

4

Religious Key Terms in Hellenism and Byzantium: Three Facets

HENRY AND RENÉE KAHANE

In a first, typological, study,¹ we emphasized certain general features inherent in key terms. In what follows we exemplify our argument with three case histories. These share the linguistic milieu, Christianity in its Greek (or, in one instance, Greco-Latin) expression; and they represent incisive phases of ecclesiastical history which center on language. But the function of language changes from case to case.

The key word of the first account is a powerful term of the Pauline tradition, which, like many lexemes of Western civilization, survived in the language of the Church, yet changed its connotation and had to be “translated” by its exegetes, period after period.—The second analysis deals with a basic term of early monasticism, which (with its synonyms) dominated all phases of that life and thereby turned into a focus of metaphorization.—The last case is an attempt to reconstruct, through its key terms, the image of a medieval sect as it appeared to an eloquent enemy; what evolves is a linguistic field with, throughout, negative values.

I. Mutations of a Pauline Key Term: *Agape* and *Caritas*

St. Paul's “Hymn to Love” (1 Cor. 13), with such phrasings as “if I am without *love*, I am a sounding gong” / “. . . faith, hope, and *love*, but the

¹ “Linguistic Aspects of Sociopolitical Keywords,” *Language Problems and Language Planning* 8 (University of Texas 1984), 143–60.

greatest of them all is *love*," had, through its key word, a considerable impact on religious lexicology. The key term is ἀγάπη in the Greek text and *caritas* in the Latin, and it exemplifies the potentialities inherent in a profane word, which in the hands of the erudite, with their classical outlook, turned into a stimulus for reinterpretation and readaptation. The following is a survey of the main semantic variations of *love* in the Greek and Latin of the Church Fathers and the medieval Latin of Scholasticism.²

1. *Greek Patristics*. In its first phase, as a technical term, ἀγάπη "love" still kept the connotations of the pristine Christian communities, in which it expressed, as in the Pauline passage, a new concept of human relationship: the people, in a mutual state of equality and united against the pagan world without, perceived themselves as a loving family, whose members were metaphorized as "brethren." The key concept "fraternal love for the neighbour" is dissected in the Apocryphal *Epistle to Diognetus* (c. 200): "Happiness consists not in the domination over neighbours [τῶν πλησίον], nor in wishing to have more than the weak, nor in wealth and power to compel those who are poorer. . . . [Happy is he who] takes up the burden of his neighbour, and wishes to help another, who is worse off in that in which he is the stronger" (X. 5-6).³

Hence, the early Fathers saw in ἀγάπη a moral concept, using the word as a synonym of φιλαδελφία "fraternal love (between brethren)" and κοινοφελές "common interest, benefit for all."⁴ Origen (2nd-3rd c.) stuck to this image. He stated explicitly that St. Paul, in his passage, "does not speak of *agape* for God but of that for one's fellow man—he (the Apostle) actually says that he is writing for the faithful. And all that is said today is just exaggerated."⁵ This view, which lasted into the Byzantine era, imparted to ἀγάπη the force of an axiom; it was the key term of a way of life, and its foremost promoter, John Chrysostom (fourth century) fixed its dominant position in the virtue system: "In the eyes of the Lord everything else ranks below ἀγάπη"⁶ and "Nothing is as pleasing to God as living κοινοφελῶς, for the common benefit."⁷

²It follows, above all, the thorough study by P. R. Balducci, *Il concetto teologico di carità attraverso le maggiori interpretazioni patristiche e medievali di I ad Cor XIII* (Rome 1951). Hélène Pétré, *Étude sur le vocabulaire latin de la charité chrétienne* (Spicilegium sacrum lovaniense 22 [Louvain 1948]), has analyzed the semantic ramifications of Lat. *caritas* up to the fourth century, as a contribution to the growth of Christian Latinity.

³K. Lake, ed. and trans., *The Apostolic Fathers* (Loeb Classical Library, London 1912-1913), II, p. 373.

⁴Pétré (above, note 2), pp. 115-17.

⁵J. A. Cramer, ed., *Catena graecorum patrum in Novum Testamentum, V: In epistolas S. Pauli Ad Corinthios* (Oxford 1844), 252.22-24.

⁶J. P. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 61: col. 289.

⁷Migne, *PG*, 58: 714.

2. *Latin Patristics*. After some vacillation between the Grecism *agape* and its Lat. synonym *dilectio*, prevalent in second and third-century African Latinity, *caritas*, a derivative of *carus* "dear," became with Cyprian (third century) the standard rendition of the Pauline term. Ambrosiaster, the fourth to fifth-century commentator on St. Paul's letters,⁸ unidentified yet marked by his legalistic mind, was no longer bound by the tradition which shaped the Greek lexeme and was shaped by it. Virtue, to him, was to be judged by man's actions, and *caritas*, expressing itself by, say, compassion or kindness, was perceived as the wellspring of merit. The mental state in which merit could be attained became a significant feature in the analysis of 1 Cor. 13: fear of punishment or selfishness were not the conditions appropriate for accomplishing the task; only love could do it. *Caritas*, in short, effected the disposition which made an action meritorious, that is, qualified a human for mercy from God. The Ambrosiaster likes the sober metaphor: "To enable them to make some profit, he [the Apostle] urges them on, to do things which would gather merit with God" (*Ad Colossenses* 3:13) and "he who is found to be patient in his tribulations gathers merit" (*Ad Romanos* 8:26). With the Ambrosiaster's doctrine of merit, the moral orientation behind the Greek lexeme, emphasizing "brotherly love," had given way to one focusing on religious virtue, with virtue determined by man's deeds and motivations.

In the doctrine of St. Augustine (fourth to fifth century) the concept of *caritas* was central and displayed new facets. His exegesis of St. Paul's passage came after his reading of Plotinus' *Enneads* and blended the Pauline tradition and Neo-Platonic ideas. In particular, the impact of the Platonic *eros*, love searching for the idea of the good, is noticeable. With God being the absolute and invariable good, *caritas*, by referring to "love of God" became the dominant ethical concept, the yardstick for worthiness of eternal life. In St. Augustine's formulation: "You may have gotten whatever you want—it will be of no use to you if you do not have the one thing [*caritas*]; you may have nothing else, but have this one and you have abided by the Law."⁹

3. *Scholasticism*. By the first half of the thirteenth century, with the Scholastic movement at its height, a science of theology evolved which went beyond the traditional exegesis of the Scriptures. Its stronghold was the University of Paris, with the group of the *Magistri in Sancta Pagina*.¹⁰ Key words used by St. Paul became technical terms in the *Summae* of the period. The fundamental explication of *caritas*, holding for centuries to come, was owed to Thomas Aquinas. He followed the Ambrosiaster, with

⁸ *Ambrosiastri qui dicitur commentarius in epistulas paulinas* (Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum 81: 1–3) (Vienna 1966–1969).

⁹ *In epistolam ad Parthos* V, 7 (Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 35: col. 2016).

