Men in Egypt: 3000 BCE to 395 AD*. Translated by David Lorton, (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2004): 310. Also see Sir Flinders Petrie, *Religious Life in Ancient Egypt*, (Originally published: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924; reprinted: New York: Cooper Square Publishers, Inc., 1972). On earth, the gods' chief agent, the Pharaoh, followed in turn by the Ptolemaic king and the Roman Emperor, was charged to maintain this fragile state of order. See Dunand, 201-205, 213. Egyptian temples gave to Ptolemaic kings and Roman emperors the same glorification, including the myth of divine birth, as they had given to pharaohs. Thus, Augustus was called "son of Re." These rulers, moreover, bore the same responsibility as the pharaohs to maintain the cosmic order, but according to H. Idris Bell (*Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Originally published: Liverpool, 1953; reprinted: Chicago: Ares Publishers, Inc., 1985):56-57), living Roman emperors, with the exception of Augustus, were not officially recognized as gods by the Egyptian priesthood.

be reminded of the conflict between the order of creation and the surrounding chaos by looking at the terrain around them. The Nile Valley, characterized by order, humanity, and tame animals, was a picture of creation. The surrounding desert,[5] characterized by danger, disorder, and threatening animals, was a picture of chaos. The former held back the latter in an uneasy eternal contest to prevent its intrusion, a picture of the universal struggle of created order against chaos.[6]

Chaos was represented in Egypt by malevolent forces that were easily interpreted to be demons or at least to be associated with them in the Christian era. These forces included gods, lesser spiritual beings, the spirits of the dead, and certain animals. Chief among the gods associated with chaos was Seth, the brother and murderer of Osiris, according to the myth best preserved in Plutarch's *On Isis and Osiris*. Seth's attempt to steal the throne was an attempt to upset the established order, to introduce chaos. Having been defeated and expelled by Osiris' son Horus, he not only continued to represent all

---

[5] The desert bears this metaphorical weight when juxtaposed to the fertile land on either side of the Nile. Chaos, therefore, is not confined to the remote desert, but is equally represented by the desert bordering upon and standing in stark contrast to the settled areas. The fact that the desert presented in some ascetic literature was not remote but rather was close to the Nile valley is discussed in several articles by James Goehring that have been republished in his *Ascetics, Society, and the Desert: Studies in Early Egyptian Monasticism* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1999). These articles include: "The Encroaching Desert: Literary Production and Ascetic Space in Early Christian Egypt," 73-88; "Withdrawing from the Desert: Pachomius and the Development of Village Monasticism in Upper Egypt," 89-109; Hieracas of Leontopolis: The Making of a Desert Ascetic," 110-133.

[6] Nicolas Grimal, *A History of Egypt*. Translated by Ian Shaw. (Originally published as *Histoire de l'Egypte ancienne* [Librairie Arthème Fayard, 1988]; reprinted by Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers, 1994): 41-44; David, *Religion,* 1-2, 12-13, 91.

that was evil or chaotic among the gods, but he also posed a physical threat to humans by expressing his unrestrained rage in nature, producing destructive storms and lightning strikes.[7]

In addition to gods, there was also a wide array of lesser spiritual beings who promoted disorder. These may have seemed even more fearsome to the Egyptians since the gods often used them to carry out their dirty work, employing them to attack men or even other gods.[8] Often acting in multiples of seven[9] and carrying knives, they

---

[7] Dimitri Meeks, "Génies, anges, démons en Égypte," *Génies, anges et démons. Sources orientales* 8 (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1971): 35-36; David Silverman, "Divinity and Deities in Ancient Egypt," *Religion in Ancient Egypt*. Edited by Byron E. Shafer. (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1991):34, 40-41; Grimal, *Egypt*, 47; John Wilson, *The Culture of Ancient Egypt* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1951): 250. Also on Seth see David Frankfurter, *Religion in Roman Egypt: Assimilation and Resistance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998): 112-115. This does not mean that Seth was not worshipped. Egyptian gods were complex entities manifesting themselves in different manners and with different characteristics at different times with no sense of contradiction and without ever fully revealing the god's identity. See Alan Bowman, *Egypt After the Pharaohs* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1986): 189; David, *Religion*, 56-57; Hornung, *Conceptions*, 91-99; Dunand, *Gods and Men,* 339; Christiane Zivie-Coche in Dunand and Zivie-Coche, *Gods and Men*, 13-15, 21. Although feared for his evil nature, he was admired for his strength and could be a useful ally. Thus, Ramses II, when on campaign against the Hittites in early winter, prayed to Seth that he delay the onset of cold winds, rain, and snow (Meeks, "Génies," 35-36), and the Hyksos and the New Kingdom's 19th Dynasty each chose the god as their patron (Leonard Lesko, "Ancient Egyptian Cosmogonies and Cosmology," *Religion in Ancient Egypt*, 104-105; John Baines, "Society, Morality, and Religious Practice," *Religion in Ancient Egypt*, 124-125; Hornung, *Conceptions*, 178-184; David, *Religion*, 58, 157, 180, 247, 252; Erik Hornung, "Seth: Geschichte und Bedeutung eines ägyptischen Gottes," *Symbolism* n. s. 2 (1974): 49-63).

[8] Meeks, "Génies," 19-22, 40-44; Baines, "Society," 146.

[9] F. C. Conybeare writes that Near Eastern demon traditions also included their appearance in sevens ("Christian Demonology II," *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 9. 1 [1896],77, 107). In Lucian's *Philopseudes*

frequently took the form of creatures such as snakes or human beings with the heads of

beasts such as bulls, crocodiles, or other frightening creatures. When unleashed, they

could bring disease or even immediate death upon individual Egyptians marked for

doom, or to larger numbers of victims by causing wars.[10]

One example of the activity of such bloody intermediaries is contained in the ancient

Egyptian text, *The Destruction of Mankind*, which has been found on the walls of several

Ramesside royal tombs and alluded to in the Middle Kingdom text *Instruction for

Merikare*.[11] In this account, a god sends out an intermediary to kill humans. The god Re

sensed that humanity was plotting against him and summoned a council of gods to

discuss a course of action.

> Then they said. . . "Cause your Eye to go that it may catch for you those who
>
> scheme evilly. The Eye is not foremost in it in order to smite them for you. Let it

---

12-13, there is an account of an exorcism in which the exorcist reads
out seven names.

[10] Meeks, "Génies," 44-48. Demons could also cause more subtle harm
like creating discord in marriage leading to divorce. See Roger
Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity* (Princeton: Princeton University
Press, 1993): 193.

[11] *Instruction for Merikare* 292-293. See Erik Hornung et al., *Der
ägyptische Mythos von der Himmelskuh: Eine Ätiologie des
Unvollkommenen,* OBO 46 (1982); *AEL* 2: 197-199; Aksel Volten, *Zwei
altägyptische politische Schriften,* Analecta Aegyptiaca 4 (Copenhagen:
Munksgaard, 1945); Wolfgang Helck, *Die Lehre für König Merikare,* Kleine
Ägyptische Texte (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1977): 83-85; *AEL* 1: 106,
109n. The significance of the text for the First Intermediate Period
is also noted by David, *Religion,* 138.

go down as Hathor." Then this goddess came and slaughtered humankind in the desert.[12]

In addition, an account taken from one version of the saga of Osiris depicts the use of intermediaries by one god against others. From his seat in the underworld, Osiris threatened to unleash upon the other gods an army of ugly demons empowered to seize the hearts of wrongdoers, should they not restore the throne to his son Horus.[13]

The dead could also become malevolent spiritual forces threatening the lives of those still living. While the attention paid by the Egyptians to the dead may defy a clear and full explanation,[14] some historians believe that they feared the dead might deliver retribution for wrongs suffered in life or visited upon their graves after death. The dead could also be entreated by the living to punish their enemies or to protect them from other spirits of the dead. Partially for these reasons, village homes contained altars for deceased relatives and busts of the same were venerated by those who could afford them. Moreover, letters to the dead have been found in tombs, some seeking assistance in taking vengeance on a foe, others seeking help against the sinister influence of another

---

[12] Lesko, "Cosmogonies," 109-110. Elsewhere Lesko argues that this text, among others, made a mockery of the gods. See Leonard Lesko, "Three Late Egyptian Stories Reconsidered, " in *Egyptological Studies in Honor of Richard A. Parker,* ed. Leonard H. Lesko (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1986): 98-103.

[13] A. H. Gardiner, *The Library of A. Chester Beatty* (London, 1931): 8 ff; Wilson, *Culture,* 267.

[14] For a recent and extensive study of Egyptian views of death, see Jan Assmann, *Tod und Jenseits im Alten Ägypten* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 2001).

deceased person. In one colorful example, a widower writes his deceased wife to implore

her to stop oppressing him in some unspecified manner.[15]

Finally, many Egyptians believed animals that were either dangerous or associated

with the desert were in league with the forces of chaos. It was shown above that some

malevolent spirits could appear bearing the features of certain animals, but it is clear that

there was also something about the real animals that many Egyptians found unsettling.

One historian writes that they "represented the fauna of the wilderness, the desert, the

realm of the god Seth, against which Egyptian religion juxtaposed kingship, order, and

cultivated lands."[16] Egyptian religion had a long tradition of attaching spiritual

significance to certain animals. Animals had represented certain deities, or at least

certain aspects of the deities. Contrary to the views of some outside observers,[17] the

---

[15] See David, *Religion,* 59, 274, 282; Kasia Szpakowska, *Behind Closed Eyes: Dreams and Nightmares in Ancient Egypt* (Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2003): 183-186; F. Friedman, "On the Meaning of Some Anthropoid Busts from Deir el-Medina," *JEA* 71 (1985): 82-97; Baines, "Society," 146, 153-155, 159; Alan H. Gardiner and Kurt Sethe, *Egyptian Letters to the Dead from the Old and Middle Kingdoms* (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1928), no. 6; Max Guillmot, "Lettre à une épouse défunte (Pap. Leiden I. 371)," *ZÄS* 99 (1973): 94-103; Georges Posener, "Les *afarit* dans l'ancienne Égypte," *MDAIK* 37 (1981): 393-401; Posener, "Les empreintes magiques de Gizeh et les morts dangereux," *MDAIK* 16 (1958): 252-270; Yvan Koenig, "Un revenant inconvenant? (Papyrus Dier el-Medineh 37)," *BIFAO* 79 (1979): 103-119.

[16] David Frankfurter, "The Binding of Antelopes: A Coptic Frieze and its Egyptian Religious Context," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 2 (2004): 101; Bell, *Cults and Creeds,* 10-11. Even the lowly turtle could not be trusted according to S. B. van de Walle, "La tortue dans la religion et la magie-égyptiennes," *La Nouvelle Clio* 5 (1953): 173 ff. On this type of Horus iconography, see also K. C. Sele, "Horus on the Crocodiles," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 6 (1947): 43 ff.

[17] For instance, see *Hist. Monach.* 8.20-23 and Lucian, *Deorum concilium* 10-11.

animals in question were not believed to be gods, but were physical and approachable

manifestations of divinities and spiritual forces in the physical world.[18] Some animals

represented forces thought hostile to order and humanity. Thus, the ritual killing of

desert animals became a part of state religious practices by the early Old Kingdom,[19] and

the sacrifice of antelopes, as representatives of the gods of disorder, continued in some

parts of Egypt into the sixth century AD.[20]

2. Greek Tradition

Hellenistic beliefs about evil spiritual forces reinforced many of the Egyptian beliefs

shown above. The Greeks also believed that the gods could become hostile to humanity,

that there were intermediary beings between gods and man that could be malevolent, and

---

[18] David, *Religion,* 53-57, 314. Varied animal and anthropomorphic manifestations of a god could exist simultaneously. This revises the older view that religion passed through animal deities to anthropomorphic ones, or the opposite, as a means of development suggested by Emile Durkheim, *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life.* Trans. by Karen E. Fields. (Originally published as *Les formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse: Le système totémique en Australie* (Paris: F. Alcan, 1912); reprinted: New York: The Free Press, 1995): 64-65. See also, Zivie-Coche, *Gods and Men,* 17. The prominent role of certain animals in some Egyptian cults was first commented upon by Herodotus (*The Histories* II. 63-68). In the Greek and Roman periods, some animals were slaughtered and mummified to be offered by pilgrims to the respective gods. See Dunand, *Gods and Men,* 331; Bowman, *Egypt*, 171-174; Zivie-Coche, *Gods and Men,* 21. See also Jan Quaegebeur, "Divinitiés égyptiennes sur des animaux dangereux," *L'animal, l'homme, le dieu dans le Proche-Orient ancien*, Cahiers du CEPOA 2(Louvain, 1984): 131-143, and Frankfurter, *Evil Incarnate: Rumors of Demonic Conspiracy and Satanic Abuse in History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006): 14-15.

[19] David, *Religion,* 70.

[20] Frankfurter, "Antelopes," 101-103 and fig. 7 on 105. See also David, *Religion,* 342. The temple of Isis at Philae, which remained open until 535, carried out such sacrifices and preserves a Ptolemaic relief of Ptolemy XIII sacrificing an antelope.

that the dead could also become hostile spiritual forces. Any student of the Classics

knows that the gods of the Greek and Roman pantheons could torment humanity.

Homer's *Odyssey*, a work of immense cultural significance for the Greek-speaking world,

recounts the sufferings of Odysseus brought upon him by the god Poseidon. The Roman

Vergil in his work, the *Aeneid*, similarly cast his hero, Aeneas, as a sufferer of

persecution from the goddess Juno.

The activity of intermediary beings is less well known and therefore requires

more attention here. The Greeks believed in intermediary spirits between the gods and

humankind that were frequently called daemons.[21] Unlike the Christian concept of

demon, these spirits could be good-natured and helpful, or they could be malevolent and

harmful. Plutarch, in his *The Obsolescence of Oracles*, preserved some ideas that were

popular in Greek thought about these beings.[22]

---

[21] I use this spelling to differentiate the Greek concept from the
Christian concept of demon. For a much more detailed analysis of the
use of the term daemon in classical Greek sources see R. Andres,
"Daimon", in *Pauly-Wissowa Realenzylopadie* Suppl. III (1918): 267-321;
C. Colpe et al. "Geister (Dämonen)," *RAC* 9 (1976): 546-796; J. Z.
Smith, "Towards Interpreting Demonic Powers in Hellenistic and Roman
Antiquity," *ANRW* (1978), 2/16. 1:425-39; Frederick Brenk, "In the Light
of the Moon: Demonology in the Imperial Period," *ANRW* 2.16.3: 2068-
2145.

[22] Frederick Brenk, *In Mist Appareled: Religious Themes in Plutarch's
Moralia and Lives* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977): 92. Cleombrotos's
views do not reflect those of Plutarch himself, whose views were more
closely expressed in the dialogue by his brother Lamprias. See Brenk,
86, 111-112. Brenk is critical of earlier scholarship that often
assumed the complete agreement of Plutarch with the words of speakers
in his dialogues. In his book, Brenk generally strives to liberate
Plutarch from any sense of a growing superstition that other
researchers believed followed a more atheistic period. On Lamprias
reply, see Brenk 113-144. According to Brenk, Plutarch sees demons as
no more than human souls. On Plutarch's demonology also see Guy Soury,

Plutarch wrote that the term "daemon" had once been used to refer to gods, but came to refer to a class of beings of an intermediate status between the gods and humanity. His character Cleombrotos noted that Homer had used "god" and "daemon" interchangeably.[23] For example, in the *Iliad*, he described the goddess Athena acting in company "with the other daemons."[24] Nevertheless, Hesiod clearly subordinated daemons to gods as part of his four classes of rational beings: gods, daemons, heroes, and men.[25] This subordination of daemons was continued by later Greek writers, who also defined daemons as beings of an intermediate status between gods and men. Plato wrote that they conveyed human affairs to the gods and divine affairs to humankind. They received prayers and sacrifices on behalf of the gods and, essential to the present discussion, they visited divine punishment upon humans.[26] Plutarch's Cleombrotos essentially says the same,[27] and Plutarch elsewhere wrote that some philosophers taught that daemons lurked about, bringing divine punishment and even execution to wrongdoers.[28] Moreover, the third century Platonist Celsus, in his dispute with

---

La démonologie de Plutarque: Essai sur les idées religieuses et les mythes d'un Platonicien éclectique (Paris, 1942).

[23] Plutarch, *The Obsolescence of Oracles* 10-15 (*Moralia* 415A- 418D).

[24] *Illiad* I. 222. μετὰ δαίμονας ἄλλους. Also see Everett Ferguson, *Demonology of the Early Christian World* (Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1984): 36-37.

[25] Plutarch, *Oracles* 10-15 (*Moralia* 415A- 418D).

[26] Plato, *Symposium* 202-203.

[27] Plutarch, *Oracles* 10-15 (*Moralia* 415A- 418D).

[28] Plutarch *Roman Questions* 51 (*Moralia* 277A). δαιμόνια περινοστεῖν, οἷς οἱ θεοὶ δημίοις χρῶνται <καὶ> κολασταῖς ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀνοσίους καὶ ἀδίκους ἀνθρώπους

Christianity, wrote similarly that subordinate gods or daemons were charged with the care of humanity, received sacrifices, and heard prayers.[29]

The daemons, as bringers of divine punishment much like the Egyptian intermediary spirits shown above, could pose a threat to humanity. This threat was intensified by the fact that the daemons were increasingly thought by some Greek philosophers to possess natures reflecting their intermediary position between gods and man. While the gods could be above base human desires and passions such as wrath and envy in some belief systems, the daemons were not above such things. Thus, daemons could be very unfriendly to humankind.[30] Plutarch had Cleombrotos ascribe all the unseemly actions of the myths not to the gods but to daemons.[31]

The capacity of daemons for both good and evil can be observed in the ways they are depicted associating themselves with individual people. While daemons might take a special interest in certain humans for good purposes, they could also do so for evil purposes. Platonists believed that there were daemons assigned to guide and watch over individual humans. Students who have studied Plato's *Apology* may recall Socrates'

---

[29] Celsus as quoted by Origen, *Contra Celsum* 4.14, 8.24, 28, 33. Ἢ τοίνυν οὐδαμῇ οὐδαμῶς βιωτέον οὐδὲ τῇδε παριτητέον, ἢ τὸν ἐπὶ τοῖσδε παρελθόντα εἰς τὸν βίον δαίμοσι τοῖς τὰ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰληχόσιν εὐχαριστητέον καὶ ἀπαρχὰς καὶ εὐχὰς ἀποδοτέον, ἕως ἂν ζῶμεν, ὡς ἂν φιλανθρώπων αὐτῶν τυγχάνοιμεν. (8.33). See also John Ferguson, *The Religions of the Roman Empire* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1970): 234-235.

[30] See Werner Foerster, "δαίμων" *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* vol II edited by Gerhard Kittel, translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964): 4-6; Ramsay MacMullen, *Paganism in the Roman Empire* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1981): 79-82.

[31] Plutarch *Oracles,* 418 D-419 B.

daemon, which acted somewhat like a conscience, guiding him away from wrong actions.[32] Plato, as well as later Platonists and Stoics, believed that human beings were accompanied by such spirits throughout their lives.[33] For a few humans, this role might be filled by a god. In the second half of the third century, Porphyry wrote that his teacher Plotinus, whom Eunapius wrote was born in Lycopolis in Egypt,[34] was one of these few. At a temple of Isis, an Egyptian priest summoned Plotinus' guardian daemon and found that this being was not a daemon but a god, who protected him from the sorcery of his enemies.[35]

Not all of these spirits were as good-natured as those of Socrates and Plotinus. Evil daemons could drive their human hosts to display symptoms similar to what would be commonly considered demonic possession by the ancient and medieval Church.[36]

---

[32] Plato, *Apology* 24 C, 40 A.

[33] Everett Ferguson, *Demonology,* 42-44. See also, for example, John Ferguson, *Religions*, 194-203 for a small selection of Stoics and Middle Platonists.

[34] Eunapius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 455.

[35] Porphyry, *Vita Plotini* 10. Κληθέντα δὲ εἰς αὐτοψίαν τὸν δαίμονα θεὸν ἐλθεῖν καὶ μὴ τοῦ δαιμόνων εἶναι γένους· ὅθεν τὸν Αἰγύπτιον εἰπεῖν· «μακάριος εἶ θεὸν ἔχων τὸν δαίμονα καὶ οὐ τοῦ ὑφειμένου γένους τὸν συνόντα.» Conybeare finds that Porphyry's views of demons closely matched those of Origen, except that Porphyry believed demons could be either good or evil, rather than being all evil. "The truth is that the Pagans, Christians, and Jews of the first five centuries all breathed the same air, ad were inspired by the same beliefs about good and evil spirits." ("Christian Demonology II," 97-98).

[36] Everett Ferguson, *Demonology,* 49-51; Conybeare, "Christian Demonology II," 70.

Several accounts of this sort are included in the *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*.[37] In one of these, Philostratus described an encounter between Apollonius and a youth who laughed or wept for no apparent reason and talked to himself. Apollonius determined that he was under the control of a daemon, which he then cast out, restoring the young man to normal behavior.[38]

Some daemons that were attached to certain people could also physically harm and kill others, particularly after the death of their host. Pausanias in his great travelogue recounted that at Temesa in Italy, one of the sailors of Odysseus was stoned to death by the inhabitants for violating a virgin. After Odysseus departed, the man's vengeful daemon attacked and killed residents of Temesa, young and old (ἀποκτείνοντά τε ὁμοίως τοὺς ἐν τῇ Τεμέσῃ καὶ ἐπεξερχόμενον ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ἡλικίαν), before finally being driven away.[39] Plutarch wrote that the daemon of Julius Caesar sought out vengeance upon his murderers.[40] For instance, Brutus was visited by a "frightening vision of a man of a size

---

[37] See Conybeare, "Christian Demonology II," 101-105. Even the Christian Eusebius did not deny that Apollonius cast out demons, but insisted that he was only able to do so by the aid of more powerful demons.

[38] Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* IV. 20. Also see Foerster, "δαίμων" 5.

[39] Pausanias, *Description of Greece* VI. 6. 8; Everett Ferguson, *Demonology,* 33-34, 40-42.

[40] Plutarch Caesar 69. 2   Ὁ μέντοι μέγας αὐτοῦ δαίμων, ᾧ παρὰ τὸν βίον ἐχρήσατο, καὶ τελευτήσαντος ἐπηκολούθησε τιμωρὸς τοῦ φόνου, διά τε γῆς πάσης καὶ θαλάττης ἐλαύνων καὶ ἀνιχνεύων ἄχρι τοῦ μηδένα λιπεῖν τῶν ἀπεκτονότων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς καθ᾽ ὁτιοῦν ἢ χειρὶ τοῦ ἔργου θιγόντας

beyond what was natural and looking unfriendly."[41] The image identified itself to Brutus

as "your evil daemon," and it foretold his demise at Philippi.[42]

Finally, like the Egyptians, some Greeks also thought that the spirits of dead

humans could become daemons.   After briefly discussing Hesiod's distinction of rational

creatures, Plutarch's Cleombrotos continued that others thought the souls and even

bodies[43] of the good could hope for transformation into heroes, and from heroes to

daemons, and from daemons to veritable gods.[44] He based this view in part on the fact

that Hesiod believed that the race of men from the Golden Age after their deaths became

friendly daemons who watched over humankind.[45] Plato, again referring back to Hesiod,

---

[41] Plutarch, *Caesar* 69. 9-10.   ὄψιν εἶδε φοβερὰν ἀνδρὸς ἐκφύλου τὸ μέγεθος καὶ χαλεποῦ τὸ εἶδος.

[42] Plutarch 69. 11.   ὁ σὸς ὦ Βροῦτε δαίμων κακός· ὄψει δέ με περὶ Φιλίππους.   Reflecting the "fuzziness" he noticed in determining the exact nature of a daemon, Brenk writes, "the *daimon* seems to be both an evil personal spirit, an *alastor* avenging the murder of Caesar, and possibly even *tyche*, or the *daimon* of Caesar, or even Caesar himself." (*In Mist Appareled*, 107). In any event, Brenk writes that Plutarch, although reporting such accounts, actually showed himself skeptical of them (109-110).

[43] Plutarch 415 B τοῖς τε σώμασιν ὁμοίως ποιοῦσι καὶ ταῖς ψυχαῖς

[44] Plutarch 415 B-C. οὕτως ἐκ μὲν ἀνθρώπων εἰς ἥρωας ἐκ δ᾽ ἡρώων εἰς δαίμονας αἱ βελτίονες ψυχαὶ τὴν μεταβολὴν λαμβάνουσιν, ἐκ δὲ δαιμόνων ὀλίγαι μὲν ἐν χρόνῳ πολλῷ δι᾽ ἀρετὴν καθαρθεῖσαι παντάπασι θειότητος μετέσχον.   Brenk (*In Mist Appareled,* 93) finds the "fuzziness" of the passage between references to demons as gods or divine spirits and demons as human souls to be its "greatest difficulty."

[45] Hesiod, *Works and Days* 110-139.   αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τοῦτο γένος κατὰ γαῖα κάλυψε, τοὶ μὲν δαίμονες ἁγνοὶ ἐπιχθόνιοι τελέθουσιν ἐσθλοί, ἀλεξίκακοι, φύλακες θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων, [οἵ ῥα φυλάσσουσίν τε δίκας καὶ σχέτλια ἔργα ἠέρα ἑσσάμενοι πάντη φοιτῶντες ἐπ᾽ αἶαν,] πλουτοδόται· καὶ τοῦτο γέρας βασιλήιον ἔσχον. (121-126).   See also Foerster, "δαίμων,"6-8.

also believed that good men could become daemons after their deaths.[46] This progress

was the result of one's virtue (δι᾽ ἀρετὴν), which would suggest daemons of a much more

pleasing variety than some others seen above. However, given their intermediate status,

these beings could lose their virtue and become evil spirits with dark and misty bodies.[47]

3. **Christianity**

The leap from the Egyptian fear of the malevolent spiritual forces shown above to

the Christian fear of demons was not a great one. For the most part, the Church added

new background information for very recognizable characters.[48] Like the Egyptians and

---

[46] Plato, *Cratylus* 397 D-398 C. Apuleius and Philo also held that demons could sometimes be the spirits of dead humans. See Conybeare, "Christian Demonology II," 97.

