

MONKS, PRIESTS, AND MAGICIANS:
DEMONS AND MONASTIC SELF-DIFFERENTIATION
IN LATE ANCIENT EGYPT

David Brakke
Indiana University

Evagrius Ponticus opened his large work *Antirrheticus* or *Talking Back*, which he called a “book on the monastic life,” by stating, “In the case of rational nature that is ‘beneath heaven’ (Eccl. 1:13), part of it fights; part assists the one who fights; and part contends with the one who fights, strenuously rising up and making war against him.” Who were these rational beings in conflict? “The fighters are human beings; those assisting them are God’s angels; and their opponents are the foul demons.”¹ As Evagrius presented it, the setting for the monastic life was cosmic: the monk lived in an aeons-old, if not quite eternal realm that he shared with angels and demons. It was not a peaceful realm: the monk was essentially a fighter, assisted by angels and opposed by demons.

The monk’s combat with demons, a ubiquitous feature of early Egyptian monastic literature, could be brutal. According to Athanasius of Alexandria, the great Antony was beaten nearly senseless by demons: the devil “struck him with blows so hard that he lay on the ground speechless from the tortures.”² Shenoute, the abbot of the White Monastery and the subject of several papers in this volume, spoke frequently of the evil plots of the devil and his demons. One of his more impressive speeches is a lengthy tirade against the devil, addressed directly to him in the second person, in which he calls Satan, among other things, a “leech” who tries to eat people. Some people, Shenoute says, make easy meals for the diabolical leech—“spillers of blood, idolaters, pagans, heretics, unjust people, fornicators, effeminate men, and unbelievers”—but others do not go down so easily: “Blessed are those who have caused wounds in your throat! You could not eat them because of their large bones, that is, those people whom you tested and attacked but whom you did not defeat because of their faith in God and their

goodness. Blessed are those who have made you vomit them out when you were unhappy after eating them!”³

The warfare between monks and demons was not always so fierce: the *Apophthegmata patrum* supplement this picture with stories of a more playful competition.⁴ At times the demons act as buffoons and tricksters, to the amusement of a monk and presumably of the hearers and readers of the sayings as well. For example, since Pambo was known not to smile, demons try to make him laugh by sticking feathers on a piece of wood and making it fly. Pambo does laugh, but tells the triumphant demons, “I did not (just) laugh (*egelasa*); rather I laughed against (*kategelasa*) your powerlessness (*adynamia*).”⁵ When Macarius the Great sleeps on top of a coffin in a pagan temple, the demons pretend to be women preparing to bathe, one of whom is under the monk. Macarius strikes the coffin and yells at the sporting demons.⁶ One purpose of these stories is to communicate a theme found also in the grimmer works of Athanasius and Shenoute: the demons, as Poemen said, are really weak in the face of God’s aid to the monk, despite their apparent power in the numerous tales of temptation and attack. But these anecdotes also invite the reader to step back from the narrow focus on the monk’s struggle with temptation and even from the distinctively Christian narrative of Christ’s triumph over the demonic pagan gods. They place the monk within the wider perspective offered by late ancient Egypt, an environment in touch with eternity, alive with the presence of invisible powers, in which the lines between good and evil were not always as sharply drawn as Evagrius claimed.

In such stories the monk and demon appear less as combatants locked in a fierce struggle for the monk’s soul as much as testy neighbors. The demons are cast as trouble-making, even impish denizens of the desert; the monk as the sometimes amused, often exasperated neighbor with the level head. The monk displayed the ability not only to see the demonic where others cannot, not only to discern the demons’ wily ways, but also to push the demonic around, to move it, to command it, ultimately to exorcise it. He came close to the power of the angel who in one story swats the demons away like flies with his fiery sword.⁷ The monk exhibited the power that he derived from his ascetic practices not only in his transformed body, but also in his indifference to and control over the invisible powers that surrounded late ancient people.

This picture of the monk as the impresario of the demonic placed him in direct relation to and competition with other figures in Egyptian society who likewise offered themselves as specialists in dealing with the supernatural powers, specifically pagan priests and pagan or Christian magicians, who in this period represent overlapping groups. Jonathan Z. Smith and David Frankfurter have each described an evolution in late ancient Egypt in which priests who offered their ritualized power to worshipers in a temple cult gave way to or became mobile “magicians” who offered their services to clients in rituals that could be performed anywhere (now available to us in the magical

Living for Eternity: The White Monastery and its Neighborhood. Proceedings of a Symposium at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, March 6 – 9, 2003. Ed. Philip Sellew. <http://egypt.cla.umn.edu/eventsr.html> (© 2009 the Regents of the University of Minnesota and the individual authors).

papyri). Smith conceptualizes this development in more theoretical terms, as an example of the shift from locative to utopian modes of religion that he sees more generally in Late Antiquity.⁸ Frankfurter's work is more empirically grounded in the conditions of third-through fifth-century Egypt: as their infrastructure of temples slowly eroded, the priesthood sought innovative ways to maintain its ritually based power.⁹ Not only the line between priest and magician was blurred, Frankfurter argues, but so too that between magician and monk. He suggests that monastic communities are among the most likely venues for the continuing scribal activities that produced the numerous magical papyri, which conflate Egyptian, Jewish, and Christian elements. He points to stories of pagan priests converting to Christianity and becoming monks as evidence that Christian monks possessed the literacy and familiarity with traditional and Christian religion and ritual necessary to produce such texts.¹⁰ The traditional social figure of the priest was giving way to new identities, the magician and the monk, both of which were themselves in the process of self-definition.

The fluidity of these identities creates problems for the modern scholar who wishes to speak precisely about persons whose identities were not so distinct. While it is relatively unproblematic to use the term "priest" for the temple-based leader of traditional Egyptian religion, the term "magician" is rightly the object of extensive scholarly discussion, and my point here is precisely the deep similarity between magicians and monks as experts in the use of efficacious texts, gestures, and substances. My practice here will be to use the term "magician" for any such ritual expert, whatever his religious affiliations, who has not taken on the more particular identity of Christian monk, a recognized role that gave his "magical" activities legitimacy in the eyes of the religious leaders who defined that identity.