¹⁰ J. de Ghellinck, "Pagina et Sacra Pagina: Histoire d'un mot et transformation de l'objet primitivement désigné," *Mélanges Pelzer* (Louvain 1947), p. 58.

caritas as the meritorious virtue, that is, as the wellspring of mercy. But he blended this explanation with the Aristotelian exegesis in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, of φιλία "friendship": "equality and likeness are friendship" (VIII. 8) and "friendship depends on community" (VIII. 9). To Thomas Aquinas *communicatio*, mutual sharing and involvement, was, apparently, the key concept:¹¹ "Every love consists in some kind of oneness" ("*In epistolam I ad Corinthios*," Lectio IV). It is the essential feature in his theological redefinition of *caritas* as *amicitia divina*, God's friendship for man. God, to him, was not only the object but also the subject of love. Thomas declared in his *Disputatio de malo*: "*Caritas*, which is *amor Dei*, God's love for man, *controls* all other virtues" (*Quaestiones disputatae*, VIII. 2). This statement says, particularly in view of the Aristotelian term "control" (*imperare* in Thomas), that (parallel to certain natural processes) in a supernatural order *caritas* "subordinates" all other moral and theological virtues to that very purpose.¹²

4. *Résumé*. The key word of St. Paul's passage stimulated reinterpretations. The term persisted, in its Greek as well as in its Latin form; the content changed. In the beginning it was an ordinary, nonliterary lexeme, surfacing with Christianity and summing up, with extraordinary simplicity, the social thrust of the rising movement. Then, with the new religion vigorously expanding, the tone-setting early Fathers institutionalized the hortatory concept as the cornerstone of a virtue system. In its transfer to the West, ἀγάπη became *caritas*, and the early use, which was closely linked to the Greek word, faded. For the Ambrosiaster *caritas*, as a virtue of high morality, was "a way to acquire merit," and merit was the way to God. At the height of Scholasticism, Thomas Aquinas, under the stimulus of the Aristotelian quasi-synonym φιλία, added to *caritas* "man's love for God" a *caritas* "God's love for man" / "God's friendship for man."

Typically, the set of the key term's changing connotations, which evolved from early to medieval Christianity and whose progression demands, step by step, some kind of "translation," illustrates the dependence of meaning upon environment.

II. The Demon in the Pachomian Community

1. *The Setting*. The fourth-century monasteries, largely located around the Eastern Mediterranean, in regions such as Egypt, Palestine, Syria, and Constantinople, were populated with simple people. They came from the farms and were often barely able, often even unable, to speak Greek, which

¹¹ L.-B. Gillon, "Les grandes écoles théologiques," s.v. *Charité* in *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, II (1953), 581.

¹² Balducelli (above, note 2), p. 175.

by then (and very much in that area) was the language of education. In their beliefs the monks preserved, intertwined with their Christianity, the tradition of popular religions, with their abundant ingredient of superstitions. The documentation of their monastic culture is of the greatest interest. As Festugière¹³ pointed out, these texts represent, within the heritage of Antiquity, the first sizable body of literature through which the "common people," the "country folk," make their voice heard. The popular vein is evident, above all, in the domain of "demonology," typical of this early monasticism. A text that contains a representative sample of this complex feature is the *Life of St. Pachomius* in its Greek version.¹⁴

Pachomius (c. 287–346), the indigenous son of a pagan peasant and himself a soldier, assembled around 320, in his monasteries at Tabennesi, in the Upper Egyptian Thebaid, several thousand monks unified in a movement created by him and called Cenobitism: living and working together in strict asceticism and in obedience to the rules of the community.

The mentor of Pachomius describes daily life in a few sentences, which in their terseness truly justify the monks' fear of demons: "My regimen is hard: in the summer I fast all day, and in the winter I eat once every two days. And by the Grace of God I only eat bread and salt. I am not used to oil and wine. I stay awake always half the night, as I was taught, for prayer and the study of God's words, and many times all night" (6).

The *Life of St. Pachomius*, probably rendering an (unknown) Coptic model, was written around 390 in Vulgar Hellenistic Greek.¹⁵ Viewed diachronically, the terminology of asceticism, as Reitzenstein has shown,¹⁶ draws heavily on the lexicon of popular Hellenistic philosophy. Festugière's attempt to link the Pachomians' "demon language" to ancient traditions of superstition is doubted by the most recent interpreter of the Pachomian community: to Rousseau¹⁷ it represents, with its purpose and its perception, "a genuine effort to achieve clarity of mind about the self and the world." The wellspring of the community's demonology is, to him,

¹³ A.-J. Festugière, *Les moines d'Orient, I, Culture ou sainteté: Introduction au monachisme oriental* (Paris 1961), p. 25.

¹⁴ The following versions of the Pachomius tradition were used [with quotations according to sections]: The Greek text: *Vita Prima*, in *Sancti Pachomii Vitae Graecae*, F. Halkin, ed. (Subsidia Hagiographica, 19; Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1932), pp. 1–96. English translation: A. N. Athanassakis, trans., *The Life of Pachomius (Vita Prima Graeca)* [with a reprint of Halkin's Greek text] (Society of Biblical Literature; Missoula, Mont. 1975). French translation: A.-J. Festugière, *Les moines d'Orient, IV: 2, La Première Vie Grecque de Saint Pachome: Introduction critique et traduction*. (Paris 1965), pp. 159–245.

¹⁵ Festugière, *La première vie grecque de Saint Pachome*, pp. 7 and 156–57.

¹⁶ R. Reitzenstein, *Historia Monachorum und Historia Lausiaca: Eine Studie zur Geschichte des Mönchtums und der frühchristlichen Begriffe Gnostiker und Pneumatiker* (Göttingen 1916), pp. 98–99.

¹⁷ Ph. Rousseau, *Pachomius: The Making of a Community in Fourth-Century Egypt* (The Transformation of the Classical Heritage, VI [Berkeley 1985]: with extensive bibliography), p. 135.

Pachomius himself, and to explain the mind of Pachomius, Rousseau adduces an apocalyptic work of c. 200, *The Shepherd* by Hermas, by then widely read in Egypt. The following analysis, however, does not trace the genesis of the Pachomian "demon"; it is a synchronic survey: trying to describe the meaning and the use of *demon*, and the associations evoked by it in the cenobitic community.

2. *Onomasiology of the Demon*. The demons, ubiquitous in the narrative, are mentioned with varying names; yet, so far as we can see, the multiplicity of names represents synonymy: it does not seem to imply semantic nuances. The designations were given from, essentially, three angles.

(a) *The Christian Tradition*. The inherited Greek lexeme is δαίμων. In classical times it referred to a divinity somewhere between a god and the tutelary genius of human beings, vaguely perceived as an internal voice and correlated with fate. In the popular beliefs of late antiquity the term alluded to some ambivalent entity between good and evil, but then in Christianity, as a feature of the pagan heritage, the demon was degraded to a spirit of evil (whereas its good features were transferred to the angels). In Christian writings the δαίμων was made responsible for a human's vices without, however, exonerating the sinner from his responsibilities.¹⁸ In the *Life of Pachomius* the term appears repeatedly (e.g., in 8, 18, 52, 73, 112). The other somewhat "technical" expression which anticipates its cenobitic use in earlier applications is Σατανᾶς, usually restricted to the singular: "Keep awake . . . lest *Satan* [ὁ Σατανᾶς] tempt you and harm you" (6). The term is drawn from the Judeo-Christian tradition.¹⁹ In the Old Testament it refers to the adversary who tests and accuses in behalf of God; in 1 Chron. 21:1, *Satan* is the tempter, luring man into sin. In the *Septuagint*, Sirach 21:27 warns against blaming one's evil intentions on the *satan*: "In cursing the *satan* as unholy, one just curses one's own soul." The Church Fathers echoed the New Testament in calling Satan the "adversary," the "accuser," and the "evil one." A third lexeme of religious tradition, somewhat less technical because morphologically transparent, is ἀντικείμενος, "the opponent," "the adversary," in the phrase σωτηρία κατὰ τῶν ἀντικειμένων, *salvation from the adversaries* (96). The term, denoting the "evil powers as adversaries," was used likewise in the plural, by Clement of Alexandria, in the third century.²⁰

(b) *The Demon as Apparition*. Some of the terms for the *demon* stress the component of the "supernatural." (i) Πνεῦμα, "breath," in a complex development,²¹ turned into a metaphor of the immaterial breath of life,

¹⁸ G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford 1961), s.v.

¹⁹ G. Kittel et al., *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (Stuttgart 1939-79), s.v.