[47] Plutarch 415 C ἐνίαις δὲ συμβαίνει μὴ κρατεῖν ἑαυτῶν, ἀλλ᾽ ὑφιεμέναις καὶ ἐνδυομέναις πάλιν σώμασι θνητοῖς ἀλαμπῆ καὶ ἀμυδρὰν ζωὴν ὥσπερ ἀναθυμίασιν ἴσχειν. Brenk (*In Mist Appareled,* 94) feels the misty character of these souls suggests a Stoic pantheistic and materialistic view of the soul.

[48] Some important works on the views of early Christians and Christian ascetics in the Eastern Empire on demons include: Stanislas Lyonnet, "Démon: I. Le Démon dans l'Écriture," *Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique: Doctrine et histoire* 3 (1957): 142-152; Jean Daniélou, "Démon: II. Dans la Littérature Ecclésiastique jusqu'a Origène," *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* 3, 152-189; Guillaumont, "Démon: III," 189-212; H. Wey, *Die Funktionen der bösen Geister bei den griechischen Apologeten des 2 Jahrhunderten nach Christus* (Winterthur: P. G. Keller, 1957); F. X. Gokey, *The Terminology for the Devil and Evil Spirits in the Apostolic Fathers* (Washington DC: Catholic University Press, 1961); J. Chryssavgis, "The Monk and the Demon: A Study of Demonology in Early Medieval Literature," *Nicolaus* 13 (1986, 265-279; L. Keimer, "L'horreur des Egyptiens pour les démons du désert," BIFAO 46 (1947); A. -J. Festugière, *Les Moines d'Orient* vol 1 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1961): 23-39; Jacques Van der Vliet, "Demons in Early Coptic Monasticism: Image and Reality," *Coptic Art and Culture* edited by H. Hondelink (Cairo: Shouhdy, 1990): 148-152; Sidney Aufrère, "L'Égypte traditionelle, ses démons vus par les premiers chrétiens," *Études Coptes* V, edited by M. Rassart-Debergh, CBibCopte 10 (Paris: Peeters, 1998): 63-92; Everett Ferguson, *Demonology*; Brakke, *Demons*.

Greeks, some Christians believed that demons were the spirits of a particular category of the dead. They held that the demons were the souls of the giants that resulted from the couplings of fallen angels with human women. This view was based upon Genesis 6: 1-4 and was also found in the apocryphal *Book of Enoch* (chapters 6, 7, 15). It was taken up by Christian writers including Justin Martyr,[49] Athenagoras,[50] and Tertullian.[51] Also like the Egyptians and Greeks, other Christians believed the demons were an intermediary class of spiritual beings, who inhabited the air between heaven and earth.[52] They identified these demons with fallen angels. Prideful and envious of the newly created humankind, the demons, under the leadership of Satan, rebelled against God and were thrown out of Heaven. This view was based upon several Jewish apocryphal works,[53]

---

[49] *Apologia Secunda* 5. 3. οἱ δ' ἄγγελοι, παραβάντες τήνδε τὴν τάξιν, γυναικῶν μίξεσιν ἡττήθησαν καὶ παῖδας ἐτέκνωσαν, οἵ εἰσιν οἱ λεγόμενοι δαίμονες.

[50] *Legatio sive Supplicatio pro Christianis* 25. 1. αἱ τῶν γιγάντων ψυχαὶ οἱ περὶ τὸν κόσμον εἰσὶ πλανώμενοι δαίμονες.

[51] *Apologia* 22.

[52] Origen, *Contra Celsum* 1. 31; Athanasius, *Vita Ant., 66, De Incarnatione* 25. See David Brakke, *Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995): 207ff; Jean Daniélou, "Les Démons de l'air dans la 'Vie d'Antoine,'" in *Antonius Magnus Eremita 356-1956* edited by B. Steidle (Rome, 1956): 137-147; William Harmless, *Desert Christians: An Introduction to the Literature of Early Monasticism* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2004): 86-87. Philo also saw the air as the abode of demons in a commentary upon Genesis 6: 2. See Conybeare, "Christian Demonology II," 78- 80, 101.

[53] For instance see *Apocalypse of Baruch* 56. 7 and *Life of Adam* 15. 1-2.

and was taken up by Christian writers including Tatian,[54] Cyril of Jerusalem,[55] and

Origen.[56]

The Church made a more significant innovation to previous belief by its assertion that

all the pagan spirits and deities, once thought to be a mixture of good and evil, were in

fact evil demons, and that they were particularly arrayed against the Church.[57] The

Church retained the belief in good intermediary spirits, the angels, but these were

unrelated to pagan spirits and deities.[58] In order to separate humankind from the

---

[54] *Oratio adversus graecos* 14–16. Δαίμονες δὲ οἱ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐπιτάττοντες οὔκ εἰσιν αἱ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ψυχαί. (16.1)

[55] Cyril of Jerusalem *Catechetical Lectures* II. 4

[56] *Contra Celsum* 4–7. Origen objected to the use of the aforementioned *Book of Enoch*, arguing that it was not divinely inspired (θεῖα). ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις οὐ πάνυ φέρεται ὡς θεῖα τὰ ἐπιγεγραμμένα τοῦ Ἐνὼχ βιβλία (5. 54). Φαύλους δὲ δαίμονας οὐ μόνοι λέγομεν ἡμεῖς ἀλλὰ καὶ σχεδὸν πάντες, ὅσοι δαίμονας τιθέασιν εἶναι... κατὰ δὲ ἡμᾶς πάντες δαίμονες ἀποπεσόντες τῆς ἐπὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν ὁδοῦ, πρότερον οὐκ ὄντες δαίμονες (7.69). See also Daniélou, "Démon: II," 153–189; Everett Ferguson, *Demonology,* 105–111; and Mango, "Diabolus," 217ff.

[57]Origen, *Contra Celsum* 7. 69. On Origen's demonology, see Conybeare, "Christian Demonology II," 59-114; Daniélou, "Démon: II," 182-189. See also Julian Ries, "Cultes païens et démons dans l'apologétique chrétienne de Justin à Augustin, " in *Anges et démons: Actes du Colloque sur 'Anges et démons,'* edited by Julian Ries (Louvain-la-Neuve: Centre d'histoire des Relgions, 1989): 337-352; Valerie Flint, "The Demonisation of Magic and Society in Late Antiquity: Christian Redefinitions of Pagan Religions," *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: Ancient Greece and Rome* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999): 277-348; Robin Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1988): 137. On the role of demons in the growth of a dualistic worldview of some Christians, see Janet Timbie, "Dualism and the Concept of Orthodoxy in the Thought of the Monks of Upper Egypt," (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1979): 67-89. See also Mango, "Diabolus," 217ff and Brakke, *Demons*, 214ff.

[58] *Contra Celsum* 8. 31. Οὐ μὴν τοὺς ἀοράτους φαμὲν εἶναι δαίμονας· ἀλλ᾽ εἰ χρὴ ἀποτολμήσαντα λέγειν τίνα, εἰ μὴ ταῦτα, δαιμόνων ἐστὶν ἔργα, φήσομεν ὅτι λιμοὶ καὶ ἀφορίαι σταφυλῆς καὶ ἀκροδρύων καὶ αὐχμοὶ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ τοῦ ἀέρος διαφθορὰ ἐπὶ λύμῃ τῶν καρπῶν ἔσθ᾽ ὅτε δὲ καὶ τῷ τῶν ζῴων θανάτῳ καὶ τῷ κατὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων λοιμῷ.

Christian God, the demons played the role of pagan gods and propagated false religion.[59]

Thus, Origen condemned pagans for worshiping demons, and Tertullian detested the

whole "pompa diaboli," the worship of idols that permeated public life in his time.[60]

Since the Church was the enemy of the demons, they had attempted to destroy it. Behind

the Church's mundane struggle to succeed was a spiritual struggle not against flesh and

blood but against demons.[61] For instance, it was demons that had moved the hearts of

emperors to persecute the Church.[62] Nevertheless, as the following two subsections will

show, Egyptian Christians in the fourth century believed in demons that were quite

similar to the blade-wielding thugs of earlier tradition. They had not become merely

intangible threats to one's thoughts, but were still forces of physical violence.

A. The Desert and the Tomb

In the vanguard of Christianity's struggle against the demons were its ascetics

who dared to occupy places associated traditionally or more recently with evil spirits.

---

[59] For instance, Origen, *Contra Celsum* 8. 61. See also Everett Ferguson, *Demonology,* 111-122; Adolf Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries.* Translated and edited by James Moffat (New York: Williams and Norgate, 1908): 136-138.

[60] For instance, see *De spectaculis* 24. 1-2.   quot adhuc modis perorabimus, nihil ex his quae spectaculis deputantur placitum deo esse aut congruens servo dei quod deo placitum non sit? si omnia propter diabolum instituta et ex diaboli rebus instructa monstravimus (nihil enim non diaboli est quicquid dei non est vel deo displicet), hoc erit pompa diaboli, adversus quem in signaculo fidei eieramus.

[61] Eph 6: 12.

[62] Origen, *Contra Celsum* 8. 44.

The writers of accounts of these ascetics in Egypt frequently detailed their encounters with demons, and in these works, the demons generally conform to the picture of Egyptian malevolent spiritual forces seen above. They were violent, used weapons, and were frequently found in the desert (not necessarily deep into the desert, but just outside of the arable territory), tombs, and abandoned temples. The last location reflects the Christian interpretation that all the traditional gods and spirits of Egypt were demons.

Athanasius' *Life of Antony*,[63] which describes Antony's movement into the desert and his foundation there of a settlement of monks,[64] depicts demons as physically violent beings that were especially threatening in the desert and in tombs. As Antony moved further from the village, the physical danger posed by demons increased

---

[63] Athanasian authorship of the *Vita Antonii* has been questioned. For instance, see Barnes, "Angel of Light," 353-368. I follow the view that Athanasius composed the work by adopting and adapting older accounts. This view is expressed by, among others, Brakke, *Politics*, 203-204, and Michael Williams, "The *Life of Antony* and the Domestication of Charismatic Wisdom," in M. A. Williams (ed.), *Charisma and Sacred Biography* (Chambersburg, PA, 1982): 23-45. On Athanasius's religious message in the work, see Martin Tetz, "Athanasius und die Vita Antonii. Literarische und theologische Relationen," *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 73 (1982): 1-30.

[64] *Vita Ant.* 14 Καὶ οὕτω λοιπὸν γέγονε καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι μοναστήρια, καὶ ἡ ἔρημος ἐπολίσθη μοναχῶν, ἐξελθόντων ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδίων καὶ ἀπογραψαμένων τὴν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς πολιτείαν. For other considerations of the demonolgy of this work, see Brakke, *Politics*, 201-265; *Demons,* 23-47; Norman Baynes, "St. Antony and the Demons," *JEA* 40 (1954): 7-10; Wilhelm Schneemelcher, "Das Kreuz Christi und die Dämonen: Bemerkungen zur *Vita Antonii* des Athanasius," in *Pietas* edited by E. Dassmann and K. S. Frank (Münster, 1980): 381-392; Jean Daniélou, "Les Démons de l'air," 137-147 .

proportionately,[65] but the danger appears to have reached its peak when Antony took up residence in a tomb.

Having decided to give up his possessions and pursue a life of asceticism, Antony first lived on the outskirts of his village, where he faced and overcame various temptations of the devil. Frustrated by his defeat, the devil appeared to him directly, but in a form that the monk did not find too threatening. He appeared in the guise of a black boy (μέλας αὐτῷ φαίνεται παῖς), an image of weakness.[66] Emboldened by his continued success, Antony left the outskirts of the village and moved into a tomb a great distance away.[67] The devil, fearing that he was going to bring ascetic settlements to the desert, now dispensed with mere temptations and physically assaulted Antony. Gone was the

---

[65] Guillaumont, "Démon: III," 190-191. "Il est remarquable que les grands assauts que le moine affronte sont en rapport étroit avec ses démarches vers la solitude." (190); Karl Heussi, *Der Ursprung des Mönchtums* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1936): 111: "Der Dämonenkampf war also teils Folge der Anachorese; der Mönch fand in der Wüste die Dämonen vor, die ihn heimsuchten und aus ihrem Bereich zu vertreiben trachteten."

[66] *Vita Ant.* 6. See also *Epistle of Barnabas* 20 where the devil is called black. Lucian, *Philopseudes* 16, 30-31 and Pausanias 6. 8 provide non-Christian accounts of an exorcised demon being the color black. For a recent consideration of black or Ethiopian demons, see Brakke, *Demons*, 157-181; "Ethiopian Demons: Male Sexuality, the Black-Skinned Other, and the Monastic Self," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 10. 3/4 (2001): 501-535. Brakke sees a connection between the devil's blackness and erotic desire deriving from a stereotype of Ethiopian hypersexuality. See also Mango, "Diabolus," 217.

[67] *Vita Ant.* 8 Οὕτω δὴ οὖν συσφίγξας ἑαυτὸν ὁ Ἀντώνιος ἀπήρχετο εἰς τὰ μακρὰν τῆς κώμης τυγχάνοντα μνήματα.

black boy, and present was a suddenly violent devil at the head of a gang of demons, determined to push Antony back into the settled area closer to the Nile. [68]

A similar story was told by John of Lycopolis to the writers of the *Historia Monachorum* about a young monk who also confined himself to a tomb. There, the demons first assaulted this monk with memories of his past sins, but having failed to drive him back to his old life, they tormented his whole body, pounding or tearing (καταξαίνω) him and leaving him nearly dead (ἡμιθανῆ). He was found groaning and lying where the demons had left him. Nevertheless, the monk was not dissuaded but returned for a second and third night of similar tortures, again nearly being killed.[69] Tombs remained fearsome places in the imagination of Egyptian Christians.

Since the Christians characterized all the traditional deities as demons, abandoned temples were also seen as the abodes of violent evil spirits. In the *Apophthegmata Patrum*, Elias told the story of a monk who was living in an old temple (seemingly, a common occurrence[70]), and there had a physical encounter with demons. The demons demanded that the monk leave, and, when he refused, they scattered his palm leaves and

---

[68] *Vita Ant.* 8 ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ φοβούμενος μὴ κατ᾽ ὀλίγον καὶ τὴν ἔρημον πολίσῃ τῆς ἀσκήσεως, προσελθὼν ἐν μιᾷ νυκτὶ μετὰ πλήθους δαιμόνων, τοσοῦτον αὐτὸν ἔκοψε πληγαῖς.

[69] *Hist. Monach.* 1. 37-43.

[70] See Brakke, *Demons,* 216-226. For other examples of monks living in old temples in the *Apophthegmata,* see Anoub 1, Elias 7, and Macarius the Great 23. See also Helen Saradi-Mendelovici, "Christian Attitudes toward Pagan Monuments in Late Antiquity and their Legacy in Later Byzantine Centuries," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 44 (1990): 50-56 on Christian encounters with and reuse of older religious sites and structures.

finally grabbed him by the hand and pulled him toward the door. The monk clung to the

lintel and cried out to Jesus for assistance.[71]

There are many other accounts of monks encountering violent demons in the

desert, although not in tombs or temples. For example, Palladius wrote that the demons

beat him for fourteen nights and dragged him by his feet.[72] Just like the blade-wielding

Egyptian beings seen above, these demons could use weapons. While carrying palm

leaves to his cell, Macarius the Great once encountered the devil, who was armed with a

scythe (δρέπανον) and struck (κρούω) at him repeatedly with the weapon.[73] Similarly, on

another occasion the devil tried to cut (κόπτω) Macarius' foot with a knife (μαχαίριον).[74]

---

[71] *Apo. Patrum:* Elias 7.

[72] Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 71.2.   Καὶ πάλιν ἄλλοτε πυκτεύσας αὐτῷ ἐπὶ δεκατέσσαρας νύκτας, καθώς μοι διηγεῖτο, καὶ σύρας ἐκ ποδὸς Compare to 18. 23 where Macarius of Alexandria was tempted by a demon of vainglory to leave his cell and go to Rome to pursue a career as a healer of the ill. Macarius laid on the floor and challenged the demons to pull him by the feet. If they could not, he would not listen to them.

[73] *Apo. Patrum:* Macarius the Great 11. καὶ ἰδοὺ ὑπήντησεν αὐτῷ ὁ διάβολος κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν μετὰ δρεπάνου· καὶ ὡς ἠθέλησεν αὐτὸν κροῦσαι, οὐκ ἴσχυσε. . . Ὁ δὲ ἔφη·Ἡ ταπείνωσίς σου· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὐ δύναμαι πρὸς σέ.

[74] *Apo. Patrum:* Macarius the Great 35. Ἄλλοτε πάλιν, δαίμων ἐπέστη τῷ ἀββᾷ Μακαρίῳ μετὰ μαχαιρίου, θέλων τὸν πόδα αὐτοῦ κόψαι·καὶ διὰ τὴν ταπεινοφροσύνην αὐτοῦ μὴ δυνηθείς, λέγει αὐτῷ· Ὅσα ἔχετε, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἔχομεν· μόνη τῇ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ διαφέρετε ἡμῶν, καὶ κρατεῖτε. The theme of humility being the secret of an ascetic's power against the demons occurs repeatedly in the *Apophthegmata*. See Antony 7, Theodora 6, Macarius the Great 11, and Or 9. On the importance of humility for Egyptian ascetics see also Douglas Burton-Christie, *The Word in the Desert* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993): 237-238, 248, 256-257.

Armed demons were not restricted to the use of blades. Clubs and fire were also at their disposal. Moses the Ethiopian was tempted by demons with thoughts of his old life of sexual impurity (τὴν [ἀρχαίαν] συνήθειαν τῆς ἀκολασίας τῆς πορνικῆς), but when he successfully fought these temptations by going out every night and filling the water jugs of some of the other monks, the demons took more drastic action. One night at the well, a demon lost his patience, struck him with a club, and left him for dead. Moses was found lying there the next day and was taken to Isidore, a priest at Scetis. He spent a year with Isidore recovering from the attack.[75] Demons could even make use of fire against their victims. Macarius of Alexandria faced a demon that became a flame and burned up everything in his cell.[76]

B. *Animals*

Egyptian Christians also continued to associate certain animals, especially ones found in the desert, with malevolent forces. This association is seen in Coptic apotropaic iconography that borrows these themes from its ancient Egyptian predecessors. Coptic Christians depicted Christ in ways reminiscent of the ways Horus had been depicted for centuries prior.[77] On murals, amulets, and stelae, the god, whether Horus or Christ, was

---

[75] Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 21. 5-10. Μιᾶς οὖν τῶν νυκτῶν ἐπιτηρήσας ὁ δαίμων καὶ μὴ καρτερήσας, ἐγκύψαντι αὐτῷ εἰς τὸ φρέαρ δέδωκε κατὰ τῶν ψοῶν ῥοπάλῳ τινὶ καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὸν νεκρόν, μὴ αἰσθανόμενον μήτε ὃ πέπονθε μήτε παρὰ τίνος.

[76] Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 18. 18. παρώξυνα τὸν δαίμονα ὡς φλόγα πυρὸς γενέσθαι καὶ κατακαῦσαί μου πάντα τὰ ἐν τῷ κελλίῳ, ὡς καὶ τὸ ψιάθιον ἐν ᾧ εἱστήκειν πυρὶ καταφλεχθῆναι καὶ νομίσαι με ὅτι ὅλως ἐμπίμπραμαι.

[77] The arrival of a new religion did not change the traditional religious needs of the population. See Frankfurter, *Religion*, 33-36.

shown in dominance over desert creatures.[78] Representations of Christ as Horus standing

upon and clutching desert animals were painted upon the walls of the catacombs of

Alexandria,[79] as well as depicted on amulets from as late as the sixth century.[80] Similar

Coptic depictions of the cross or Christ have been found in stela form, resembling Horus-

cippi,[81] which were stelae, found in temples and in homes, that depicted the child Horus

(also called Harpocrates), sometimes accompanied by the god Bes, standing upon or

clutching various desert animals such as snakes, scorpions, and antelopes. These images

were believed to offer protective healing powers against these animals and the dangerous

spiritual forces they represented.[82]

---

[78] Examples of the use of Horus to represent Christ were compiled by W. Drexler in his article on Isis in Roscher's *Lexicon der griech. und röm. Mythologie* ii, col. 431 ff. See also Dunand, *Gods and Men,* 338. Coptic art routinely borrowed pagan motifs either for decoration or bearing a Christian reinterpretation.

[79] In 1888, Néroutsos-Bey (*L'ancienne Alexandrie* (Paris, 1888): 38 ff.) noticed a similarity between depictions of Horus standing upon and clutching Sethian creatures and wall paintings of Christ in catacombs within Christian Alexandria.

[80] A. A. Barb, "Three Elusive Amulets, "Journal *of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 27 (1964): 10-17. While one side of this amulet is explicitly Christian, the side with the Horus-like figure is a mixture of Christian, Jewish, Gnostic, and magical elements that may make the identity of the figure uncertain. Barb himself admits (13 n. 80) that the use of this type of Horus iconography was rare on "gnostic" amulets. Nevertheless, his dating of the amulet to the sixth century and the similar use of this type of figure for Christ elsewhere, although not usually associated with Gnostic pieces, seem to be the strongest arguments for this association.

[81] Frankfurter, "Antelopes," 97-109.

[82] Dunand, *Gods and Men,* 305.

The same associations are found in accounts written about monks in the desert. The story of Antony in the tombs reflects not only the traditional Egyptian fears of tombs (and the spirits of the dead that inhabited them) seen above, but also fears of creatures associated with the desert. On another night in the tombs, the devil and his demons appeared to Antony as dangerous wild animals including lions, leopards, bulls, snakes, and scorpions.[83] The appearance of demons as dangerous animals occurs in other ascetic texts as well. For instance, Palladius and Pachomius would separately describe the devil or demons appearing in the form of wild asses.[84]

The Christians of Late Antique Egypt, therefore, believed in demons that fit the mould of beings their ancestors had feared for ages. They were not new creations introduced by the Church, even though the Church did add its own interpretation of their identity. These were not merely beings that tempted humans to sin, although they did that as well. These were physically violent beings that sometimes even used weapons upon the flesh of their victims. Any account of demons in fourth century Egypt must take these types of beings into account, because many Egyptian people believed in them and feared them.

---

[83] *Vita Ant.* 10 Καὶ ἦν ὁ τόπος εὐθὺς πεπληρωμένος φαντασίας λεόντων, ἄρκτων, λεοπάρδων, ταύρων καὶ ὄφεων καὶ ἀσπίδων καὶ σκορπίων καὶ λύκων. Later in the vita, Antony recounted facing demonic beatings and demons in the form of wild animals (39-40). See also Lucian, *Philopseudes* 12-13 in which an exorcist clears a field of demons in the form of reptiles.

[84] Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 16. 6. Αἰσχυνθεὶς δὲ ὁ δαίμων ἐπὶ τῇ ἥττῃ εἰς λαίλαπα ἀνελύθη καὶ εἰς ὀνάγρους σκιρτῶντας καὶ φεύγοντας καὶ ψόφους ἀπολύοντας; Pachomius, *Instr* 1. 56 (CSCO 159 p 22).

III.   Hope

While traditional means of fighting demons and protecting oneself and others from their activities would survive into the Christian period,[85] the leadership role in the battle against the demonic in the Christian imagination would come to be filled by ascetics. This is important for this study of the Pachomians because the monasteries of the Koinonia enclosed many ascetics with reputations for fighting demons. Before considering what effect a large number of such men may have had on demons, it is necessary to consider the effect individual ascetics were believed to have on them.

The power possessed by Christian ascetics against demons is demonstrated by the fact that they are not merely attacked by the demons; they successfully endure these attacks. This ability to overcome these attacks will give hope to others that they may also be able to protect them from the demons.

In the *Life of Antony*, Antony demonstrates his superiority to his demonic adversaries by successfully enduring the worst of their attacks. After they fail to defeat him by

---

[85] For instance, Shenoute would complain of the survival of traditional cultic rites among Christian Copts in *The Lord Thundered,* 18, 61-70. English translation: Janet Timbie and Jason Zaborowski, "Shenoute's Sermon *The Lord Thundered*: An Introduction and Translation," *Oriens Christianus* (90: 2006): 91-123. Also see Brakke, *Demons*, 104-113. Shenoute also sought to expose "crypto-pagans" who appeared Christian outwardly but practiced the old rites privately. On Christian descriptions of pagan cult activity in Egypt, see also Stephen Emmel, "From the Other Side of the Nile: Shenute and Panopolis," in A. Egberts, B.P. Muhs, and J. van der Vliet, *Perspectives on Panopolis: An Egyptian Town from Alexander the Great to the Arab Conquest*, (Leiden: Brill. 2002): 95-113, and Jennifer Taylor Westerfield, "Christian Perspectives on Pharaonic Religion: The Representation of Paganism in Coptic Literature *JARCE* XL (2003): 5-12.

physically beating him in the tombs, they are either unable or unwilling to attempt such strong-arm tactics with the monk again. Thus, although Antony was the one who suffered during the attacks, it was the demons that appear to have lost. After he relocated to an abandoned fort, the demons did not attempt to harm him, but cried out "Leave what is ours! What are you doing also in the desert?" and attempted to frighten the monk back to civilization.[86] Moreover, as Antony recounted later in the *vita*, the devil would directly appear to him again. This time, the devil was powerless to stop Antony, but could only complain that he no longer had a home because Christians were now everywhere, even in the desert.[87] The devil and the demons could still complain about Antony encroaching upon their territory, but, having failed to overcome him with violence, they seem to have lost the ability to do anything about it.