My paper, then, assumes an Egyptian religious environment marked by a variety of religious virtuosi and asks how monastic authors—the tradents and compilers of the *Apophthegmata* as well as such men as Athanasius, Evagrius, and Palladius—sought to define and legitimate the Christian monk.¹¹ It examines three aspects of the complicated interactions among monks, priests, magicians, and demons, and in each case it will describe how monastic literature differentiated the monk from similar and competing figures. First, while some monastic authors played down or rejected the monk's ability to perform healings and the like, others acknowledged the similarity between what monks and priests/magicians did—provide supernatural and/or anti-demonic aid through ritualized means—and countered it by basing the monk's ability to control the demonic in a superior written text, the Christian Scriptures, rather than in composed magical texts. Second, monks appeared in direct competition with pagan priests and/or magicians, a struggle that the monastic literature sought to resolve through stories of pagan priests becoming monks and monks resisting a return to priesthood, anecdotes in which the priest was portrayed as in league with the demons. Finally, accounts of exorcisms by monks located monastic authority over the demonic in the virtue of humility, a strategy of

legitimation that more generally promoted the monastic lifestyle as superior to other options for religious virtuosi. During the fourth and fifth centuries, the new social identity of Christian monk was constructed in a variety of ways: differentiating the monk from figures like the priest and magician was one aspect of the creation of this new social role.

Priests, magicians, and monks all offered concrete supernatural help to other people. Ancient magical spells promised to tell the future, heal illnesses, curse enemies, create pregnancies, instill erotic passion in desired mates, and so on. Likewise, monastic literature presents non-monastic Christians (and non-Christians) coming to monks seeking information about the future, healing from illnesses, and exorcisms.¹² A set of letters from lay people to a monk named Paphnutius illustrates the range of concerns that they believed an accomplished ascetic could address: illnesses, temptations, plots from their enemies, sins for which they hoped to atone.¹³ Just as magicians could use special substances to produce the desired end, so a certain Heraclides asked Paphnutius to bless oil for healing purposes.¹⁴ According to Shenoute, “a great monk” gave a sick “official” some fox claws, saying, “Bind them to yourself, and you will recover,” and Christian presbyters and monks would provide people with special water or oil that would give them relief from diseases.¹⁵ Palladius and the *Historia Monachorum* relate how Macarius the Great used oil to undo a spell that had turned a woman into a mare, an incident to which I shall return.¹⁶ While monks may have been performing their disciplines to achieve the overall goal of ultimate salvation, they and others saw more limited and immediate payoffs to their ascetic labors. The monks were indeed living for eternity, but they and their admirers also had needs in the here and now.

Some monastic authors played down the abilities of monks to provide healings and other supernatural services or rejected such activities as inappropriate for the monk. For example, when a group of people came to the White Monastery hoping that Shenoute, as an exceptional monk, would reveal to them who had stolen some of their possessions and where the missing items were hidden, Shenoute refused to do so: “Let no one come to me on account of this sort of thing. I am not that sort of person!” Rather, “the adjudication of this place is that we gain our soul”: if Shenoute would reveal anything to his visitors, it would be “which persons Sin has stolen” and “where the enemy has hidden them.” Shenoute acknowledged the existence of such purveyors of clairvoyance, but asserted that people would not “find mercy before God” on account of them.¹⁷ In his view, illnesses, pain, poverty, and other such troubles were “trials” (peirasmoi), usually sent by God “for our salvation and the healing of our impieties” and thus best dealt with through endurance, prayer, and repentance. Remedies such as oil, special water, and animal parts, whether offered by “charmners and sorcerers” or by “the Church’s presbyters and monks,” provided merely “deceptive relief.”¹⁸ Shenoute believed that the monk’s only tasks were to prepare himself for the final judgment and to call others to repentance, and thus he flatly rejected the role of ritual specialist. Still, even Shenoute’s followers did not maintain this position: *the Life of Shenoute*,

Living for Eternity: The White Monastery and its Neighborhood. Proceedings of a Symposium at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, March 6 – 9, 2003. Ed. Philip Sellew. <http://egypt.cla.umn.edu/eventsr.html> (© 2009 the Regents of the University of Minnesota and the individual authors).

traditionally attributed to his successor Besa, presents its hero as a conventional miracle-working holy man, his sanctity demonstrated by the spiritual gifts that he received.¹⁹

Other monastic authors tried to subordinate such gifts to the monk's quest for virtue. Although he included accounts of miraculous deeds in his *Institutes* and *Conferences*, John Cassian stated, "My plan is to say a few things not about the marvelous works of God but about the improvement of our behavior and the attainment of the perfect life, in keeping with what we have learned from our elders"; a litany of miracles, he said, would be "a useless and vain object of wonderment" when what the reader needs is "correction for faults."²⁰ According to Cassian, since sinners and demons were known to have performed miraculous deeds, such acts were not an accurate measure of a person's "purity of love"; monks blessed with the gifts of healing or exorcism made use of them only in circumstances of extreme necessity.²¹ In comparison, Athanasius' *Life of Antony* is filled with healings, exorcisms, and instances of Antony's clairvoyance, but like Cassian Athanasius tried to detach such powers from the monk himself and to attribute them to Christ instead.²² Such efforts by elite authors could not, however, obscure the role of the monk in providing such help: Valeria, one of Paphnutius' correspondents, acknowledged that any healing that she may receive would come from Christ, but she told the monk that "I am confident that through your prayers I receive healing, for the revelations of the ascetics and worshipers are manifested."²³ Despite the efforts of Cassian and Athanasius, people believed that monks had a special relationship with God and thus could provide supernatural aid through ritualized means.

In this respect the monk resembled the priest and magician, for they too enjoyed intimate contact with supernatural beings. These were persons who lived with, talked to, negotiated with, and manipulated "gods" or "demons." The priest had an obvious relationship to the god he served and to which he sacrificed,²⁴ but the case of the ritual specialist not based in a temple, the magician, was more complex. The magical papyri frequently refer to an "assistant" (*paredros*), a supernatural being that did the bidding of the magician and could be called a "demon" (*daimôn*), an "angel" (*aggelos*), or a "god" (*theos*).²⁵ While some spells acquired an assisting demon or angel on a one-time basis for the specific action in view, others procured a more long-term, all-purpose "companion," who would "reveal everything" to the magician and "eat and sleep with" him.²⁶ Indeed, to have such a supernatural companion was part of what made the magician who he was, and the status of the magician could be measured by the status of his "assistant": a "god" was more prestigious than a "demon."²⁷ The social identity of the mobile ritual expert was grounded in part in his relationship to a demon, angel, or god.

