Whispers of Sin, Wisps of Demons:

The Origins of the *Logismoi* and *Telōnia*

by

Shawn Daniel McAvoy

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

Approved December 2010 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Richard Newhauser, Chair
J. Eugene Clay
Michael Tueller

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2011

ABSTRACT

An early Christian construct which had the recently-deceased soul endures a series of judicial proceedings by demons, the *telōnia* has survived as a folk belief in Orthodox nations such as Russia and Ukraine. The *telōnia* construct is a controversial one in Orthodoxy, however, as discussions of the construct's origins often break down into polemical debate regarding the ontological reality of the *telōnia*. This thesis, as its primary goal, investigates the origins and early development of the *telōnia* in a methodical, scholarly manner. It adduces texts from ancient Egypt to propose that the origins of the *telōnia* extend to the earliest written phases of the Egyptian religion.

Secondarily, this thesis investigates the origins of the *logismoi*: intentions which demons introduce into human minds to seduce them to sin. In 1952, Morton Bloomfield posited that the *logismoi* ultimately evolved from the *telōnia*. Bloomfield's assertion has become the secondary inquiry of this thesis: to wit, whether the *logismoi* construct evolved from the *telōnia*.

This study employs textual criticism of sources in Greek, Latin, and Coptic to answer the two queries. The evidence indicates that the *telōnia* evolved from three previous constructs over the course of at least 2500 years. It also indicates that neither the *telōnia* nor any of its ancestral constructs influenced the creation of the *logismoi*.

i

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

Introduction

<div align="center">Primary Thesis</div>

This thesis investigates the origins of a construct called the *telōnia* (τελώνια, singular τελώνιον *telōnion* meaning 'tollbooth,' or 'customs house') in Greek. The Russians know them as the *mytarstva* (мытарства, singular мытарство *mytarstvo* meaning 'an ordeal,' 'trial,' or 'trying situation'), and the Romanians as the *vămi* (singular *vamă*).[1] All of these words refer to a construct that envisions a series of customs houses on the road to Heaven, a road which in most traditions takes forty days to traverse. Within the sacred space of the *telōnia* construct, the soul feels intimidation, and possibly terror, as it submits to a series of tribunals which try the soul to establish its guilt or innocence for particular sins. Failure at any one *telōnion* condemns the soul to Hades. One can trace this belief to at least the tenth century in the Roman Empire; Constantinopolitan writers employed the *telōnia* in works of literature such as the *Dioptra* and the *Life of Basil the Younger*.[2]

In the Orthodox world today, the *telōnia* remain not only a widespread folk belief, but a controversial topic.[3] Never officially promulgated by any of the seven ecumenical councils or by any local synod since, the *telōnia* construct maintains a

---

[1] Nineteenth-century Russian missionaries dispatched to the Tatars of the Russian Empire even employed the *telōnia* in their endeavors to convert the Muslims, resulting in an unexpected survival of this construct. Dr. Agnes Kefeli-Clay in a conversation with the author, 10 April 2009.

[2] Scholars traditionally have considered Constantine I's founding of the city of Constantinople in 330 as the founding of the Byzantine Empire. The term 'Byzantine' first appeared in Germany in 1557 as a creation of historians. Over the next three centuries, many historians employed the term as a way to separate the Christian phase of the empire from its pagan phase, but the citizens of the empire themselves never made such a distinction. Until the last day of the empire on 29 May 1453, the citizens referred to themselves as 'Romans' and to their polity as the *Basileia tōn Rhōmaiōn* or just *Rhōmania*: 'Empire of the Romans' or just 'Romania.' This thesis will employ the term 'Roman Empire' to refer to the polity throughout its history.

[3] This thesis will employ the Greek word *telōnia* to refer to this construct instead of translating it into English.

disturbing liminality in Orthodox consciousness. At issue in these discussions is the question of whether the *telōnia* construct is a Christian construct or a pagan eruption into the Orthodox thoughtworld (a question which this thesis will not address). This question has vexed the Orthodox world since at least the early fifteenth century when at the Council of Florence (1439-1445), Greek East and Latin West considered reunion and entered into debates upon Latin Purgatory as the middle state of post-mortem souls between Heaven and Hell.

The most recent discussion in the *telōnia* dialogue has only occurred within the past thirty years. In 1980, Father Seraphim Rose published *The Soul After Death*, which prompted controversy. A hieromonk with the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia (ROCOR), Fr. Rose prompted fierce responses with his contentions that the *telōnia* are very much an Orthodox doctrine taught by the church fathers since Late Antiquity, and that the *telōnia* construct is at least a partial metaphor for some real experience which befalls the soul during its post-mortem voyage to its destiny.[4]

The major opponent of Fr. Rose's work to emerge at that time was Fr. Lazar Puhalo, a deacon in ROCOR. The public debate between Puhalo and Rose became so divisive within the church that ROCOR held a synod in 1980 on the debate, not to settle which side was right, but to terminate the discussion. The ROCOR synod refused to take any stand on the ontological reality or unreality of the *telōnia*. In the years since the ROCOR synod, Rev. Dr. Michael Azkoul, also with ROCOR, has entered the debate. His work *The Aerial Toll-House Myth: The Neo-Gnosticism of Fr. Seraphim Rose* argues for the *telōnia* as a non-Orthodox heresy introduced in tenth-century Thrace by the Bogomils.[5]

---

[4] Seraphim Rose, *The Soul After Death* (Platina CA: Saint Herman of Alaska Brotherhood, 1993), 243.

[5] Lazar Puhalo, *The Tale of Basil "the New" and the Theodora Myth: A Study of a Gnostic Document and General Survey of Gnosticism* (Dewdney BC: Synaxis Pr, 1996); and Michael Azkoul, *The Toll-House Myth: The Neo-Gnosticism of Fr. Seraphim Rose* (Dewdney BC: Synaxis Pr, 1998). Both works examine the *telōnia* construct from a

Although Rose, Puhalo, and Azkoul discuss the *telōnia*, in none of their works do they conduct scholarly investigations of the origins and early development of the construct. All of the works in this latest discussion are polemical, and some suffer from serious problems. For example, Seraphim Rose could not read Greek. All of the Greek sources he employed in his work were those first translated, sometimes inaccurately, into Russian or Old Bulgarian, which he then translated into English.