The suffering of a holy man that results in the defeat of the forces of evil could certainly remind a Christian writer of the passion of Christ, and in Athanasius' case, it may have done so. In both the account of Christ and that of Antony, the tortured gains a victory over Satan and the demons by enduring their afflictions, which each could have

---

[86] *Vita Ant.* 12-13 Ἀπόστα τῶν ἡμετέρων. Τί σοὶ καὶ τῇ ἐρήμῳ; These questions are reminiscent of those the demons asked Jesus. For instance, see Matt 8: 29.

[87] *Vita Ant.* 41 Οὐκέτι τόπον ἔχω, οὐ βέλος, οὐ πόλιν. Πανταχοῦ χριστιανοὶ γεγόνασιν· λοιπὸν καὶ ἡ ἔρημος πεπλήρωται μοναχῶν. As has been seen, the demons had not been driven into the desert by Christianity, but were believed by the Egyptians to have always made their home there. See Mango, "Diabolus," 219ff. Mango draws comparisons from other nearly contemporary ascetic texts as well as from Byzantine texts centuries later. Brakke (*Politics,* 226) writes, "The barren waterless land of the desert offered no welcome to ancient Egyptians, who thus populated it with the demonic enemies of humanity. Led by Antony, however, the monks settle the desert and reclaim the devil's territory."

ended by yielding to their enemy, but the comparisons run deeper than this. Christ left

one world, Heaven, and came to Earth, the province of demons. Antony left the settled

world and came to the desert, the province of demons. Christ submitted himself to

torture, death, and burial in a tomb. Antony entered a tomb, where he was severely

beaten and left like a corpse. The demonic attack upon Antony was finally broken by a

divine ray of light that virtually resurrected Antony from death, as the monk was said to

recover his breath.[88] Antony asked God why He did not appear earlier to relieve his

suffering, a question that might bear correlation to Christ's asking God why He had

forsaken him. God promised the resurrected Antony to make his name known all over

the world, just as had happened with Christ. Finally, just as demonic power on earth was

broken by the death and resurrection of Christ, demonic power in the Egyptian desert,

according to Athanasius, was broken by Antony's suffering and metaphorical death and

resurrection. Thenceforth, the demons would be powerless to harm Antony, just as

Athanasius taught they were powerless to harm any other Christians in the desert or the

city.[89] The remaining attacks by demons upon Antony in the work are easily turned aside

---

[88] Ὁ δὲ Ἀντώνιος, αἰσθόμενος τῆς ἀντιλήψεως, καὶ πλέον **ἀναπνεύσας** κουφισθείς τε τῶν πόνων

[89] *Vita Ant.* 8-10. Brakke (*Demons,* 23-47) describes Antony's bout in the tombs as a martyrdom, bringing "to completion in Egypt a victory that Christ already won."(27). Antony was empowered to overcome the demons by Christ. While these observations are valid, they do not seem to account for the uniqueness (acknowledged by Brakke on 27) of Antony's suffering at the hands of the demons. While Antony's strength in the face of violent demonic attacks, a strength made possible by Christ, illustrated the ability of Christians to overcome the demons, Christians in general did not have to face such direct violence. The demons were supposed to flee at the very naming of Christ or making the sign of the cross. Brakke seems to leave the question of why the demons would be able to attack Antony in this manner but be too weak to inflict such tortures directly upon Christians otherwise open, when he

by the monk employing measures familiar to the archbishop and available to all Christians: calling upon Christ and making the sign of the cross.[90]

The ability to withstand demonic assaults was not the limit of a holy man's power against demons. He could also protect and save others from their grasp and the effects of their activity. He could drive demons out of possessed persons and even drive out the demonic taint Egyptians had long attached to the desert and certain animals.

1. Exorcism

The ability to exorcize demons was an important component of the holy man's social function.[91] Accounts of exorcisms are found widely in texts written about famous ascetics.[92] Thus, the *Life of Antony* depicts the monk being disturbed on numerous occasions by those coming to seek this service.[93] The Pachomians also shared this reputation for being able to cast out demons. The lives include several accounts in which Pachomius performed these services. Once, a man came to Tabennesi on behalf of his daughter, who was believed to be possessed. Pachomius asked for an article of her

writes, "Antony's violent contest with the demons may be, in Athanasius's view, a unique event, at least in Egypt." (27).

[90] For instance see *Vita Ant.* 13, 23, 51-53.

[91] The ability to exorcise demons was essential for the charisma and authority of holy men and the Church in general. See Peter Brown, "The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity," in *Society and the Holy in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982): 123-126 (originally published in *Journal of Roman Studies* LXI (1971): 80-101); Robin Lane Fox, *Pagans and* Christians, 327-330; Ramsay MacMullen, *Christianizing the Roman Empire* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1984): 27-28; Frankfurter, *Evil,* 33-37.

[92] For two colorful examples from Palladius, see *Hist. Laus.* 11, 22.

[93] For instance, *Vita Ant.* 48, 62-64, 71.

clothing from which he determined that she was sexually promiscuous. He prayed over some oil, which he gave to the father to anoint his daughter, and passed on the command that she keep herself chaste in the future.[94] On another occasion, another man brought his son to Pachomius for exorcism. To this man he gave not only oil, but also a loaf of bread. Once the boy ate this bread and was anointed with the oil, he was healed.[95] The lives relate that Theodore too was sought out for healings and exorcisms. He was approached in the monastery or even accosted on the road for these favors.[96] The people believed that holy men such as Pachomius or Theodore were superior to demons and able to provide to them protection from the same.

2. Purifying the Desert

The presence of holy men in the desert could also produce a purification of that region and its animal denizens of their association with chaos and evil spirits. This phenomenon is also widely found in accounts of ascetics in the desert. A very vivid depiction of this ability is found in the story of an Egyptian monk named Theon, who lived in the desert, not far from the city.[97] The text relates that robbers[98] had to come

---

[94] G₁ 43, Bo 43 (CSCO 89 p. 46-47).

[95] G₁ 44, Bo 44 (CSCO 89 p. 47-48).

[96] G₁ 133.

[97] *Hist. Monach.* 6. 1. οὐ μακρὰν τῆς πόλεως ἐπὶ τὴν ἔρημον

[98] Attacks by robbers were a worrisome threat for Egyptians traveling lonely roads. See Bagnall, *Egypt,* 144; Bowman, *Egypt,* 153. The case of Moses the Ethiopian provides an illuminating example. Prior to becoming a monk, Moses had been the head of a group of robbers, victimizing, among others, shepherds watching their flocks outside the

"from afar" (μακρόθεν) to rob his cell. After being frozen in their tracks and saved from execution by Theon, the robbers do not return to some far off place but join monasteries that were nearby (ἐν τοῖς πέριξ μοναστηρίοις). The origin of their wickedness then was far removed, but the locus of their salvation was in the desert.

The text goes on to say that Theon took pleasure in the company of such desert creatures as antelopes, wild asses, and gazelles.[99]   There is something more here than an idyllic picture of a monk at peace with nature. Theon turned normal human interaction upon its head. He rejected normal human company, not speaking for thirty years except to plead for the lives of his would-be robbers, and silently greeting visitors through a window in his cell. Not only did he reject secular human interaction, but, living alone as an anchorite, he also rejected the company of other monks. Yet, he enjoyed spending time with these wild animals of the desert, some of the same animals Egyptians had generally sought to avoid. He became a friend to these animals, even providing them with drinking water.

---

protection of the cities. Moreover, after settling in Nitria as a monk, Moses's cell was attacked by another group of robbers. See Palladius, *Hist. Laus.*, 19 and Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.*, 6.29. For other examples see from the *Historia Monachorum*: 10. 3, 23, 27. 3, 8; and from the *Hist. Laus.*: 7. 3, 19. 1, 3, 58.4. The interaction of desert monks and robbers was frequent enough to make the detail that Theon's robbers came "from afar" seem curious. Just as dangerous animals in the desert became associated with demons, it seems that gangs of robbers in the desert were also easily associated with demons. See G. J. M. Bartelink, "Les démons comme brigands," *Vigiliae Christianae* 21. 1 (1967): 12-24, finds a tendency by a variety of patristic writers to depict demons as robbers.

[99] *Hist. Monach.* 6. 4. ἦν γὰρ ἰδεῖν ἴχνη βουβάλων καὶ ὀνάγρων καὶ δορκάδων καὶ ἄλλων κτηνῶν περὶ τὴν μονὴν αὐτοῦ, οἷς ἀεὶ προσετέρπετο.

Numerous monks not only lived at peace with the animals of the desert, but also lived among or like them.[100] Paphnutius' *Life of Onnophrius* provides a number of striking examples. On a tour of ascetics of the desert in Upper Egypt, Paphnutius came upon the astonishing sight of a monk covered with nothing but his own hair running with a herd of wild antelopes. The wild monk had lived apart from other humans for so long that he feared Paphnutius was a demon.[101] On another occasion, still in the desert, Paphnutius came upon Onnophrius, a monk similarly covered with nothing but his own hair and some leaves. The man had taken on such an animalistic appearance that Paphnutius initially thought he might be a wild ass. Onnophrius had been living this wild life for sixty years.[102]

Just as the demons could not harm pious ascetics, but became obedient to their commands to leave the bodies of the possessed, dangerous animals not only did not harm

---

[100] I would include among these the "boskoi," like John in *Hist. Monach.* 13.8, who wandered the desert feeding on plantlife. On the existence of such wandering monks in areas other than Egypt, see Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* I. 6. 33. See also Daniel Caner, *Wandering, Begging, Monks: Spiritual Authority and the Promotion of Monasticism in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002): 19-82.

[101] Paphnutius, *Life of Onnophrius* 3-7.

[102] Paphnutius, *Life of Onnophrius* 10-11. The similarity of these two and other accounts was no accident. Alison Goddard Elliott (*Roads to Paradise: Reading the Lives of the Early Saints* (Hanover and London: University Press of New England, 1987): 58-59) sees this text "not as nine distinct adventures, but of one tale told nine times," in line with the larger pattern of descent, ascent, and liminality seen in a wide array of hagiographic literature. For a similar account of an Apa Aphou who lived with antelopes in the desert, see F. Rossi, *I Papiri Copti…di Torino* vol 1, fax 3, p 5.

them, but became obedient to their commands.[103] A certain Nubian once came to Abba

Aaron in a panic because a crocodile had snatched away his only son. The holy man

gave the father a piece of wood with instructions to throw it into the water where the

event had happened. Having done so, the man was thrilled to see the crocodile return his

little boy unharmed on the shore.[104] In another example, Pachomius impressed his

brother John with his faith and confidence in the face of a crocodile. He chided his

brother for his fear of the beast, and when the crocodile came too close, he merely threw

a handful of water in the beast's face and called upon God to forbid the creature to return

to that spot.[105]

The power of the ascetic against demons, therefore, was not limited to the demon

itself, but extended to the places and creatures long associated with evil and chaos in

Egypt. That is to say that the Christian holy man in Egypt responded to very old

traditions regarding malevolent spiritual forces in that area.

---

[103] For other examples of monks with power over animals in ascetic
literature, see *Hist. Monach.* 9. 6, 8-10, 12.5, 21. 15-16; *Hist. Laus.*
18. 8-9, 27-28, 23. 3-4; *Apo. Patrum: Antony* 36, *Theodore of Pherme* 23;
Jerome, *Vita Pauli* 16.

[104] Paphnutius, *Monks of Upper Egypt*, 98-100.

[105] Bo 20 (CSCO 89 p. 19-20). ⲡⲁϩⲱⲙ ⲇⲉ ⲁϥⲙⲁϩⲧⲉϥϫⲓϫ ⲙ̄ⲙⲱⲟⲩ ⲁϥⲥⲁⲧⲥ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ϧⲉⲛⲡϩⲟ
ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲙ̄ⲥⲁϩ ⲉϥϫⲱ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ ϫⲉⲉⲣⲉⲡϭ̄ⲥ̄ ⲉⲣⲉⲡⲓⲧⲓⲙⲁⲛ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲕϣⲧⲉⲙⲕⲟⲧⲕ ⲉⲓ̄ ⲉⲡⲁⲓⲙⲁ ϣ[ⲁⲉ]ⲛⲉϩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩ
ⲇⲉ ⲁϥⲱⲙⲥ ⲛ̄ϫⲉⲡⲓ[ⲙ̄]ⲥⲁϩ For a few other colorful examples of holy men
displaying power over crocodiles, see *Hist. Monach.* 4. 3, 12. 6-7, 27.
12-13.

IV.   Conclusion

While some Christians feared the ability of demons to influence their thoughts and lead them to sin, the demons were also thought, and had been thought for centuries, to be able to inflict physical harm and even death upon humans. They could do this directly or they could utilize certain animals. These beliefs persisted into the Christian era as shown by various examples taken from accounts written about their principal antagonists, the Christian holy men. The latter offered hope to those who feared the demons. The same literature cast these holy men as having the power to overcome these beings, to endure the worst of their violence, to protect others from them, and to undo the effects of their deeds. What might be the effect then of large numbers of holy men coming together with less experienced monks in the communities of the Koinonia? Were there advantages to living in such a community beyond what could be enjoyed by the disciples of an individual holy man?

Chapter Three

Oasis

Οὐ σὺν ἐμοὶ ἦτε ἐν τῷ μοναστηρίῳ ποτὲ μοναχοὶ πρὸ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ὑμῶν; Οὐκ οἴδατέ με τῇ χάριτι τοῦ θεοῦ ἀγαπῶντα τὸν θεὸν ὡς ὑμεῖς καὶ φροντίζοντα τῶν ἀδελφῶν; Καὶ ὅτ ε Μ ω σ ῆ ς ὁ τοῦ λεγομένου Μ α γ δ ώ λ ο υ ἐδαιμονίσθη καὶ ἁρπαζόμενος ὑπὸ δαιμόνων εἰς τὰ κατάγαια ἐκινδύνευε θανατωθῆναι, οὐκ ἔγνωτε πῶς δι' ἐμοῦ ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ἐβοή θησεν αὐτῷ;

(G₁ 112)

I.   Protected Space

I showed in the previous chapter that demons, or malevolent spiritual forces, were

long feared in Egypt prior to the rise of Christianity for their abilities to cause physical

harm to humans and that these same fears persisted into the Christian era as demonstrated

by their depiction in literature written about ascetics. I also showed that these ascetics

were able to demonstrate their power over the demons by their ability to withstand

physical attacks. Christian holy men were also able to go on the offensive against the

demons by exorcizing them from humans and even by freeing geographical regions and

animals from the taint resulting from centuries of association with the spiritual forces of

evil and chaos. This was the wider context within which the Koinonia operated. In this

chapter, I will show the ways the Pachomians also believed that the demons were able to

do physical harm. These beliefs will fit well with what was shown in the last chapter. I

will also show that the Pachomians believed they enjoyed protection from these demonic

threats and why they believed this was so. This will also fit well with the previous

chapter to the extent that their protection stemmed from the power of holy men, however I will emphasize the ways that the communal life shared by the Pachomian monks made their experience unique and their protection from demonic attack more secure.

In his recent book on demons and Christian ascetics, David Brakke placed his chapter on the Pachomians immediately following his chapter on Evagrius. This ordering suits Brakke's development of his topic, since he finds that Pachomian demonology was "similar to Evagrius's in its emphasis on thoughts."[1] Indeed, after reading Brakke's Pachomian chapter, one might conclude that these monks had abandoned the physical fears described in my previous chapter and now saw demons merely as intangible forces of temptation and not blade-wielding thugs.[2]

The Pachomians certainly feared the ability of demons to attack their thoughts and lead them to sin, a subject addressed in the next chapter, but like other fourth century inhabitants of Egypt, they believed that demons could physically harm humans. For instance, a demon once threatened to kill his host if Pachomius attempted to exorcize him,[3] and, as will be seen below, the demons could do more than threaten.

The Pachomians also believed that the demons could cause disease, something they would have learned not only from native tradition, but also from their reading of the

---

[1] Brakke, *Demons*, 92.

[2] Brakke (*Demons*, 89) writes, "Within the community,demonic activity was mostly (but not entirely) limited to the suggestion of evil thoughts. . ."

[3] Bo 111 (CSCO 89 p 153-154).

Bible. The New Testament clearly taught this. In Luke 13: 10-17, Jesus healed a woman

who had been crippled by Satan for eighteen years.

They also believed that the demons could take the form of animals. The *Instruction*

Concerning a Spiteful Monk[4] depicts the devil being brought in the form of a wild ass to

[4] The authorship of this text is not certain, but it is generally agreed to be an authentic Pachomian text. The introductory heading added to the text ascribes the work to Pachomius. This attribution was called into serious question by M. M. van Molle ("Confrontation," 395f). Among other arguments, van Molle suggests that the text does not reflect Pachomian cenobiticism. Ruppert (388-390) counters that the text is not about a choice between cenobiticism and any other form of ascetic life, but about the "(n)otwendigkeit einter geistlichen Führung, ganz gleich, wo einer steht." Ruppert adds that the other works and letters ascribed to Pachomius, Theodore, and Horsiesius also make no special reference to the forms of Pachomian cenobiticism. It is clear, however, that the text is partially a compilation. Towards the end of the work, a long excerpt from a work of Athanasius has been worked into the text (See Lefort, "S. Athanase écrivain copte," *Muséon* 46 (1933): 1-33) and an aphorism used in the text has been attributed to Evagrius (See Lefort, "A propos d'un aphorisme d'Evagrius Ponticus," *Bulletin de l'Académie Royale de Belgique* (1950): 70-79). Ruppert writes that the Athanasian work was added because it fit in so well with the themes expressed elsewhere in the text. Veilleux acknowledges that the presence of the Athanasian material demonstrates that the work is a compilation, but holds that the work was clearly composed in Coptic and reflects Pachomian terminology and mentality (*Liturgie*, 134). Veilleux suggests that the work may have been the work of a Pachomian monk, rather than an exact preservation of an instruction by Pachomius himself (*Pachomian Koinonia III*, 2). More recently, Cristoph Joest ("Übersetzung von Pachoms Katechese 'An einen Grollenden Mönch,'" *Muséon* 120 [2007], 91-129) has defended this text by demonstrating its many Pachomian features and its correlations to other works of Pachomius, Theodore, and Horsiesius. The fact that this text has been redacted to some extent over time, including the insertion of the Athanasian material, and that it hypothetically could have been more the work of a Pachomian monk than Pachomius himself do not seem sufficient to overturn the traditional attribution of this work to Pachomius, given the Pachomian nature of the text. Moreover, the demonology in this text is consistent with other Pachomian texts. I will refer to Pachomius as the author of this work, leaving out the Athanasian material and acknowledging the remaining doubts surrounding this attribution.

Pachomius.[5] The lives also contain several examples of demons appearing as animals, such as the fish in the river by the temple from which the priest chased young Pachomius,[6] or the bird that later crowed in his face.[7]

Like other Egyptian ascetics, the Pachomians believed that Christian holy men had power against the demons and were able to provide protection to others, but they transferred this power from individual holy men to an institution. Thus, monks who became separated from the community, also became vulnerable to demonic attacks. The basis of Pachomian confidence against these attacks remained fundamentally the same: the spiritual power and authority of the holy man. Yet, this power did not stem from a single holy man, but from whole gangs of them, working and praying side by side every day. Moreover, the system of the Koinonia was designed to replenish itself constantly with new generations of protective holy men replacing those who died. The protection offered by the Koinonia then was superior to that offered by individuals or even small groups of holy men, because it was not dependent on the steadfastness of one (or a few) and it was perpetually self-regenerating.

II. Safety

The fact that the Koinonia served as protected space for developing monks can be shown in part by the fact that, within the community, physical assaults by demons or by

---

[5] *Pach Instr* 1. 56. ⲚⲐⲈ ⲚⲞⲨⲈⲒⲀⲚⲦⲞⲞⲨ (CSCO 159 p 22) Cf. Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 16. 6.

[6] G₁ 3, Bo 4 (CSCO 89 p 2).

[7] G₁ 18, Bo 21 (CSCO 89 p 21).

the demon-possessed only happened to the leaders, otherwise dangerous animals were unable to harm the monks, and demons were unable to inflict disease.

1. Physical Attacks Upon Fathers

The Pachomian literature reveals a belief that the demons could physically attack humans, either directly or indirectly by means of a possessed person. The leaders of the Koinonia faced these attacks and their endurance of them displayed their superiority to the demons, but the less advanced monks in their care were protected from violent attacks.

The lives contain two accounts of direct attacks by demons upon Pachomius. First, G_1 contains a reference to Pachomius being beaten by demons prior to becoming father of the Koinonia.[8] These attacks happened after the demons had made numerous attempts to distract Pachomius' mind. The demons had created an illusion of a pit before the holy man when he knelt to pray. He ignored the illusion and knelt in faith. The demons had marched in front of him shouting "Make way for the Man of God" in hopes of drawing his attention, but to no avail.[9] He mocked their weakness. The demons had shaken his cell in hopes of distracting him with the fear that it may collapse, but again failed to

---

[8] G_1 20.

[9] S_3 (CSCO 99 p 111) specifies that this temptation happened at the tombs near Palamon's habitation where Pachomius would go to pray. Antony faced his demonic beating also in a tomb (*Vita Ant* 8). The *Paralipomena* (14) places a similar experience later in the career of Pachomius in the desert while he was traveling between monasteries. Τοῦ ἁγίου γέροντος ἀπερχομένου εἰς τὸ ἴδιον μοναστήριον καὶ γενομένου περὶ τὴν ἔρημον τὴν λεγομένην Ἀμνῶν

disturb him. At another time, a demon had appeared as a bird and crowed in his face, but

he closed his eyes and ignored it. The demons humorously had tied heavy ropes to a leaf

and pretended to be pulling a heavy stone, but even this did not distract him. He prayed

and they vanished. The demons took the form of naked women and sat with him when he

ate his meals.[10] He closed his eyes and waited until they disappeared.[11] At this point, G_1

states that he was physically beaten by demons and tormented all night,[12] although Bo

does not include this portion of the account.

The Greek writers may have been more careful to include this detail because of their

familiarity with another work of hagiography. This progression from harmless demonic

ploys to physical attacks fits the pattern seen in the *Life of Antony*, a work known to the

---

[10] Sexual encounters with local women, or even just the accusation, may
have been a very real threat for Egyptian ascetics. For instance, see
Apo. Patrum: Macarius the Great 1, *Hist Monach.* 14. 5-7. Also see
Brown, *The Body*, 241-258. In his introduction to the 2008 reprinting
of *The Body* , Brown cautions against using ascetic texts as sources for
social history (li-lii), nevertheless it remains reasonable these
encounters were believable to the readers of this literature. Bagnall
(*Egypt*, 144) writes that the caves and wadis of the "outer desert"
provided hiding places for debtors or fugitives from justice, so
stories of awkard encounters with monks must not have seemed so unusual
to contemporaries.

[11] G_1 18-19; Bo 21 (CSCO 89 p 21). S_1 (CSCO 99 p 8-9) provides a parallel
account of demons struggling to move an object as if it were a large
stone. S_1 continued to an account of a woman knocking on Pachomius'
door, to whom the monk lowered his eyes. On the preoccupation of
monks generally with the avoidance of women and sexual desire, see in
the *Apo. Patrum:* Antony 11, Arsenius 28, Daniel 2, Sisoes 3; in the
Hist. Monach.: 1. 33-35, 13. 1-2; Palladius, *Hist. Laus.*: 38. 11, 71.
1. Impeding prayer was seen as a demonic goal elsewhere; for instance
see *Apo. Patrum*: Agathon 9. For a similar instance of demons seeking
to make an ascetic laugh, see Pambo 13, where the demons tie feathers
to a block of wood and attempt to make it fly.

[12] G_1 20 Καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δὲ πολλοῖς ἐπειράζετο σκληροτέρως, ὥστε καὶ εἰς σῶμα δαρῆναι καὶ ἀλγεῖν αὐτὸν
φανερῶς ἀπὸ ὀψὲ ἕως πρωΐ

writers of G_1.[13] This similarity demonstrates that Pachomius' credentials as a holy man were on a par with Antony. Thus, when introducing his request for sleeplessness,[14] the Greek text also adds a comparison between him and Antony, stating that they both spent much time wrestling demons.[15] Just as Antony had faced physical violence from demons,[16] the writers of G_1 were careful to depict similar sufferings for their holy man, but this does not mean that they invented them. In the *Instruction Concerning a Spiteful Monk*, Pachomius claimed that he was tormented (ⲑⲗⲓⲃⲉ) and pressed (ϩⲟⲝϩⲝ) on all sides while he was in the desert.[17] His language may not have been as specific as that used in G_1, but it certainly does not exclude beatings.

The second account of a demonic physical attack upon Pachomius is not as clear as the first. One morning, as Pachomius was teaching the brothers in the synaxis, he saw a dark spirit standing in the doorway.[18] Pachomius interpreted this apparition to mean that something bad was about to happen, and so he covered his head. Above him, a vent was closed by a mat held down by two bricks. One of the monks pulled the string to open the

---

[13] This pattern of progression from temptations to hallucinations and finally to physical assault is noted by Guillaumont (191-193).

[14] G_1 22; Bo 21 (CSCO 89 p 20-21).

[15] G_1 22 Καὶ ἐπειδὴ πολλοὺς χρόνους ἐποίησε πρὸς τοὺς δαίμονας πυκτεύων ὁ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀθλητὴς καθάπερ ὁ ἁγιώτατος Ἀ ν τ ώ ν ι ο ς

[16] For instance, see Athanasius *Vita Ant.* 8 where Antony is beaten by demons in the tombs: Ἔνθα δὴ μὴ φέρων ὁ ἐχθρός, ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ φοβούμενος μὴ κατ᾽ ὀλίγον καὶ τὴν ἔρημον πολίσῃ τῆς ἀσκήσεως, προσελθὼν ἐν μιᾷ νυκτὶ μετὰ πλήθους δαιμόνων, τοσοῦτον αὐτὸν ἔκοψε πληγαῖς, ὡς καὶ ἄφωνον αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν βασάνων κεῖσθαι χαμαί.