²⁰ Migne, *PG*, 9:692D; Lampe, s.v. ἀντικείμενα, c.

²¹ Kittel, s.v., 333-37.

applied to the "mind" of man and, under Judeo-Christian influence, to the transcendental "ghost." The fourth-century catechist, Cyril of Jerusalem, was aware of the term's ambiguity: καὶ ἄγγελος καλεῖται πνεῦμα . . . καὶ δαίμων ἀντικείμενος καλεῖται πνεῦμα "an angel is called 'spirit' just as a hostile demon is called 'spirit'" (*Catech.* 16:13).²² Epithets are used to integrate πνεῦμα into its context: in the magic *Papyrus Mimaut* 3. 8 a numen is reverently addressed as ἱερὸν πνεῦμα, "holy spirit"; Acts 19:15, on the other hand, mentions τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ πονηρὸν, "the evil spirit." The latter phrase is a common one in the Pachomian community: πονηρὸν πνεῦμα (73) / πνεῦμα πονηρὸν (84), "evil spirit." (ii) Several expressions call the demon a "vision": ὄραμα (99, 135), ὀπτασία (99), and φαινόμενον (87). (iii) Through lexemes describing a tricky transformation, the demon is marked as a hallucination: *took the shape of* . . . [σχηματισθείς] (8) / *in the form of* . . . [σχῆματι + gen.] (19) / *took the form of* . . . [τύπον λαβών] (19) / *by appearing (in a deceptive guise)* [τῷ φαίνεσθαι] (18).²³

(c) *Persecution Mania*. Frequently the demon's designation reveals a victim's perception of his tormenter, that is, the monk's dread of his own impulses.²⁴ But the enemy inside is described as if he were outside. The relevant appellations occur, to be sure, in Biblical parlance, yet as mere words they kept their *sensus literalis* also independently of that tradition. The term that defines the relationship between monk and demon, most commonly and most simply, is ἐχθρός, *enemy*. An abbot, for example, mentions the *enemy* and adds: "Combating me all day long he has crushed me" (140). Vituperative expressions come naturally when they are applied to the *demon*: either in the form of a noun, such as θηρίον, *beast* (105), or in that of adjectives, such as πονηρὸν (πνεῦμα), *evil (spirit)* (73), and ἀλλότριος (λογισμός), *alien (thought)* (132). Also the demon's primary function, *to tempt*, produced designations: he is called ὁ πειράζων, *the tempter* (18), and ὁ πειράσας ἐχθρός, *the enemy who tempted [them]* (131).

3. *The Language of Angst*. The Saint talks to the brethren about their sins (96): "He talked not only about bodily chastity but also about such various thoughts as lust for power, sloth, hatred toward a brother, and love for money." The aim of his talk was to enlighten them on the measures of safety for salvation from the adversaries [σωτηρίας κατὰ τῶν ἀντικειμένων] (96). For sins are perceived, that is, expressed, through the medium of the "enemy." He elicits, he exposes, and he symbolizes the weakness of the flesh. And he does it in many guises.

²² Lampe, s.v. πνεῦμα, I.

²³ A. and C. Guillaumont, *Démon: III. Dans la plus ancienne littérature monastique*, in *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, III (1967), 192.

²⁴ Festugière, *Les moines d'Orient*, I (above, note 13), pp. 34–35.

(a) *The Demons at Work*. The *Life of Pachomius* contains many "exempla" of human weakness which substantiate the ἐνέργεια δαιμόνων, *the demons in action* (8).

The case histories describe, first of all, the cardinal sins. *Pride*: There was an ascetic brother who [by showing off his asceticism] did not live by God. . . . [Pachomius warned him:] "*I see that you are envied by the enemy* [ὄρω σε φθονούμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐχθροῦ]. . . . Do not pray much until you master *the demon of boasting* [τοῦ δαίμονος τῆς καυχήσεως]" (69). — *Vainglory*: The evil spirits used to come in front of him and they marched on both sides, *as one does escorting a dignitary* [ὡς ἐπὶ ἀρχοντος], saying to each other, "*Make room for the man of God* [ἴδτε τόπον τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ]" (18). — *Gluttony*: An evil spirit came to him *to tempt and to deceive him into the sin of eating first* [πειράσαι αὐτὸν τῇ ἀπάτῃ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν αὐτὸν πρῶτον] from the food intended for the sick (84). — *Lust*: The evil spirit *took the shape of a beautiful and well-adorned woman* [σχηματισθεῖς εἰς γυναικείαν μορφήν] (8) and as he would sit to eat, they used to come *in the form of naked women* [σχῆματι γυμνῶν γυναικῶν] to sit and eat with him (19). — *Anger*: [An abbot who broke certain rules of monastic life] *was angered* [ἠγανάκτησεν] when reprimanded *owing to the temptation of the enemy* [κατὰ πειρασμὸν τοῦ ἐχθροῦ] and wanted to withdraw his monastery from the community . . . and with him not listening to his superior who tried to dissuade him, *the tempting spirit prevailed* [ἐνίσχυσεν ὁ πειρασμός] (127).

Broadly stated, offenses against cenobitic discipline set the demons in motion. Pachomius admonishes a neophyte: "*Why do you not pay attention to yourself* [προσέχεις σεαυτῷ] instead of *giving free rein to your heart* [ἀπέλυσας τὴν καρδίαν σου]?" (104). Two infringements of self-control, in particular, provoke the enemy. *Fear*: [The demons] attempted to shake the foundations of his hermitage, *threatening* [φοβερίζοντες] that it was to fall upon him (19). —As he was praying and about to kneel, [the demons] made the space in front of him appear as a pit, *so that he might not kneel out of fear* [ἵνα τῷ φόβῳ μὴ κλίνη γόνατα] (18). —*Laughter*, which the ascetic commonly has to restrain:²⁵ The evil spirit came and *took the form* [τύπον . . . λαβὼν] of a cock and crowed in his face . . . *in order to relax his heart and make him laugh* [ὅπως γελάσει ἐν ἐκλύσει καρδίας] (19).

Angst and stress, flowing from the demons and enwrapping the monastic community, are echoed in a vocabulary of their own. Two key concepts subsume the main fears of the monk: that the demon wants to *harm him* and wants *to be his master*. Two sets of verbs correlate with these two hyperonyms.

²⁵ P. Keseling, "Askese II," in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, I (1950), p. 767, s.v.

(b) *The Demon as the "Destroyer."* The monk finds no peace of mind, always paralyzed by the fear "lest Satan tempt you and you suffer harm [βλαβῆς]" (6). The demon ruins the body and stifles the will power: "The Enemy acted wickedly within some of us [ἐπονηρεύσατο ἐν τισιν ἡμῶν ἰδίοις]" (113). — "[The demon] is plotting against you [ἐπιβουλεύει σοι]" (69). — The evil spirits wished to lay him low [καταβαλεῖν] (18). — The enemy wickedly destroys the body [τὸ σῶμα ἀφανίζει κακίᾳ] (118). — "Enviied by the enemy I see you lose all your labor [ἀπολέσαι ὄλον τὸν κάματόν σου]" (69). — ". . . that the enemy may not scatter the fruits of our father's labor [διασκορπίση τὸν κάματον τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν]" (131).

(c) *The Demon as "Master."* He dominates his man, instills desires, and always "stands in his way": [The Enemy] gains mastery of the entire man [κυριεύει τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὅλου], who is then destitute of anything good (75). — Thus the enemy found a place in him [εὐρὼν ἐν αὐτῷ τόπον] . . . (118). — As the demon was shooting him with an evil desire [εἰς ἐπιθυμίαν κακὴν τοξεύοντος αὐτόν], the monk became inclined to sin (8). — The enemy has eaten up the willingness of the soul [καταφαγὼν τὴν προθυμίαν τῆς ψυχῆς] (118). — When the evil spirit that had deceived him saw that he was under its control [ὑποχείριον τοῦτον εἶναι] . . . (8). — The demons in every way try to stand in the way of the faithful [ἐν παντὶ ἐπιχειροῦσιν ἐμποδίζειν τοὺς πιστοὺς] (52).