This thesis, as its primary goal, investigates the origins and early development of the *telōnia* in a methodical, scholarly manner. It adduces texts from ancient Egypt such as the *Pyramid Texts* and the *Book of the Dead* to demonstrate that the origins of the *telōnia* extend to the earliest written phases of the Egyptian religion. The key text in the transference of the Egyptian ideas into Christianity is the second/third century CE *Coptic Apocalypse of Paul*. From Egypt, the bishop Theophilus of Alexandria and Pseudo-Cyril of Alexandria then introduced the *telōnia* to the wider Christian world.

The thesis does not address either the ontological reality of the *telōnia* construct or whether modern Orthodox Christians ought to believe in this construct as an afterlife possibility. It only analyses the *telōnia* as a construct in intellectual history: from which times did it arise, how did this construct arise from its times, and how did those times influence its development?

<div align="center">Secondary Thesis</div>

The second question investigates a construct known to scholars and to priests in both the Eastern and Western traditions as *logismoi*. Literally 'intentions,' *logismoi* are introduced by demons into human minds to seduce them to sin. In 1952, Morton Bloomfield in his work *Seven Deadly Sins* analyzed the Latin construct of the Seven Deadly Sins, which he traced back to the *logismoi* construct. This genealogy is well-established and not contested by current scholarship. Bloomfield continued, however,

---

doctrinal viewpoint in the current debate within Orthodoxy. For the ROCOR debate, see Bishop Gregory, "Extract from the Minutes of the Session of the Synod of Bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia," *Orthodox Life* 31 (1981): 23-37.

and posited that the *logismoi* ultimately evolved in the fourth century CE from the *telōnia* construct.[6]

This assertion by Bloomfield constitutes the secondary thrust of this thesis: to wit, did the *logismoi* construct evolve from the *telōnia*?

The Approach

Morton Bloomfield, naturally, based his assessment upon data which he had available to him when he wrote. This thesis has the advantage of employing knowledge unavailable to Bloomfield in 1952. In order to answer the questions, this thesis must not only trace the origins and development of the *telōnia* and the *logismoi*, but of the constituent constructs of the *telōnia*. The *telōnia* construct is complex, and no less than three major previously existing constructs fed into it.[7]

This thesis therefore examines each construct by chapter in the chronological order in which each of the three constructs developed. Not every example of a construct's appearance in literature finds its way into these chapters, but merely those appearances most important to that construct's origin, evolution, and/or popularization. In practical terms this results in the examination of first the construct of the Gatekeepers, then that of the Heavenly Ascent, third the construct of the Aerial Demons; the construct of the *logismoi* next appears as it did chronologically; and finally, the full *telōnia* construct before a conclusion summing up this investigation. In this way, the present work adduces the data necessary to answer the primary and secondary questions posed by the thesis.

---

[6] Bloomfield did not define some of his constructs as strictly as this thesis, but his work did not require such fine distinctions. At one point he calls the ancestral construct the "Gnostic Soul Journey", and another the "Soul Drama." At all times, he meant the same construct. Morton Bloomfield, *The Seven Deadly Sins* (East Lansing: Michigan State College Pr., 1952), 16-17.

[7] And very likely many minor constructs. One could expend a great deal of ink in analyzing a construct as complex as the *telōnia*.

One caveat for the reader: the author is not a theologian, but this thesis does deal with theological issues. The author begs the reader's indulgence to allow that the following pages represent only an *intellectual discussion*, and that they make no claim to issues of ontology, eschatology, or of doctrine.

Chapter 2

Gatekeepers

Introduction

The first construct this thesis examines is the ancient Egyptian construct of the Gatekeepers, who served to mark the various stages of the deceased's journey into the afterlife. At any time, the Gatekeepers could halt the deceased's progress if the deceased failed certain tests. In later Egyptian texts, the Gatekeepers could banish the soul to hellish punishments. Versions of the Gatekeepers appear in other religions worldwide. The Gatekeepers also appear as the oldest of the ancestral constructs of the *telōnia*.

Journey to Judgment: Birth of the Gatekeepers

Egyptians conceptualized the self as consisting of several components: the *ḫ3wt*, the *ib*, the *k3*, the *b3*, the *3ḫ*, the *rn*, and the *šwyt*.[1] The *šwyt* constituted the shadow of the person; the *rn*, the name; and the *ib*, the heart. The Egyptians conceived of the *k3* as the vital force of the individual. The gods created the *k3* at the same time as they created the body, only the *k3*, unlike its body, possessed immortality as its nature.[2] The word *k3* descended from the same verbal root as *k3* 'bull,' *k3t* 'vulva,' and *k3w* 'food,' indicating that in the Egyptian language the *k3* possessed a generative power.[3]

The *b3* also conceptualized the vital force of the individual, but in a different way because it arose from a different aspect of Egyptian religion. Envisioned as a bird

---

[1] Lanny Bell, "The New Kingdom "Divine" Temple: The Example of Luxor," in Shafer, Byron E., ed., *Temples of Ancient Egypt* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Pr., 1997), 130. The transliteration system employed for Egyptian is the most current used in the field of Egyptology. See: Antonio Loprieno, *Ancient Egyptian: A Linguistic Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Pr., 1995), 8-10, 15-16.

[2] Siegfried Morenz, *Egyptian Religion*, trans., Ann E. Keep (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Pr., 1992), 170.

[3] Bell, "The New Kingdom "Divine" Temple," 282, n.2.

with the head of the deceased, the *b3* also possessed immortality as part of its nature, and was associated with the heavens. References in the literature written during the Old Kingdom[4] indicate that the Egyptians believed that the *b3* escaped the corpse via its decomposition fluids.[5] The earliest references to the *b3* also indicate that only the king possessed a *b3*; the First Intermediate Period and Middle Kingdom of Egyptian history saw nobles and commoners usurp this aspect of the king's being to themselves by way of the appropriation of the *Pyramid Texts* to the *Coffin Texts*.[6] The *3ḫ* appears to have been the transfigured spirit of the individual in the afterlife.[7] Best known to moderns is the *ḫ3wt*, or body, because it required mummification after death. The postmortem self never reassembled itself quite as it had existed during life. The constituent components of the person did not congregate into one locus, such as the body, but through ritual became recreated into a being of many parts, all united but not physically fused, who simultaneously existed on the earth, in the underworld, and in the sky.[8] The earliest known ritual texts which aid the dead to its new existence, and which mention the Gatekeeper construct, are the *Pyramid Texts*.