[17] *Instr.* 1. 11. ⲉϣⲁⲩⲑⲗⲓⲃⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲓ̈...ϣⲁϥϩⲉⲭϩⲱⲭⲧ̄ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲥⲁ ⲛⲓ̈ⲙ (CSCO 159 p 3).

[18] Bo 98 ⲁϥϫⲟⲩϣⲧ ⲉϥⲙⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲣⲟ ⲁϥⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲟⲩⲡ̄ⲛ̄ⲁ ⲛ̄ⲭⲁⲕⲓ ⲉϥⲟϩⲓ ⲉⲣⲁⲧϥ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ (CSCO 89 p 123).

vent and allow more light to enter the room. This caused the bricks to fall upon

Pachomius' head. The text does not make it clear what the dark spirit had to do with the

events following its appearance. There is no indication that the demon placed the bricks

where they could fall on Pachomius or caused them to fall. There is no indication that the

monk who pulled the string was possessed or under the control of a demon in any way.

He was merely innocently attempting to open the vent. Therefore, it is not clear what, if

anything, the spirit of darkness had to do with the event other than acting as a harbinger.

Nevertheless, Pachomius recognized that there was a connection between the appearance

of the spirit and the falling of the bricks or whatever bad thing was about to follow. That

is why he covered his head. It seems then that there must have been some causative

relationship between the appearance of the dark spirit and the bricks falling on

Pachomius.[19]

The lives also contain two accounts of attacks by possessed persons upon the leaders

of the Koinonia, one upon Pachomius and the other upon Theodore. First, at the Synod

of Latopolis, when Pachomius had finished defending himself against the charges of

clairvoyance, a man possessed by a demon approached and attempted to kill Pachomius

with a sword.[20] On this occasion, just as the demon attempted to kill Pachomius by

means of a person, the text states that God saved Pachomius through his monks, who

---

[19] As he had endured earlier being beaten by demons, he endured this attack as well. In fact, he told the brothers that before the bricks fell he had been suffering from a headache, but now he was fine. ⲘⲠⲀⲦⲈϤⲀⲓ ϢⲰⲠⲒ ⲘⲘⲞⲒ ⲚⲀⲢⲈⲦⲀⲀϤⲈ ⲘⲞⲔⲌ ⲈⲢⲞⲒⲠⲈ ⲦⲚⲞⲨⲬⲈ ⲌⲰϤ ⲀⲤⲘⲦⲞⲚ ⲈⲢⲞⲒ (CSCO 89 p 123). The text adds that Pachomius said this keeping in mind the injunction to "give thanks in all things" (1 Thes 5:18).

[20] G₁ 112 ἦλθε γάρ τις ἐνεργούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐχθροῦ, μάχαιραν ἔχων ὥστε σφάξαι αὐτόν

extracted him from the midst of the resulting riot and brought him to their monastery of

Phnoum.[21]

The second example is found in Greek and Coptic, and it is the only account of a

demonic attack by means of a possessed person inside the walls of a Pachomian

monastery.[22] Pachomius sensed that a certain monk was practicing an ascesis greater

than that practiced by his fellows not out of piety but because of vainglory. He sent

Theodore to check on the man in his cell. G_1 reports that he instructed him that if the

monk was praying, he was to stop him and this would cause the demon to manifest

itself.[23] When he stopped him from praying, the man rose up and attacked Theodore with

a club.[24]

The fact that these stories depict the principal protagonists of the lives in violent

encounters with demons is certainly not exceptional. What is important is the presence of

these stories in the tradition along with the lack of stories depicting attacks upon monks

who had not reached the same level of spiritual maturity. The leaders, like Antony and

other monks who had proved their power over demons, faced attacks; the others did not.

---

[21] G_1 112 ἔσωσεν αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος διὰ τῶν συνόντων ἀδελφῶν. Καὶ διασωθεὶς ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν ἐσχάτην αὐτοῦ μονὴν λεγομένην Π α χ ν ο ύ μ

[22] G_1 69, Bo 64 (CSCO 89 p 64-66).

[23] G_1 69 Ὕπαγε, κώλυσον αὐτὸν εὔχεσθαι· ὅτε δὲ κωλύσεις αὐτόν, εὐθὺς ἔχει φανῆναι ὁ δαίμων ἐν αὐτῷ In Bo 64, it is not the demon but that man's vainglory that manifests itself and the man is only angry like the devil- ⲁⲕϣⲁⲛⲭⲉⲙϥ ⲉϥϣⲗⲏⲗ ⲁⲙⲟⲛⲓ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟϥ ϣⲁϯ ⲟⲩⲟϩ ⲥⲁⲧⲟⲧϥ ⲡⲓϣⲟⲩ ⲉⲧϣⲟⲩⲓⲧ ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̅ϧⲏⲧϥ ⲭⲱⲗⲉⲙ…ⲛ̅ⲧⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩ ⲁϥϫⲱⲛⲧ ⲙ̅ⲫⲣⲏϯ ⲙ̅ⲡⲓⲇⲓⲁⲃⲟⲗⲟⲥ (CSCO 89 p 65)

[24] Bo has "stone."

2. Animals

The Pachomian literature also reveals a belief that while the dangerous animals associated with demons in the last chapter could injure and even kill humans, the monks of the Koinonia lived in an environment in which they believed they were able to realize the promises of the Gospel that the followers of Jesus would have power against these dangerous creatures. Jesus promised his followers that they would walk upon snakes and scorpions, which he associated with "the enemy," and not be harmed.[25] They would even safely pick up snakes with their hands,[26] as did the Apostle Paul after being shipwrecked on the island of Malta.[27]

The Pachomians lived in the presence of experienced leaders, who, like Paul, fulfilled these promises of Jesus.[28] Pachomius not only walked safely upon snakes and scorpions,

---

[25] Luke 10: 19 ἰδοὺ δέδωκα ὑμῖν τὴν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ πατεῖν ἐπάνω ὄφεων καὶ σκορπίων, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ ἐχθροῦ, καὶ οὐδὲν ὑμᾶς οὐ μὴ ἀδικήσῃ.

[26] Mark 16: 18. [καὶ ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν] ὄφεις ἀροῦσιν, κἂν θανάσιμόν τι πίωσιν οὐ μὴ αὐτοὺς βλάψῃ, ἐπὶ ἀρρώστους χεῖρας ἐπιθήσουσιν καὶ καλῶς ἕξουσιν

[27] Acts 28: 6 οἱ δὲ προσεδόκων αὐτὸν μέλλειν πίμπρασθαι ἢ καταπίπτειν ἄφνω νεκρόν. ἐπὶ πολὺ δὲ αὐτῶν προσδοκώντων καὶ θεωρούντων μηδὲν ἄτοπον εἰς αὐτὸν γινόμενον, μεταβαλόμενοι ἔλεγον αὐτὸν εἶναι θεόν.

[28] Confidence with poisonous snakes is a hallmark of other ascetic literature. In the *Historia Lausiaca,* Macarius of Alexandria is bitten by a poisonous snake while digging a well. Macarius, unharmed, tore the snake in two asking how dare it come when God had not sent it (Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 18. 10). Pachon, who, as seen above, was seeking suicide before giving in to demon-inspired passions, ground the head of a poisonous snake against himself, but was not even bitten (Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 23.5).

but also displayed his power over other wild animals.[29] His confident rebuke of the

crocodile that so impressed his brother John has already been shown in the last chapter.[30]

In addition to that, the lives include an account of Pachomius as a boy having been

charged with the task of bringing antelope meat to feed some workers. On the way, the

devil attacked him by means of demons in the form of dogs. Pachomius merely looked

toward heaven and wept and the demons immediately fled having been unable to do him

any harm.[31] Moreover, the lives state that once, while he was addressing the brothers

who were harvesting, two snakes wound themselves around his feet. He ignored the

snakes, which did not bite him, until he was finished, and then he killed them.[32] The

Letter of Ammon contains a nearly identical account in which Theodore concealed two

small snakes under his feet during instruction and then has the creatures killed.[33] That

fact that the animals are killed in both accounts, despite having caused no harm,

illustrates their continued association with evil.

   When dangerous creatures did bite, they were unable to do harm. The lives state that

when Pachomius was stung by scorpions while at work, he would continue working

---

[29] G₁ 21 Πρὸ τοῦ γνῶσιν τελείαν κτήσασθαι παρὰ κυρίου τὸν μέγαν Παχώμιον, τοιαύτην εἶχε πίστιν τελείαν ὡς καὶ φανερῶς ἐπάνω ὄφεων καὶ σκορπίων πατεῖν καὶ ἐπὶ κροκοδείλων διαβαίνειν ἐν ὕδασι καὶ θηρίων κατατολμᾶν καὶ μὴ βλάπτεσθαι ὑπ' αὐτῶν.

[30] Bo 20 (CSCO 89 p 19-20); S₃ (CSCO 99 p 112).

[31] Bo 5 ⲁⲥϣⲱⲡⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ⲕⲉⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲩϯ ⲛⲁϥ ⲛⲟⲩϣⲓⲱ ⲛⲁϥ ⲛ̄ϣⲟϣ ⲛ̄ϫⲉⲛⲉϥⲓⲟϯ ⲉⲑⲣⲉϥϭⲓⲧⲥ ⲛ̄ⲛⲓⲉⲣⲅⲁⲧⲏⲥ ⲉⲧⲉⲣϩⲱⲃ ϧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲙⲁ· ⲉⲧⲁϥⲓ̈ ⲇⲉ ⲉϥⲙⲟϣⲓ̈ ϧⲉⲛⲡⲓⲙⲁⲛⲙⲟϣⲓ̈ ⲁⲡⲓⲇⲓⲁⲃⲟⲗⲟⲥ ⲓ̈ⲛⲓ ⲉϫⲱϥ ⲛ̄ϩⲁⲛⲙⲏϣ ⲛ̄ⲇⲉⲙⲱⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲙⲟⲧ ⲛ̄ϩⲁⲛⲟⲩϩⲱⲣ ⲉⲩⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲉϩⲟⲑⲃⲉϥ· (CSCO 89 p 2-3).

[32] Bo 98 (CSCO 89 p 123-124).

[33] *EpAm* 19.

despite the pain. Similarly, if he were stung in the evening during prayer, he would

remain standing until he was healed.[34]

This power over dangerous creatures was not limited to Pachomius and Theodore, but

extended to other monks as well. Pachomius reminded his monks on numerous occasions

of Christ's promise in Luke that he would give them the power to walk upon snakes,

scorpions, and all the power of the enemy.[35] The lives preserve an account of a monk

named Paul who, while standing in recitation, was stung by a scorpion. He suffered

greatly but refused to stop praying until he was healed. In the morning, the other monks

saw the dead scorpion lying at the monk's feet.[36] There is also a similar account

regarding an unnamed monk.[37]

Should someone, who was not protected by this promise for some reason,[38] be bitten

by a poisonous creature, the leaders of the Koinonia, and presumably other experienced

---

[34] Bo 98 (CSCO 89 p 122-123).

[35] For instance, see *Instr.* 1. 42 ⲙⲏ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲓϯ ⲉⲍⲟⲩⲅⲓⲁ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲉⲍⲱⲙ ⲉⲭⲛ̄ⲛ̄ⲍⲟϥ ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲟⲍⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲭⲛ̄ⲧϭⲟⲙ ⲧⲏⲣⲥ̄ ⲙ̄ⲡⲭⲁⲭⲉ (CSCO 159 p 17), *Para* 12 ἐπάνω σκορπίων καὶ ὄφεων πατεῖν ποιῶν καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ ἐχθροῦ, Bo 98 ⲓⲥⲭⲉⲛⲡⲓⲉⲍⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲁϥⲍⲟⲛⲍⲉⲛ ⲉⲧⲟⲧⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲛⲓⲥⲛⲏⲟⲩ ⲉⲑⲃⲉⲍⲟϥ ⲍⲓⲟⲗ ⲓⲉ ⲕⲉⲍⲁⲓ ⲛ̄ⲑⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲉϣⲧⲉⲙⲭⲁⲡⲟⲩⲛⲁⲍϯ (CSCO 89 p 122).

[36] Bo 99 ϧⲉⲛⲡⲓⲉⲭⲱⲣⲍ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲉⲧⲉⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲛⲉⲟⲩⲟⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲡⲉ ⲭⲉⲡⲁⲩⲗⲉ ⲉⲟⲩⲛⲓϣϯ ⲉⲛⲁⲥⲕⲓⲧⲏⲥⲡⲉ ⲉϥⲟⲍⲓ ⲉⲣⲁⲧϥ ⲉϥⲉⲉⲣⲙⲉⲗⲉⲧⲏ ⲟⲩⲟⲍ ⲁⲟⲩⲟⲗ ⲗⲟⲕⲥϥ ⲉⲧⲉϥϥⲁⲧ:- ⲛ̄ⲑⲟϥ ⲇⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉϥⲭⲁⲧⲟⲧϥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲓⲥⲭⲉⲛⲣⲟⲩⲍⲓ ϣⲁϣⲱⲣⲡ ⲉϥⲉⲣⲙⲉⲗⲉⲧⲏ ⲍⲱⲥⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉϥϯ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉϥⲡ̄ⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ϣⲁⲧⲉⲛⲕⲉⲕⲟⲩⲭⲓ ⲉⲑⲃⲉⲡϩⲓⲥⲓ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲁⲑⲟⲩⲓ̈ ⲉⲧⲁϥⲓ̈ ⲉⲡϣⲱⲓ ⲉⲭⲉⲛⲡⲉϥⲍⲏⲧ (CSCO 89 p 124).

[37] G₁ 101 Ἦν δέ τις ἄλλος δυνατὸς τῷ πνεύματι καὶ τὴν ὑπομονὴν τοῦ μεγάλου ζηλῶν. Τοῦτον οὖν ποτε εὐχόμενον ἔδηξεν ὁ σκορπίος κατὰ τοῦ ποδός. Ὁ δὲ τὸν δεδηγμένον πόδα τῷ σκορπίῳ ἐπιθεὶς ηὔξατο λέγων· «Εἰ ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἰάσεταί με, τίς με ἰάσεται;» Καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν δοκιμαζομένου αὐτοῦ εἰ ὑπομένει καὶ τῆς ὀδύνης τοῦ ἰοῦ βασανιζούσης αὐτοῦ τὴν καρδίαν, παρ' ὀλίγον ἐδεδώκει τὸ πνεῦμα. Οὕτω δὲ καρτερῶν βίᾳ τὴν βάσανον ἐνίκησεν ἕως ὥρας τῆς συνάξεως.

[38] Some possible reasons are presented on pp 91-93.

monks, had the power to heal them. S₂ preserves an account of a man paralyzed by

snakebite who was brought to Pachomius in a chariot for healing. The injured man was

healed as soon as the holy man headed toward the chariot.[39] According to the *Letter of*

Ammon, when a monk had been bitten by a poisonous snake, Theodore made the sign of

the cross on the wound and assured the monk that Christ had healed him.[40] Moreover,

the picture seen above of the young Pachomius holding the flesh of antelopes and

standing his ground against demons in animal guise might reflect the confidence the

Pachomians placed in their leaders to provide this service.[41] This is because the scene is

at least reminiscent of the apotropaic iconography seen in the last chapter that depicted

Horus or Jesus standing upon or holding antelopes or other desert creatures while

offering protection against the demonic forces those creatures represented.

3. Disease

Physical disease was an everyday reality for Pachomian monks. Many of them,

including Pachomius, would die of disease. It was shown in the previous chapter that

Egyptians feared the capability of demons to cause illnesses and the Pachomians also

believed they could cause disease for some humans. For those in the community,

however, they were only able to cause the symptoms of disease, not actual physical

---

[39] S₂ (CSCO 99 p 132). For biblical models of remote healings at the very moment a holy person declared their intention to carry out the act, see Matt 8: 5-13, Luke 7: 1-10, John 4: 46-54.

[40] *EpAm* 27.

[41] Bo 5 Ⲛ̄ⲑⲟϥ ⲇⲉ ⲡⲓⲁⲗⲟⲩ ⲁϥϥⲁⲓ Ⲛ̄ⲛⲉϥⲃⲁⲗ ⲉⲡϣⲱⲓ ⲉⲧⲫⲉ ⲁϥⲣⲓⲙⲓ Ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩ ⲁⲩⲭⲱⲣ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ (CSCO 89 p 2-3).

maladies that required care. True diseases, on the other hand, were sent by God for the benefit of the monks' souls.

The demons were able to harass the Pachomians by causing the symptoms of disease, but were unable to inflict the diseases.[42] The experience of these symptoms is described in a story recorded in several of the lives. Pachomius felt ill and for this reason spent two days in bed and without food. He rose only to carry out his daily prayers. On the third day, he felt better and joined the brothers for a meal.[43] The Greek text adds that he perceived that he did not have a physical disease (αἰσθανόμενος μὴ φυσικὴν εἶναι τὴν νόσον). Demons had caused him to experience the symptoms of a disease. Pachomius would teach the brothers about this tactic of the demons so that they would not become objects of the sport of the enemy (μὴ ἐμπαίζεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν).

The Pachomians believed real diseases only occurred in conformity with the will of God.[44] Horsiesius taught that God sometimes used sickness to lead one to repentence.[45] He might also allow a monk to suffer from an illness as a form of ascesis.[46] For instance,

---

[42] For a wider consideration of the belief in demonic illness and the nonmedical treatment it required among the Pachomians and other ascetics, see Andrew Crislip, *From Monastery to Hospital: Christian Monasticism & the Transformation of Health Care in Late Antiquity* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2005): 18-28.

[43] G_1 52; Bo 47 (CSCO 89 p 49-50).

[44] Crislip (*From Monastery*, 137) emphasizes the Pachomian "destigmatization of illness."

[45] S_{21} 64-65 (W. E. Crum, *Der Papyruscodex*, 18-19.)

[46] G_1 90. See Brakke, *Demons,* 186-187. For a consideration of the role of bodily suffering in the perfection of the soul see Elizabeth Castelli, "Mortifying the Body, Curing the Soul: Beyond Ascetic

G₁ apologizes for the fact that Pachomius became ill, despite his personal holiness, by stating that this illness was a form of testing sent by God.[47] God could also send an illness to make a monk's ascesis easier to bear. A voice from heaven once stopped Pachomius from praying for a monk's healing, because the illness had been given to help him overcome the temptations of youth.[48]

A monk who felt ill could attempt to determine the nature of his symptoms, whether they were merely symptoms caused by demons or a real disease, by consulting a more experienced monk with the gift of discernment.[49] Once, having received a man he felt was a "darnel" and having placed a heavy ascesis upon him, Pachomius advised the new monk not to believe he was sick, even if he felt ill, until Pachomius discovered whether the sickness was physical or had been caused by demons. If he found the sickness was physical, he would send the monk to those brothers charged with the care of the sick.[50]

Dualism in *The Life of Saint Syncletica*," *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 4. 2 (1992): 134-153; Maureen Tilley, "The Ascetic Body and the (Un)Making of the World of the Martyr," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 59. 3 (1991): 467-479; and Bruce Malina, "Pain, Power, and Personhood: Ascetic Behavior in the Ancient Mediterranean," in *Asceticism,* Vincent Wimbush and Richard Valantasis, eds., 162-177.

[47] For instance, see G₁ 52 δοκιμαστὴς ὁ Θεὸς τῶν δούλων αὐτοῦ ποικίλως. Veilleux assigns this to chapter 53 in his English translation (*Pachomian Koinonia* I, 333, 412 n. 1).

[48] Av 87-88.

[49] G₁ 52 Ἐδοκίμαζε δὲ τῇ διακρίσει τοῦ πνεύματος καὶ τὰς διαφορὰς τῶν νόσων ὁποῖαί τινες εἶεν

[50] S₅ 107 ⲛⲉⲁϥϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲛⲁϥ, ϫⲉⲉϣⲱⲡ[ⲉ] ⲉⲕϣⲁⲛϣⲱⲛ[ⲉ] ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲥⲟⲡ, ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲧ[ⲁⲛ]ⳅⲟⲩⲧⳍ ϫⲉⲟⲩϣ[ⲱ]ⲛⲉⲡⲉ, ⲉⲓ̈ⲙⲏⲧⲉⲓ [ⲉⲛⲕ̄ⲧⲁⲙⲟⲓ̈] ⲛ̄ⲧⲛ̄[ⲇⲟⲕⲓⲙⲁ]ⲍⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ [ϫⲉⲟⲩϣ]ⲱⲛⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ [ϩⲓⲧⲙ̄] ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉⲡⲉ [ϫⲛ̄ⲛ̄]ⲇⲁⲓⲙⲱⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲛⲏⲣⲟⲛ ⲛⲉⲧ[ϭⲱ]ⲣϭ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ [ϩ]ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⳅⲃⲏⲅⲉ ⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲛⲧⲁⲕϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⳅⲏⲧⲟⲩ ⳅⲙ̄ⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ

A monk could also test the severity of his symptoms by attempting to ignore them and not lessening his ascesis. If the symptoms persisted, he could decide to seek help from the infirmary. Although the suffering caused by disease could serve as an ascesis that was a replacement of a monk's regular program during his recovery, this decision to seek care for the body was not always an easy one. Pachomius once collapsed in a field during harvest because he stubbornly endured sickness rather than relax the burdens he placed on his body,[51] and some monks even died before lessening their asceticism.[52]

If a monk decided that he needed medical care, he could expect to receive it. The *Rules* would dictate that a sick monk had a right to receive care not only from the monks in the infirmary, but also from his housemaster.[53] Moreover, if a monk was too ill to go out to work, he might remain in his cell. For instance, an old housemaster named Mauo

---

(CSCO 99 p 173) A fragment of this account also exists in S_{13} (CSCO 99 p 31).

[51] S_7 (CSCO 99 p 87-88). The text indicates that Pachomius routinely did not believe his illnesses were physical. For a consideration of the ways some ascetic leaders sought to counter the threat some monks posed to their health by excessive ascesis during illness, see Crislip, *From Monastery*, 92-99.

[52] Pachomius' mentor Palamon sought medical assistance for a disease, but when he discovered that his condition did not improve he resumed his former ascetic lifestyle (G_1 13; Bo 16, 18 (CSCO 89 p 17-19). According to G_1, Palamon died after resuming his old lifestyle, but according to the Coptic lives, he recovered and died later of another illness. A monk named Talmas died after continuing his ascetic lifestyle when faced with the symptoms of a fever (G_1 82).

[53] For instance, *Precepts* 40, 42 (Boon, *Pachomiana Latina*, 23-24).

took offense at Pachomius' constant warnings to be vigilant, and instead of going out to

work with the brothers, he pretended to be ill and returned to his cell.[54]

III.   Vulnerability

Inside the Koinonia, monks enjoyed protection from the worst of demonic attack.

Violent assaults were rare and only happened to their leaders, who, like Antony, were

able to bear them. Animals that were deadly to most people, were harmless to the monks.

Demons were able to strike down some humans with disease, but were only able to create

the symptoms for the monks. This protection, however, was not shared by everyone and

could be lost. A monk who separated himself from the protection of the community,

either physically or by ceasing to participate in the community's spiritual program, was

again vulnerable to demonic attack. This renewed vulnerability is demonstrated below

by three examples of monks who simultaneously lost their membership in the community

and the protection that membership had provided them.

1.   Zanos

The first example depicts a monk whom the demons attack with violence and disease

after he left the protection of the community. The story is taken from a fragmentary text

that may have originated in a Pachomian milieu and, in any event, concerns a monk

(Zanos) who identified himself as a Pachomian. The devil put worldly desires, including

---

[54] G₁ 76 Γέρων δέ τις τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄκακος καὶ καλὸς λίαν, Μ α ῦ ο ς λεγόμενος, τῶν ἀρχαίων οἰκιακῶν, κατ᾽ ἐκείνην τὴν ὥραν οὐκ ἀπῆλθεν ἔξω μετὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν θερίσαι θρύα <u>ὡς ἀσθενῶν</u> καὶ λυπούμενος; Bo 68 [ⲛ]ⲉⲟⲩⲟⲛⲟⲩⲃⲉⲗⲗⲟ ⲛⲁⲣⲭⲉⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲣ̅ⲏⲧⲟⲩ ⲉⲟⲩⲣⲉⲙ̅ⲛⲏⲡⲉ ⲉⲡⲉⲩⲣⲁⲛⲡⲉ [ⲁ]ⲡⲁ ⲛⲁⲅⲱ· ⲛ̄ⲑⲟⲟⲩ ⲇⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲩϣⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲉⲙⲛⲓⲥⲛⲏⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲉⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲁⲩⲛ̄ⲕⲟⲧ ϧⲉⲛ†ⲕⲁⲗⲓⲃⲓ <u>ϩⲱⲥⲭⲉⲩϣⲱⲛⲓ</u> (CSCO 89 p 69).

the desire for fornication, into the monk's mind until he decided to leave the monastery. Having done so, he encountered a demon on the road disguised as a female ascetic with whom the monk then had sex. Upon completion of the act, the demon slapped him and then incapacitated him with a fever. After he recovered from this fever, the monk again encountered the demon in the form of the female ascetic. Angry that he had lost his victim, the demon physically assaulted him for a second time. The demon kicked the monk in the stomach, causing a hernia from which he suffered from that moment on.[55]

2. A Monk Bitten By a Scorpion

The second example concerns a monk who lost his protection from deadly animals after psychologically separating himself from the community by refusing to participate in its spiritual life. S[5] preserves this account of a monk of Pbow who did not want to confess his sins to Theodore and as a result faced attacks by dangerous animals. First, while on the road between monasteries, the monk narrowly escaped the attack of a crocodile when he ventured to the river for water. Then, after he returned to Pbow, he was stung by a scorpion, which caused his death only two days later.[56]

---

[55] *Draguet II* 7-10. See R. Draguet, "Un paralipomenon pachômien inconnu dans le Karakallou 251," in *Mélanges Tisserant* II, (*ST* – 232), Vatican 1964, 55-61. Also see Brakke, *Demons,* 204-205.