We have seen that Evagrius calls the angels the monk's "assistants" in his combat with the demons, but the monk could also have a specific angelic or even demonic companion.²⁸ Both the *Shepherd of Hermas* and Origen had taught that two angels, a good one and an evil one, accompanied every person and suggested virtuous or sinful thoughts; this idea was a Christian variation on a well-attested but minority view in antiquity that a person had not one, but two personal *daimones*.²⁹ Monks readily accepted the notion of a helpful angelic companion, while expressing doubts about the

demonic one. Many stories indicate that the individual monk had his own specific assisting angel, and the quality of that relationship could serve as a measure of the monk's virtue. Thus, Paul the Simple could see that a monk was sinning because "his angel, filled with grief, with head bowed, follows him at a distance."³⁰ Palladius reports that the virtue of Mark the Ascetic was evident in that his angel, not a human priest, gave him the Eucharist,³¹ and he warns that God withdraws "the angel of providence" from the monk who succumbs to pride and claims that he has achieved virtue by his own ascetic practice rather than thanks to God's help.³² Angels, then, assisted the monk in his fight against demons, and many monks believed that they had a specific angelic companion, whose disposition toward them could change, even to the point that it would depart. We are perhaps not so far from the "magical spells" of Apa Anoub and others, which invoke Michael, Gabriel, and many other angelic powers, either singly or in groups, to come to their aid "against the first formed one [viz., Satan] and all his powers and his unclean and evil demons."³³

On the other hand, the evidence for the monk having a specific demonic adversary is not as strong. Evagrius rejected the idea that "the same demons persist with" the soul.³⁴ Yet his student Palladius seems to have had in mind a long-term demonic companion when he claimed that Moses the Ethiopian's conversion to ascetic virtue was so complete that he "brought his helper in wickedness from his youth, the very demon who was his companion in sin, forthwith to the acknowledgment of Christ."³⁵ Obviously, monks who renounced the role of magician or who accepted the Christian distinction between angels and demons would not have sought a demon as a long-term companion, although one monk did invite a demon to live with him as a way to get him to leave a possessed person. After twelve years of enduring the monk's strict diet of only twelve date pits a day, the demon left.³⁶ Doubtless it was more comfortable to eat and sleep with a (non-monastic) magician. In any event, both monk and magician defined themselves in terms of a more intentionally cultivated relationship with the guiding spirit or invisible companion that was believed to accompany every person.

Moreover, both knew how to communicate with and especially to persuade beings that most people could neither hear nor see: they knew the right words to say, and both invested power over the demonic in those words. A saying attributed to Abba Poemen and other fathers makes the comparison explicit: "The charmer does not understand the force (*dynamis*) of the words that he says, but the beast hears it, understands, submits, and humbles itself. So it is with us also: even if we do not understand the force of the words that we are saying, the demons nonetheless hear them and withdraw in fear."³⁷ The use of the word *dynamis* here conveys the same ambiguity as the English word "force": the speaker does not comprehend either the meaning of the words or their power, but that does not hinder their effectiveness. Frankfurter has described how magic spells and books of late antique Egypt drew on the authoritative power of writing and of sacred texts that was traditional in Egyptian temple culture.³⁸ The sacred words of Homer, properly inscribed on a piece of iron, could protect a runaway slave from being found, bring their wearer the love of anyone he or she meets, keep away wild animals, and so on.³⁹ It is

likely, as Frankfurter and others have claimed, that Christian monks participated in this movement of text production and thus of ritual power from temple to scriptorium.⁴⁰

If the monk then knew, spoke, and wrote down the right words, what words did he use? Characteristically, the *Apophthegmata* are ambiguous about precisely where to locate the monk's anti-demonic words, whether in the Bible or in monastically composed prayers and sayings. In the story about not understanding "the force" of one's words, the effective text against demons of fornication is "Son of God, have mercy on me," which is quasi-scriptural (cf. Matt 9:27; 15:22; etc.), and in any event it is not explicitly identified as being powerful because it may be scriptural.⁴¹ In general, prayers (whether scriptural or not) and the devotion and intensity that praying creates in the monk repel demons.⁴² One demon refuses to wake a sleeping monk because "once when I woke him, he got up and burned me by singing Psalms and praying."⁴³ Monks respond to demonic temptations with statements that sometimes are drawn from the Bible and sometimes not.⁴⁴ In a strange, vaguely Marcionite anecdote, a demon shows up in a monk's cell and recites by heart the Book of Numbers. The monk asks it whether it can recite from the New Testament as well, and at the sound of the word "New" the demon disappears.⁴⁵ The surviving magical texts with Christian elements are similarly diverse: some use passages from Scripture just as others use lines from Homer; others call upon Christian divinities, angels, or biblical figures in words composed by the author.⁴⁶ Although the monks of the *Apophthegmata* and the magical spells use biblical phrases against demons, they use other words as well and do not explicitly privilege Scripture.

But authoritatively positioned authors such as Athanasius of Alexandria and Evagrius of Pontus did not hesitate to identify the words in Scripture as the best available weapons against demons. The precedent for this view was, of course, Jesus' use of Scripture to answer the devil's temptations in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke (Matt 4:1-11; Luke 4:1-13). In the *Life of Antony*, Athanasius has Antony cite Jesus' example: "For what the Lord said, he did for our sakes, so that when the demons hear similar such sayings from us they will be overturned because of the Lord, who rebuked them with these sayings."⁴⁷ Athanasius, note, attributes the anti-demonic power not to the biblical words themselves, but to "the Lord," who first used them. This subtle point may not have been clear to every reader of the *Life*, which frequently portrays Antony singing Psalms or reciting other biblical verses in his conflicts with demons without such explanatory comments.⁴⁸

In his *Talking Back* Evagrius likewise invoked the example of Jesus' temptation as the model for his collection of biblical passages to be used in answering back demonic thoughts.⁴⁹ But he had also read the *Life of Antony*, for in prescribing the use of Ps. 117:7 to drive away "the demons that gradually begin to imitate obscene images and to appear

out of the air,” he explicitly cited Antony’s use of this verse against the demon of fornication as described in the *Life*: his readers “should,” he says, “answer with this phrase, as the righteous blessed Antony answered.”⁵⁰ In addition to biblical and monastic precedent, a carefully developed psychological theory lay behind *Talking Back*. In Evagrius’ view, good and evil thoughts “cut off” one another: the monk must preserve good thoughts against being cut off by evil ones and use good thoughts to cut off evil ones. “If one of the thoughts that cut off persists, it settles itself in the place of cutting off [i.e., the intellect], and eventually the person will be set in motion by that thought and become active.”⁵¹ *Talking Back* provides scriptural passages that could “cut off” evil thoughts, organized under brief headings, usually “Against the thought that . . .” or “Against the demon that . . .”⁵² But the treatise goes beyond this simple oppositional function by also providing passages that the monk in various circumstances could address “toward the Lord” or “toward the holy angels” or that he could speak to other monks as their conditions warrant: for example, “For the soul that is frightened by the attacks of demons that happen through touching.”⁵³ In its literary shape as an arsenal of effective words to oppose demons, to enlist supernatural aid, or to help persons in distress, Evagrius’ treatise invites comparison with the magician’s spell manual, which likewise listed various words or actions under brief headings: “For one who is swollen”; “For your enemies, that they (may) not prevail over you.”⁵⁴ Although each of the eight books of *Talking Back* presents its passages in canonical order, the overall effect is to atomize the scriptural text into a series of powerful sayings appropriate for various circumstances of need.