---

[4] Egyptologists divide Egyptian history into dynasties, which then form periods. The Archaic Period (Dynasties I-II) lasted 3150-2686 BCE; the Old Kingdom (III-VI) 2686-2181 BCE; the First -Intermediate Period (VII-X) 2181-2040 BCE; the Middle Kingdom (XI-XII) 2040-1782 BCE; the Second Intermediate Period (XIII-XVII) 1782-1570 BCE; the New Kingdom (XVIII-XX) 1570-1070 BCE; the Third Intermediate Period (XXI-XXVI) 1069-525 BCE; the Late Period (XXVII-XXXI) 525-332 BCE; the Macedonian Period 332-305 BCE; the Ptolemaic Period (XXXII) 305-30 BCE; the Roman Period 30 BCE-330 CE; and, the Late Roman Period 330-641 CE. [All dates approximate] See: Peter A. Clayton, *Chronicle of the Pharaohs* (New York: Thames & Hudson, 2001). Dates for the reigns of the kings in the main will follow Clayton; exceptions will be noted.

[5] Morenz, *Egyptian Religion*, 205.

[6] Ibid., 206.

[7] Ibid., 151.

[8] Jan Assmann, *Death and Salvation in Ancient Egypt*, trans. David Lorton (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Pr., 2005), 111-112.

The Old Kingdom

The *Pyramid Texts* are a body of spells which first appear in writing in the pyramid of the Fifth Dynasty king Wenis (r.2375-2345 BCE).[9] They constitute the oldest corpus of Egyptian religious and funerary literature currently extant.[10] Wenis reigned at a time when Egypt had begun to engage the wider Bronze Age world.[11] Egypt had opened diplomatic relations with Nubia and Byblos.[12] During this time, Egyptian state religion had increasingly emphasized the solar cult. The Fourth Dynasty king Sneferu (r.2613-2589) had invented the pyramid, with sides which sloped in imitation of the sun's rays. His grandson Djedefra (r.2566-2558) had first employed the style "Son of Ra" in the official titulary. The first king of the Fifth Dynasty, Userkaf (r.2498-2491), constructed the first solar temple: a mortuary temple featuring a stone symbolizing the Sun.[13] The ninth and last king of the Fifth Dynasty, Wenis, first had the *Pyramid Texts* inscribed onto his tomb walls.

Wenis' pyramid, called "Beautiful are the cult places of Wenis" in Egyptian, is one of the smallest of Old Kingdom pyramids. Egyptian priests had these spells, which betray signs of originally having been composed orally, carved into the king's subterranean chambers.[14] They may have committed the oral spells to writing as a way to ensure that the king has the spells at his disposal in case his mortuary

---

[9] Erik Hornung, *The Ancient Egyptian Books of the Afterlife*, trans. David Lorton (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Pr., 1999), 1.

[10] R.O. Faulkner, *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts* (Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1969), v

[11] Nicholas Grimal, *A History of Ancient Egypt*, trans. Ian Shaw (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), 76.

[12] Ibid., 80.

[13] Stephen Quirke, *The Cult of Ra* (New York: Thames & Hudson, 2001), 128.

[14] Miroslav Verner, *The Pyramids* , trans. Steven Rendall (London: Atlantic, 2001), 332.

priesthood became unreliable at some time, thus endangering the king's afterlife.[15] References within the *Pyramid Texts* to Old Kingdom politics and society date the earliest hymns to the time just after the unification of Egypt around 3050 BCE.[16] Egyptologists date those texts which refer to the creation of the king into an *3ḫ* as the latest written, likely sometime in the Fifth and Sixth dynasties.[17] The emphasis on the realm of the sun god indicates that the texts hail from the priesthood in the city of Iunu (Heliopolis in Greek).[18]

The *Pyramid Texts* refer to the *m3ḳt/p3ḳt*, a ladder which the king uses to ascend into the Heavens.[19] Ra had knotted the ladder for Osiris to reach the afterlife,[20] and after his own death, the king finds the ladder already set up for him. The king finds that Anubis' daughter guards access to the ladder.[21] He then addresses the ladder itself to let him pass.[22] No judgment by the gods appears, just the king demanding to take his rightful place among the deities. At the end of his journey, the celestial gates are opened for the king and he passes into the divine while an earthquake rages on the earth below.[23] After ascending the ladder the king approaches the *ʿrrt*, a gate.[24] The 'Double Ram Gate' is bolted and double doored.[25]

---

[15] Mark Lehner, *The Complete Pyramids* (New York: Thames & Hudson, 1997), 155.

[16] Ibid., 31.

[17] Ibid., 31.

[18] Ibid., 32.

[19] Faulkner, *Pyramid Texts*, 79. Pyramid Text 271. Hereafter PT [Pyramid Text] followed by the spell number.

[20] PT 305, 472, 971. Whitney M. Davis, "The Ascension-Myth in the Pyramid Texts," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 36 (1977): 169.

[21] PT 304, 468, 1431.

[22] PT 478.

[23] PT 511.

[24] PT 392.

A fearsome creature called the *štṯ*, the Summoner, awaits to engage in a verbal

repartee.[26]

> Geb laughs, Nut shouts for joy before me when I ascend to the sky. The sky
> thunders for me, the earth quakes for me, the hail-storm is burst apart for me,
> and I roar as does Seth. Those who are in charge of the parts of the sky open
> the celestial doors for me, and I stand on the air, the stars are darkened for me
> with the fan of the god's water-jars.

Further, it states: "I will find a fare for myself, (because) the Summoner, the gate-

keeper of Osiris, detests a crossing without payment (?) being made to him."[27]

The Summoner demands the king's name (*rn*), but the king must refuse to

answer since giving the Summoner his name would give the Summoner power over him.

The Summoner then demands to know who, if anyone, supports the king's mortuary

cult, to which the king replies that his successor supports it. If nobody on Earth were

to maintain the mortuary cult, then not only would the king fail to gain entrance

through the gates, but his self would die. The king then asks to be announced to Horus

and the gates are opened.[28]

PT 373 speaks of one particular gate, the 'gate to keep out *rḫy.t*.' The

Egyptian word *rḫy.t* meant commoner or average person (Raymond O. Faulkner

translates it as "plebs"). Only the king could proceed to the Otherworld to enter the

realm of the gods. The rest of the people had a different, chthonic, eternity.[29]

The Middle Kingdom

The end of the Old Kingdom coincided with an abrupt climate change which

saw Nile inundations become less frequent, and those inundations which did occur on

time carry less water than previously. Food shortages and economic instability ensued

---

[25] PT 1726, 1915, 502.

[26] PT 1157.

[27] PT 511.

[28] PT 194, 592. Davis, "The Ascension-Myth," 172-3.