(d) *Ecstasy.* For the monk unaware that his blasphemy was implanted by the Enemy, ἔκστασις, a breakdown, is bound to follow: "If one is neither sufficiently vigilant nor consults a wise man in order to learn to overcome the enticement to blasphemy, the latter will destroy him [ἡ τῆς βλασφημίας ὑποβολὴ . . . τοῦτον ἀπολέσει]. . . Many men, in fact, killed themselves" (96). They were victims of their πάθος.²⁶ The demons, in short, have seen to it that his guilt has made him "deranged." "One, in a state of ecstasy [ὡς ἐκστατικός] threw himself down from a cliff" (96); another monk, who was "in a frenzied state" [ἐκστατικὸν ὄντα], the demon threw into the furnace . . . and he was burned (8).

4. *The Language of Resistance.* The saga of the ascetic brother, the ἄσκητῆς ἀδελφός (69), always on trial and always struggling, created its linguistic field, the δύναμις ἀθλητοῦ, the "strength of the champion," as Athanasius called it in his *Vita Antonii*.²⁷ The semantic aspects of the terminology highlight the monk's strategies.

(a) *Warfare.* Soldierly drill was, to begin with, a feature of the Pachomian monastery,²⁸ and the all-pervading demon transformed and

²⁶ Translated as "passion" by Athanassakis, and as "illness" by Festugière.

²⁷ Migne, PG 26:861A.

²⁸ J. Olphe-Galliard, "Cénobitisme," in *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, II (1953), 405.

metaphorized the monk into a *soldier-in-action*. The key terms of his feats play up such efforts of his as *vigilance*, *obedience*, and *combat*.

(i) *Vigilance* [νήψις] was a monastic virtue of the time:²⁹ [A monk testing a possessed fellow monk] was scared, thinking of *how much vigilance man needs to escape the wiles of the demons* [διὰ πόσης νήψεως ἐκφύγη τὰς ποικιλίας τῶν δαιμόνων ὁ ἄνθρωπος] (69). —*If perchance he is not vigilant* [ἐάν μὴ νήψη] the enemy will defeat him in some other matter (75). —“*Keep awake* [νήφε] . . . lest Satan tempt you and harm you” (6). —. . . *being awake* [ἄγρυπνον ὄντα] day and night he might defeat the enemy (22). —Unless he who is tempted is not *exceedingly keen* [ἀκρότατος διακριτικός] in discerning the tempter he is deceived (135). —. . . to be blameless in *knowing and not ignoring* [ἐν τῷ εἰδέναι καὶ μὴ ἀγνοεῖν] the power of the enemy (56). —He, *aware of the tricks* [τὰς τέχναις συνιῶν] of his tempters . . . (18).

(ii) *Obedience*, a religious concept since the *Septuagint* and the New Testament,³⁰ became a fundamental feature in the hierarchical structure of monasticism. Pachomius inculcated it upon his monks as a most desirable cenobitic virtue:³¹ Seeing [Pachomius'] *obedience in everything* [τὴν εἰς πάντα ὑπακοήν] and the progress of his endurance, the old man [his guide to monasticism] rejoiced (6). On the other hand, the reverse, disobedience [ἀπειθεία], as well as “obedience in the wrong place” hand a monk over to the demon: since he [the monk] *was disobeying and about to be possessed by the demon* [ἀπειθοῦντος αὐτοῦ καὶ μέλλοντος δαιμονισθῆναι] . . . (69), and coming from the mouth of the demon: “*My man is obedient* [τινὰ ἔχω εὐπειθῆ]. If I [the demon] advise him, *he listens to me* [ἀκούει μου] and does it” (73).

(iii) *Combat*. Military duty for the faith was a feature of Christianity from its early stages on: “I have not come to bring peace but a sword” (Matt. 10:34) / “Let us . . . put on our armor as soldiers of the light” (Rom. 13:12). The topos of the Fighting Christian reached a peak in the monastic movement, which fused the concept of the plotting enemy with the doctrine of virtues and vices, and identified the vices with the demons: *In his struggle he did not allow* [ἀγωνιζόμενος οὐ συνεχώρει] unclean thoughts to settle in his heart (18). —. . . *an unyielding man* [ἄνθρωπον σκληρόν] (73). —“You saw the demons and you combated them to ward them off from souls [πολεμῶν αὐτοῦς

²⁹ Lampe, s.v.

³⁰ Bauer (A *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, trans. and adapt. W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, 2nd ed. Chicago 1979), and Lampe, s.vv. ὑπακοή, ὑπακούω.

³¹ P. Resch, *La doctrine ascétique des premiers maîtres égyptiens du quatrième siècle* (Paris 1931), p. 238.

ἀποστήσαι τῶν ψυχῶν]" (112). —[Each brother confessed to him] *how he battles the enemy* [ὡς πολεμεῖ τὸν ἐχθρόν] (132). —“ . . . *the beast which has been making war on you* [τὸ πολεμοῦν ὑμᾶς θηρίον] . . . *Silvanus has slain it* [ἔσφαξεν αὐτόν]" (105).

(b) *Faith*. The language of faith creates a shield against temptation, formulated either as an appeal to the Lord or as some symbolic evocation of the Scriptures (intertwined with traditions of religious practice).

(i) *Appeal to the numen*. He constantly *kept in mind the fear of God* [ἐμελέτα τὸν φόβον τοῦ Θεοῦ] *and remembered the Judgment and the tortures of the eternal fire* [. . . καὶ τὴν μνήμην τῶν κρίσεων καὶ τὰς βασάνους τοῦ πυρὸς τοῦ αἰωνίου] (18). —*Through his hope in God* [τῇ εἰς τὸν Κύριον ἐλπίδι] he laughed at the tempters scornfully (18). —He would teach the brothers . . . *how to oppose the enemy with the Lord's power* [ἀντικεῖσθαι αὐτοῖς τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ Κυρίου] (56). —“*If you speak with faith* [μετὰ πίστεως λέγων], the demon's suggestion will vanish like smoke” (96). —He . . . *knelt with faith* [μετὰ πίστεως ἐγονυπέτει], bringing shame upon [the demons] *with his praise of God* [τὸν Θεὸν εὐλογῶν] (18).

(ii) *Evocation of the Scriptures*. *Having learned from the Holy Scriptures and especially from the Gospel* [μαθὼν ἐκ τῶν θείων γραφῶν καὶ μάλιστα ἐκ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου], he endured many temptations by evil spirits (17). —*Against them he recited the psalm* [ἐμελέτα κατ' αὐτῶν τὸν ψαλμὸν . . .], “*God is our refuge and strength*” (19). — . . . *the various temptations which he withstood in accordance with the Gospel and his True Faith* [οὓς ὑπέμεινεν κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὴν ὀρθὴν αὐτοῦ πίστιν] (30). —Thus, one of the demons says, “. . . when I suggest a thought to him, *he stands up immediately and prays* [εὐθὺς στήκει εἰς εὐχήν]. So I burn and come out” (73). —“*You should guard yourselves and make the sign of the cross in the name of Christ* [σφραγίζεσθε τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ]. If you oppose the evil spirits, they will have no power over you” (73).

(c) *Stoicism*. A few times the monk succeeds in mastering the demon through ἀπάθεια, the suppression of his emotions. This strategy was known to the Egyptian monks from early on.³² The defense, a poor man's stoicism, is metaphorized as “paying no attention” and “closing the eyes of the mind”: When he saw them, he sighed at them, and *since he paid no attention* [μὴ προσέχοντος αὐτοῦ] they departed (19). —*So he would close the eye of his mind* [καμμύοντος αὐτοῦ τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν τῆς διανοίας αὐτοῦ], and the enemy would disappear, having accomplished nothing against him (19).