[56] S[5] 148 ⲡⲉⲭⲁϥ ⲙ̅ⲡⲉⲛⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲑⲉⲟⲇⲱⲣⲟⲥ ϫⲉⲡⲁⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲕⲱ ⲛⲁⲓ̈ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϫⲉⲁⲓ̈ⲣ̅ⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϫⲉⲙ̅ⲡⲓϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ ⲛ̅ⲧⲙⲉ ⲙ̅ⲡⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̅ⲧⲁⲕϣⲁϫⲉ ⲛⲙ̅ⲙⲁⲓ̈ ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲡⲁⲟⲩϫⲁⲓ̈ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲁⲓ̈ϣⲱⲡⲉ ϩⲛ̅ⲟⲩⲁⲣⲛⲏⲥⲓⲥ ⲙ̅ⲡⲉⲕⲙ̅ⲧⲟ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩϭⲉ ⲱ̅ ⲡⲁϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲛ̅ⲉⲓⲱⲧ, ⲥⲟⲡⲥ̅ ⲉϫⲱⲓ̈ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲟⲩⲛⲁ ⲧⲁϩⲟⲓ̈ ⲉⲓⲥϩⲏⲏⲧⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲓ̈ⲛⲁⲃⲱⲕ ⲛ̅ϭⲓϫ ⲙ̅ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ (CSCO 99 p 194).

3. A Monk Who Howled Like a Bull

The third example is taken from the *Letter of Ammon* and concerns a monk who was even protected from some forms of demonic temptation in the community, but becomes vulnerable not only to temptation but also to possession once he loses his membership.[57] In this passage, Theodore summons a monk named Mousaios because he had become aware that this monk had been entertaining evil thoughts and was thus making himself a great pasture (νομή) and even a habitation (οἰκητήριον) for the demons. The monk claimed that these thoughts were planted by the demons, but Theodore countered that the demons had not yet been allowed to attack (ἐπιθέσθαι) him. Since the monk had persisted in this negligence, he decided to expel him from the monastery. The expulsion scene that follows presents the connection between his loss of membership and loss of protection geographically. Theodore sent four monks to escort the man back to his own house,[58] but when they reached the gates, the threshhold between the monastery and the secular world surrounding it, the man became possessed by a demon, howled like a bull, and ran back to his village.

The last two sections clearly show two things. First, the monks in the Koinonia enjoyed protection from demonic activity that they believed troubled others. The most experienced monks in the community might on rare occasion bear the violent attacks of a demon, but these fathers were equipped to endure these attacks, and so they merely

---

[57] *Ep Am* 24.

[58] *Ep Am* 24 εἰς τὸν ἴδιον αὐτοῦ οἶκον. I take this as a reference to his home in the secular world. He would later run off to his ἴδιον κώμην.

demonstrated the superiority of the fathers to their demonic enemies. Weaker monks are spared. Moreover, the demons are not able to cause real diseases, or to employ dangerous animals to kill the monks. Second, all of these protections depended on membership in the community. Monks who abandoned it also lost the protection it provided. While the examples provided above demonstrate these two points, it remains to be shown how membership in the community gave protection to the monks and what impact communal life had upon this protection.

IV. τεῖχός ἐστε

1. Holy Men as Protectors

Having shown that membership in the Koinonia provided a measure of protection from the worst of demonic activity, I now address the origin and nature of this protection. It was shown in the previous chapter that holy men were able to provide hope for those fearful of demonic activity. They proved their superiority to demons by bearing their violent assaults. They could not only exorcize demons from the possessed, offer protection from dangerous animals, and heal diseases; they could also intercede to save individuals from violent attacks by demons. Moreover, the proximity of a holy man could provide an enduring protection to those near him. Thus, in the *Historia Monachorum*, when a disciple of Abba Helle ran from his cave during the night to the holy man and said the demons had tried to strangle him,[59] Helle was able to provide an

---

[59] *Ep Am* 24 οἱ δαίμονες πνίγειν αὐτὸν ἐπεχείρουν

enduring protection to the monk by drawing a line around the place. The demons could not cross the line because of the authority of the holy man.

The Pachomians also believed that holy men were able to provide both immediate and enduring protection to their disciples. At the Synod of Latopolis, Pachomius reminded his interlocutors how he had once saved a man named Moses from the hands of demons who were carrying him underground with the intent of killing him.[60] Moreover, even before the founding of the Koinonia, Pachomius was able to provide enduring protection to the monks settled near him.

After Pachomius left the company of Palamon, he began to be attacked physically by demons. Like the monks depicted in the previous chapter, he struggled but was able to withstand these assaults without losing his resolve. His defeat of these violent demons seems to have shielded those around him from facing similar attacks that they might not have been able to withstand. This same principle applied in the Koinonia: on rare occasion the leaders faced violent attacks, which displayed their superiority to demons, but the monks dependent upon them were shielded.

During the time of those first attacks prior to the foundation of the Koinonia, Pachomius was visited by Hieracapollon, one of the monks who seem to have depended upon his protection. This monk urged him to be strong and endure the beatings he received from the demons, because if he should fall, it would result in the devil gaining

---

[60] G₁ 112 Καὶ ὅτε Μωσῆς ὁ τοῦ λεγομένου Μαγδώλου ἐδαιμονίσθη καὶ ἁρπαζόμενος ὑπὸ δαιμόνων εἰς τὰ κατάγαια ἐκινδύνευε θανατωθῆναι, οὐκ ἔγνωτε πῶς δι᾽ ἐμοῦ ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ἐβοήθησεν αὐτῷ. See Bousset, 231-236.

power over him and the other monks settled near Pachomius.[61] He connected the

dependency of these monks upon Pachomius to his role as a lookout or a guard (σκοπός)

for them. In the Athenian text of G₁, he states that these monks,

ἔχοντάς σε σκοπὸν εἰς ἀρετὴν, would be in jeopardy if Pachomius fell. Others have

translated σκοπός as "model,"[62] and with εἰς ἀρετὴν this translation might seem to make

sense. After all, if other monks are imitating Pachomius as a model of righteousness,

then his fall could certainly have negative effects upon them. Yet, surely we should not

imagine that they were so dependent upon the example of a man living near them but not

with them that the loss of his example would cause them to fall under the devil's power.

The Florentine text has a different reading. According to this text, the monks σε ἔχοντας

σκοπὸν would be in jeopardy. Without εἰς ἀρετὴν the translation of σκοπός as "model"

seems much less certain.

The term is not found elsewhere in G₁, but its use in Greek texts with which we know

the writers of G₁ were familiar strongly suggests a meaning of "lookout" or "guard." In

the Septuagint, it occurs both as a noun and as a verb (σκοπέω) and consistently conveys

these meanings.[63] Σκοπέω occurs in several places in the New Testament and again

conveys the ideas of observation, consideration, and occasionally being on guard.[64] Its

---

[61] G₁ 20.

[62] See Veilleux, *Pachomian Koinonia* I, p 310.

[63] For instance, see Ex 33: 8, 1 Sam 14: 16, 2 Sam 13: 34, 2 Kings 9: 20.

[64] Lk 11: 35, Rom 16: 17, 2 Cor 4: 18, Gal 6: 1, 2: 4, Phil 3: 17. The two references from Galatians suggest being on guard.

one use as a noun in the New Testament (Philippians 3: 14) might seem to be an

exception. There it seems to mean "goal" or "target," but it is connected to an athletic

metaphor in which Paul states he is racing toward the goal (σκοπός) for his reward

(βραβεῖον). He is certainly not referring to a person he has adopted as a model for his

spiritual development, but to the completion of his metaphorical race through life. The

idea of being an observer or a guard that is suggested by its use in the Septuagint and as a

verb in the New Testament, on the other hand, easily applies to a person, just as when it

takes a prefix to form ἐπίσκοπος.

The meaning "lookout" or "guard" is also suggested by the use of σκοπός in the *Life

of Antony*, a work the writers of G₁ knew well.   The term occurs in this work both in its

noun and verb forms.[65]   In each case it conveys the idea of observation or being on guard.

Its single use as a noun in the text refers to a sentinel of King David who watched from

the roof for approaching messengers.[66]

I conclude therefore that σκοπός in G₁ 20 was a reference to the role of overseer or

guard played by Pachomius for these monks. He watched over these monks and he

protected them in some way from the demons. After all, the text does not state that

Hieracapollon or the other monks were being beaten by demons, despite the fact that the

demons had not yet gained control of them. The demons appear to have needed to defeat

Pachomius before they could touch the weaker targets dependent upon him, just as the

---

[65] σκοπέω: *Vita Ant* 45, 49. σκοπός: *Vita Ant* 32.

[66] *Vita Ant* 32. 2 Samuel 18: 24.

demons could not cross Helle's line to strangle his disciple without being able to overcome the holy man. Therefore, Pachomius' victorious endurance of these demonic attacks gave protection to these monks, but only a protection that could be lost if this one holy man fell.

2. The Koinonia As Protector

A passage of the *Paralipomena* clearly displays the belief among Pachomians that holy men could bear demonic attacks in protection of weaker monks in their company, and demonstrates the contribution made by the communal nature of life in the Koinonia to this method of fighting demons. According to this account, Pachomius and Theodore were walking through one of their monasteries in the evening when they saw a great apparition (φαντασία).[67] A beautiful woman escorted by a gang of demons was approaching them. The two men prayed for these to be driven away from them, but the demon and her escorts were able to approach them nonetheless due to divine permission. The woman identified herself as the daughter of the devil and all his power (ἡ θυγάτηρ τοῦ διαβόλου ἡ πᾶσα δύναμις αὐτοῦ). She revealed the protective role played by the presence of holy men when she said she was greatly offended by Pachomius, because he had brought together so great a gang (ὄχλος) against her that her attendants were not able to come near to any of the monks freely (μετὰ παρρησίας). She further revealed that monks able to provide this protection could, like Pachomius above, face demonic attack when she continued that she had come to attack Pachomius, Theodore, and the other great

---

[67] *Para* 24-26.

monks. These were strong enough to withstand her. She was not able to attack weaker monks, whom she might succeed in overcoming and leading astray, because these were protected by the presence of the fathers,[68] who helped them by means of their prayers and acted as a wall for them.[69]

Hieracapollon feared the day when Pachomius might fall and not be able to protect him and the others. The devil's daughter had to hope for the day when not only Pachomius, but also the other experienced monks in the Koinonia would die and no longer be there to protect the others. Yet Pachomius knew that after the present generation passed, another would replace it, and he asked how she knew the next generation might not be even stronger. She could not know this, he asserted, because demons did not know the future. He expelled the demon, forbade her to return to the monastery, and sent word to the fathers in the other monasteries about what had occurred.

While the disciples of an anchorite might be protected from the worst of demonic activity by a circle in the sand, the Pachomian monks were surrounded by walls. The fact that the protection offered by a single holy man was dependent upon his life and endurance was a weakness that was eliminated by the communal nature of life in the Koinonia. Pachomius was not the only holy man protecting the weaker brothers in the Koinonia. In addition to obvious examples such as Theodore, Petronius, and Horsiesius, Bishop Ammon encountered several less well known monks at Pbow with reputations for

---

[68] *Para* 25 εἰ γὰρ συνεχωρούμην πρὸς πάντας πολεμῆσαι, πολλοὺς ἂν καὶ τῶν ἐπερειδομένων τῇ σῇ σκέπῃ ἐξηπάτησα

[69] *Para* 25 οἷς νῦν διὰ τῶν εὐχῶν βοηθεῖτε καὶ τεῖχός ἐστε

their power against the demons.[70] The death or fall of an individual monk would not

deprive the weaker monks of protection because the Koinonia was both a gathering spot

for experienced monks with power against demons and a school for the creation of such

monks. Barring a complete breakdown of the system, something about which Pachomius

frequently expressed conern, the weaker monks did not need to fear being overpowered

by demonic adversaries.

V.   Conclusion

The Pachomian monks held the same fears about violent demons as their

contemporaries in fourth century Egypt. They also held the same hope as that held by

many of their contemporaries in the power of Christian holy men against the demons.

The Pachomians believed the demons would flee from a man who was blazing with the

indwelling of the Holy Spirit and in the Koinonia it was not a matter of a single holy

man, but of many. Power against demons was not confined to leaders like Pachomius,

Theodore, and Horsiesius, but extended to many other experienced monks. It was also

not a matter of a single generation of fathers, but of succeeding generations. Pachomius

had constructed a school of piety, designed to create future generations of monastic

fathers who would maintain the protection against demons provided by the fathers of his

generation. The fathers formed a wall surrounding and shielding the weaker monks until

they were ready to take their spots in that wall. The Koinonia therefore was protected

---

[70] In *Ep Am* 3, Theodore calls Patelloli an object of fear to the demons
and in *Ep Am* 15, Ammon learned of the power against demons possessed by
an old monk named Pekyssius.

space for monks plagued with fears of demonic attack beyond their ability to withstand, but, as will be seen in the following chapter, it did not shield them from all aspects of demonic activity. I have made the point that we cannot dismiss the fact that demons were feared as sources of physical violence, but we also cannot go to the opposite extreme and overlook the fact that Christians feared demonic attacks upon their thoughts. Although they would not face the devil's daughter, the monks would face some attacks of this sort by demons. Their communal life will again play an important role in the fight against these less tangible assaults.

Chapter Four

Thoughts

O homo, qui haec loqueris,[1] intellege quod furore supereris et odium occupaverit cor tuum, ut magis tuo vitio quam suo peccato frater pereat.

-Horsiesius, *Testament* 9

ⲥⲱⲧⲉⲙ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲉⲡⲟⲩⲃⲱⲗ ⲉⲩⲥⲟⲡ ⲫⲏ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲧⲉⲣⲡⲣⲟⲕⲟⲡⲧⲓⲛ ϧⲉⲛⲧⲕⲟⲓⲛⲱⲛⲓⲁ ϧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲧⲟⲩⲃⲟ ⲛⲉⲙⲟⲩⲙⲉⲧⲣⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲉⲙ ⲛⲉⲙⲟⲩⲑⲉⲃⲓⲟ ⲛⲉⲙⲟⲩϭⲛⲉϫⲱϥ ⲟⲩⲟϩ ⲉϥϯϩⲁⲓ ⲛϭⲣⲟⲡ ⲁⲛ ⲓⲉ ⲥⲕⲁⲛⲇⲁⲗⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ϩⲁⲓ ⲛ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲓ ϧⲉⲛⲡⲉϥⲥⲁϫⲓ ⲓⲉ ⲧⲉϥϫⲓⲛⲉⲣϩⲱⲃ ⲫⲁⲓ ⲟⲩⲛ ϥⲛⲁⲉⲣⲣⲁⲙⲁⲟ ϧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲙⲉⲧⲣⲁⲙⲁⲟ ⲛⲁⲧⲧⲁⲕⲟ ⲟⲩⲟϩ ⲉⲑⲙⲏⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϣⲁⲉⲛⲉϩ ⲉϣⲱⲡ ⲇⲉ ϩⲱϥ ⲁϥϣⲁⲛⲉⲣⲁⲙⲉⲗⲉⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲟⲩⲯⲩⲭⲏ ϭⲓϭⲣⲟⲡ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲟⲧϥ ⲟⲩⲟϩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲥⲙⲟⲩ ⲟⲩⲟⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲣⲱⲙⲓ ⲉⲧⲉⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲛⲟⲛϫⲉ ⲁϥⲧⲁⲕⲟ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉϥⲯⲩⲭⲏ ⲙ̄ⲙⲓⲛ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ ⲛⲉⲙⲛⲉϥϧⲓⲥⲓ ⲉⲧⲁϥϣⲟⲡⲟⲩ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ϥⲛⲁϯⲗⲟⲅⲟⲥ ⲟⲛ ⲙ̄ⲫ̄ϯ̄ ϧⲁⲧϯⲯⲩⲭⲏ ⲉⲧⲁⲥϭⲓϭⲣⲟⲡ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲟⲧϥ

--Bo 105 (CSCO 89 p 137)

I.   Introduction

It was shown in the last chapter that monks within the Koinonia inhabited an oasis of protection from physical demonic attack. The fathers of the monasteries, the experienced monks whose power over the demons was occasionaly demonstrated by their ability to withstand such attacks, surrounded less advanced monks like a wall. The demons were unable to harm the monks inside through direct violence, animal attacks, or disease. Yet, despite this, the demons were very active inside the Pachomian monasteries. They lived alongside the monks, accompanied them out to work, sat next to them at their meals, and

---

[1] Horsiesius is referring to housemasters who were not concerned for the salvation of the monks entrusted to them.

even shared their cells. Some demons were even assigned to individual monks;

Pachomius and Theodore separately recounted that they overheard demons discussing

their respective charges.[2]

The demons posed a threat not to the monks' bodies, but to their thoughts. Christians

had long feared the ability of demons to harm them not only physically, but also

spiritually by leading them to dwell upon evil thoughts and commit sinful actions.[3] In the

Instruction Concerning a Spiteful Monk, Pachomius warned his monks that the devil

would "whisper" wicked suggestions to them. Should the monk open his ears to these

suggestions, the devil would pour his poison into their hearts.[4] Theodore associated the

---

[2] For Pachomius, see G₁ 73, Bo 67 (CSCO 89 p 68-69). For Theodore, see *EpAm* 21. A demon could be assigned to a monk by God for the monk's spiritual benefit. In Bo 111 (CSCO 89 p 153-154) and Av 87v (Am 562, 1. 2), Pachomius ceased his attempt to exorcise a demon from a monk when he was informed by an angel that the demon had been given to him by God for his salvation.

[3] For instance, Justin Martyr (*2 Apol* 5) wrote that the demons sowed all acts of wickedness among men. For a few examples among a milieu chronologically and geographically closer to Pachomius, see *Vita Ant.* 23 and Evagrius, *Prakt.* 4-6, 54. For an interesting discussion of these initial thoughts prior to their becoming passions and their antecedents in Stoicism and other Christian writers including Didymus the Blind (*Comm. Eccles.* 294. 8-20), see Brakke, *Demons,* 52-70. As Brakke writes (54), at times the Evagrius's demons seem to be synonymous with the evil thoughts or with passions, but, as pointed out by Guillaumont (202), it would be a mistake to imagine that Evagrius or his readers did not understand a distinction between the demons themselves and their tools and effects upon the minds of their victims.

[4] *Instr. 1* 28 (CSCO 159 p 11). ⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉⲡⲉⲕⲭⲁϫⲉ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲥⲕ̄ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ, ⲉⲧⲉⲡⲁⲓ̈ⲡⲉ ⲡⲇⲓ̈ⲁⲃⲟⲗⲟⲥ. Cf. G₁ 73, Bo 67 (CSCO 89 p 68-69) in which Pachomius speaks about demons suggesting evil thoughts (λογισμός, ⲙⲉⲅⲓ̈) to the minds of his monks.

arrows of the devil in Ephesians 6: 16 with the insertion of demonic thoughts into the hearts of his listeners.[5]

While the Pachomian monk might not be able to avoid the devil's whispering or arrows, he did have the ability to decide whether to dwell upon these evil thoughts or to dismiss them from his mind. The devil's daughter explained to Pachomius and Theodore that she and the other demons sowed these thoughts into the souls of the monks[6] and, if they received the thoughts, they allowed themselves to be invaded by the demons, which would then set them aflame with pleasurable sensations.[7] If they rejected the thoughts, on the other hand, the demons would vanish like smoke in the air.[8] Pachomius, therefore, implored his monks to examine their thoughts,[9] not only to purify them but also to be able to hear Jesus, who also was speaking to them through their thoughts.[10] Theodore

---

[5] Theodore *Instr.* 3. 30 (CSCO 159 p 53) ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲟⲩⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲣⲉϥⲕⲧⲟ ⲉⲡⲁϩⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲙ̄ⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲉⲭⲥⲟⲧⲉ ⲉϥϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲡⲉⲛϩⲏⲧ Theodore had earlier made reference to the arrows of Eph 6: 16 without connecting them specifically to thoughts in 3. 4 (p 41). Cf. *EpAm* 21 in which Theodore also described demons planting thoughts (ἐνθυμήσεις) into the minds of monks.

[6] *Para.* 24-26 σπείρομεν τὴν ἰδίαν κακίαν ἐπὶ τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ ἀνταγωνιστοῦ

[7] *Para.* 26 καὶ μάλιστα εἴπερ ἴδωμεν ὅτι ὑποδέχεται ἢ ὅλως συγχωρεῖ ἡμῖν ἐπιβῆναι αὐτῷ, πλέον ἐκκαίομεν αὐτῷ τὰς ἡδονάς.

[8] *Para.*26 εἰ δὲ μὴ θελήσει ὑποδέξασθαι ἡμῶν τὸν σπόρον μηδὲ τὰ παρ' ἡμῶν προβαλλόμενα ἡδέως κατα δέξεται τῇ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν πίστει αὐτοῦ, ὡς καπνὸς εἰς ἀέρα διαλυόμενος οὕτως ἐσόμεθα πρὸ τῶν φλιῶν τοῦ νοὸς αὐτοῦ (26).

[9] *Instr.* 1. 55. (CSCO 159 p 22) ⲛ̄ⲅⲕⲣⲓ̈ⲛⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲕⲗⲟⲅⲓⲥⲙⲟⲥ

[10] *Instr.*, 1. 58. (CSCO 159 p 23) ⲡⲉⲡⲛⲉⲩⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲓ̄ⲏⲥⲟⲩⲥ ⲛⲁϣⲁϫⲉ ⲛ̄ⲙⲙⲁⲕ ϩⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲕⲗⲟⲅⲓⲥⲙⲟⲥ

likewise taught his monks that ridding themselves of worldly thoughts was an important component of the weakening of demons.[11]

Of course, the fact that demons caused some evil thoughts did not mean that they caused all of them.[12] Nevertheless, the danger posed by these thoughts to the soul was the same and served the purposes of the demons regardless of the source. In the account of the expulsion of Mousaios from Pbow, the monk was quick to blame his evil thoughts on demons, but Theodore insisted that the demons had not yet been permitted to attack him. He was responsible for his thoughts and was preparing himself for the demonic incursion that followed.[13]

The kinds of thoughts, against which a monk needed to be on guard, may lack an authoritative listing, but they are not difficult to imagine. The *Instruction Concerning a Spiteful Monk* includes a list of fifteen evil spirits (ⲡⲛⲉⲩⲙⲁ), partially based upon Galatians 5, that threatened to separate humanity from God.[14] It states that the spirits of cowardice (ⲙⲛ̄ⲧϭⲁⲃϩⲏⲧ) and faithlessness (ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲛⲁϩⲧⲉ) go together (ⲙⲟⲟϣⲉ

---

[11] *Instr.* 3. 26 (CSCO 159 p 52).

[12] Cf. *Apo. Patrum:* Antony, 22. Antony spoke of movements within the body that were natural, were caused by eating and drinking, or were caused by the demons.

[13] *EpAm* 24 οὐδέπω ἦν δαίμων συγχωρηθεὶς ἐπιθέσθαι σοι

[14] *Instr.* 1. 10 (CSCO 159 p 2-3). In G₁ 96, Pachomius warned of sexual temptation, love of power, laziness, hatred, and greed. Theodore, in Bo 186 (CSCO 89 p 168-173), described the successful monastic life as one in which the monk walks a narrow path between sexual desire on one side and pride on the other. See Frankfurter (*Evil*, 13-30) for a discussion of the use of lists to define and control the demonic.

ⲙⲚⲚⲈⲨⲈⲢⲎⲨ). The spirits of lying (ϭⲟⲗ) and deceit (ⲙⲚⲧⲥⲁⲛⲕⲟⲧⲥ̄) go together. The

spirits of the love of money (ⲙⲁⲓ̈ϩⲟⲙⲚⲧ), profit (ⲙⲚⲧⲉϣⲱⲧ), swearing falsely

(ⲙⲚⲧⲣⲉϥⲱⲣⲕ̄ Ⲛⲛⲟⲩⲭ), wickedness (ⲡⲟⲛⲎⲣⲓ̈ⲁ), and envy (ⲙⲚⲧⲉⲓ̈ⲣ̄ⲃⲟⲟⲛⲉ) go together.

The spirits of vainglory (ⲕⲉⲛⲟⲇⲟⲝⲓ̈ⲁ) and gluttony (ⲙⲚⲧⲗⲁⲃⲙⲁϩⲧ̄) go together. The

spirits of fornication (ⲡⲟⲣⲛⲓ̈ⲁ)[15] and impurity (ⲁⲕⲁⲑⲁⲣⲥⲓ̈ⲁ) do likewise.[16] Finally, the

spirits of enmity (ⲙⲚⲧⲭⲁϫⲉ)[17] and sadness (ⲗⲩⲡⲎ) go together.

The types of thoughts listed above, even when not found in Galatians 5, generally

bear an inverse relationship to the fruits of the Spirit also listed in that chapter of the New

Testament. Galatians 5: 22-23 states that the fruits of the Spirit were love, joy, peace,

patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control, but the

Pachomian understanding of the fruits seems to have also extended to the Beatitudes and

to Christian virtues in general.[18] This list's contrary nature to the list in the paragraph

above is self-evident and of course the Pachomians were not the only Egyptian monks to

notice this. Thus, Pachomius taught his monks that the demons made war on the fruits of

the Spirit. If they were able to deprive a monk of one of them, they gained a right of

entry like that possessed by a man who had rented a room in a house. They could then

---

[15] Cf. Gal. 5: 19.

[16] Cf. Gal. 5: 19.

[17] Cf. Gal. 5: 20.