[29] Assmann, *Death and Salvation*, 334.

in Egypt, the northern provinces of the Akkadian Empire collapsed, the Harrapan culture along the Indus disintegrated, and people in Canaan and western Syria deserted their towns and villages.[30] Not only did the society and economy of Egypt change, but also the afterlife. From appearing only in the tombs of the kings, the *Pyramid Texts* migrated to the burials of queens and nomarchs beginning in the reign of the Sixth Dynasty king Neferkare Pepi II (r.2278-2184 BCE). By the First Intermediate Period, the Gatekeepers had taken root in Egyptian popular religion.[31] From the Egyptian king's ascent into the heavens via a rope ladder in the reign of Wenis, the journey diffused throughout Egyptian society during the First Intermediate Period and the Middle Kingdom so that all could make the heavenly ascent.

A variant of the soul journey construct in which the post-mortem soul leaves its corpse for a journey to another place or another dimension, the heavenly ascent involves the soul of the deceased ascending into the heavens, which means that the heavenly ascent requires the body to be dead. In contrast, the construct in which the soul ascends into the heavens while the body remains alive, whether in a trance or in some other condition, is the soul flight construct.[32] This distinction between the heavenly ascent and the soul flight becomes important when determining texts discussing the post-mortem journey of the soul from those relating a visionary experience.

By the Middle Kingdom, the gods judged all of the dead; even the kings. But to reach the gods, the deceased still had to pass through the Gatekeepers. *Coffin Text* (CT) 404 describes the deceased's travels through these gates. Because CT 404 appears

---

[30] D. Kaniewski *et al.*, "Middle East Coastal Ecosystem Response to Middle-to-Late Holocene Abrupt Climate Changes," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 105 (2008): 13941.

[31] S.G.F. Brandon, "A Problem of the Osirian Judgment of the Dead," *Numen* 5 (1958): 117.

[32] Christopher Carr and D. Troy Case, *Gathering Hopewell* (New York: Birkhäuser, 2006), 36, 106, 192.

on coffins dated to the Twelfth Dynasty (c.1991-1782 BCE), a *terminus ante quem* of

the Twelfth Dynasty for the composition of CT 404 applies.[33] But a date of composition

anytime from the late First Intermediate Period (which began c.2181 BCE) is possible.[34]

Each of seven gatekeepers engages the deceased in conversation to test his knowledge

of the gatekeepers.[35] CT 404 instructs the deceased about the encounter:

> SPELL FOR ARRIVING AT THE FIRST PORTAL OF THE FIELD OF RUSHES. WHAT IS
> TO BE SAID TO THE GATE-KEEPER: 'Open, O *Gšgš*, for your name is *Gšgš*.' Hail
> to you, You of the Netherworld, my lord; make ready your place for me. [The
> Gatekeeper replies] 'Come, be a spirit, my brother; proceed to the place of
> which you know.' CT 404[36]

After each challenge, the Gatekeepers allow the deceased to pass with the invocation,

"Be a spirit (*íy ꜣḫ*)." Sometimes translated as "you who have become spiritualized (or

informed)," the text more precisely should be translated as an imperative, "Become an

ꜣḫ!" and refers to the deceased's change in status.[37] It is the Gatekeepers who first

recognize the change in the deceased.

<div align="center">The New Kingdom: Gatekeepers in Their Glory</div>

After two dynasties, the sources for the Middle Kingdom go silent. Societal

collapse does not appear to be the culprit; nonetheless, records cease for unknown

reasons around the transition from Dynasty XII to XIII.[38] When records resume, a

Semitic people from the Levant remembered as the Hyksos have taken control in the

Delta. While the Hyksos Fifteenth Dynasty ruled from Avaris in the Delta, and the

Kingdom of Kerma expanded from the south, the beleaguered Dynasty XVII ruled from

---

[33] Dieter Mueller, "An Early Egyptian Guide to the Hereafter," *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 58 (1972): 123.

[34] Ibid., 124.

[35] Ibid., 101.

[36] R.O. Faulkner, *The Ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts* (Oxford: Aris & Phillips, 2004), II 48.

[37] Mueller, "Early Egyptian Guide," 112. Faulkner, *Coffin Texts*, II 51, n.5.

[38] Grimal, *History of Ancient Egypt*, 184.

Waset with the dynastic goal of expelling the Hyksos and reunifying all Egypt.[39] After

years of war, the Waset kings succeeded in their quest as King Nebpehyre Ahmose I

(r.1570-1546 BCE) expelled the Hyksos, reunited Egypt, and inaugurated the Eighteenth

Dynasty.[40]

From the turbulent Seventeenth Dynasty emerged the earliest version of the

Book of the Dead, a book whose spells became commonly employed in tombs of nobles

by the time of Menkheperre Thutmose III (r.1504-1450 BCE).[41] In the New Kingdom, for

the first time, Egyptians began to conceive of a 'this world' as a distinct and separate

construct from the 'other world.' These two constructs did not exist separated,

however, with no contact between them, but intersected with one another. This

allowed the dead, previously exiled to the realm of the gods, to return and actively

partake of and participate in the lives of their families.[42]

The creation of two constructs for the world of the living and the world of the

Other delineated a liminal space between the two. Egyptians believed that nobody

alive could see the gods or enter the realm of the gods, even in visions. Humans could

traverse the gulf which separated the gods from the physical world only at death. Even

then, death only admitted humans to a liminal space which was not the realm of the

gods but a no man's land which the gods themselves did not inhabit. The divine order

which ruled the realms of the gods and humans did not apply in the post-mortem

liminal space.[43] Within this liminal space functioned the Gatekeepers.

---

[39] Ibid., 185-7.

[40] Ibid., 194.

[41] Hornung, *Books of the Afterlife*, 13.

[42] Assmann, *Death and Salvation*, 216.

[43] Ibid., 78.

In the *Book of the Dead* (BD) Spell 146, the *b3* must reckon with 21

Gatekeepers; in BD 144 and 147, the number falls to seven. The Gatekeepers require

the *b3* to tell the name of both gate and Gatekeeper before it may pass.[44]

> 'I will not announce you,' says the door-keeper of this Hall of Justice, 'unless
> you tell my name.' '"Knower of hearts, searcher out of bodies" is your name,'
> 'To which god shall I announce you?' 'To him who is now present. Tell it to
> the Dragoman of the Two Lands.' 'Who is the Dragoman of the Two Lands?'
> 'He is Thoth.' BD 125[45]

Some of the Gatekeepers possess colorful names:

Gate 1:

> 'He whose face is inverted, the many-shaped' is the name of the keeper of the
> first gate; 'Eavesdropper' is the name of him who guards it; 'The loud-voiced'
> is the name of him who makes report in it.