³² Lampe, s.v. ἀπάθεια; see also J. B. Russell, *Satan: The Early Christian Tradition* (Ithaca, NY 1981), p. 185.

(d) *God behind the Demon*. One way, finally, of allaying the unholy dread of the demons is to eliminate them by positing a design of God behind the machinations of the "enemy."³³ The demon is the Lord's tool of trying, and by providing the monk on trial with the chance to conquer, the demon works for the good of the soul. By association with *God's will* and *Divine concession* the negative connotation of concepts such as "temptation" and "trial" is scaled down: *God tests* his servants *in various ways* [δοκιμαστῆς ὁ Θεὸς . . . ποικίλως] (52). —*Through divine concession* [ἐκ θείας συγχωρήσεως] he saw evil spirits at work (8). —His being tempted by various temptations . . . *happened through divine concession and trial* [ἦν ἐκ συγχωρήσεως θείας καὶ δοκιμῆς] (18). —*If with the Lord's will* [τοῦ Κυρίου βουλομένου] he ever saw a vision or an apparition . . . (99). —What kept the suffering monk going was, in short, *the thought that God was training him* [ἡ μνήμη τοῦ παιδεύοντος Θεοῦ] (20).

5. *Epilogue*. We have attempted to describe the characteristic aspect of a religious movement, Cenobitism, through the analysis of its most conspicuous key term, *demon*. The term was embedded in a representative hagiography, and the concept behind the word (and its synonyms) evolved, in changing contexts, as the dominating force in all phases of the monk's life: as his enemy and his savior, his weakness and his strength, the Devil and God. With such a load of transfers and associations, *demon* illustrates well an essential feature of key terms. On the level of the "text," it expresses the *literal meaning*, which evokes the *allegorical meaning* "hidden" (in Dante's phrasing³⁴) "under the cloak of the narrative." In the text at hand, the story, that is, the *sensus litteralis*, focuses on the demon, the monk's tempter and oppressor, but what is really meant by "demon," that is, its *sensus allegoricus*, concerns the monk's restless ego. Interestingly, in the Pachomian *Vita* these two levels of meaning are correlated with domains of religious attitude and style: the *sensus litteralis* uses the images of popular beliefs and lore to highlight the drama inherent in monastic existence, which is the theme of the *sensus allegoricus*.

III. The Paulician Heresy as seen by Orthodoxy

1. *Introductory*. Our third approach views a movement as a linguistic field. The movement chosen as an example is that of the Paulicians, an offshoot of the Byzantine Church which flourished, from the seventh to the ninth century, in Asia Minor, at the eastern frontier of Hellenism. It was a

³³ J. A. Timbie, *Dualism and the Concept of Orthodoxy in the Thought of the Monks of Upper Egypt* (Diss., University of Pennsylvania [University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, Mich.] 1979), pp. 135–36. A. Kallis, "Geister (Dämonen)," C II. *Griechische Väter*, in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, IX (1976), 712–14, s.v.

³⁴ H. and R. Kahane, "Linguistic Aspects of Sociopolitical Keywords" (above, note 1), 148.

dualistic and docetist sect, returning to the roots of Evangelical Christianity. Its religious language was marked by a bent for the allegorical reading of the Sacred Scriptures, contrasting with the literalness of Orthodox exegesis.

The text on which the analysis rests is by Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople and the dominant figure of the Byzantine Renaissance.³⁵ He acquired his detailed knowledge of the movement around 871–72, through two writings: the summary, *About the Paulicians* by a certain Abbot Petrus, and the *History of the Heresy of the Paulicians* by the ecclesiastical annalist Petrus Siculus (Πέτρος Σικελιώτης). The two “Peters” refer, quite possibly, to the same man. The Patriarch, without mentioning it, plagiarized these two works so that, so far as the facts were concerned, he did not contribute much. Yet compared with his models (at least with Peter, the Abbot) he was more of a writer, marked by “a style quite diffuse and prolix” and thus very suitable for a repository of key words. The typology of the “heretic,” which evolves from the Byzantine corpus of key terms, prefigured in many features the image of the Western medieval heretic.³⁶

The key terms which define the movement center on four main themes: the image of the heretic; verbal strategy; illusions; and propaganda.

2. *Image of the Heretic.* The Patriarch's rejection of the heretical doctrines, an inherent feature of the contemporary Orthodox attitude, determined his perception of the men who represented them (mostly men are implicated). Their image evolves in the process. A few specific facets of the portrait become the portrayer's favorites:

(a) *Misbegotten.* Evil breeds evil, and the traditional scapegoats of society are indicted: Some of the leaders are the *offspring of Saracens* [Ἀγαρηνῶν . . . γεννήματα]; others are *marked by the outrages and sufferings of slavery* [τοῖς τῆς δουλείας κατεστιγμένους . . . καὶ ὕβρεσι καὶ παθήμασι]; others again are the *progeny of adultery* [μοιχείας . . . βλαστήματα]; some, finally, reveal themselves as *disciples of female madness and ranting judgment* [παραφροσύνης γυναικείας καὶ ἔμμανοῦς γνώμης μαθητάς] (102).

(b) *Egalitarian.* The priests of heresy are accused of not upholding the dignity of the office: in their pursuit of populism they do not manifest, either in dress or in manners, *their distinctiveness from the common people*

³⁵ The version of the Photius text used here, entitled Διήγησις τῆς νεοφανοῦς τῶν Μανιχαίων ἀναβλαστήσεως, “Account of the Recent Revival of the Manichaeans,” was established by W. Conus-Wolska, with a French translation by J. Paramelle, on the opposite pages (*Travaux et Mémoires*, 4; Paris 1970; pp. 120–73). Quotations are according to sections. The Paulician movement, documentation, and scholarship were examined with circumspection by P. Lemerle, “L'histoire des Pauliciens d'Asie Mineure d'après les sources grecques” (*Travaux et Mémoires*, 5; Paris 1973; pp. 1–144).

³⁶ As drawn by H. Grundmann in 1927: “Der Typus des Ketzers in mittelalterlicher Anschauung,” repr. in *Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, I, *Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, 25:1 (Stuttgart 1976), pp. 313–27.

[τὸ διάφορον αὐτῶν πρὸς τὸ πλῆθος] (34). —The people *call them not priests but "fellow travelers"* (a Pauline term, here approximately "comrades") [οὐχ ἱερεῖς, ἀλλὰ συνεκδήμους . . . ἐπονομάζουσιν] (34). —All of them, functioning as a group and equal in status [ὁμοτίμως ἀλλήλοις αὐτοὶ κατὰ πλῆθος], guide the people (143).

(c) *Secretive*. The heretics are described as if they were a secret society. The leaders were anxious *not to confide right away* [μὴ κατ' ἀρχὰς εὐθύς . . . θαρρεῖν] to the newcomers the ultimate of sacrileges, *nor to display before them* [μηδὲ . . . προτιθέναι] the most abominable of the mysteries (111). —A dominant teacher and leader is described as "expounding and confiding his own doctrines about himself to a specially selected group" [εἰς τὸ ἐξηρημένον] (97). —Non-initiates are barred and the climate of mystery is cultivated. The slogan is succinct, indeed: "*think and speak together only in secrecy*" [μυστικῶς καὶ φρονεῖν καὶ λέγειν πρὸς ἀλλήλους] (97). —*Scripta manent*: One of the leaders *avoided confiding* [παραδοῦναι οὐκ ἐθάρρησεν] his heretical thoughts to writing (6). —(Another one hoped that) *by escaping* (through emigration) *from intercourse with other people* [τῷ ἀνεπιμίκτω τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων] and thus *being among themselves* [καθ' ἑαυτοὺς ὄντας], they would be able to devote themselves, without fear and openly, to their diabolical and extravagant practices (147). —The Patriarch underlines the secrecy of the *mysteries* [μυστήρια] by accusing the heretics of *secret orgies* [ἀπορρήτων . . . ὀργίων] (143), and blames them for excelling in *secret magics and witchcraft* [ἐν ταῖς μυστικαῖς μαγανείαις τε καὶ γοητεῖαις] (142).