Evagrius may have found another precedent for his book in Athanasius’ *Epistle to Marcellinus*, in which any contrast with magical spells implicit in *Talking Back* is made explicit.⁵⁵ The ill Marcellinus to whom Athanasius addressed this work was certainly an ascetic Christian and may have been a monk, since Athanasius presents the work as the teaching of an “old man” (*gerôn*).⁵⁶ The *Epistle* is similar to *Talking Back* in that it suggests particular Psalms to recite for different conditions in which the Christian finds himself, ranging from persecution to demonic attack to the desire to give thanks to God. The words stabilize the soul through an effectiveness based in Christ’s incarnation.⁵⁷ In the conclusion, Athanasius explicitly contrasts the Bible with magical spells. In ancient Israel, he explains, people “drove demons away and refuted the plots they directed against human beings merely by reading the Scriptures.” But more recently certain persons have “abandoned” the Scriptures; instead, they have “composed for themselves plausible words from external sources, and with these have called themselves exorcists.” Such persons must be Christians who compose magic spells, and the ascetic character of the epistle and its addressee suggest that these are monks. The demons, Athanasius says, “mock” such spell-composing monks, while those who use the Bible send the demons away in terror because “the Lord is in the words of the Scriptures.”⁵⁸ Ascetic leaders such as Evagrius and Athanasius Christianized anti-demonic ritual activity by replacing composed texts, which could be a jumble of “pagan” and “Christian” elements, with texts

from the Bible, the distinctly Christian book. This was one strategy by which the Christian monk could distinguish himself from the magician and by which the ill-defined demonic specialist could take on the more specific identity of Christian monk.

Other stories present the monk as overlapping with and in competition with the pagan priest, a religious type that was transforming into the magician during the fourth century as well. Faced with the decline of their temples and the aggressive recruitment of the now imperially supported Church, pagan priests could choose to continue their lives as religious virtuosi as Christian monks; in turn, monks faced the temptation to return to their old pagan identities. When Abba Olympius has a priest as an overnight guest, the pagan is puzzled that Olympius does not receive visions from his Christian God even though he practices such a rigorous ascetic regime. The priest reports that his sacrifices are enough to get his god to reveal all his mysteries to him, and he sagely suggests that Olympius is not receiving visions because “impure thoughts” separate him from God. Other monks approve of this diagnosis.⁵⁹ This story presents the priest-monk relationship matter-of-factly; they are colleagues who follow two paths to revelations from God and can compare notes, so to speak.

But stories of priests converting and becoming monks suggest not only overlap between the two groups, but also competition. One priest beats nearly to death a young monk who had called him a “devil,” but he then converts and becomes a monk when Macarius the Great greets him warmly.⁶⁰ In two stories priests convert when they learn that the demons they either command or worship are unable to cause monks to fall into sin.⁶¹ These stories use the demonic to establish clear boundaries between monk and priest by aligning the priest with the demons that the monk fights; the monastic victory over the demonic enables the conversion of priest to monk. Similarly, several stories portray abandoned pagan temples as the peculiar dwelling places of the demons.⁶² Doubtless these accounts reflect the actual use of abandoned temples as temporary lodgings by traveling monks: it must have been eerie for a monk to spend the night surrounded by images of the pagan gods. But they also contribute to the clear othering of the category of priest, an identity that some monks had given up for their new Christian roles. Thus, a monk’s fall could involve his lapse into his old priestly or perhaps magical practices, as when a brother, overwhelmed by his sexual urges, “sacrificed” in order to procure a sexual partner. The story’s point is not really the sin of fornication, but the brother’s identity: his use of sacrifice for erotic purposes casts him as a priest or a magician, for erotic spells often performed burnt offerings as a form of sacrifice or promised the demon a sacrifice if the spell worked.⁶³ The story ends when Abba Lot for three weeks does penance with the brother, who then submits to Lot for the rest of his life. The brother ends up an obedient junior monk, not a priest or magician.⁶⁴

A lengthy anonymous *apophthegma* is most likely another version of this story—the key detail is the three weeks of repentance—and here the choice of monk versus priest is made much more explicit. I quote the story almost in full:

A brother was attacked by the demon of fornication. It happened that he went through a certain village in Egypt; when he saw the daughter of a priest of the pagans, he fell in love with her and said to her father, “Give her to me as my wife.” The other replied, “I cannot give her to you without being advised by my god,” and he went to the demon and said to him, “Here is a monk who has come, wanting my daughter. Shall I give her to him?” The demon answered, “Ask him if he will renounce his God, his baptism, and his vow as a monk.” And the priest went and said to the monk, “Renounce your God, your baptism, and your vow as a monk.” The monk agreed to this, and immediately he saw, as it were, a dove coming out of his mouth that flew up to heaven. Then the priest went to the demon and said to him, “Yes, he has agreed to these three things.” Then the devil replied to him, “Do not give him your daughter as his wife, for his God has not turned from him but continues to help him.” The priest went and said to him, “I cannot give her to you, for your God aids you and has not turned from you.” When he heard these words, the brother said to himself, “God has shown me such great goodness, wretch that I am, even though I have renounced him, my baptism, and my vow as a monk. He who is good continues even now to help me!” So he came to his senses, and became watchful, and went into the desert to a great old man, and told him about the affair. The old man answered him, “Stay here with me in the cave, and fast for three consecutive weeks, and I will intercede for you to God.” And the old man labored for the brother and besought God, saying, “Lord, I beseech you, grant me this soul and receive his repentance,” and God heard him.—[For three weeks the brother fasted and prayed, and finally the dove returned into his mouth.]—Then the old man gave thanks to God and said to the brother, “See, God has accepted your repentance; from now on pay attention yourself.” And the brother replied, “Look, from now on, abba, I shall stay with you until I die.”⁶⁵