[18] Veilleux, *La liturgie*, 345-347.

proceed to deprive the monk of all the other fruits.[19] One's spiritual progress then could

be measured by the security in which one possessed all the fruits of the Spirit. Similarly,

Theodore taught his monks that they experienced salvation in proportion to their pursuit

of the fruits of the Spirit.[20]

Pachomian strategies to resist the incursion of demonic thoughts were not entirely

unique. The Pachomians shared some important strategies with monks living in less

communal environments and even solitary anchorites. Perhaps for this reason, some have

emphasized similarities between the Pachomians and anchorites such as Antony.[21] Most

important of these shared strategies was ⲙⲉⲗⲉⲧⲁ, the continuous contemplative repetition

of Scripture. Monks practiced ⲙⲉⲗⲉⲧⲁ throughout their day, and their intimate

familiarity with Scripture is revealed by the frequent full and partial quotations and

allusions throughout the Pachomian corpus.[22] Brakke emphasizes that the Pachomians

also practiced asceticism with hopes of spiritual benefits, and he is certainly correct to the

---

[19] G₁ 75, Bo 67 (CSCO 89 p 68-69). In Bo 73 (CSCO 89 p 74-78), Pachomius has a vision in which the fruits of the Spirit appear as jewels in the crown of the Lord.

[20] Theodore, *Instr.* 3. 26 (CSCO 159 p 52).

[21] Brakke begins his chapter by arguing that the differences between cenobite and anchorite "styles of monasticism should not be exaggerated." Throughout his chapter, he emphasizes a strict ascetic regime and a system of counseling with fathers who possess the gift of discernment, features that also applied to anchorite monks (78ff).

[22] This role of ⲙⲉⲗⲉⲧⲁ or *meditatio* in the Koinonia is discussed by Veilleux, *La liturgie*, 266ff. Also see Brakke, *Demons*, 92-93. Douglas Burton-Christie, *The Word in the Desert: Scripture and the Quest for Holiness in Early Christian Monasticism* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993) remains an essential work on this topic, but it does not address the Pachomians in particular.

extent that fasting and vigils were a part of the daily life of the monks and were thought to aid their spiritual development.[23]

Although there were similarities, the experience of cenobites and anchorites was quite different. Only the former had walls, both a literal one and a metaphorical one of fathers and brothers. The differences extended beyond the obvious sociological ones and to those of the inner spiritual experience of monks in these respective environments. As I will show below, the environment played a tremendous role in a monk's spiritual development. My intention, therefore, is not to emphasize the similarities between Pachomian strategies and those used by less communal monks, but to show what living in a community added to a monk's struggle against demonic assaults on his mind. Brakke argues that the communal nature of life in the Pachomian monasteries played a role in the monks' battle against evil thoughts, but he essentially limits this role to "exhortations to vigilance," and to "confessing their thoughts and giving counsel."[24] He is correct that these two practices were very important, but much more needs to be added.

My intention is also not to revisit at length aspects of life in the Koinonia that have been thoroughly explored by Rousseau primarily in his book *Pachomius: The Making of a Community in Fourth-Century Egypt*. He describes the role played by the leading and more experienced monks in assisting others by means of counseling and, when necessary, punishment for the development of self-knowledge and spiritual improvement, the

---

[23] Brakke, *Demons,* 86ff.

[24] Brakke, *Demons*, 81. Brakke discusses the importance of the gift of discernment for the leaders of the movement and other experienced monks in providing counseling to the monks in their care on 81ff.

responsibility felt by all monks (ideally) for their brothers' salvation, and the daily

routines of their rule-based life. He captures the central components of Pachomius'

design (developed over time) for a "school of self-knowledge and self-improvement,"[25]

but I am more concerned with some aspects of which Pachomius certainly was aware but

did not need to plan, and that are not emphasized by Rousseau.

I will explore two themes below. Both will illustrate ways that the communal life of

the Koinonia, in addition to providing monks protection from violent attacks, provided

protection for monks against demonic attacks upon their thoughts. First, I will consider

the theme of combating evil thoughts by means of fostering the growth of the fruits of the

Spirit. In particular, I will address the role of experiencing the examples set by monks

practicing these virtues. This involved not only monks being competitively inspired to

keep up with the spiritual progress they witnessed in others,[26] but also monks escaping

the grip of evil thoughts as a result of the practice of the opposing virtue by another. That

is to say, virtues drove out not only their opposing vices in the mind of one monk, but

also drove those vices from the minds of his brothers. I also address the fact that close

daily contact meant that monks thought worthy of imitation were inevitably models not

only of achievement, but also of struggle and sometimes failure. This allowed the monks

of the Koinonia to identify with those they may have considered models, and this made

the example set by those models more meaningful to them. It also increased the capacity

---

[25] Rousseau, *Pachomius*, 95.

[26] This has already been noted by Rousseau (*Pachomius*, 132).

of those models to counsel other monks, because these other monks knew by experience that their role models could identify with the struggles in which they needed help.

Second, I will consider the ways hidden thoughts could be revealed and thus addressed by monks living in a community. Ideally, monks freely confessed their thoughts to their elders. If they did not, their elders might learn these thoughts by means of their skills of discernment. Yet, life in a community offered another means of revealing hidden thoughts. The monks were surrounded by witnesses to their behavior, who could report their misdeeds. Of course, a monk might simply hold back from carrying out his desires, while the thought lingered in his mind and poisoned his spiritual development. These hidden thoughts could nonetheless be revealed as a result of communal life. The *Rules* reveal the attention the Pachomians paid to the observation, not only of sin, but also of actions that might seem innocent, but provided clues to the observer that the monk might have been secretly struggling with an evil thought. What these two themes have in common is the role played by communal life. Just as the monks were protected from demonic violence because of the presence of other monks, they were also protected from demonic attacks on their thoughts by the presence of others.

Unlike an anchorite then, whose battle with thoughts was primarily psychological, the Pachomian monk's struggle became a social event. This struggle was not hidden, since the close observation often revealed a monk's inner battles. It was also not fought alone. Not only was the monk surrounded by monks who were able to give him advice, but his thoughts were also influenced by the examples set by others.

II.   Defending the Mind

1.   Fostering the Fruits

Since there was an inverse relationship between the fruits of the Spirit and the evil thoughts, one method available to the Pachomians to combat the latter was to foster the development and retention of the former. The demons could not penetrate the metaphorical bronze door created by the possession of a pure heart.[27] The principle was not novel; other Egyptian ascetics believed in fighting evil thoughts by means of their opposing virtues (and sometimes vices).[28] My concern is, given the inverse relationship between virtues and vices, what role did communal life play in fostering the former. Theodore encouraged his monks to stir each other up to bring forth all their fruits as things pleasing to God.[29] These efforts to stir up one's brothers certainly included exhortations, but it also included another tactic that may have been more effective: teaching by example. Thus, he also instructed his monks to imitate (kwx) the example set by Pachomius and the other monks who preceded them into the community.[30]

---

[27] G₁ 18.

[28] For instance, see Evagrius, *Prakt.* 58. Evagrius advises his readers not only to oppose vices with virtues, but also to use the evil thoughts against each other. For example, he believed the thoughts of vainglory and impurity were contradictory and thus could be applied against each other. John Cassian (*Conf.* 7. 19) taught the same thing, but the Pachomians do not appear to have favored this strategy.

[29] Theodore, *Instr.* 3, 30, 41 (CSCO 159 p 53-54, 58).

[30] Theodore, *Instr.* 3. 35, 47 (CSCO 159 p 56, 60). ⲘⲀⲢⲚ̄ⲔⲱϨ ⲉⲡⲂⲓⲟⲥ Ⲛ̄ⲀⲡⲀ ⲠⲀϨⲟⲘⲱ

Abba Isaac may have said that, not being a cenobite, he did not give orders, but rather set an example for his disciples to follow.[31] Yet, teaching by example rather than simply by orders and the enforcement of rules was also characteristic of life in the Koinonia.[32] Pachomius believed that the life of his monks was superior to that of anchorites because, although it carried the risk of harming a brother by one's bad behavior, it offered the opportunity to incite a brother to improvement by one's good example.[33] Thus, the monks made progress by observing and imitating the fruits of the Spirit in their brothers.[34] The difference between a monk in the company of Abba Isaac and one in the Koinonia is that the latter was surrounded by a wall of humanity made up of many positive role models, not only the leaders of the movement, but also many other great "athletes of Christ."[35] Pachomius imitated his teacher, Palamon.[36] Once he entered the Koinonia, Theodore imitated Pachomius and the other experienced fathers he found there, and when he became recognized as an experienced monk, he was imitated by the

---

[31] *Apo. Patrum,* Isaac of the Cells, 2.

[32] Ruppert (166ff) writes that Pachomius patiently allowed a monk to be led by his conscience and by God, rather than demanding strict obedience.

[33] Bo 105 (CSCO 89 p 135-138).

[34] G₁ 105 Καθ' ὅσον δὲ ἀλλήλων ἐζήλουν τὰ κατορθώματα, τοσοῦτον καὶ προέκοπτον, μάλιστα ὁρῶντες ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν δυνατὸν ὄντα τῷ πνεύματι τὸν μέγαν πατέρα, ἐν ᾧ ὁ Χριστός.

[35] For a few examples of monks who merited being listed by name in the hagiography, see G₁ 79, 123.

[36] Bo 17 (CSCO 89 p 18-19). ⲡⲓⲁⲗⲟⲩ ⲇⲉ ⲡⲁϧⲱⲙ ⲛⲁϥⲉⲣⲁⲅⲱⲛⲓⲍⲉⲥⲑⲉ ⲉⲭⲟϩ (the Bohairic form for ⲕⲱϩ) ⲉⲣⲟϥ ϧⲉⲛϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲃⲉⲛ ⲉⲧⲧⲟⲓ ϩⲓⲱⲧϥ

brothers as well.[37] By this imitation, monks learned to acquire the fruits of the Spirit,
which would defend them against the incursion of demonic thoughts.

A. Humility

Examples were not merely witnessed; they were experienced. Monks did not just
practice the fruits of the Spirit in front of each other; they practiced them upon each
other. These personal encounters with virtue in another monk could have an enormous
impact upon a monk's spiritual development because the possession of a virtue by one
monk could help to drive out the opposing vice in another. This is particularly evident in
the case of the struggle between humility and vainglory.

1. Vainglory

The evil thought of vainglory was especially feared by the Pachomians, and naturally
it bore an inverse relationship to humility. Living in a community brought this struggle
to the fore because the admiration some monks received from others for their piety or
ascetic achievement, the indignity others felt as a result of being corrected or insulted,
and the positions of authority still others possessed could produce feelings of vainglory.
Humility not only fought against this vice in the mind of the individual, but it also
exerted a powerful influence on other monks.

Pachomius encouraged his monks to pursue a moderate asceticism in part because he
feared that they might practice a more extreme lifestyle to gain the admiration of their

---

[37] G₁ 36; Bo 30, 32 (CSCO 89 p 32-33, 35-36). [ⲁ]ϥϫⲟϩ ⲉⲛⲟⲩϩⲃⲏⲩⲓ ⲉⲑⲛⲁⲛⲉⲩ
ⲛⲉⲙⲛⲟⲩⲁⲣⲉⲧⲏ

brothers. Even if a monk was not initially motivated by vainglory, the admiration he received from others could spark this evil thought. Pachomius once praised a monk named Silvanus for his humility, but he added that most monks would be tempted to vainglory as a result of being praised. Silvanus was an exception, because praise only caused him to humble himself even more.[38]

The hagiographies preserve several accounts of monks who pursued ascetic excess for the sake of vainglory. Pachomius once advised a certain monk to moderate his fasting and prayers because he sensed the monk was motivated by this sin. The monk disobeyed his father and, having become possessed by a demon, attacked Theodore with a club for daring to interrupt his excessive prayers.[39] In one other example, this taken from the *Paralipomena*, a monk was very proud of the fact that he had made two mats instead of the usual one per day and left them outside his cell, hoping that Pachomius and the others would admire and praise his efforts. Instead, Pachomius condemned him for his vainglory and forced him to stand and confess his sins while holdng the mats in the synaxis and in the refectory.[40]

Life in a community not only led to praise from one's neighbors; it also led to correction and even insults that could also stir vainglory in the hearts of monks who felt they deserved better treatment. Thus, a monk once came to Theodore and asked why he

---

[38] G$_1$ 105, *Para* 4.

[39] G$_1$ 69, Bo 64 (CSCO 89 p 64-66).

[40] *Para* 34.

(the monk) became angry whenever someone said something hard to him.[41] Pachomius

warned that one should be indifferent to both curses and praise.[42] Going beyond this

advice to be merely indifferent, he also taught that instead of becoming angry when

cursed or insulted, the monk should be thankful to God because he shared in the suffering

experienced by Christ and the saints.[43] When Christ was insulted, he did not respond in

kind, and neither should they.[44] Theodore would echo these sentiments. In one surviving

instruction, he taught that corrected monks must not respond with anger, but with love for

the one who pointed out their failings.[45] The monk should realize that God trains those

whom he loves and this training could take the form of insults. Even their father

Pachomius had endured these trials.[46] In fact, monks should view these insults as gold

coins, and one does not hate a man for giving him gold coins.[47]

   More than metaphorical coins was at stake. Fears of what may await in the afterlife

were exploited in hopes of promoting humility among the monks. Pachomius had a

vision of Heaven in which he saw the fates of two monks. When the first was alive, he

not only did not become angry at insults, but he also did not become upset even when

---

[41] G$_1$ 140, Bo 187 (CSCO 89 p 173-174).

[42] Pachomius, *Instr.* 1. 22 (CSCO 159 p 8).

[43] *Instr.* 1. 24, 28 (CSCO 159 p 8-9, 11).

[44] G$_1$ 57.

[45] Theodore, *Instr.* 3. 22 (CSCO 159 p 50).

[46] Theodore, *Instr.* 3. 1-3 (CSCO 159 p 40-41).

[47] G$_1$ 142, Bo 186 (CSCO 89 p 169-173). Theodore colorfully adds that one does not threaten to gouge out the eyes of someone for giving gold coins.

struck, mindful of the times he had offended God but had not been punished. When the second was alive, he hated anyone who offended him. Pachomius witnessed the luxury in which the first monk now lived in heaven, and he saw that the second monk did not enjoy luxury, but had to endure punishment. He was bound to a tree in a hot desert.[48] The lesson was clear: Do not become angry because of the words of another, for there will be a reward for one's humility and gentleness, and a punishment for one's hatred.

At the same time, Pachomius did not wish the leaders of his monasteries to provoke their monks to anger without necessity. He taught Theodore the Alexandrian that as a housemaster, he should show patience to a monk who became angry because of correction. The housemaster should leave him and wait for God to lead him to repentance.[49] Responding to anger with anger would only exacerbate the situation. This, of course, required humility on the part of the housemaster.

Possessing positions of leadership could also be a source of vainglory even for the most respected monks and thus demanded humility from those holding office, both for their own spiritual well-being, and for that of other leaders who would look to them for a good example. Pachomius' style of leadership was inextricably bound to the virtue of humility,[50] and this attachment was shared by both Theodore and Horsiesius. Pachomius

---

[48] The ingredients of this story are found in Bo 115 (CSCO 89 p 154-155), S$_2$ (*Muséon* 1936, p 223), and S$_7$ (CSCO 99 p 86-87).

[49] G$_1$ 95, Bo 90 (CSCO 89 p 106-107).

[50] Rousseau (*Pachomius*, 108ff) writes that the *Lives'* depiction of Pachomius' humility cannot be dismissed as idealization, but reflects his true nature.

shared the same life as his monks, living in a house under a housemaster, possessing no

property, and refusing any special privileges or treatment. The writers of the lives sought

to depict his humility with anecdotes such as the one in which he allowed a young monk

to instruct him on what he felt was the right way to weave a mat.[51] Theodore's great sin

was to imagine himself the leader of the Koinonia after the expected death of Pachomius.

Following this failing, he practiced such a great humility that at times he was even

mistaken for a neophyte.[52] Even after finally becoming the leader of the Koinonia,

Theodore only claimed to be acting on behalf of Horsiesius, with whom he often

consulted.[53] Horsiesius also presented himself as a model of humility. While accepting

that it was the will of God for him to lead the Koinonia, he insisted that he did not

consider himself qualified for the task and thought that Theodore was the one most

worthy of the position because he imitated their common father Pachomius more

closely.[54]

2. *Experiencing Example*

A monk did not merely have to compel himself to see insults as gold coins or to make

certain he did not practice asceticism with a desire to impress others. Being surrounded

by the wall of brothers and fathers, he could see in them the virtues he sought to possess

---

[51] G_1 86, Bo 72 (CSCO 89 p 73-75).

[52] G_1 109, 121; Bo 96-97 (CSCO 89 p 120-122); S_5 132, 150 (CSCO 99 p 187, 196).

[53] G_1 125, S_5 129 (CSCO 99 p 185-186).

[54] S_5 125 (CSCO 99 p 181-182).

acted out in a living theater and he could experience their practice of virtues personally. The Pachomians understood that this could have a powerful impact upon a monk's spiritual development.

A monk once became upset because he felt Pachomius had spoken harshly to him. Theodore noticed that the brother was upset and told him that he also had experienced this sort of treatment from the old man. He suggested they test Pachomius once more. If he was good to them, they would stay, but if he was not, they would leave the monastery together. Having consulted with Pachomius about the situation first, Theodore brought the monk to him and began to reprimand the holy man for his conduct. Pachomius responded with a display of humility, gently asking for their forgiveness and asking that they, as sons, be patient with their father. Theodore began his correction again, but was stopped by the monk, who was no longer angry with Pachomius due to his gentle reply.[55] This illustrates the fact that the Pachomians understood that one monk could defuse the vainglorious anger in another by a display of humility, but another example will show that such a display could also foster the growth of humility in the mind of the vainglorious monk.

On another occasion, a monk from another monastery became angry when he was denied a position by his father. When asked for a reason, this father falsely claimed that Pachomius had said he was not yet worthy of it. The monk was enraged and stormed off to find Pachomius and challenge him on his claim. He found him in his monastery

---

[55] G_1 66, Bo 62 (CSCO 89 p 60-61).

building a wall, called him a liar, and demanded justification for his supposed statement

concerning him. He even proceeded to insult Pachomius' reputation for clairvoyance,

calling him as blind as a stone. The holy man had no idea what this monk was talking

about, but he did not become angry, nor did he even defend himself. He told the monk

that he had sinned against him and asked for his forgiveness. As a result, the monk was

no longer angry.

Pachomius discussed the matter with the monk's father. The man was distraught over

the action of the monk, but the holy man reassured him that he would still be saved. The

father should give the monk the office he wanted, because doing good to a bad man could

lead that man to a greater understanding of the good. This was the love of God, to show

compassion to each other.[56] Indeed, Pachomius' display of humility helped this monk

overcome not only his anger, but also his vainglory.   The monk, humble and deeply

apologetic, returned to Pachomius and said that if the holy man had not been patient, but

instead had spoken against him, he would have abandoned the monastic life and become

alienated from God.[57] Thus, Pachomius' humility not only defused the monk's anger, but

drove out his vainglory by fostering the virtue of humility.

The brothers who surrounded each individual monk in the Koinonia thus acted as a

wall against demonic attacks upon his thoughts. They did this not only by demonstrating

and encouraging the fruits of the Spirit in a general way, but also in a personal way as a

---

[56] G₁ 42 Συμβαίνει γὰρ καὶ κακὸν ἄνδρα εὐεργετούμενον εἰς αἴσθησίν τινα τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἐλθεῖν. Αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ συμπάσχειν ἀλλήλοις

[57] G₁ 42, Bo 42 (CSCO 89 p 44-46).

result of the daily interactions that accompanied communal life. Witnessing and experiencing the practice of virtues made it easier for the monk to practice these virtues himself and thereby block the intrusion of evil thoughts.

B. *Imperfectly Perfect Examples*

Although my conclusion to the previous section is accurate, the practice of learning by example in the Koinonia was also more complex. The consistent daily observation made possible by communal life ensured that not every encounter or observation of a fellow monk was edifying. The whole man became visible. One's brothers and fathers were not perfect. They struggled and were seen to do so. Fathers in less communal environments might have been candid about their spiritual struggles or may have even feigned them for the sake of humility,[58] but that is not quite the same as actually being seen to struggle. A monk who saw his father only on occasion might have consistently witnessed his best conduct. A small group of monks living with an exceptional father might have only rarely seen a slip in his behavior. Yet, a monk living with a number of elders, not all exceptional, would have seen men not only at their best moments, but also at their worst. The examples set by even the most respected monks in the Pachomian monasteries were not those of men who had attained apatheia or lacked personal failings. They were not paragons of virtue, who passed judgment upon the inner struggles of others, nor did they pretend to be. They could not conceal occasional failings that others

---

[58] In the *Apo. Patrum*, Macarius the Great (31) preferred to speak with those who wished to speak about his sordid past than with those who only saw him as a figure of holiness, and Arsenius (43) pretended to fall asleep during a vigil.

were able to observe and did not always conceal failings of which others were not aware. They were merely men, who had faced the same struggles faced by those who came to them for guidance and who continued to face struggles. For this reason, they were able to do something a monk above the passions could never do. They could serve as examples of struggle and perseverance.

The Pachomian hagiographies illustrate the fact that the same monk who usually served as a positive example of the possession of the fruits of the Spirit, could on some occasions be a cautionary example of conduct to be avoided. Theodore the Alexandrian once came to Pachomius and said that he had heard that Cornelius was able to keep his mind undistracted through the entire synaxis, but that he could barely stay focused through three prayers. He wanted Pachomius to tell him how he could be like Cornelius and not become distracted. Pachomius, who understood the role of this holy envy in the production of virtue in his communities, responded that it was normal in all walks of life for one to want to be like one at a higher station and he would do well to imitate Cornelius, but that he would also have to imitate the great effort Cornelius had made to acquire this gift.[59]

Elsewhere in the lives, Cornelius appears as a cautionary example. Pachomius, along with two younger monks, was once visiting some of the other monasteries. They came to a certain monastery where Cornelius served as steward. The two younger monks informed the steward that Pachomius had led them in vigil throughout the previous night,

---

[59] G_1 111, Bo 91 (CSCO 89 p 107-108).

but one monk had not been able to stay awake. Cornelius criticized him for not being

able to match the endurance of an old man like Pachomius, a critique unkind to the monk

and disrespectful to the father of the Koinonia. The next night, Pachomius invited

Cornelius to keep vigil. The younger monks, not driven by a spirit of competition,

retired, leaving the elders praying into the night. Cornelius stayed awake until morning

but was exhausted. He complained to Pachomius about his demanding vigil. The latter

reminded him of his criticism of the young monk, prompting the steward's repentance.[60]

Thus, the same monk presented as a positive example elsewhere in the lives, in this story

is presented as an example of misconduct. Cornelius may have made more spiritual

progress than most of the brothers, but he still knew what it was like to struggle, to err,

and even to be corrected by a superior. The monks who nonetheless considered him

worthy of imitation knew these things about Cornelius as well.

Even Pachomius and Theodore were depicted by the writers of the *vitae* in both their

good and bad moments. Those who read these works knew the young Pachomius who

disturbed the demons of the pagan temple. They also knew the one who ran home during

the night in flight from an amorous young woman who wished to have sex with him.

They knew him as a young man who prayed for God to help him to stay awake so he

could continue to rout the demons. They also knew him as a young man who could not

restrain the passion of anger when he was in the company of his brother John. They

knew Theodore as the true son of Pachomius. They also knew the man who imagined

---

[60] G$_1$ 60-61, Bo 59 (CSCO 89 p 58-59).

himself the leader of the Koinonia while Pachomius was seriously ill and who, even as father of the community, continued to fear falling from grace.[61]

Fathers, even Pachomius and Theodore, were also willing to reveal their failings that other monks might not have noticed. After Theodore had yielded to vainglorious thoughts that he would one day lead the Koinonia, Pachomius gathered him and some other monks together and instructed all of them to confess their faults. Pachomius not only participated by revealing a fault of his own, but he even went first. He confessed that he had failed to spend enough time visiting the brothers. Theodore, who at the time was expected to succeed Pachomius as leader of the Koinonia, then confessed his fault to the group.[62] These men were not filled with an in-born virtue that less gifted monks could not hope to possess, but a virtue for which they had to struggle and for which others could expect to struggle as well.[63] The resulting degree of identification a monk was able to feel with his elders made the latter both more meaningful models, and more potent counselors. The monk knew that his elders were not merely aware of their struggles; they understood them by personal experience. The power of this identification might be seen in the example below.

---

[61] G_1 140, Bo 187 (CSCO 89 p 173-174). Cf. Gal. 5: 4.

[62] G_1 106, Bo 94 (CSCO 89 p 109-115).

[63] G_1 25. Rousseau (*Pachomius*, 128-129) rightly notes the sense of freedom possessed by Pachomian monks as opposed to a sense of fatalism possessed by some others in Egypt at the time. As G_1 25 indicated, the monks were struck that a man born from pagan parents could nevertheless achieve a high state of holiness. Yet, this high state of holiness was far from perfection. Pachomius' self-acknowledged failings reminded his monks that his accomplishments were entirely imitable by men who made the same effort.

C.   Succession Crisis

A father's ability to correct others regarding a sin may have been enhanced by the

fact that he was known to have struggled with the same or a similar sin, and this

phenomenon may have assisted Theodore to resolve a great crisis that occurred in the

Koinonia after the death of Pachomius. Horsiesius' first attempt to serve as leader of the

Koinonia ended because of the threat of dissolution rising from the actions of certain

fathers of individual monasteries who envisioned themselves as the leaders of their

communities. Horsiesius asked Theodore to take over his office. Having reluctantly

agreed to Horsiesius' request, he lambasted the fathers who had refused to submit to the

leadership of his predecessor.[64] He did so as one who had once succumbed to a similar

temptation to envision himself as the leader not merely of an individual monastery, but of

the entire Koinonia, and the monks receiving his rebuke would have been well aware of

this. In his lecture, he shifted easily from the second to the first person plural, identifying

himself as a sinner alongside his listeners, although not being guilty of the particular sin

---

[64] Edward Watts (*Riot in Alexandria: Tradition and Group Dynamics in Late Antique Pagan and Christian Communities* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010], 95-99) writes that Theodore's strong words for the leaders of the individual monasteries were intended to disabuse them of any notion that he would rule according to their consent. While there may be some truth in Watts' observation, I believe Theodore's concern for the spiritual needs of these men primarily motivated his instruction. Just as Theodore had sinned when he imagined himself the leader of the movement, there was a sin involved in their actions as well and not only a disagreement on how the Koinonia should be governed. By refusing to be governed by the legitimate father in succession from Pachomius, by imagining they had the right to decide how and to whom they would submit, they had yielded to vainglory.

he was discussing. [65] His audience would have been well aware of Theodore's earlier struggle that features so prominently in the lives. Surely, these monks were able to see themselves, their sins, and their repentance displayed in Theodore, whose previous failings and correction made him uniquely qualified to correct them.