(d) *Stubborn*. The heretics remain obstinate, above all, in regard to their return to orthodoxy: the attempts to convert them to the right faith come to a *dead end* [πρὸς ἀνόνητον . . . πέρας] (56). —Instead of converting *they displayed incorrigibility* [τὸ ἀδιόρθωτον ἐπεδειξαντο] (68). —*They absolutely refuse* [οὐδαμῶς καταδέχονται] to curse their leaders (10). —*Not even by the sword came their impious vigor to a halt* [μηδὲ (ξίφει) ἱσταμένης] (56). —The obsession applied even to the group: a leader suffered death by burning together with those of his disciples *whom unrepentance seized* [ὄσους εἶλεν τὸ ἀμεταμέλητον] (70).

(e) *Fraudulent*. This salient feature of the heretical image is realized in many forms. One heretic is called "a natural in *making up things and lying*" [τεραπευόμενος καὶ ψευδολογῶν], and a certain claim of his about his mission is judged by the Patriarch "as one of the many stories which *he embroidered and fabricated*" [διερραψῶδει καὶ συνέπλαττεν] (63). —Another heretic knows how to get rid of his impieties: by simply *disavowing* them [διὰ τῆς ἀρνήσεως ἀποδυσομένου] (74). —The brisk word portrait of the apostate Sergius, a leading Paulician (living in the first half of the ninth century and coming from the theme of Armeniakon), consists of variations of perfidy. He outshines his forerunners in *fraud* [ῥαδιουργία] / *craftiness* [περινοία] / *scheming* [μηχανουργία] / *wily*

mappers [ἐπικλόποις ἤθεσιν] (108). Sergius' scheming produces further synonyms: Photius calls him *most apt for any kind of intrigue* [πρὸς πᾶσαν δραματουργίαν δεινότατον], and *sharp in contriving tricks* [ὀξὺν δόλους ῥάψαι] (96). But the richest terminology of fraud which Sergius evoked concerns the art of dissimulation: he is experienced in *hiding his thought* [κρύψαι τὸ φρόνημα] at the right time (96).—*He used to transmute himself* [ἑαυτὸν μετέπλαττεν] into a thousand guises, *adapting* [ἄρμοζόμενος] to the diverse characters of the deceived; with shrewd metaphorical insight *he transformed himself and turned into* [τυπούμενος καὶ διαπλαττόμενος] a monkey or a lion or a fox (122). —He was *terrific in feigning* [σχηματίζασθαι] virtue (96). —His conduct was a *faked show of virtues* [σκηνὴ ἀρετῶν προβεβλημένη]: his graciousness was just *simulated behavior* [κατεσχηματισμένος τρόπος], as were his *sweetness* [ἡμερότης] and his *humble ways* [ταπεινὸν ἦθος] (126), although whatever the circumstances *he showed off* [ἠλαζονεύετο] (115).

(f) *Lewd. Their way of life* [ἡ πολιτεία τούτων] is dragged into the open as a welcome weapon against them. A harsh vocabulary describes the heretics' unrestrained conduct (36), with the key phrase, *it is full of licentiousness* [γέμει ἀκολασίας]. They are marked by *drunkenness and profligacy* [μέθη καὶ ἀσωτία]; and *they indulge in the two varieties of love life* [χρῶνται μίξεσιν ἑκατέρας φύσεως], involving the opposite as well as their own sex. The Patriarch's conclusion: *They lead a life in no way inconsistent with their doctrines* [οὐδὲν τὸν βίον ἀπάδοντα τοῖς δόγμασιν περιφέρουσι].

3. *Verbal Strategy*. Two sets of key words evolve from the diatribe of the Patriarch which reveal what to him and to his cause was the essence of apostasy: *negativism* and the *manipulation of the Sacred Words*.

(a) *Negativism*. The attitude of denial and rejection, attributed to the heretics, is expressed by negative prefixes (ἀ- / δυσ- / ἀπο-) and by verbs of rejection (πτύω, "spit" / πλύνω ὕβρεσι, "wash with abuses"). The Patriarch's strongest effect results from the reverse collocation of terms associated with heresy: God is "negated" whereas the Devil is glorified with the epithets appropriate only for God. The hyperonym expressing the heretics' non-conformism is βλασφημέω "blaspheme," lit. "speak (φημ-) evil (βλασ-)": . . . *reviling* [βλασφημοῦντες] our Supreme-Holy Mistress, the Mother of God (19). Some synonyms: *most of all . . . they revile* [δυσφημοῦσιν] Peter (since he disclaimed Christ) (23). —. . . *reviling* [δυσφημοῦντες] the lifegiving Cross (22). —*They do not accept* [(οὐκ) . . . ἀποδέχονται] either the priests of the Catholic Church (that is, the Church before the Great Schism) or the other members of the clergy (34). —[Peter] *they consider utterly to be rejected and turned away from* [ἀπόβλητον καὶ ἀποτρόπαιον τίθενται] (25). —*They spit at* [διαπτύοντες] the saving baptism (30). —*They abuse with a thousand outrages* [μυριάς ὕβρεσι

πλύνοντες] the Holy Communion (21). —In regard to their doctrines they are *impious* [δυσσεβείς] and they are equally in *discord* [ἀσύμφωνοι] with the truth as they are with each other (36). —The summa of their secret doctrines is the *complete negation of God* [ἄρνησις παντελῆς θεοῦ] and their belief in the *glory and power and creative force of the devil* [τοῦ διαβόλου δόξα καὶ κράτος καὶ δημιουργίας ἰσχύς] (111).

(b) *Heretical Exegesis*. In the heretics' hands, as the Patriarch is convinced, the sacred body of the Scriptures fares badly. The truths anchored in the Holy Words are cynically distorted. The "unholy philology" of the heretics (as one is tempted to call this view) evoked a phraseology of its own, focusing on the *manipulation of the text*, with its reinterpretations, adaptations, deletions, additions, and incoherences. Their technique of obscurantism involves, above all, semantics: meanings are insinuated, falsified, invented, colored, and hidden.

A sweeping statement sets the tone: the heretic exegete is *falsifying and mutilating the entire meaning of Orthodoxy* [ὅλον τὸν νοῦν τῆς εὐσεβείας διαστρέφων καὶ καταθραύων] (6). The theme is endlessly varied: The exegete tries to *adapt and to adjust* [ἐναρμόζειν τε καὶ περιάπτειν] the words of the Gospel and the Apostle to his doctrines (58). —*Tearing those words out from their context* [τὰς λέξεις ἐκείθεν ἀποσπαράξαντες], they assign them [ταύτας ἐπιφημίζουσι] to quite impious meanings (17). —The heretic *ascribes and insinuates meanings to the words* [ἀνάπτει καὶ ὑποβάλλει (τοῖς ῥητοῖς) νοήματα], which have no counterpart in the Holy Sayings, nor is there *any coherence* [οὐδεμία ἀκολουθία] in these meanings but *they are full of contradictions* [μάχεται πρὸς ἄλληλα] (7). —He invested all his cunning and effort in *reading and instilling* (his doctrines) *into the words* [ὑποβάλλειν τε καὶ ὑποτιθέναι ῥήμασιν] of the Lord and the Apostle (60). —They are the ones who truly, to their own perdition, *twist and distort* [στρεβλοῦντες καὶ διαστρέφοντες] the sayings of the Lord, the citations from the Apostle Paul, and other Scriptures (27). —The heretics *adulterate* [κατακιβδηλεύουσι] the Holy Words . . . *they obscure their impious thought* [τὸ δυσσεβὲς ἐπισκιάζουσι φρόνημα] (152). —One heretical leader used, on the face of them, *the ecclesiastical words* [τὰς ἐκκλησιαστικὰς λέξεις], under which *he was hiding* [ἔκρυπτεν] the deadly poison of apostasy (81); and *he tinged* (the impieties) *with orthodox words* [ῥήμασιν ὀρθοδόξου ἐπιχρωνύνοντος] (74). —*His words were the familiar and common ones* [τὰ ῥήματα ἦσαν τοῦ θεάτρου καὶ κοινά], but the meanings of these words *were those of apostasy and were secret* [τὰ δηλούμενα τῆς ἀποστασίας καὶ μυστικά] (76). —The heretics *make a travesty of the Words of the Lord* [τερατολογοῦντες τὰ δεσποτικὰ ῥήματα] (21).