Although the ancient compiler placed this story with others under the heading, “Against the Warfare that Arises from Fornication,” it really is not about fornication.⁶⁶ The priest’s daughter never appears and functions only as device to set in motion the real story, which is a precisely constructed competition between two fathers for the allegiance of a young monk. The pagan priest, potential father-in-law, offers marriage and traditional religion. The Christian elder, potential abba, offers celibacy and Christian asceticism. Both function as intermediaries between the brother and their respective

gods. But the anecdote makes the priest's god a demon, whose power is ineffectual in the face of the loyalty of the Christian God, to which even the demon testifies. And thus the young man ends up more secure in his identity as a monk, son to the Christian abba, not to the pagan priest. No doubt many religiously inclined young men in fourth- and fifth-century Egypt faced the choice of religious mentors that confronted this brother.⁶⁷

As opponents of the demons, monks were famous not only for resisting their temptations, but also for driving them out of people, for being exorcists. The *Historia Monachorum* singles out four of its monks as exceptional exorcists, including Paul the Simple, to whom it is reported Antony himself sent those persons whose demons he was unable to drive out.⁶⁸ Antony, at least the Antony of Athanasius' *Life*, had set the standard for the monastic exorcist, even amazing a group of visiting philosophers by cleansing a set of demoniacs who just happened to be present.⁶⁹ But, typically, Athanasius has Antony warn against boasting in one's ability to cast out demons or distinguishing among monks based on their exorcising skills. Antony cites Luke 10:20—"Do not rejoice that the demons are subject to you, but that your names are written in heaven"—and explains, "That our names are written in heaven is a testimony to our virtue and way of life, but casting out demons is a gift given by the Savior," thus severing the ability to perform exorcisms from virtue and the ascetic regime.⁷⁰ But Athanasius' own depiction of Antony the exorcist undermined this principle, and later authors were not so cautious. According to Palladius, the monk Innocent of the Mount of Olives was given the power to drive out demons precisely because he was so innocent, and the author of the *Historia Monachorum* frankly attributed Paul the Simple's superior exorcistic abilities to his superior obedience, demonstrated through years of unquestioning submission to the harsh requirements of Antony himself.⁷¹

Exorcism was clearly the monastic gift of healing *par excellence* and thus, as Antony warned, provided an occasion for temptation. According to Evagrius, to request gifts of healing from God was to fall prey to the demon of vainglory, who could also say to a monk blessed with such gifts, "Look, you are proficient with the gift of healing that you have received."⁷² His student Cassian warned that a monk's presentation of himself as an exorcist to other people, particularly among "admiring crowds," was a sign of "the disease of vainglory."⁷³ Palladius, another disciple of Evagrius, describes in lurid detail a very impressive exorcism performed by Macarius the Alexandrian—the boy levitates and expands horrifically until water bursts out of all his sense organs and he returns to normal size—and then immediately follows this scene with one in which the spirit of vainglory suggests to Macarius that he go to Rome to parlay his gift of healing into greater fame. This is a temptation so powerful that Macarius lies on the ground and challenges the demons to drag him to Rome; he later places a basket of sand on his shoulders to prevent himself from leaving.⁷⁴

Likewise, a significant number of *apophthegmata* dealing with exorcisms emphasize humility—not just that the monk must be humble about his exorcisms, but even more that humility itself enables exorcisms.⁷⁵ Stories of exorcism by humility dramatize the more general monastic belief that humility is the most effective virtue in the monk’s struggle with the demonic.⁷⁶ Thus, demons depart from their human hosts when a monk turns the other cheek after being struck by the possessed man or when another monk identifies himself as one of the goats in the Parable of the Sheep and the Goats: in the latter case, the demon admits, “Look, it is because of your humility that I am coming out.”⁷⁷ The motif of humility as exorcising power generated comic stories in which supremely humble monks furtively cast out demons or must be tricked into doing so inadvertently. For example, Abba Longinus says, “I can do nothing for you,” when presented with a possessed man, and sends the demoniac to Abba Zeno. When Zeno undertakes the exorcism, the demon departs, but declares that it is departing because of Longinus’ prayers, telling Zeno, “I would not have given you an answer.”⁷⁸ A group of priests tricks Abba Bessarion into casting out a demon by telling Bessarion to say to the possessed man while he is sleeping, “Arise, and go out,” a command that the demon promptly obeys.⁷⁹ What would have happened if Macarius had gone to Rome as the demon of vainglory suggested to him? An anonymous *apophthegma* tells of a monk similarly blessed with great gifts who was summoned to meet the Emperor, from whom he received gold and properties. But when this monk tried to exorcise a demon, the demon would not leave, saying, “You have become like one of us by abandoning your attention to God and living for earthly cares.”⁸⁰ The power to exorcise could be lost as well as gained.

The development behind these stories is clear. Monks demonstrated their acquisition of virtue through exorcism, which then could be an occasion for pride. Monks then exhorted each other to be humble about their anti-demonic powers, and then in turn the virtue of humility became itself the source of that power, so that exceptional monks outdid one another in exorcism by outdoing one another in humility. This paradoxical circle of humility and achievement is familiar to any reader of monastic literature. In the context of our topic, however, exorcism by humility appears to have been another strategy for differentiating the monk from his competitors by attributing power over the demonic to the overall effect of the monastic lifestyle, rather than to the right words or actions. These monks were superior to other potential exorcists in their very persons, so much so that they did not have to perform exorcisms at all in order to drive out demons. Their virtue, carefully built up through the ascetic regime, was sufficient to repel the evil spirits.