Gate 2:

> 'He whose hinder-parts are extended' is the name of the keeper of the second
> gate; 'Shifting of Face' is the name of him who guards it; 'Burner' is the name
> of him who makes report in it.

Gate 5:

> 'He who lives on snakes' is the name of the keeper of the fifth gate; 'Fiery' is
> the name of him who guards it; 'Hippopotamus-faced, raging of power' is the
> name of him who makes report in it.
> O you gates, O you who keep the gates because of Osiris, O you who guard
> them and who report the affairs of the Two Lands to Osiris every day . . ."
> BD144[46]

According to the *Book of the Dead*, the Gatekeepers served only as the first

part of the deceased's trials. The second and final judgment saw the deceased stand

before Osiris to make the negative confession which included such statements by the

deceased as: "O You of the cavern who came forth from the West, I have not been

sullen;" "O You whose face is behind him who came forth from the Cavern of Wrong, I

---

[44] Ibid., 191.

[45] R.O. Faulkner, *The Ancient Egyptian Book of the Dead* (Austin: University of Texas Pr., 1993), 33.

[46] Ibid., 133.

have neither misconducted myself nor copulated with a boy;" and, "O You of the darkness who came forth from the darkness, I have not been quarrelsome."[47]

Reorganized in the Twenty-Sixth Dynasty (664-525 BCE) into a tighter composition, the *Book of the Dead* afterward came very close to becoming a canonical sacred scripture for the Egyptians.[48] The *Book of the Dead* did not remain confined to the Black Land. BD 125 appears in the Kingdom of Kush to the south of Egypt in present Sudan, in the tomb of Prince Khaliut, son of King Piye of Kush and Egypt (r.752-721 BCE). The spell also appears in a modified form on the Khaliut Stele, created after the prince's death, at the Amun Temple at Napata.[49] Portions of the *Book of the Dead* also appear in the tomb of Henuttakhebit, wife of the Kushite King Aspelta (r.600-580 BCE).[50]

The *Book of the Dead* reorganized the Gatekeeper construct so that instead of serving as sentinels on the way to the deceased's final destination, they became denizens within a liminality between worlds, denizens who effectively conducted a series of trials before allowing the deceased to enter the realm of the gods where it underwent the final trial before Osiris.

Akhenaten and the Aten Revolution

Ascending the throne around 1350 BCE as Amunhotep IV, Neferkheperure-Waenre Akhenaten (r.1350-1334 BCE) initiated a religious and cultural revolution as he

---

[47] Ibid., 32.

[48] François Dunand and Christine Zivie-Coche, *Gods and Men in Egypt, 3000 BCE to 395 CE*, trans. David Lorton (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Pr., 2004), 187.

[49] Morenz, *Egyptian Religion*, 242-3. P.L. Shinne, "The Nilotic Sudan and Ethiopia, c.660 BC to c.AD 600," in Shinnie, P.L., ed., *The Cambridge History of Africa, vol.2: c.500 BC - c.AD 1050* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Pr., 1979), 216.

[50] Morenz, *Egyptian Religion*, 345, n.57.

revealed to his kingdom the religion of the Aten, the sun disk aspect of Re-Herakhti and perhaps even the light from the sun disk.[51]

The Aten initially had gained prominence during the reign of Menkheperure Thutmose IV (r.1419-1386 BCE), Akhenaten's grandfather.[52] On a scarab from that king's reign, Thutmose had called the Aten a god of battles. Later, during the lifetime of Akhenaten's father, Nebmaatre Amunhotep III (r.1386-1349 BCE), philosophical discussion about the nature of the Aten became commonplace within the royal court. On one statue of Amunhotep III, found in the Luxor Cache, the king refers to himself as "Amunhotep III: Shining Aten of All Lands."[53] Amunhotep III had even adopted the Aten into one of his names: *Tjekhenaten*, meaning "Radiance of the Aten."[54] The king emphasized the Aten as well as his own divinity, a program he could pursue since his brother-in-law Anen served as the High Priest of Amun.[55] By the final years of his reign, Amunhotep had himself portrayed as having merged with Ra; a metaphor only previously employed after a king's death.[56]

Amunhotep III died in his Regnal Year 39. Crown Prince Thutmose had predeceased his father, so the younger son Amunhotep IV ascended the throne. Immediately, the new king began constructing monuments to the Aten. In his Regnal Year 4, the king held a *sed*[57] festival in which he revealed to the kingdom the religion

---

[51] Marc Gabolde, *D'Akhenaton à Toutânkhamon* (Lyon: Institut d'Archaéologie et d'Histoire de l'Antiquité, 1998), 27. Dennis Forbes, "Re Shining," *KMT* 16 (2005-6): 75.

[52] Cyril Aldred, *Akhenaten: King of Egypt* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1991), 142.

[53] Quirke, *Cult of Ra*, 154.

[54] Richard H. Wilkinson, *The Complete Gods and Goddesses of Ancient Egypt* (London: Thames & Hudson, 2003), 236.

[55] David P. Silverman, "Divinity and Deities in Ancient Egypt," in Shafer, Byron E. (ed.), *Religion in Ancient Egypt* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Pr., 1991), 74-5.

[56] Quirke, *Cult of Ra*, 150.

[57] Grimal, *History of Ancient Egypt*, 401. The *sed* festival occurred in the thirtieth year of a king's reign (although kings sometimes celebrated it earlier), and intermittently

of the Aten.[58] In doing so, he alienated the priesthood of Amun, the patron deity of

the Eighteenth Dynasty kings; an open rupture between the Amun priesthood and the

king ensued as Akhenaten proclaimed the Aten the primary god of Egypt.[59] In

Akhenaten's Regnal Year 5, the king formally changed his nomen from Amunhotep IV to

Akhenaten, and moved the capital of Egypt from Waset in Upper Egypt to Akhetaten in

Middle Egypt.[60]

The king altered the traditional temple architecture as he demanded that the

Aten's temples open to the Sun instead of swathing priests in darkness as Egyptian

temples had done for over a thousand years.[61] Akhenaten also changed the path

through which Egyptians accessed the divine; he and his queen, Nefertiti, would act as

sole (and possibly unitary) intermediary between man and the divine even to the point

where one's existence in the afterlife would depend upon one's loyalty to the king and

queen, and vicariously to the Aten.[62] The *b3* of the deceased rose every dawn to feed

at the morning temple ritual, then came and went freely throughout the day. The *k3*

and the other components of the deceased had no obvious roles in the Atenist

---

thereafter. The king had to undertake various physical tasks in order to prove his
continued vitality.