Behind the heretic's verbal defense against accusations the Patriarch senses an unholy case of "heretical semantics." While overtly pronouncing

the traditional religious words the heretic covertly substitutes his own, quite devious, meaning for the one accepted by Orthodoxy. The following are examples of such strategy, with emphasis on the terminology of "distortion." For Theotokos, "Godbearing," that is, Mother of God, they *substitute* [ὑποβάλλονται] Heavenly Jerusalem, which (with an allusion to Hebr. 6:20) "Christ entered as precursor for us," and by this switch they show that they do not recognize the Virgin Mary (19). —For the word [τῆ φωνῆ] "baptism" they *substitute* [ὑποβάλλοντες] the sayings of the Gospel (as spoken by the Lord in John 4:10–14): "I am the living water," and thereby reveal their rejection of baptism as a sacred rite (30). —For the "cross" the deceivers and sorcerers *dream up the meaning* [ἀναπλάττοντες] "Christ Himself," visualized with outstretched arms (that is, different from the Crucifix) (22). —The terms Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are pious, to be sure, but the heretics *impute to them* [ὑποβάλλοντες δὲ ταύταις] the extreme impiety. . . . When they say "Father" they *don't proclaim* [οὐ . . . ἀνακηρύττοντες] Him "the Almighty" . . . , but they *link* [ἐπισυνάπτουσιν] the term "Father" with "the heavenly," thereby completely denying to Him the sovereign power over both heaven and earth (17). With these changes in the Creed their dualism becomes manifest: they *confess two principles* [δύο ἀρχὰς ὁμολογοῦσιν], as the Manichaeans do, distinguishing between two Gods, *the heavenly father* [τὸν ἐπουράνιον πατέρα] and *the demiurge of the material world* [τὸν δημιουργὸν τοῦ κόσμου] (15).

4. *Illusions*. Another trait of the heretics likewise rooted in language, which the Patriarch denounces, is their urge to identify with persons and features of primitive, prevalently Pauline, Christianity. They realize their compulsion in two ways: either they feign to be someone they are not, or they transfer the nomenclature of orthodoxy onto their own heretical institutions.

(a) *The alter ego*. Sergius, that central figure of the movement, tended to identify himself with higher beings, and the verbs of self-assertion, which verbalize the transformation, commonly express their inherent autism either by the reflexive pronoun ἐαυτόν, "himself," or by a middle-voice ending. The Patriarch accuses Sergius: he did not shrink from "*naming himself* [καλεῖν ἐαυτόν] Paraclete and Holy Ghost nor from letting his disciples *call and perceive him* [ὀνομάζειν τε καὶ νομίζειν] in this way" (97). —In a similar passage the term for Sergius' self-glorification is even stronger: *he celebrated himself* [ὑμῶν ἐαυτόν] as the Holy Ghost (114). Sergius *called himself* "*doorkeeper, shepherd, and guide*" [ἐκάλει . . . ἐαυτόν καὶ θυρωρὸν καὶ ποιμένα καὶ ὁδηγόν] (118) and, quite in line with such a self-image, transformed himself into Tychicus, a disciple of St. Paul's, whom the Apostle called "beloved brother" (Eph. 6:21) and "fellow-servant in the Lord" (Col. 4:7): Sergius not only *usurped the name* [οὐ τὴν κλησιν ἐκκλέπτων μόνον] but *remodeled in his own image and faked and*

appropriated [εἰς ἑαυτὸν μεταπλάσσωσιν καὶ παραχαράσσωσιν καὶ ὑποβαλλόμενος] the very identity of Tychicus (113).

The link to Paulinism, sharply stressed in Photius' portrait of Sergius, was cultivated, indeed, by the Paulicians. The practice started with Constantine, the organizer of the movement (seventh century, from Armenia): *he pretended to be* [ἑαυτὸν ἔλεγεν εἶναι] the one whom the Letters of Paul the inspired mention under the name of Silvanus; he was the travel companion of Paul in Philippi (Acts 16:19 ff.) (63). The expression, much in vogue, of "belonging" by adopting the name of a Pauline disciple produced a considerable accumulation of synonyms for "name-changing": ἑαυτὸν μετωνόμασεν (5) / ἑαυτὸν μετονομασάμενος (8) / ἑαυτὸν μετεκάλεσεν (8) / αὐτὸν ἐπωνόμαζεν (113) / μεταβεβλημένος τὸ κύριον (the name) (8) / τὴν κλήσιν (the name) μετέθετο (69). The metonymy spread from humans to places. The Patriarch castigated the Paulicians' phony practice of designating their churches, and thereby their townships, by the terminology sanctified by the Pauline Letters (12–14). He mentions such names as Φιλιππίσιοι / Ἐφέσιοι / Κολασσαεῖς, as well as Λαοδικεῖς, after a letter apparently sent to the Laodiceans (Col. 4:16). One church is called Ἀχαιία, after the Achaians mentioned in 2 Cor. 1:1; another one, Μακεδονία, after the area of Paul's travels (Acts 16:11–12; 17:1).

(b) *Lexical Camouflage*. The heretics hide behind the language of orthodoxy: *they feign to rely on* and *they pretend to lay claim to* [προσανέχειν ὑποπλάττονται . . . ἀντιποιεῖσθαι σχηματίζονται] the Words of the Lord and the Letters of the Apostle Paul; and the Patriarch qualifies their citation of the sources as done in a malicious and dishonest spirit (52). —The act of make-believe is expressed by some verbs for "naming" which tie a good "word" to a bad "thing": While they stamp the true Christians as "Romans," *they claim the label "Christians" for themselves* [ἑαυτοῖς τὴν κλήσιν τῶν Χριστιανῶν περιάπτουσιν] (16). —One of the leaders, Gegnesius, is described as *calling his own impiety "orthodox"* [ὀρθόδοξον καλῶν τὸ οἰκεῖον ἀσέβημα] (75). —*They call their assemblies a "Catholic Church"* [καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὰ ἑαυτῶν καλοῦσι συνέδρια] (29). —Gegnesius expresses the same simile with more elaborate verbs: *He perceived and extolled the assemblies of the Manichaeans as the "Catholic Church"* [τὰ συνέδρια τῶν Μανιχαίων καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐνενοεῖ τε καὶ ἀπεσέμνυνεν] (79). —Also the townships with the Pauline names, which are the centers of their *organization and indoctrination* [σύστημα καὶ διδασκαλία] (14), are their so-called "churches" [αἱ λεγόμεναι ἐκκλησῖαι] (15).