I conclude with a story about Macarius the Great, which features all three of our religious types: monk, priest, and magician. Reported by both the *Historia Monachorum* and Palladius, this story has been perceptively analyzed in a recent essay by David Frankfurter.⁸¹ In Palladius’ version, an Egyptian commissioned a sorcerer—a *goes*—to

Living for Eternity: The White Monastery and its Neighborhood. Proceedings of a Symposium at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, March 6–9, 2003. Ed. Philip Sellew. <http://egypt.cla.umn.edu/eventsr.html> (© 2009 the Regents of the University of Minnesota and the individual authors).

procure for him the love of a married woman. In order to get the husband to send his wife away, the sorcerer turns her into a mare. The distraught husband brings his wife, now a horse, to the village priests, but they are unable to do anything, and for three days the mare does not eat any food. Macarius, however, prays and pours blessed water over the mare, and she resumes her human shape. According to Palladius, Macarius explains that the woman did not really change into a mare: she only appeared to do so because the onlookers were lustful sinners (“You are the horses, for you have the eyes of horses”) and the woman had not gone to communion for five weeks.⁸² In the *Historia*, the woman really did become a mare, and there is no moralizing conclusion. Frankfurter learns much from this story about ancient magic and about our topic here, the similarity and overlap among monks, priests, and magicians. He concludes “that the dichotomy between sorcerer and monk in the monastic literature, where the one removes through Christ what the other sets through magic, masks a much more fluid range of ritual experts both within and without the monastic fold. A monk was certainly as likely to provide one with an erotic binding spell as was an Egyptian priest, a rabbi, or an ‘intellectual pagan,’ and each could supply the counterspell as well.”⁸³

This conclusion is exactly right, but I have been interested also in the strategies by which monastic literature sought to create and solidify the distinctions among these religious virtuosi within the fluidity that Frankfurter describes. Among these strategies were tying ritual power to the text of the Christian Scriptures, telling stories in which priests become monks or monks resist returning to the priesthood, and paradoxically investing the power to exorcise in the monastic virtue of humility. Palladius’ version of the Macarius anecdote performs its own paradox: it displays the monk Macarius as the superior ritual expert, able to do what the priests could not, while denying that he has done anything at all, since what the magician did was not real. It is this paradox that runs throughout this literature: the monks embraced the powers and social roles of the very identities that they renounced and derided as impotent. The Christian monk was fashioned in part through a simultaneous acknowledgment and disavowal of his religious cognates, the priest and the magician.

ENDNOTES

¹ Evagrius Ponticus, *Ant.* pref. (ed. W. Frankenberg, *Euagrios Ponticus* [Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1912], 472-74). For their comments on earlier versions, I am grateful to David Frankfurter, Bert Harrill, and the other participants in the symposium.

² Athanasius, *Vit. Ant.* 8.2 (SC 400: 156).

³ Shenoute, *Because of You Too, O Prince of Evil* XH 192-93 (ed. P. du Bourgeut, "Diatribes de Chenouté contre le démon," *Bulletin de la société d'archéologie copte* 16 [1961-62]: 17-72, at 28-29).

⁴ Antoine and Claire Guillaumont, "Démon: III. Dans la plus ancienne littérature monastique," *Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique: Doctrine et histoire* 3 (1957): 189-212, at 211-12.

⁵ *Apoph. patr.* Pambo 13 (PG 65: 372).

⁶ *Apoph. patr.* Macarius the Great 13 (PG 65: 268-69).

⁷ *Apoph. patr.* Macarius the Great 33 (PG 65: 277).

⁸ Jonathan Z. Smith, "Trading Places," in *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power* (ed. Marvin Meyer and Paul Mirecki; *Religions in the Graeco-Roman World* 129; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 13-27.

⁹ David Frankfurter, *Religion in Roman Egypt: Assimilation and Resistance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), 198-237.

¹⁰ Frankfurter, *Religion in Roman Egypt*, 257-64.

¹¹ The use of the *Apophthegmata* as sources for fourth- and fifth-century Egyptian monasticism is controversial since the collections that we have most likely were made no earlier than the second half of the fifth century in Gaza and may reflect a view of early monasticism revised in the wake of the Origenist controversy. My points do not depend on the historicity of any particular anecdote that I adduce, but I do assume that as a collection the *Apophthegmata* do not distort the overall situation in Scetis and Lower Egypt, at least on the subject of monks and other ritual specialists. For defenses of this use of the *Apophthegmata*, see Graham Gould, *The Desert Fathers on Monastic Community* (Oxford Early Christian Studies; Oxford: Clarendon, 1993), 5-25, and Douglas Burton-Christie, *The Word in the Desert: Scripture and the Quest for Holiness in Early Christian Monasticism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 76-103.

¹² From the *Life of Antony* alone, see chaps. 14, 48, 56-58, 61-62, 64, 71, 80, 84-85. The *Historia Monachorum* is famous for its emphasis on the miraculous deeds of the monks. In general, see Françoise Dunand, "Miracles et guérisons en Égypte tardive," in *Mélanges Étienne Bernard* (ed. Nicole Fick and Jean-Claude Carrière; *Annales littéraires de l'Université de Besançon* 444; Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1991), 235-50. Dunand contrasts the pagans' practice of requesting healings and the like directly from the gods with the Christians' seeking such help from intermediary human figures, the monks, but this difference is not so clear-cut: on the one hand, the pagan priest was the always present facilitator of persons' appeals to the gods; on the other hand, requests to monks for help often took the form of requests for their prayers to God or Christ, the actual source of the benefit.

¹³ Texts: H. Idris Bell, *Jews and Christians in Egypt* (London: British Museum, 1924), 100-20, and Adolf Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East: The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Greco-Roman World* (rev. ed.; trans. Lionel R. M. Strachan;

New York: George H. Doran, 1927), 215-16. Recent English translation: Robert F. Boughner, with introduction by James E. Goehring, "Egyptian Monasticism (Selected Papyri)," in *Ascetic Behavior in Greco-Roman Antiquity* (ed. Vincent Wimbush; *Studies in Antiquity and Christianity*; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 456-63. Discussion: David Brakke, *Athanasius and Asceticism* (1995; repr. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 210-12.

¹⁴ *P. Lond.* 1928 (Bell, *Jews and Christians* 114-15).

¹⁵ Shenoute, *Acephalous* work A 14, XY 55-56 (ed. Tito Orlandi, *Shenute: Contra Origenistas* [Rome: C.I.M., 1985], 18).

¹⁶ Palladius, *H. Laus.* 17.6-9 (ed. Cuthbert Butler, *The Lausiaca History of Palladius* [Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1904], 44-46); *H. mon.* 21.17 (ed. André-Jean Festugière, *Historia monachorum in Aegypto: Édition critique du texte grec et traduction annotée* [*Subsidia Hagiographica* 53; Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1971], 128). See David Frankfurter, "The Perils of Love: Magic and Countermagic in Coptic Egypt," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 10 (2001): 480-500.

¹⁷ Shenoute, *I See Your Eagerness* XJ 82-84 (ed. Émile Amélineau, *Oeuvres de Shenoudi: Texte copte et traduction française*, 2 vols. [Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1907-14], 2: 69-72).