[58] Gabolde, *D'Akhenaton à Toutânkhamon*, 27. Forbes, "Re Shining," 75.

[59] Gabolde, *D'Akhenaton à Toutânkhamon*, 28.

[60] Assmann, *Death and Salvation*, 335. The Egyptian word *3ḫ.t* (*akhet*) in Akhetaten
usually is translated as 'horizon,' but this word does not adequately capture the
meaning of *3ḫ.t*. The word *3ḫ.t* expresses a liminal space between the sky and the
earth. Sacred spaces such as temples, pyramids, the place where the sun rose and set,
are called *3ḫ.tw*. So *3ḫ.t* could be better interpreted as expressing an event horizon
within which heaven and earth meet. Thus, Akhenaten's city Akhetaten was named
because he meant it to act as the event horizon of a liminal space within which the
Aten interacted with the mundane world.

[61] Jan Assmann, *The Search for God in Ancient Egypt*, trans. David Lorton (Ithaca:
Cornell, 2001), 209.

[62] Erik Hornung, *Akhenaten and the Religion of Light*, trans. David Lorton (Ithaca:
Cornell Univ. Pr., 1999), 96.

afterlife.[63] By royal decree, the realm of the dead shifted from *d3t*, the realm of

Osiris, to the Great Temple of the Aten; all books of the underworld, and funerary

texts and spells, became obsolete.[64] The judgment by Osiris also disappeared by the

king's will; Akhenaten's mercy and grace would replace it and sustain the *b3* of the

dead during the day. At night, the *b3* slept in oblivion.[65] Akhenaten's new religion

exclusivized the physical world at the expense of the Otherworld; the realm of the

gods became irrelevant to the realm of man.[66] In this new interpretation, one's

afterlife occurred in *this* world, but only if the king permitted.[67]

      Yet Akhenaten's revolution did not succeed as well as he might have hoped.

Around Egypt, the people continued to worship their traditional gods in the traditional

ways.[68] Representations of the gods continued, even in the king's new capital, while

he instituted a statewide persecution of the god Amun around Regnal Year 10.

Egyptian soldiers defaced monuments and smashed personal belongings that had the

name of the proscribed god.[69] Even with their own army turned against them,

Egyptians clung to their gods and beliefs.

      After the death of Akhenaten sometime around 1334 BCE, two kings reigned

briefly in turn at his capital of Akhetaten: Ankhkheperure I Neferneferuaten, and

---

[63] Ibid., 97.

[64] Ibid., 96, 99.

[65] Ibid., 102.

[66] Assmann, *Death and Salvation*, 217.

[67] Hornung, *Akhenaten and the Religion of Light*, 103.

[68] Jacobus Van Dijk, "The Amarna Period and the Later New Kingdom (c.1352-1009 BC)," in Shaw, Ian, ed., *The Oxford History of Ancient Egypt* (New York: Oxford Univ. Pr., 2000), 287.

[69] Nicholas Reeves, *Akhenaten: Egypt's False Prophet* (New York: Thames & Hudson, 2005), 139, 154.

Ankhkheperure II Smenkhkare.[70] Although the two successors ruled Egypt and helmed

the Aten religion for a combined total of one to four years, the Aten Revolution

collapsed without its founder. Finally, Akhenaten's son Tutankhuaten ascended the

throne between 1333-1330 BCE at the age of nine. Whether of his own volition or

under the influence of his advisors, Nebkheperure Tutankhuaten moved the capital of

Egypt back to Waset, changed his name to Tutankhamun, and reinstated the traditional

cults as the official state religion.[71]

After Aten

The *Book of Gates* dates to the reign of Akhenaten, even though it does not

employ Atenist theology. It first appears in an incomplete copy in the tomb of

Djeserkheperure Setepenre Horemheb (r.1321-1293 BCE) with the earliest complete

version appearing in the tomb of Menmaatre Seti I (r.1291-1278 BCE).[72]

Employing the chthonic descent,[73] the *Book of Gates* concerns itself with the

praxis of the deceased gaining access to the underworld through the various

Gatekeepers. Each gate has a serpent Gatekeeper on the door flanked by two other

Gatekeepers with fire spitting uraei.[74] Some of the Gatekeepers, namely the *3ḫu* and

mummies, possessed forms only achievable after their own deaths.[75] The *Book of*

---

[70] Gabolde, *D'Akhenaton à Toutânkhamon*, 221; James Allen, "The Amarna Succession," in Brand, Peter J. and Louise Cooper (ed.), *Causing His Name to Live: Studies in Egyptian Epigraphy and History in Memory of William J. Murnane* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 12, 19-20.

[71] Grimal, *History of Ancient Egypt*, 241.

[72] Hornung, *Books of the Afterlife*, 55.

[73] Another variant of the soul journey, the chthonic descent construct (created by the author) sees the soul descending to an underworld which may or may not include punishments for acts committed in life. In a third variant, the horizontal wandering construct, the post-mortem soul can remain on the same plane, or in the same world, as it inhabited in life.

[74] Hornung, *Books of the Afterlife*, 58.

[75] Edward F. Wente, "Mysticism in Pharonic Egypt?" *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 41 (1982): 177.

Gates contains the most systematic schema of the gates of any Egyptian afterlife book.[76] Yet the emphasis in the book is not on the answering of the questions of the Gatekeepers, but on the punishments meted out to those who fail to make their way to the Osirian judgment. The god Atum received power over the damned. For those who made their way to the Hall of Osiris within Gate Five and who survived, their *b3w* led to their union with the corpse of the sun to rise anew each morning.[77]

<div align="center">The Gatekeepers in the Post-Aten World</div>

Akhenaten's new theology had led to a crisis in the Egyptian thoughtworld, which in turn may have aided in the creation of the construct of damnation, a concept previously little known in the Egyptian afterlife. Before Akhenaten, Egyptians conceived of an afterlife where one either survived the Gatekeepers and the trial to enter the afterlife, or one failed and found oneself fed to the Devourer of Hearts; Egyptians considered oblivion the most horrific post-mortem fate. Egyptians saw life as arising from death; the two formed a complimentary dualism in the Egyptian mind.[78] Death was not the thing to fear, but oblivion. In the inchoate, undifferentiated, unordered oblivion, even death ceased to exist. This nonexistence inspired the greatest fear in the Egyptians.[79] Akhenaten's afterlife seemed to offer the worst of all possible outcomes. During the day, one's *b3* lived while the Sun shone only because the king allowed; at night, one slumbered in oblivion. After Akhenaten, damnation joined oblivion as a third possibility after death. Yet, the *Book of the Dead* made a

---

[76] Hornung, *Books of the Afterlife*, 57.