Thus, the visibility of the whole man, which was made possible by communal life, also helped other monks to make spiritual progress, because maturing monks could relate to their models and knew that they truly understood the struggles they faced. The experienced monks served as models not only of achievement, but also of struggle, and most importantly, they were observed modeling both things.

2. Revelation of Thoughts

Protecting the minds of monks from the intrusion of evil thoughts by fostering the growth of their opposing virtues by example was not always sufficient. Despite exhortations and examples to the contrary, some monks still entertained these thoughts. Some of these could result in visible actions, while others could lurk silently and unseen in the monk's mind. In order for these thoughts to be eradicated, they first needed to be brought to the attention of those with the ability and authority to counsel and/or punish the monk. This could be accomplished in a variety of ways. Some methods were shared with monks living in less communal environments, while others were unique to life in a community.

---

[65] S₅ 141 (CSCO 99 p 188-189). Using the first person plural, Theodore states: ⲉⲱϫⲉⲁⲛⲣ̄ⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲙⲁⲣⲛ̄ⲙⲉⲧⲁⲛⲟⲓ The use of the first person plural may not appear exceptional in itself, but in this case it seems to emphasize the fact that he had once been guilty of a similar sin.

A. Confession and Discernment

The simplest way for an experienced monk to learn about another monk's struggle with an evil thought is for that monk to tell him.[66] The practice of less experienced monks confessing their inner thoughts to their spiritual fathers and receiving guidance and prayers from the same for their spiritual development was a hallmark not only of Pachomian life but also of the life of monks living a much less communal lifestyle.[67] For this reason, Pachomius taught that it was evil not to confess one's temptations to someone more experienced,[68] and Theodore warned that one who concealed his sins would not be upright.[69] Among Pachomians, this practice could be much more regular and consistent than it was among monks not living in communities. They lived within an

---

[66] A practice emphasized as a necessity by Michel Foucault when he wrote, "How can this 'discrimination' (of good and bad thoughts) actively be done? There is only one way: to tell all thoughts to our director, to be obedient to our master in all things, to engage in the permanent verbalization of all our thoughts." ("Technologies of the Self," in *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault*, edited by Luther H. Martin et al. (Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1988): 47.) Also see Elizabeth Clark, "Foucault, The Fathers, and Sex," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* LVI (1988): 619-637 and John Behr, "Shifting Sands: Foucault, Brown and the Framework of Christian Asceticism," *The Heythrop Journal* XXXIV (1993): 1-21.

[67] For one example from the Pachomian corpus, see S₆ (CSCO 100 p 277). ⲛⲉⲧⲉϣϣⲉ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲙⲉⲧⲁⲛⲟⲓ̈ ⲉϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ̈ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉϥⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲉϥϫⲱ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲓ̈ϩⲉ · ϫⲉⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲉⲛⲉⲧⲛⲉⲣⲏⲩ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲛ ϫⲉⲡⲥⲟⲡⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲇⲓ̈ⲕⲁⲓ̈ⲟⲥ ϭⲙ̄ϭⲟⲙ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲧⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ϥⲉⲛⲉⲣⲅⲉⲓ̈· (James 5: 16-18). Rousseau (*Pachomius,* 98-99) stressed the joint role of Scripture, elders, and immediate superiors in directing the spiritual progress of the monk. Some examples from the *Apophthegmata* are found in Graham Gould, *The Desert Fathers on Monastic Community* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993): 31ff. Also see J.-C. Guy, "Educational Innovation in the Desert Fathers," *Eastern Churches Review* 6 (1974): 49-50.

[68] G₁ 96.

[69] S₆ (CSCO 100 p 277) ⲡⲉⲧϩⲱⲡ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉϥⲙⲛ̄ⲧϣⲁϥⲧⲉ ⲛⲁⲥⲟⲟⲩⲧⲛ̄ ⲁⲛ (Proverbs 28: 13).

organized structure that provided for the constant interaction of the experienced and the less experienced. Moreover, the brothers had recourse not to one father (or even two or three), but were surrounded by many to whom they could confess their thoughts and seek guidance. What a monk of Kellia might enjoy in moderation, a Pachomian could enjoy in abundance.

The simplest method did not always work. A monk beset by evil thoughts could not always be counted upon to reveal it to another. The thoughts a monk wished to hide could nonetheless be revealed because select fathers had the ability to know the secret thoughts of the monks in their care by means of the gift of discernment, another gift shared by monks living a less communal lifestyle. Pachomius' gift of discernment was so well known (and feared) even outside of the Koinonia that the local ecclesiastical authorities summoned him to the synod of Latopolis to respond to the reports of his abilities.[70] At this gathering, Pachomius explained that when God sees one concerned for the spiritual well-being of his neighbor, he sometimes chooses to give him the gift of discernment (διάκρισις) or a vision (φαντασία) in order to assist him in saving the soul of that neighbor.[71] When Pachomius learned in this manner about the secret thoughts of a monk, he would speak with him and lead him to confess his fault.[72]

---

[70] G_1 112. Pachomius practiced this ability not only with his monks, but also with those outside the community. He once discerned that a certain young lady, who had become possessed by a demon, was not chaste after examining an article of her clothing (G_1 43, Bo 43 [CSCO 89 p 46-47]).

[71] G_1 112.

[72] Bo 106-108 (CSCO 89 p 138-151) include examples of this process.

Theodore possessed the same gift of discernment. He claimed that angels revealed to

him the faults of his monks. On one occasion, an angel revealed to him that one of his

monks was teaching his son that the flesh was evil and would not be resurrected.[73] On

another occasion, an angel revealed to him the names of negligent monks and even

designated some to be expelled from the community.[74]

B.   Clues

Some thoughts that a monk wished to keep hidden may have only been accessible to

monks with the gift of discernment, but others led the monk entertaining them to carry

out either an observable sin, or acts that, although not sinful, provided visible clues to the

presence of an evil thought. A monk living in a community was surrounded by a human

wall of potential witnesses to such acts, since he would spend his entire day in the

company of other monks,[75] and if he were sent outside of the monastery, he would not be

sent alone.[76] The night also did not bring him privacy. Even if he had a private cell,[77]

---

[73] *EpAm* 26. Goehring (*Letter*, 273-274 n 148. 22-23) writes that this
may be a reference to Origenism, but there were other possibilities. A
condemnation of Origenism by Theodore (but not Pachomius) would fit
Goehring's view ("Pachomius's Vision of Heresy," 156) that the
leadership period of Theodore was characterized by an attempt to
identify the movement more closely with Alexandrian orthodoxy.

[74] *EpAm* 19-20.

[75] For a summary of a Pachomian monk's day gleaned from the primary
sources, see Harmless, 127-129 and Rousseau, *Pachomius,* 78-86.

[76] *Pr.* 56.

[77] Monks may have had private cells in the early history of the Koinonia
(see Harmless, 125, 143 n 31; Rousseau, *Pachomius*, 79; Ladeuze, 263,
275f; Chitty, *Desert*, 39 n 26), but the *Rules* present monks sharing

this did not guarantee privacy because his housemaster or even the father of the Koinonia might drop by for a visit during the night.[78] Thus, there were many opportunities for a monk's suspicious activity to be noticed by his fellows.

At times monks may have overlooked wrongdoing they either observed or suspected, but at other times they reported it to their superiors. For example, a group of monks once brought one of their brothers to Theodore, accused him of theft (wrongly in this case), and asked Theodore to expel him for his crime.[79] A housemaster was able to handle alone most faults reported to him, but in more serious cases he reported the matter to the father of the Koinonia.[80] If the situation warranted, a monk could be taken to the father of the Koinonia. Theodore once brought a monk, who was struggling with demonic temptation, from Tabennesi to Pbow so that Pachomius could pray over him.[81] Otherwise, the housemasters might await a visit from the father to their community. When Theodore, as father, visited a monastery, he would privately consult monks brought to him by their housemasters who feared they were struggling with evil

cells (for instance, *Pr.* 88, Horsiesius, *Reg* 17), and Palladius even believed the Pachomians slept three to a cell (*Laus Hist* 32. 2).

[78] For instance, see Bo 191 (CSCO 89 p 179-181). According to *Pr.* 107, locked cells were not usually allowed.

[79] G_1 92, Bo 75 (CSCO 89 p 79-80).

[80] G_1 95, Bo 90 (CSCO 89 p 106-108).

[81] Bo 76 (CSCO 89 p 80-82).

thoughts.[82] Before any of this could happen, the thought needed to be brought out into the open.

C. Sexy Demons

A consideration of the evil thought of lust in the Koinonia reveals the way that the close observation made possible by communal life in the monasteries could expose thoughts monks had wished to keep hidden.[83] A Pachomian monk's experience of lust could be quite different than that of many anchorites. Unlike a monk living a solitary life in his own cell, a Pachomian, living in a walled all-male community, could have little hope of a woman slipping into the monastery by night, or of him sneaking a woman in to his cell. A woman would certainly have had a hard time not only getting past the gate and guesthouse, but also successfully making her way into one of the houses and to the door of a cell. Even women who had relatives inside the monastery were not able to slip inside the walls. For instance, Pachomius' sister and Theodore's mother both found themselves barred from entry.[84] Monks were allowed to meet with their female relatives

---

[82] Bo 191 (CSCO 89 p 179-181).

[83] Albrecht Diem (in *Das monastische Experiment. Die Rolle der Keuschheit bei der Entstehung des westlichen Klosterwesens* [Münster: LIT Verlag, 2005]) describes the attention paid to sexuality by monastic communities in the Latin West. Monks living in isolation faced their struggle for chastity as an individual contest, but monks in a community faced a communal struggle that required, among other things, rules forbidding friendships and ones requiring mutual observation. It will be seen below that the Pachomians also recognized the need to craft rules against too much familiarity between monks and these rules were made enforcable by mutual observation.

[84] For Pachomius's sister, see G_1 32, Bo 27 (CSCO 89 p 26-28); for Theodore's mother, see G_1 37, Bo 37 (CSCO 89 p 39-40).

in one of the female monasteries, but only with permission and in the company of a trusted chaperon.[85] Strange women did come to the monastery in search of shelter and, at some point, the monasteries did begin to provide it for them, but not in a way that would bring them into contact with the monks. These women were kept in quarters separate from them.[86]

   Monks could still fantasize about women, but these fantasies would not have been fueled by the expectation of realizing them, and the pressures against fantasizing about women may have affected the stories monks told about demons. The fantasy of women, who later turn out to be demons, appearing at the door of a monk's cell had no place in the Koinonia. This was a familiar *topos* in ascetic literature,[87] including the Pachomian corpus, but these accounts are never depicted occurring inside one of their monasteries. The prideful monk who walked upon the coals in the company of Pachomius and Palamon was later visited when he was alone by a demon appearing as a woman in flight from her creditors.[88] Zanos encountered a demon appearing as a female ascetic when he was on the road by himself after he had abandoned his monastery.[89] Pachomius was sometimes visited by demons in the form of naked women as he ate his meals alone prior

---

[85] G$_1$ 32, Bo 27 (CSCO 89 p 26-28).

[86] *Pr.* 52.

[87] See Brakke, *Demons*, 199ff, "The Lady Appears: Materializations of 'Woman' in Early Monastic Literature," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 33 (2003): 387-402.

[88] G$_1$ 8, Bo 14 (CSCO 89 p 13-16).

[89] *Draguet II* 7-10. See p 92 n 54 above.

to the founding of the Koinonia.[90] What all these accounts have in common is a monk in isolation and this is surely no accident. After the establishment of the Koinonia, these stories stop appearing in the lives. In an environment into which it would have been nearly impossible for a woman to enter and in which there were many witnesses to her doing so if she had attempted, such stories must have seemed much less relevant than they were for monks living alone.

Deprived of contact with women, some monks' lust turned to their brothers. Their presence may have removed any hope of a woman turning up at one's cell door, but it also contributed to the threat of homosexual lust. Horsiesius strongly condemned "evil friendships" (i.e.- sexual relationships, see note) particularly between older and younger monks.[91] In a community of witnesses, it was difficult for monks to engage in homosexual activity without being noticed. Some texts of the lives preserve accounts of monks who attempted to do so, but were discovered and punished.[92] Yet, a monk who dwelt upon this evil thought, but neither confessed it, nor attempted to engage in sexual activity with a brother, could still have his thought revealed by the observation of various less overtly sexual activities that suggested the presence of this evil thought in the mind

---

[90] G₁ 19, Bo 21 (CSCO 89 p 20-21). This account and G₁ 8, Bo 14 (CSCO 89 p 13-16) were apparently overlooked by Brakke when he writes that the "major *Lives*" do not present demons appearing as females (*Demons*, 203).

[91] Horsiesius, *Instr.* 7 (CSCO 159 pp 76-79) ⲱ ⲦⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲱⲂ︤Ⲏ︦Ⲣ ⲈⲐⲞⲞⲨ, ⲦⲀⲒ ⲈⲦⲞⲨⲘⲞⲤⲦⲈ ⲘⲘⲞⳞ ⳉⲒⲦⲘ̄ⲠⲚⲞⲨⲦⲈ ⲘⲚ̄ⲚⲈⳐⲀⲄⲄⲈⲖⲞⳞ...ⲱ ⲦⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲱⲂⲎⲢ Ⲙ̄ⲠⲞⲚⲎⲢⲞⲚ. Horsiesius made the target of his ire clear when he added ⲈⲒϢⲀⳢⲈ ⲈⲠⲈⲦⲞⲨⲱϢ ⲈⲦⲀⲔⲞ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈⳐⲠⲀⲢⲐⲈⲚⲒⲀ

[92] As shown in chapter one, Ladeuze was suspicious of such accounts, but his suspicions have not been widely maintained by later writers including Bousset (*Apophthegmata*, 248ff). For more recent treatments, see Rousseau, *Pachomius*, 96 and Veilleux, *La liturgie*, 89.

of the monk. For this reason, rules were crafted against activities that might seem

innocent on the surface, but may be clues of an inner struggle with lust. Monks were

forbidden to hold hands or to sit together on a mat.[93] They could not sit together on a

donkey or on a wagon shaft.[94] They were not allowed to leave their cells during the

night,[95] or speak to another monk in his cell or in the dark.[96] They could not draw up

their garments too high when doing laundry.[97] Thus, monks engaging in suspicious

activities always needed to look over their shoulders in fear of being observed.

Horsiesius colorfully described monks nervously looking around, waiting for a good

moment to exchange gifts secretly.[98] None of these activities were necessarily tied to

lust, but for monks entertaining desires they dared not speak, they could be.   The

observation and punishment of these acts, therefore, was a means to fight an evil thought

that might otherwise have lurked unnoticed in the mind of some monks.

D. *Tasty Figs*

Gluttony is another example of a hidden thought that the close observation of a

monk's behavior (even actions that might appear innocent) could bring to the attention of

---

[93] *Pr.* 95.

[94] *Pr.* 109.

[95] *Pr.* 126.

[96] *Pr.* 88, 94.   G₁ 59 states that a monk was not permitted to visit another monk in his cell without the housemaster's permission.

[97] *Pr.* 69.

[98] Horsiesius, *Instr.* 7 (CSCO 159 p 77) ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲉ<ⲕ>ϭⲱϣⲧ̄ ⲉⲡⲓ̈ⲥⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ⲡⲁⲓ ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩϣⲧⲟⲣⲧⲣ̄, ⲉⲕⲡⲣⲟⲥⲉⲭⲉ ϣⲁⲛⲧⲉⲕϭⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲩⲕⲉⲣⲓⲁ, ⲛⲅ̄ϯ ⲛⲁϥ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧϩⲁⲡⲉⲕⲧⲱⲡ ϩⲓϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲕϣⲧⲏⲛ

his superiors. The monk's diet was not necessarily very different from that of the local

peasantry,[99] and, inside the Koinonia, Pachomius sought to enforce equality of food for

all of his healthy monks,[100] so the monk was surrounded by others who ate a diet just like

his own. The monks did fast but with moderation. Pachomius, Theodore, and Horsiesius

all warned against excessive fasting.[101] Nevertheless, sometimes a monk wanted to eat a

little more than he had been given.

The visibility of life in the Koinonia made it difficult for a monk to satisfy his desire

for extra food. The monks ate their meals together, whether inside the monastery or on

assignment outside of it. This visibility allowed monks to notice signs of gluttony in their

fellows and created opportunities for this to be pointed out and addressed. Once while

traveling between monasteries, Pachomius and the monks in his company stopped to eat a

meal. Pachomius, who was satisfied merely by eating bread, was moved to tears by the

sight of his compatriots eating a meal of cheese, figs, olives and other things. He

explained to the monks that it was not a sin to eat, but he feared that they had become

---

[99] Rousseau, *Pachomius*, 120. For monks from a wealthier background, the Pachomian diet could have been more of a deprivation. On the experience of monks for whom an ascetic diet was significantly more restricted from that to which they had been accustomed, see Teresa Shaw, *The Burden of the Flesh: Fasting and Sexuality in Early Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998). On the diet of Egyptian peasants, see Bowman, *Egypt After the Pharaohs*, 150-151; Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity,* 23ff.

[100] G_1 25, Bo 23 (CSCO 89 p 22-23). Exceptions were made for the sick. In G_1 53 and Bo 48 (CSCO 89 p 50-51), Pachomius scolds the monks who cared for the sick because they did not provide meat to a monk who requested it.

[101] Pachomius: Bo 35 (CSCO 89 p 38), Theodore: *EpAm* 20-21, Horsiesius: Excerpta B (CSCO 159 pp 81-82). See also Ruppert, 92 f.

dominated by their desire for food.[102] Likewise, Theodore once was eating with some

brothers outside of the monastery when he noticed a new monk was eating what he

considered too many leeks and was quick to let him know that eating so many leeks was

a bad thing. In this case, Theodore had acted rashly and should have shown more

patience with the monk,[103] but the story illustrates the fact that eating was a public and

observable event inside the Koinonia, an event that could reveal which monks were

struggling with their desire for food more than others were.[104]

   Monks who wished to conceal their gluttony needed to find less obvious ways to

fulfill their desires, and rules were created to address those situations. A monk might

know better than to fill up on leeks under the eyes of Theodore, but sneaking a little fruit

from a tree might not reveal his struggle with gluttony. Any monk seeing him do so

might not know how frequently he visited the tree. For this reason, monks were

forbidden take any food for themselves from the garden, from trees, or from the fields.[105]

Pachomius was very aware that demons could hide in such places. He once ordered a fig

tree to be cut down because it harbored a demon of gluttony. Boys had been helping

---

[102] G$_1$ 55, Bo 59 (CSCO 89 p 57-59).

[103] In the account about Pachomius (G$_1$ 55, Bo 59 [CSCO 89 p 57-59]), the father wept at the sight of his monks eating so eagerly, but said nothing until his monks asked him several times why he was crying. Also see Ruppert, 112, 229.

[104] Bo 79 (CSCO 89 p 84-85). Cf. S$_{10}$ (CSCO 159 p 41).

[105] *Pr.* 71, 73, 77.

themselves to the figs without the knowledge of the gardener.[106] Some monks resorted to

hanging around the bakery or the "bread-board" place, in hopes of an opportunity to

indulge their gluttonous desires in a somewhat surreptitious manner. Thus, they were

forbidden to enter these places.[107] If a monk succeeded in sneaking away with a few figs

or a little bit of bread or dough from the bakery, he might want to store it somewhere to

eat later. His cell offered the closest thing he had to privacy. His cellmate might not

jump to the conclusion that the monk was struggling with gluttony, if he just noticed him

with a fig and was unaware of what remained hidden in the cell. Thus, a rule was crafted

banning monks from storing or eating food in their cells,[108] although this injunction does

not seem to have applied to the *tragematia*, which monks were expected to eat in their

houses,[109] or to the small loaves (*parvuli panes*) prepared for monks who fasted beyond

the norm and did not eat together with the other monks.[110] The enforcement of these

rules, just as the ones concerning incipient homosexual behavior, revealed the monks'

struggle with thoughts, which they had desired to keep hidden, in a way that allowed

---

[106] *Para* 28-31. According to the account, Pachomius did not enforce his order for the sake of the gardener, who had protested. On the following day, God caused the tree to wither and die.

[107] *Pr.* 112, 117. Veilleux writes that the "bread-board place" was the place where the bread was placed before or after baking (*Pachomian Koinonia II*, p 190 n. 1 Pr 112). Cf. *Pr.* 116 and Horsiesius, *Regulations* 40.

[108] *Pr.* 78, 114.

[109] *Pr.* 37. Rousseau (*Pachomius*, 84-85) suggests this was dried fruit. See also Lefort, "Un mot nouveau," *Muséon* 26 (1923): 27-31 and Festugière, *La première Vie grecque*, p 56 n. 1.

[110] *Pr.* 79.

them to receive counseling or correction from more experienced monks or leaders in the monastery.

The visibility of a monk breaking any of these rules not only made them enforceable, but also led some monks to expect to be caught if they did choose to break them, somewhat like the killer in Poe's *The Tell-Tale Heart*. Horsiesius' amorous monks looking over their shoulders have already been mentioned. In addition, a monk named Elias, who had hidden five figs in a jar, seemed to have successfully evaded notice, but he was so consumed by the expectation of having his sin revealed that, when he heard Pachomius merely mention a jar in a figurative sense meant to refer to someone's spiritual sin, he immediately leapt to the conclusion that he had been found out. He retrieved his jar of figs and swore that these were all that he had taken.[111]

This was another way the human wall that surrounded Pachomian monks on a daily basis protected them from demons. The close and consistent observation by one's brothers made the hidden battles in one's mind suddenly visible. If there were any observable signs of an inner struggle inside a monk, there were many sets of eyes there to see them. As the *Rules* indicate, the Pachomians knew to look for signs of such struggles, rather than to wait for a thought to drive a monk to carry out a more blatantly sinful act. Once a monk's secret thoughts had been brought into the open, they could be addressed and corrected by those in authority.

---

[111] G₁ 97, Bo 72 (CSCO 89 p 73-75).

III.   Conclusion

In the previous chapter, I showed that the Pachomian monk was protected from violent demonic attacks due to the presence of other monks. In this chapter, I have shown that he was also protected from demonic assaults upon his mind by this human wall. Pachomius taught that the pattern of life followed by his monks was superior to that followed by anchorites because his monks were able to contend not only for their own souls, but also for the souls of their brothers. They did this not only through instruction and exhortation, but also by simply living their lives in a communal setting. Monks practicing the fruits of the Spirit not only provided examples worthy of imitation by their brothers, but also could help to free them from the grip of thoughts opposed to those virtues. Even the best monks under constant observations would occasionally make mistakes and become a cautionary example. This view of experienced monks still struggling and making mistakes in their spiritual lives allowed the less experienced to identify with their models and to hope that they could match their spiritual successes. It also reminded monks that their fathers truly understood the struggles they faced and could address their faults out of the experience they gained from the same struggles. Communal life also contributed to the revelation of evil thoughts monks might have wished to keep hidden. Even if a monk restrained himself from carrying out the most obvious acts inspired by evil thoughts, they might still reveal the presence of these thoughts by means of less conspicuous actions to which the Pachomians became sensitive. Therefore, the Pachomians fought evil thoughts not as individuals, but as a community, a community not merely temporal but eternal. For when the Pachomian

monk closed his eyes in death, he did so in hope of seeing his brothers again in the world

to come, a world finally devoid of demons.

Conclusion

As I stated in Chapter 1, the Pachomians never produced a literary work dedicated to their beliefs about demons. Although this makes the task of discovering their beliefs more difficult, it does not mean that these beliefs were unimportant. One reason the Pachomians may not have seen a need to produce such work is that their concept of demon was nothing new. The Pachomians, like many other Christians in Egypt, believed in demons that had been familiar figures in the fear and folklore of their ancestors. Of all the types of malevolent spiritual forces in Egyptian and Greek tradition that the Christians might define as demons, those bloody knife-wielding intermediary beings stand out. They could physically attack and kill humans, as well as strike them down with disease. These same violent forces appear as demons in literature written about Christian ascetics. Egyptians had long believed that certain animals were in league with the unseen forces of evil and chaos. It has been shown that in Christian texts as well, demons or the devil appear as some of these animals or make use of them. My work, therefore, reinforces the need to recognize the limits of Christianization. Previous beliefs were not swept away by a great wind of Christianity. It also shows the need to avoid an intellectual conceit that could lead a researcher to discount the importance of beliefs thought to be primitive superstition. Features of earlier belief systems still colored the religious experience of Christians in fourth century Egypt. Historians cannot look at the texts written by the Pachomians in isolation. They must look at them in their wider

cultural context. The fact that these texts do not feature many violent demonic attacks does not mean that the Pachomians did not believe in them or consider them an important component of the demonic threat. Historians need to ask why there are so few references to demonic violence in these works produced in that wider cultural context.