¹⁸ Shenoute, *Acephalous* work A 14, XY 48-50, 55-56, XW 161-62 (Orlandi, *Contra Origenistas*, 16-18). On this work, see Stephen Emmel, "Shenoute's Literary Corpus" (Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1993), 1010, 1184-85.

¹⁹ On the distance between Shenoute's works and the *Life* on this point, see Heike Behlmer, "Visitors to Shenoute's Monastery," in *Pilgrimage and Holy Space in Late Antique Egypt* (ed. David Frankfurter; *Religions in the Graeco-Roman World*; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 341-71, at 354-59.

²⁰ John Cassian, *Inst. praef.*8 (Boniface Ramsey, *John Cassian: The Institutes*, ACW 58 [New York: Newman, 2000], 13); *Conf.* 18.1.3 (Boniface Ramsey, *John Cassian: The Conferences*, ACW 57 [New York: Paulist, 1997], 635).

²¹ Cassian, *Conf.* 15.1-2 (Ramsey, *Conferences*, 537-39).

²² Brakke, *Athanasius and Asceticism*, 248-53; Rowan A. Greer, *The Fear of Freedom: A Study of Miracles in the Roman Imperial Church* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1989), 104-07.

²³ *P. Lond.* 1926 (Bell, *Jews and Christians*, 108-09).

²⁴ See, for example, *Apoph. patr.* N190 (*Revue de l'orient chrétien* 13 [1908]: 274-75), quoted at length below.

²⁵ C. Colpe, "Geister (Dämonen): B. III. a. *Synkretismus in Ägypten*," *RAC* 9 (1976): 615-25, at 621-22.

²⁶ Specific: *PGM* IV. 1716-820, 2006-125; VII. 862-918. All-purpose: *PGM* I. 1-41 (quoted phrases from 1-5), 42-195.

²⁷ Fritz Graf, *Magic in the Ancient World* (trans. Franklin Philip; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997), 107-16.

²⁸ On the late ancient person's "invisible companion," see Peter Brown, *The Making of Late Antiquity* (Carl Newell Jackson Lectures, 1976; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978), 68-71, 89-91. For a group of angels who function as special ministers to monks, see *Apoc. Paul* 9 (*The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation*, ed. J. K. Elliott [Oxford: Clarendon, 1993], 622).

²⁹ Herm. *Mand.* 6.2; Origen, *Princ.* 3.2.4 (SC 268: 170); *Hom. Luc.* 3.5.3-5 (SC 87: 414-18). Two *daimones*: Pierre Boyancé, “Les deux démons personnels dans l’antiquité grecque et latine,” *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d’histoire anciennes*, 3d ser., 9 (1935): 189-202.

³⁰ *Apoph. patr.* Paul the Simple 1 (PG 65: 381-84).

³¹ Palladius, *H. Laus.* 18.25 (Butler, *Lausiac History*, 56). Cf. *Apoph. patr.* Macarius the Great 33 (PG 65: 277), in which Macarius learns of the virtue of two monks in part by observing an angel protecting them from demons.

³² Palladius, *H. Laus.* 47.9 (Butler, *Lausiac History*, 139). This appears to be what happens to the proud virgin in Jerusalem (*H. Laus.* 28 [Butler, *Lausiac History*, 83-84]).

³³ *Ancient Christian Magic: Coptic Texts of Ritual Power* (ed. Marvin W. Meyer and Richard Smith; rev. ed.; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), nos. 63 (Apa Anoub), 71 (quotation), and 135 (pp. 117-19, 133-46, 326-41).

³⁴ Evagrius Ponticus, *Pract.* 59 (SC 171: 638-40).

³⁵ Palladius, *H. Laus.* 19.2 (Butler, *Lausiac History*, 59; trans. Kathleen O’Brien Wicker, “Ethiopian Moses [Collected Sources],” in *Ascetic Behavior in Greco-Roman Antiquity: A Sourcebook* [ed. Vincent L. Wimbush; Studies in Antiquity and Christianity; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990], 329-48, at 336). I consider this the best way to read this puzzling passage; I cannot accept R. Draguet’s claim that the word “demon” is used here in a “figural sense” (“L’Histoire Lausiaque’: Une oeuvre écrite dans l’esprit d’Évagre,” *RHE* 41 [1946]: 321-64; 42 [1947]: 5-49, at 41: 361).

³⁶ *Apoph. patr.* N12 (*Revue de l’orient chrétien* 12 [1907]: 52).

³⁷ *Apoph. patr.* N184 (*Revue de l’orient chrétien* 13 [1908]: 271-72).

³⁸ Frankfurter, *Religion in Roman Egypt*, 257-64.

³⁹ *PGM* IV. 2145-240.

⁴⁰ Frankfurter, *Religion in Roman Egypt*, 258-60, cites much of the evidence; see also Siegfried G. Richter, “Bemerkungen zu magischen Elementen koptischer Zaubertexte,” *Akten des 21. internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Berlin, 13.-19.8.1995* (ed. Bärbel Kramer et al.; Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete Beiheft 3; 2 vols.; Stuttgart and Leipzig: Teubner, 1997), 835-46, esp. 838.

⁴¹ *Apoph. patr.* N184 (*Revue de l’orient chrétien* 13 [1908]: 271-72). For a similar prayer that sounds biblical, see *Apoph. patr.* Amoun of Nitria 3 (PG 65: 128). G. Bartelink assumes that the prayer in N184 is biblical in his brief discussion of the apotropaic power of biblical texts among monks: “Die Rolle der Bibel in den asketischen Kreisen des vierten und fünften Jahrhunderts,” in *The Impact of Scripture in Early Christianity* (ed. J. den Boeft and M. L. van Poll-van de Lisdonk; Supplements to *VC*; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 27-38, at 36-37. Likewise Burton-Christie (*Word in the Desert*, 199-200) is more likely than I to see scriptural citations and allusions in the phrases with which monks in the *Apophthegmata* respond to and repel demons.

⁴² E.g., *Apoph. patr.* N45, N64, N66 (*Revue de l’orient chrétien* 12 [1907]: 175, 393-94).

⁴³ *Apoph. patr.* N36 (*Revue de l’orient chrétien* 12 [1907]: 66).