[77] Ibid., 58-62.

[78] As opposed to an opposing dualism common in the Western mind. Egyptians conceived of dualities as necessary for cosmic balance, but the dualities did not exist in opposition to one another. The West tends to see dualities as necessarily in opposition if not mutually exclusive: God and Satan; flesh and spirit; light and dark; life and death, *et cetera*.

[79] Erik Hornung, *Conceptions of God in Ancient Egypt: The One and the Many*, trans. John Baines (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Pr., 1996), 180, 183.

forceful resurgence after the collapse of the Aten Revolution. Scenes from the *Book of the Dead* dominated post-Amarna tomb decoration in a way not seen before Akhenaten unleashed his revolution upon the Black Land.[80]

Before Akhenaten, the Gatekeepers guarded the heavenly ascent, an ascent into the realm of light. After Akhenaten, a bifurcation seems to have settled into the Egyptian mind. The *Book of the Dead* continued, as did the identification of the king with solar deities, and the guardianship of the Gatekeepers over the heavenly ascent, but another view arose which saw the post-mortem voyage as becoming a chthonic descent. Although this descent always existed in Egyptian religion from the earliest times as the afterlife of the people while the king ascended to the heavens, after Amarna the chthonic descent became as prominent a belief as the *Book of the Dead*'s pre-Amarna heavenly ascent.

The tension between the Osirian chthonic afterlife and the solar heavenly afterlife never reached a satisfactory resolution during Egyptian history.[81] Both the heavenly ascent and the chthonic descent would co-exist for centuries, and during those centuries the Gatekeepers would fulfill their functions along both Soul Journeys.

The Late New Kingdom

Although only one afterlife book appears to have descended directly from Atenist theology,[82] the concept of the solar deity as preeminent in the pantheon survived. In addition, the production of afterlife books exploded during the post-Amarna period, which saw the creation of the *Book of Gates*, the *Book of the Earth*, the *Book of the Heavenly Cow*, and the *Book of Caverns*.

---

[80] Van Dijk, "Amarna Period," 289.

[81] Morenz, *Egyptian Religion*, 207-8.

[82] Alexandre Piankoff, *The Shrines of Tut-Ankh-Amon* (New York: Pantheon, 1955), 120-131. *The Enigmatic Book of the Underworld* appears only in the tomb of Tutankhamun. With one third of the text apparently gibberish, the book depicts the gods and the deceased physically breathing the light of the Sun.

After the death of Tutankhamun, the Thutmosid bloodline died out. An ephemeral king, Kheperkheperure Ay (r.1325-1321 BCE), held the throne for about four years before Tutankamun's general Djeserkheperure Setepenre Horemheb (r.1321-1293 BCE) ascended to the throne. Horemheb oversaw the final demolition of the city of Akhetaten.[83] He reformed the Egyptian government and appointed his own successor: a fellow army man named Piramesses.[84]

Piramesses, known to history as Menpehtyre Ramesses I (r.1293-1291 BCE), inaugurated the Nineteenth Dynasty. His grandson Usermaatre Ramesses II (r.1279-1212 BCE) concluded history's first known peace treaty by making peace with the Hittite Emperor Hattusili III (r.1267-1237 BCE).[85] After Ramesses' death, however, his dynasty slowly unraveled. Finally, one Userkhaure Setepenre Setnakhte (r.1185-1182 BCE) took the reins of power and inaugurated Dynasty XX.[86] Setnakhte's son Usermaatre Meryamun Ramesses III (r.1182-1151 BCE) oversaw Egypt's last period of hegemony in the Bronze Age. Ramesses III's world saw the onset of another abrupt climate change which prompted the contributed to the collapse of the Hittite Empire, and the Kingdom of Wilusa[87] as catastrophic droughts plagued the eastern Mediterranean.[88] Ramesses had to defend Egypt against a coalition of migrants from the north, called the Sea Peoples, who had descended upon his kingdom intent on carving out part of it for themselves.[89] Ramesses III's son Heqamaatre Ramesses IV (r.1151-1145 BCE) would preside over an Egypt in decline. Political and economic

---

[83] Grimal, *History of Ancient Egypt*, 243.

[84] Ibid., 243-5.

[85] Ibid., 257.

[86] Ibid., 269.

[87] The basis for the legendary Ilion of the *Iliad*.

[88] Kaniewski *et al*., "Middle-to-Late Holocene Abrupt Climate Changes," 13941.

[89] Grimal, *History of Ancient Egypt*, 272.

instability would stalk the Two Lands beyond the end of the Twentieth Dynasty under

Menmaatre Setepenptah Ramesses XI (r.1098-1070 BCE)

In the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties, the god Amun changed from being

just one of the gods to the essence of divinity. Most likely influenced by Atenist

theology during its nearly two decade duration, Amun became not just a chief god but

in one sense the One with all other deities either informed by him or expressions of

him.[90] Other changes in Egyptian religion occurred as the chaos sown in the Amarna

period, and first seen in the *Book of Caverns*, appears to have left a permanent mark in

a more perilous journey to *d3t* in which the penalty for failing the tests of the

Gatekeepers becomes eternal torment.

Variants of the *Book of Caverns* first appear in the tomb of Ramesses II's son

Baenre-merynetjeru Merenptah (r.1212-1202 BCE), with the earliest nearly complete

copy appearing in the tomb of Nebmaatre Meryamun Ramesses VI (r.1141-1133 BCE).[91]

The *Book of Caverns* transposes the Gatekeepers, in the form of guardian serpents, to

an underworld where they stood guard at the entrances to the various *qrwt*, or

caverns, in which the damned were punished and through which the deceased had to

travel.[92] Egyptian texts give no indication that the Gatekeepers now served to prevent

the damned from escaping. Those justified (*m3ꜥ-ḫrw* lit. 'true of voice') passed by the

caverns in an area called the Place of Annihilation in which they witnessed the damned

deprived of their *b3w*. They also saw in lakes of fire the bodies decapitated or

otherwise mutilated.[93]

---

[90] Douglas M. Parrott, "Gnosticism and Egyptian Religion," *Novum Testamentum* 29 (1987): 85.