5. *Propaganda*. The expansionist zeal of the heretics, with its inroads into the ranks of orthodoxy, weighs on the Patriarch's mind. It stimulates many remarks of his, directed against their campaigning, which, as a whole, yield the terminology of a missionary movement—as seen by its opponent.

The language dwells on three aspects of the process: the tactics of the preachers, the ways of the people who become their willing victims, and the fate in store for them.

(a) *The Missionaries*. The emissaries of heresy are *teachers and heralds* [διδάσκαλοι καὶ κήρυκες] (102), handling indoctrination and propaganda. The qualifications for the selection of heralds are stated: those whom the leaders found *excelling in impiety, and very active in evildoing* [τῶν ἄλλων ἐπὶ τῇ δυσσεβείᾳ διαφέροντας, καὶ δραστηρίους ὄντας τὸ κακοποιῆσαι], they sent out into new lands as *heralds of lawlessness* [κήρυκας τῆς ἀνομίας] (3). One *herald of impiety* [κήρυξ τῆς ἀσεβείας], who had passed through many towns and countries, is depicted as more *ardent* [διάπυρος] than any one before him, *hunting, deceiving, ensnaring souls* [θηρῶν, ἀπατῶν, παγιδεύων . . . ψυχάς] (115). This very man, Sergius, most persuasive in *preaching impiety* [κηρύξαι τὴν ἀσέβειαν] (96), had himself been defiled in his youth *by a woman teaching and preaching* [γυναικί τινι πρεσβευούσῃ τε καὶ κηρυττούσῃ] the destructive doctrines of the Manichaeans (101).

When the missionary was taken for a *teacher* [διδάσκαλος] (66, 69) or, with emphasis on the religious aspect, for a *mystagogue* [μυσταγωγός] (3), that designation was usually qualified by some negatively slanted epithet such as *of apostasy* [ἀποστασίας] (69) or *of perdition* [ἀπωλείας] (66) or *of defilement* [μύσους] (3). These agents work in the area assigned to or selected by them, from a base of operations described as a *workshop of error* [ἐργαστήριον τῆς πλάνης] (66) or an *impious school* [δυσσεβὲς διδασκάλιον] (8). One so-called *teacher of piety and leader of salvation* [διδάσκαλος εὐσεβείας καὶ ὁδηγὸς σωτηρίας] is singled out by the Patriarch as an example of heretic strategy. By using the simile of Matt. 7:15, about "*hiding the wolf in a sheepskin*" [κωδίῳ προβάτου τὸν λύκον ἑναποκρύπτων], Photius portrays Sergius as a pseudo-prophet. In order to "take the sting out" of his dissolute deeds and sacrilegious tenets, Sergius made them less revulsive by *pruning* his filth, *covering up* his licentiousness, *toning down* his profanities, or *blending* the intolerable with the tolerable [περικόπτων / ἐπικαλύπτων / συστέλλων / καταμιγνύς] (110).

In several places the heretics' involvement in propaganda and indoctrination is expressed by the old simile of "the weeds sown among the wheat" (Matt. 13:25). The very terms of the passage in St. Matthew are echoed in a reference to early Paulician activity: disciples of Manes *sowed the weed of the devil* [τὰ τοῦ πονηροῦ ζιζάνια ἐγκατέσπειραν] (55). — According to the Patriarch, an Armenian apostate, upon arriving in the area of his activity, *devoted himself to sowing impiety* [σπείρων ἐσπούδαξε τὴν ἀσέβειαν] (72). — And one of the villages *received in its womb the seeds of impiety* [τὰ τῆς ἀσεβείας ἐνεκυμόνησε σπέρματα] (3).

(b) *The Misguided*. The human beings who succumb easily to the lure of the missionaries are seen from various angles. One view is expressed through words of folksy psychology: the leaders corrupt the *souls of men* [ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων] (84); and the *deceived* [οἱ ἠπατημένοι] (97) are rather *slow-witted* [νωθέστεροι] (52). Another perception of the victims is couched in sociological terms: they are, essentially, *the people* [ὁ λαός] (143) and *the natives* [οἱ ἐγχώριοι] (64) defined by their habitat, such as a *small town* [κώμη / πολίχνη / πολίχνιον] or a village [χωρίον] (3, 13), or by their education, such as *the fairly ignorant* [οἱ ἀπλούστεροι] (115). One of the leaders-to-be, when brought around as a young man, was still *of the common herd and boorish* [τῶν ἀγελαίων . . . καὶ ἀγροίκων] (106). Even an Orthodox missionary sent out to spread his creed among the Paulicians turned out to be so *ignorant* [ἀμαθής] of the true dogma, *light-minded* [τὰς φρένας κοῦφος], and *easy to lead astray* [εὐπαράγωγος] that he succumbed to their pernicious superstition (68).

And the Patriarch scoffs at the blind admiration which precisely the simple people feel toward their seducers. The verbs he uses mark their heresy as a cult in itself. Today's children of the Manichaeans *deify and honor* [θειάζουσι καὶ περιέπουσιν] Constantine (the early Paulician leader) to the highest degree, and they *worship* [γεραίρουσι] his successors like the Apostles of Christ, to say the least (62). —When the heretics split, some of them *deify* [θεοποιοῦσι] Baanes, and the others Sergius (11). —The *wretched* [τάλανες] disciples of Sergius carry matters so far as to *seal their prayers in his name* [ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ τὰς ἰδίας προσευχὰς . . . ἐπισφραγίζουσιν]. The Patriarch calls these prayers “*barkings*” [ὕλακας] (117).

(c) *Into the Abyss*. The Patriarch's vision of the fate destined for the misled is apocalyptic. The dire predictions which run through the Διήγησις point to the impact of apostasy on the gullible. Among the verbs picturing that effect the basic meaning “drag” is dominant, which locates the victims' guilt in their lack of resistance. One of the leaders is described as *pulling down* [κατασύρων] the ones who trusted in him, into the pit of perdition (90). —Another found people, *whom he attracted to himself so as to trust him* [οὓς εἰλκυσε πείθεσθαι αὐτῷ] (63). —A third one is quite skillful *in drawing the souls of men* [ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων συνελκύσαι] to their perdition (96). —The same leader *hurled* [κατεκρήμνισεν] many into the abyss of utter perdition, who, in their *lack of awareness* [ἀπροόπτως], were *swallowed up* [καταποθέντες] by him (110). —One of the seducers' successes is, finally, described in the language of warfare: *dragging many off as booty, away from orthodoxy* [πολλοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας συλαγωγήσας] (70).

6. *Summary*. In an analysis focused on the key words of a movement, the text from which these are abstracted “creates” its own linguistic field and in the case at hand the text is an *Orthodox* treatise directed against a sect and

assessing it as *heretical*. "Heresy," in short, evolves as the hyperonym of the field. With that generic concept in the negative, the field turns into a unified structure of negative ideology: the hyperonym transmits the negativism to its constituents, the key concepts; and these transfer it to the broadly synonymous lexemes, which actually express the "values." The effect is what Antonio Gramsci, the Italian linguist, called "a single cultural climate."³⁷

But the Patriarch's negative language vilifying the Paulician heresy, which he usually labels "apostasy," conceals a word portrait exalting orthodoxy. The negative values insinuate their positive correlates: "they lie" implies that "we speak the truth." This function of the underlying antonymy underpins the exegesis, proffered by Thomas Aquinas, of the Pauline maxim (1 Cor. 11:19), δεῖ καὶ αἰρέσεις εἶναι "there must also be heresies": that orthodoxy is brought into relief if it is seen against its counterpoint, heresy.³⁸

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

³⁷ H. and R. Kahane (above, note 1), 152.

³⁸ Cf. H. Grundmann, "Oportet et haereses esse: Das Problem der Ketzerei im Spiegel der mittelalterlichen Biblexegese" (1963), repr. in *op. cit.* (above, note 36), p. 361.