⁴⁴ The monk in *Apoph. patr.* N313 (*Revue de l’orient chrétien* 17 [1912]: 206) uses Mark 13:21 par. to refute the demons’ offer to show him Christ. Poemen recommends repelling a demonically inspired thought of blasphemy with a retort that is not scriptural (*Apoph. patr.* Poemen 93 [PG 65: 344-45]), *pace* Burton-Christie, *Word in the Desert*, 199.

⁴⁵ *Apoph. patr.* N632 (Lucien Regnault, *Les sentences des pères du désert: série des anonymes* [Solesmes: Bellefontaine, 1985], 275).

⁴⁶ Many examples could be cited from Meyer and Smith, Ancient Christian Magic, but for the use of Scripture see nos. 7 and 9 (pp. 33-35) and for the use of other words see nos. 8, 10, and 16-17 (pp. 33-36, 40-41).

⁴⁷ Athanasius, Vit. Ant. 37.3-4 (SC 400: 236).

⁴⁸ Athanasius, Vit. Ant. 6.4-5; 9.2-3; 13.7; 39.3; 41.5 (SC 400: 148, 158, 170-72, 240, 244). In the last incident Antony “countersings” (katapsallein) a demon.

⁴⁹ Evagrius Ponticus, Ant. pref. (Frankenberg, Euagrius, 472).

⁵⁰ Evagrius Ponticus, Ant. 4.47 (Frankenberg, Euagrius, 508), referring to Athanasius, Vit. Ant. 6.4 (SC 400: 148).

⁵¹ Evagrius Ponticus, Peri Logismôn 7 (SC 438: 174-76).

⁵² Evagrius Ponticus, Ant. pref. (Frankenberg, Euagrius, 474).

⁵³ Evagrius Ponticus, Ant. 4.65 (Frankenberg, Euagrius, 510). Passages “toward the Lord” are frequent; for “toward the holy angels” and similar, see Ant. 2.14, 42 (Frankenberg, Euagrius, 486, 490).

⁵⁴ Meyer and Smith, Ancient Christian Magic, nos. 128, 133, 135 (pp. 271-72, 305-07, 339-41).

⁵⁵ Evagrius’ statement that “the melody that is applied to the Psalms alters the condition of the body” (Ant. 4.22 [Frankenberg, Euagrius, 504]) may indicate knowledge of the Epistle, which teaches precisely this (Athanasius, Ep. Marcell. 28 [PG 27: 40]).

⁵⁶ Athanasius refers to Marcellinus’ “discipline” (askêsis) (Ep. Marcell. 1 [PG 27: 12]). For the possible monastic setting, see M. J. Rondeau, “L’Épître à Marcellinus sur les Psaumes,” VC 22 (1968): 176-97, at 194-97.

⁵⁷ See esp. Hermann-Josef Sieben, “Athanasius über den Psalter: Analyse seines Briefes an Marcellinus,” TP 2 (1973): 157-73; more briefly, Brakke, Athanasius and Asceticism, 194-96.

⁵⁸ Athanasius, Ep. Marcell. 33 (PG 27: 44-45).

⁵⁹ Apoph. patr. Olympius 1 (PG 65: 313).

⁶⁰ Apoph. patr. Macarius the Great 39 (PG 65: 280-81).

⁶¹ Apoph. patr. N77 (Revue de l’orient chrétien 12 [1907]: 397-98); 5.44 (SC 387: 288-90).

⁶² Apoph. patr. 7.17 (SC 387: 346; = Macarius the Great 13); Elias 7 (PG 65: 184-85); Lot 2 (PG 65: 256); N 176 (Revue de l’orient chrétien 13 [1908]: 268-69).

⁶³ See PGM IV. 1830-40, 2095-100.

⁶⁴ Apoph. patr. Lot 2 (PG 65: 256).

⁶⁵ Apoph. patr. N190 (Revue de l’orient chrétien 13 [1908]: 274-75; trans. Benedicta Ward, The Wisdom of the Desert Fathers [Fairacres, Eng.: SLG, 1986], 19-20, alt.).

⁶⁶ Apoph. patr. N163 (Revue de l’orient chrétien 13 [1908]: 53).

⁶⁷ For another example of the priest and abba as rival father figures to young men, see Paphnutius (?), Histories of the Monks of Upper Egypt 31-52 (Tim Vivian, Histories of the Monks of Upper Egypt and the Life of Onnophrius [rev. ed.; Cistercian Studies 140; Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 2000], 87-97).

⁶⁸ Or, Copres, Pityrion, and Paul the Simple: H. mon. 2.6; 10.1; 15.1; 24.10 (Festugière, Historia Monachorum, 37, 75, 111, 133).

⁶⁹ Athanasius, Vit. Ant. 14.5; 48; 63-64; 71; 80.2-5 (SC 400: 174, 264-66, 300-04, 318-20, 338).

⁷⁰ Athanasius, *Vit. Ant.* 38.1-3 (SC 400: 238). Cassian follows Athanasius in this use of Luke 10:20 (*Conf.* 15.6.3; 15.9 [Ramsey, *Conferences*, 541-43]).

⁷¹ Palladius, *H. Laus.* 44.3 (Butler, *Lausiatic History*, 131-32); *H. mon.* 24 (Festugière, *Historia Monachorum*, 131-33); cf. Palladius, *H. Laus.* 22.

⁷² Evagrius Ponticus, *Ant.* 7.35, 42 (Frankenberg, *Euagrios*, 536).

⁷³ Cassian, *Conf.* 15.7.4 (Ramsey, *Conferences*, 542-43).

⁷⁴ Palladius, *H. Laus.* 18.22-24 (Butler, *Lausiatic History*, 54-56).

⁷⁵ On humility in the *Apophthegmata* see Burton-Christie, *Word in the Desert*, 236-58, esp. 256-58 on humility as anti-demonic.

⁷⁶ *Apoph. patr.* Theodora 6, Macarius the Great 35 (PG 65: 204, 277).

⁷⁷ *Apoph. patr.* N298, 307 (*Revue de l'orient chrétien* 17 [1912]: 204-06); cf. Daniel 3 (PG 65: 153-56).

⁷⁸ *Apoph. patr.* Longinus 4 (PG 65: 257).

⁷⁹ *Apoph. patr.* Bessarion 5 (PG 65: 141); cf. Poemen 7 (PG 65: 321).

⁸⁰ *Apoph. patr.* N398 (Regnault, *Sentences*, 132).

⁸¹ Frankfurter, "Perils of Love."

⁸² Palladius, *H. Laus.* 17.6-9 (Butler, *Lausiatic History*, 44-46).

⁸³ Frankfurter, "Perils of Love," 500.