In Chapter 3 and Chapter 4, I showed how living in a community was of advantage to monks worried about demons. Certain experienced monks had been able to prove their superiority to the demons by enduring their physical attacks without losing their resolve. These monks were able to provide not only spiritual guidance to less experienced monks, but also protection from demonic attack. If a dependent monk abandoned his relationship with his spiritual father, however, he could become vulnerable to violence again. He could also face violence if his father died; Pachomius faced his first violent attacks after the death of Palamon. The advantage of living in a community was that the monk was surrounded by large numbers of such fathers who were able to intimidate demons, and that this body of fathers was self-regenerating. The community trained new fathers to take the place of those who died. The community, therefore, offered a more secure protection than did an individual father. These observations also reinforce the need to consider cultural continuity when reading Pachomian texts. The relationships these monks had with the fathers and with demons resembled the relationships people living throughout the Mediterranean in Antiquity had with powerful figures. There were powerful persons who (like demons) oppressed or seemed to oppress those weaker than they were. One method of resistance against such an oppressor was to seek the protection of a more powerful person (like the fathers). The favor of a

benevolent patron, moreover, could greatly contribute to the growth of an individual's wealth and power, until they were also able to protect weaker persons. Although these relationships were removed from their mundane context and reimagined in a spiritual one, they must have seemed quite natural to men of the fourth century.

Although much of my work has focused on fears of violent demons, it is also important to consider the threat many Christians believed demons posed to their thoughts. This type of demonic attack has been explored in depth in other works, but I have added a few ways that communal life protected the minds of monks from this threat. I have shown that a monk in a community was surrounded by examples that could foster the development of the fruits of the Spirit in the monk, which blocked the intrusion of demonic thoughts. I have also shown that the constant interaction of monks in the Koinonia allowed a developing monk to identify more closely with the fathers and this enhanced the fathers' ability to serve as meaningful examples and guides. Moreover, life in a community made it difficult for a demonic thought to go unnoticed. Even if a monk restrained himself from blatantly fulfilling his desires, he may have carried out less offensive acts that the experienced eyes of his fathers might have noted as clues to an inner struggle. Once exposed, that thought could be confronted collectively by the fathers. I have thus made not only a contribution to previous scholarship on the relationship between communal life and spiritual development, but also, by illustrating some ways that a Pachomian monk's inner struggle for spiritual improvement became a social event, a contribution to scholarship on the relationship between observation and reform.

Finally, my work has offered a contribution to the attempt to explain the development of cenobitic monasteries in Egypt. Communal life offered advantages both to monks seeking protection from violent demonic attack and to those fearing attacks upon their thoughts. These factors may have helped to motivate the establishment of these communities. The Pachomians may not have explicitly referred to this protection from demons, but they did not need to do so. I have demonstrated that, according to what they did say, they believed they enjoyed protection from the demons. In addition, those living outside of the monasteries saw them as places of healing for loved ones thought to be possessed by demons. The connection would have been obvious for a would-be monk longing for protection.

I hope that the future will bring works exploring questions raised by my conclusions above. In particular, there is a need for geographical and chronological comparisons. I expect that much of what I have written (especially in Chapter 4) would apply to Christian cenobitic foundations in other times and places. Nevertheless, I have been careful to specify that my conclusions pertain to the Koinonia in fourth century Egypt. I do not presume that my conclusions will necessarily hold for Syria, Europe, or any other area in the late antique world. I also do not presume that my conclusions hold equally for monasteries in the Thebaid several centuries later when Christian cenobitic establishments were no longer novel. Works exploring these issues may be very enlightening for our understanding of the motivation for communal religious life across cultures and time periods.

Bibliography

Achelis, Hans. "Revue: Grützmacher, *Pachomios und das älteste Klosterleben," ThLZ* 9 (1896), 240-244.

Amélineau, Émile. *Monuments pour server à l'histoire de l'Égypte chrétienne au Ive siècle. Histoire de Saint Pakhôme et de ses communautés. Documents coptes et arabes inédits, publiés et traduits par É. Amélineau. ADMG 17.* Paris: Leroux, 1889.

_____. *Monuments pour servir à l'histoire de l'Egypte chrétienne aux IVe, Ve, VIe et VIIe siècles. Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission archéologique française au Caire- 4.* Paris: Leroux, 1895.

Assmann, Jan. *Tod und Jenseits im Alten Ägypten.* Munich: C. H. Beck, 2001.

Andres, R. "Daimon." In *Pauly-Wissowa Realenzylopadie* Suppl. III (1918), 267-321.

Aufrère, Sidney. "L'Égypte traditionelle, ses démons vus par les premiers chrétiens." *Études Coptes* V. Edited by M. Rassart-Debergh. CBibCopte 10. Paris: Peeters, 1998, 63-92.

Bagnall, Roger S. *Egypt in Late Antiquity.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Baines, John. "Society, Morality, and Religious Practice." In *Religion in Ancient Egypt.* Edited by Byron E. Shafer. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991, 123-200.

Barb, A. A. "Three Elusive Amulets." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 27 (1964), 10-17

Barnes, Timothy. "Angel of Light or Mystic Initiate? The Problem of the Life of Antony." *Journal of Theological Studies* 37 (1986), 353-368.

Bartelink, G. J. M. "Le diable et les démons dans les oeuvres de Jérôme." *Studia Patristica* 17 (1982), 463-469.

_____. "Les démons comme brigands." *Vigiliae Christianae* 21. 1 (1967), 12-24.

Baynes, Norman. "St. Antony and the Demons," *JEA* 40 (1954), 7-10.

Behr, John. "Shifting Sands: Foucault, Brown and the Framework of Christian
    Asceticism." *The Heythrop Journal* XXXIV (1993), 1-21.

Bell, H. Idris. *Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt*. Reprint. Chicago: Ares
    Publishers, Inc., 1985. Originally published: Liverpool, 1953.

Binns, John. *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
    Reprint 1996.

Boon, Amand. *Pachomiana Latina. Règle et épîtres de s. Pachôme, épître de s.
    Théodore et <<Liber>> de s. Orsiesius. Texte latin de s. Jérôme. Bibliothèque
    de la Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 7. Louvain: Bureaux de la Revue, 1932.

Bousset, Wilhelm. *Apothegmata: Studien zur Geschichte des ältesten Mönchtums*.
    Tübingen: Mohr, 1923.

Bousquet, J. and F. Nau. *Histoire de saint Pacôme (Une redaction inedited des Ascetica)
    Texte grec des manuscripts Paris 881 et Chartres 1754 avec une traduction de la
    version syriaque et une analyse du manuscrit de Paris Suppl. grec 480*. In
    Patrologie Orientale IV, 5 (1907).

Bowman, Alan K. *Egypt After the Pharaohs*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of
    California Press, 1986.

Brakke, David. *Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press,
    1995.

_____. *Demons and the Making of the Monk: Spiritual Combat in Early Christianity*.
    Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2006.

_____. "Ethiopian Demons: Male Sexuality, the Black-Skinned Other, and the Monastic
    Self." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 10. 3/4 (2001), 501-535.

_____. "The Lady Appears: Materializations of 'Woman' in Early Monastic Literature."
    Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies 33 (2003), 387-402.

Brenk, Frederick. *In Mist Appareled: Religious Themes in Plutarch's Moralia and
    Lives*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977.

_____. "In the Light of the Moon: Demonology in the Imperial Period." *ANRW*
    2.16.3: 2068-2145.

Brown, Peter. *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1988. Reprint 2008.

_____. "The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity." In *Society and the Holy in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982. Originally published in *Journal of Roman Studies* LXI (1971), 80-101.

Budge, E. A. Wallis. *The Book of Paradise*. London, 1904.

Burton-Christie, Douglas. *The Word in the Desert*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Caner, Daniel. *Wandering, Begging, Monks: Spiritual Authority and the Promotion of Monasticism in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

Castelli, Elizabeth. "Mortifying the Body, Curing the Soul: Beyond Ascetic Dualism in *The Life of Saint Syncletica.*" *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 4. 2 (1992), 134-153.

Chitty, Derwas. "Pachomian Sources Reconsidered." *JEH* 5 (1954): 38-77.

_____. *The Desert a City*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1966.

Chryssavgis, J. "The Monk and the Demon: A Study of Demonology in Early Medieval Literature." *Nicolaus* 13 (1986), 265-279.

Clackson, Sarah. "Coptic or Greek? Bilingualism in the Papyri." In *The Multilingual Experience in Egypt: From the Ptolemies to the Ābbāsids.* Edited by Arietta Papaconstantinou. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2010.

Clark, Elizabeth. "Foucault, The Fathers, and Sex." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* LVI (1988), 619-637.

Colpe, C. et al. "Geister (Dämonen)." *RAC* 9 (1976), 546–796.

Conybeare, F. C. "Christian Demonology II." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 9. 1 (1896), 59-114.

Corrigan, Kevin. *Evagrius and Gregory*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2009.

Crislip, Andrew. *From Monastery to Hospital: Christian Monasticism & the Transformation of Health Care in Late Antiquity*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2005.

Crum, Walter E. *Der Papyruscodex saec. VI-VII der Phillippsbibliothek in Cheltenham. Koptische theologische Schriften. Schriften der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft in Strassburg* 18. Strassburg: Trübner, 1915.

Daniélou, Jean. "Démon: II. Dans la Littérature Ecclésiastique jusqu'a Origène." *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* 3, 152-189.

_____. "Les Démons de l'air dans la 'Vie d'Antoine.'" In *Antonius Magnus Eremita 356-1956*. Edited by B. Steidle. Rome: Orbis Catholicus, 1956, 137-147.

David, Rosalie. *Religion and Magic in Ancient Egypt*. London: Penguin Books, 2002.

de Vogüé, Adalbert. "Epîtres inédites d'Horsièse et de Théodore." In *Commandements du Seigneur et Libération évangélique,* SA 70. Rome, 1977, 24-257.

_____. "La vie arabe de saint Pachôme et ses deux sources presumes," *AnBoll* 91 (1973), 379-390.

Diem, Albrecht. *Das monastische Experiment. Die Rolle der Keuschheit bei der Entstehung des westlichen Klosterwesens.* Münster: LIT Verlag, 2005.

Draguet, René. "Un paralipomenon pachômien inconnu dans le Karakallou 251." In *Mélanges Tisserant* II, (*ST* 232), Vatican 1964, 55-61.

Drexler, Wilhelm. "Isis." In *Lexicon für griechische und römishce Mythologie*. Edited by Wilhelm Roscher. Leipzig, 1882-1921, 2. 406.

Dunand, Françoise and Christiane Zivie-Coche. *God and Men in Egypt: 3000 BCE to 395 AD*. Translated by David Lorton. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2004.

Durkheim, Emile. *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life.* Translated by Karen E. Fields. New York: The Free Press, 1995. Originally published as *Les formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse: Le système totémique en Australie*. Paris: F. Alcan, 1912.

Elliott, Alison Goddard. *Roads to Paradise: Reading the Lives of the Early Saints*.
  Hanover and London: University Press of New England, 1987.

Emmel, Stephen. "From the Other Side of the Nile: Shenute and Panopolis." In
  Perspectives on Panopolis: An Egyptian Town from Alexander the Great to the
  Arab Conquest. Edited by A. Egberts, B.P. Muhs, and J. van der Vliet. Leiden:
  Brill, 2002, 95-113.

Festugière, A. –J. *Les Moines d'Orient, IV/2: La première Vie grecque de saint*
  Pachôme. Introduction critique et traduction. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1965.

Ferguson, Everett. *Demonology of the Early Christian World*. Lewiston, NY: The
  Edwin Mellen Press, 1984.

Ferguson, John. "Apuleius." *Greece & Rome.* Second Series 8.1 (1961), 61-74.

_____. *The Religions of the Roman Empire*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press,
  1970.

Flint, Valerie. "The Demonisation of Magic and Society in Late Antiquity: Christian
  Redefinitions of Pagan Religions." In *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: Ancient*
  Greece and Rome. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999,
  277-348.

Foerster, Werner. "δαίμων." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by
  Gerhard Kittel. Translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids,
  MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964, 2. 1-20.

Frankfurter, David. *Evil Incarnate: Rumors of Demonic Conspiracy and Satanic Abuse*
  in History. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.

_____. *Religion in Roman Egypt: Assimilation and Resistance*. Princeton: Princeton
  University Press, 1998.

_____. "The Binding of Antelopes: A Coptic Frieze and its Egyptian Religious
  Context." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 2 (2004): 97-109.

Fox, Robin Lane. *Pagans and Christians*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1988.

Friedman, Florence. "On the Meaning of Some Anthropoid Busts from Deir el-Medina."
    JEA 71 (1985), 82-97.

Foucault, Michel. "Technologies of the Self." In *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar
    with Michel Foucault.* Edited by Luther H. Martin et al. Amherst: The
    University of Massachusetts Press, 1988, 16-49.

Gardiner, Alan H. *The Library of A. Chester Beatty*. London: Oxford University Press,
    1931.

_____ and Kurt Sethe. *Egyptian Letters to the Dead from the Old and Middle Kingdoms*.
    London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1928.

Goehring, James. "Hieracas of Leontopolis: The Making of a Desert Ascetic." In
    Ascetics, Society, and the Desert: Studies in Early Egyptian Monasticism.
    Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1999, 110-133.

_____. "Pachomius' Vision of Heresy: The Development of a Pachomian Tradition."
    Muséon 95 (1982): 241-262.

_____. "The Encroaching Desert: Literary Production and Ascetic Space in Early
    Christian Egypt." In *Ascetics, Society, and the Desert*, 73-88.

_____. *The Letter of Ammon and Pachomian Monasticism.* Berlin: Walter De Gruyter,
    1986.

_____. "Withdrawing from the Desert: Pachomius and the Development of Village
    Monasticism in Upper Egypt." In *Ascetics, Society, and the Desert*, 89-109.

Gokey, Francis X. *The Terminology for the Devil and Evil Spirits in the Apostolic
    Fathers*. Washington DC: Catholic University Press, 1961.

Gould, Graham. "Pachomian Sources Revisited." *Studia Patristica* 30. Leuven:
    Peeters, 1997, 215-217.

_____. *The Desert Fathers on Monastic Community*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Grimal, Nicolas. *A History of Egypt*. Translated by Ian Shaw. Oxford and Cambridge:
    Blackwell Publishers, 1994. Originally published as *Histoire de l'Egypte
    ancienne*. Librairie Arthème Fayard, 1988.

Grützmacher, Georg. *Pachomios und das älteste Klosterleben. Ein Beitrag zur Mönchsgeschichte*. Leipzig: Mohr, 1896.

Guillaumont, Antoine and Claire. "Démon: III. Dans la plus ancienne littérature monastique." *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* 3, 189-212.

Guillmot, Max. "Lettre à une épouse défunte (Pap. Leiden I. 371)." *ZÄS* 99 (1973), 94-103.

Guy, J.-C. "Educational Innovation in the Desert Fathers." *Eastern Churches Review* 6 (1974), 49-50.

Harmless, William. *Desert Christians: An Introduction to the Literature of Early Monasticism*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Harnack, Adolf. *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*. Translated and edited by James Moffat. New York: Williams and Norgate, 1908.

Harvey, Jr., Paul B. "Saints and Satyrs: Jerome the Scholar at Work." *Athenaeum* 86 (1998), 35-56.

Halkin, François. *Le corpus athénien de saint Pachome. Cahiers d'Orientalisme* 2. Genève: Cramer, 1982.

_____. *Sancti Pachomii Vitae Graecae. Subsidia hagiographica* 19. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1932.

Helck, Wolfgang. *Die Lehre für König Merikare. Kleine Ägyptische Texte*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1977.

Heussi, Karl. *Der Ursprung des Mönchtums*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1936.

Hornung, Erik. *Conceptions of God in Ancient Egypt: The One and the Many*. London: 1983.

_____ et al. *Der ägyptische Mythos von der Himmelskuh: Eine Ätiologie des Unvollkommenen.* OBO 46 (1982).

_____. "Seth: Geschichte und Bedeutung eines ägyptischen Gottes." *Symbolism* 2 (1974), 49-63.

Hunink, Vincent. "Apuleius, Pudentilla, and Christianity." *Vigiliae Christianae* 54.1 (2000), 80-94.

Joest, Christoph. "Die Geheimschrift Pachoms. Versuch einer Entschlüsselung, mit Übersetzung und Deutung der Pachom-Briefe 9a und 9b." *Ostkirchliche Studien* 45 (1996), 268-289.

_____. "Die pachomianische Geheimschrift im Spiegel der Hieronymus- Übersetzung. Mit dem Deutschen Text von Brief 11b des pachomianischen Schriftencorpus und dem Versuch einer Übertragung." *Muséon* 112 (1999), 21-46.

_____. "Die *Praecepta* Pachoms. Untersuchung zu dem grössten Abschnitt der Pachom-Regeln." *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 13 (3, 2009), 430-451.

_____. "Übersetzung von Pachoms Katechese 'An einen Grollenden Mönch.'" *Muséon* 120 (2007), 91-129.

Keimer, Ludwig. "L'horreur des Egyptiens pour les démons du désert." BIE 26 (1944): 135-147.

Koenig, Yvan. "Un revenant inconvenant? (Papyrus Dier el-Medineh 37)." *BIFAO* 79 (1979), 103-119.

Ladeuze, Paulin. *Étude sur le cénobitisme pakhômien pendant le IVe siècle et la première moitié du Ve*. Louvain and Paris: 1898.

Layton, Bentley. "Rules, Patterns, and the Exercise of Power in Shenoute's Monastery: The Problem of World Replacement and Identity Maintenance." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 15. 1 (2007): 45-73.

Lefort, L. T. "A propos d'un aphorisme d'Evagrius Ponticus." *Bulletin de l'Académie Royale de Belgique* (1950), 70-79.

_____. "S. Athanase écrivain copte." *Muséon* 46 (1933), 1-33.

_____. *S. Pachomii vita bohairice scripta. CSCO* 89 Louvain: L. Durbecq, 1925. Reprint 1953.

_____. *S. Pachomii vitae sahidice scriptae. CSCO* 99-100 Louvain: L. Durbecq, 1933/34. Reprint 1953.

_____. *Oeuvres de s. Pachôme et de ses disciples.* *CSCO* 159. Louvain: L. Durbecq, 1956.

_____. *Oeuvres de s. Pachôme et de ses disciples.* *CSCO* 160. Louvain: L. Durbecq, 1956.

_____. "Un mot nouveau." *Muséon* 26 (1923), 27-31.

Lesko, Leonard H. "Ancient Egyptian Cosmogonies and Cosmology." In *Religion in Ancient Egypt.* Editedby Byron E. Shafer. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991: 88-122.

_____. "Three Late Egyptian Stories Reconsidered." In *Egyptological Studies in Honor of Richard A. Parker.* Edited by Leonard H. Lesko. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1986, 98-103.

Letronne, Antoine-Jean M. *Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines de l'Égypte.* Paris: 1848.

Lyonnet, Stanislas. "Démon: I. Le Démon dans l'Écriture." *Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique: Doctrine et histoire* 3 (1957), 142-152.

MacMullen, Ramsay. *Christianizing the Roman Empire.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1984.

_____. *Paganism in the Roman Empire.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1981.

Malina, Bruce. "Pain, Power, and Personhood: Ascetic Behavior in the Ancient Mediterranean." In *Asceticism.* Edited by Vincent Wimbush and Richard Valantasis. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998, 162-177.

Mango, Cyril. "Diabolus Byzantinus." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 48 *Homo Byzantinus: Papers in Honor of Alexander Kazhdan* (1992), 215-223.

Meeks, Dimitri. "Génies, anges, démons en Égypte," *Génies, anges et démons. Sources Orientales* 8. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1971.

Merrills, A. H. "Monks, Monsters, and Barbarians: Re-Defining the African Periphery in Late Antiquity." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 12. 2 (2004): 217-244.

Miller, Patricia Cox. "Jerome's Centaur: a Hyper-Icon of the Desert." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 4. 2 (1996), 209-33.

Néroutsos-Bey. *L'ancienne Alexandrie*. Paris: Leroux, 1888.

Petrie, Flinders. *Religious Life in Ancient Egypt.*   New York: Cooper Square Publishers, Inc., 1972. Originally published by Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924.

Posener, Georges. "Les *afarit* dans l'ancienne Égypte." *MDAIK* 37 (1981), 393-401.

_____. "Les empreintes magiques de Gizeh et les morts dangereux." *MDAIK* 16 (1958), 252-270.

Quaegebeur, Jan. "Divinités égyptiennes sur des animaux dangereux." In *L'animal, l'homme, le dieu dans le Proche-Orient ancien.* Cahiers du CEPOA 2. Louvain: 1984, 131-143.

 Quecke, Hans. *Die Briefe Pachoms. Griechischer Text der handschrift W. 145 der Chester Beatty Library eingeleitet und herausgegeben von Hans Quecke. Anhang: Die koptischen Fragmente und Zitate des Pachombriefe. Textus Patristici et liturgici* 11. Regensburg: Kommisions-Verlag, Friedrich Pustet, 1975.

_____. "Ein Brief von einem Nachfolger Pachoms." *Orientalia* 44 (1975), 426-433.

Ries, Julian. "Cultes païens et démons dans l'apologétique chrétienne de Justin à Augustin." In *Anges et démons: Actes du colloque sur 'Anges et démons.'* Edited by Julian Ries. Louvain-la-Neuve: Centre d'histoire des Religions, 1989, 337-352.

Rousseau, Philip. *Pachomius: The Making of a Community in Fourth-Century Egypt.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985. Reprint 1999.

Ruppert, Fidelis. *Das pachomianische Mönchtum und die Anfänge klösterlichen Gehorsams*. Münsterschwarzach: Vier Türme, 1971.

Saradi-Mendelovici, Helen. "Christian Attitudes toward Pagan Monuments in Late Antiquity and their Legacy in Later Byzantine Centuries." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 44 (1990), 47-59.

Schmidt, Victor. "Reaktion auf das Christentum in den Metamorphosen des Apuleius." *Vigiliae Christianae* 51 (1997), 51-71.

Schneemelcher, Wilhelm. "Das Kreuz Christi und die Dämonen: Bemerkungen zur *Vita Antonii* des Athanasius." In *Pietas*. Edited by E. Dassmann and K. S. Frank. Münster: 1980, 381-392.

Schwartz, E. *Kyrillos von Skythopolis. Texte und Untersuchungen* 49.2. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1939.

Sele, K. C. "Horus on the Crocodiles." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 6 (1947).

Shaw, Teresa. *The Burden of the Flesh: Fasting and Sexuality in Early Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998.

Silverman, David. "Divinity and Deities in Ancient Egypt." In *Religion in Ancient Egypt.* Edited by Byron E. Shafer. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991: 7-87.

Smith, J. Z. "Towards Interpreting Demonic Powers in Hellenistic and Roman Antiquity." *ANRW* (1978), 2/16. 1: 425-439.

Soury, Guy. *La démonologie de Plutarque: Essai sur les idées religieuses et les mythes d'un Platonicien éclectique*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1942.

Szpakowska, Kasia. *Behind Closed Eyes: Dreams and Nightmares in Ancient Egypt*. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2003.

Tetz, Martin. "Athanasius und die Vita Antonii. Literarische und theologische Relationen." *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 73 (1982), 1-30.

Tillemont, L. S. *Mémoires pour servir á l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles.* 16 vols. Paris: 1693-1712. Revised edition with Tillemont's corrections and additional notes by Jacques le Mineur. Paris: 1701-1714.

Tilley, Maureen. "The Ascetic Body and the (Un)Making of the World of the Martyr." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 59. 3 (1991), 467-479.

Timbie, Janet. "Dualism and the Concept of Orthodoxy in the Thought of the Monks of Upper Egypt." PhD Dissertation. University of Pennsylvania, 1979.

_____ and Jason Zaborowski. "Shenoute's Sermon *The Lord Thundered*: An Introduction and Translation." *Oriens Christianus* 90 (2006), 91-123.

van Cranenburgh, H. *La vie latine de saint Pachôme traduite du grec par Denys le Petit, edition critique. Subsidia hagiographica* 46. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1969.

van de Walle, S. B. "La tortue dans la religion et la magie-égyptiennes." *La Nouvelle Clio* 5 (1953).

van Molle, M. M. "Aux origins de la vie communautaire chrétienne, quelques equivoques déterminantes pour l'avenir." *VS Supplément* 88 (1969), 101-121.

_____. "Confrontation entre les règles et la littérature pachômienne postérieure." *VS Supplément* 86 (1968), 394-424.

_____. "Essai de classement chronologique des premières règles de vie commune en chrétienté." *VS Supplément* 84 (1968), 108-127.

_____. "Vie commune et obéissance d'apres les intuitions premières de Pachôme et Basile." *VS Supplément* 93 (1970), 196-225.

Veilleux, Armand. *La liturgie dans le cénobitisme pachômien au quatrième siècle.* Studia Anselmiana 57. Rome: Herder, 1968.

_____. "Le problem des Vies de Saint Pachôme." *RAM* 42 (1966): 287-305.

_____. *Pachomian Koinonia.* 3 vols. Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, Inc., 1980-1982.

Vliet, Jacques van der. "Demons in Early Coptic Monasticism: Image and Reality." In *Coptic Art and Culture.* Edited by H. Hondelink. Cairo: Shouhdy, 1990, 148-152.

Volten, Aksel. *Zwei altägyptische politische Schriften.* Analecta Aegyptiaca 4. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1945.

Walsh, P. G. "Lucius Madaurensis." *Phoenix* 12 (1968), 151-153.

Watts, Edward. *Riot in Alexandria: Tradition and Group Dynamics in Late Antique Pagan and Christian Communities*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010.

Westerfield, Jennifer Taylor. "Christian Perspectives on Pharaonic Religion: The Representation of Paganism in Coptic Literature." *JARCE* XL (2003), 5-12.

Wey, H. *Die Funktionen der bösen Geister bei den griechischen Apologeten des 2 Jahrhunderten nach Christus.* Winterthur: P. G. Keller, 1957.

Williams, Michael A. "The *Life of Antony* and the Domestication of Charismatic Wisdom." In *Charisma and Sacred Biography*. Edited by M. A. Williams. Chambersburg, PA: Scholars Press, 1982), 23-45.

Wilson, John A. *The Culture of Ancient Egypt*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1951.

Wortley, John. *John Moschos: The Spiritual Meadow*. Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1992.