[91] Hornung, *Books of the Afterlife*, 83.

[92] Ibid., 85.

[93] Ibid., 87.

By the end of the New Kingdom, the Gatekeepers had become lords of liminality. From Old Kingdom sentinels at rope ladders leading to the circumpolar stars, they evolved into denizens who tried the deceased before it reached its final judgment before Osiris, and they presided over caverns of torments for those who failed. The Gatekeepers continued in Egyptian religion through the Thirtieth Dynasty (380-343 BCE) and into the Roman period (30 BCE – 330). During such times, they could not exist in isolation from the world as influences from across the eastern Mediterranean flooded into Egypt affecting Egyptian ontology, axiology, epistemology, and cosmology.

Egyptians continued to make copies of the *Book of the Dead* into the Ptolemaic and Roman periods.[94] In the Roman Period, the *Book of the Dead* survived the transition into a demotic text thus making it available for a new generation who could no longer read hieroglyphs or hieratic.[95] The Gatekeepers and the Egyptian cults would endure for centuries side-by-side with the new religion of Christianity.

Ptolemaic and Roman Periods

Egyptologists recognize three different compositions which have often been conflated into the *Letter of Breathings*, a work first attested sometime before 350 BCE.[96] The *Letter for Breathing Which Isis Made* was composed during the Ptolemaic era (Dynasty XXXII – 305-31 BCE); the *First Letter of Breathings* and the *Second Letter of Breathings* were created during the Roman period.[97] The *First Letter of Breathings* includes the construct of the Gatekeepers.[98]

---

[94] Ibid., 14.

[95] Ibid., 14.

[96] Ibid., 23.

[97] Mark Smith, *Traversing Eternity: Texts for the Afterlife from Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt* (New York: Oxford Univ. Pr., 2009), 499.

[98] Hornung, *Books of the Afterlife*, 24.

The three letters of *Breathings* were not new compositions but much shorter redactions of the *Book of the Dead*.[99] Most of the production seems to have been centered in Waset in Upper Egypt.[100] While the *Book of the Dead* continued to be copied and adapted into the Roman Period, the three *Breathings* became the major afterlife texts produced during both Dynasty XXXII and the Roman Period.[101] This popularity arose, in part, from the priesthood's public relations savvy in claiming to have discovered divine originals of the three *Breathings*. During the reign of Augustus (r.27 BCE – 14 CE), one priest 'discovered' one of the letters of *Breathings* on the wrappings of a mummy from the reign of Wahibre Psamtik I (r.664-610 BCE). Claiming it the work of a god, the priest copied the book and sent a copy to Rome for Augustus' perusal.[102]

In *First Breathings*, attributed to the god Thoth, the Gatekeepers continue their ancient task although sometimes covertly.[103] In the *Letter for Breathing Which Isis Made* and *Second Breathings*, the Gatekeepers are often barely mentioned. Papyrus Joseph Smith I appears to be a version of the *Letter for Breathing Which Isis Made*, and dates from Dynasty XXXII into the Roman Period.[104] In it the gods tell the deceased: "You shall not be turned [away] from the doors [of the Underworld]."[105]

---

[99] Morenz, *Egyptian Religion*, 227.

[100] Dunand and Zivie-Coche, *Gods and Men in Egypt*, 189.

[101] Ibid., 320.

[102] Morenz, *Egyptian Religion*, 220.

[103] Ibid., 228.

[104] Robert K. Ritner, ""The Breathing Permit of Hôr" Among the Joseph Smith Papyri," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 62 (2003): 164-7.

[105] Ibid., 172.

The Gatekeepers are not specifically mentioned, but the deceased requires aid against their power (at the "door," same word as 'gate') nonetheless.[106]

The three *Breathings* continued in active production until at least the second century CE.[107] During this time, they provided a valuable guide to the *b3w* on the soul journey. According to the papyri, the deceased required such spells as: "You open the way to the vicinity of the great portal, and your *k3* crosses the Upper Gate;"[108] and, "You embrace Osiris in the Great House of Gold, and Khenty-imentiu in his sarcophagus. You pass over the two Gates of the cavern gods, and join yourself to the recumbent ones."[109]

First Breathings calls Anubis the "strict" Gatekeeper of the underworld, and called the others collectively, "[Gatekeepers] of the underworld who are the guardians of the West."[110] One version of *First Breathings* even gives a visual representation of the Gatekeepers. Three vignettes show a series of figures guarding the underworld gates. In the first two vignettes, knife-wielding beings await the deceased's *b3*. In the first vignette, the knife-wielders have human heads; in the second, they have animal

---

[106] Ibid., 161-2. The Papyrus Joseph Smith I is the same papyrus which Joseph Smith purchased in 1835 and from which he purported to translate the *Book of Abraham*, published in 1842. Long believed lost, the Metropolitan Museum of Art had acquired the papyrus fragments through a chain which stretched back ultimately to his wife Emma Hale Smith who kept his papers after his assassination. The Met gifted the P. JS I to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints on 27 November 1967. When Egyptologists translated P. JS I, they found not the *Book of Abraham* but a copy of the *Letter for Breathing Which Isis Made* titled *The Breathing Permit of Hôr*.
   Joseph Smith demonstrated a lifelong fascination with Egyptology from having the Small Plates of Nephi in the *Book of Mormon* composed in "the language of the Egyptians" (I Nephi 1:2), to having the Plates of Mormon written in "reformed Egyptian" (Mormon 9:32), to publishing an account of Abraham's revelations regarding God's throne at Kolob in the P. JS I.

[107] François René Herbin, *Le Livre de Parcourir l'Éternité* (Leuven: Uitgeveru Peeters, 1994), 12-3.

[108] Ibid., 48.

[109] Ibid., 48-9.

[110] Smith, *Traversing Eternity*, 505, 512.

heads on human bodies. The third vignette shows a mummiform falcon guarding the

tight side of a gate, and a jackal and a recumbent cow keeping the left.[111]

Since the Gatekeepers continued their tasks into the Roman Period, the

deceased continued to require aid to survive the passage through the Gates. Even the

political, economic, and social changes which affected Egypt at the beginning of the

Common Era did not release the Gatekeepers from their charges.

<div align="center">Gatekeepers and the Taxing of Souls</div>

The *Book of the Dead* continued to be actively copied and adapted into the

Roman Period, with copies in hieroglyphic, hieratic, and demotic. The three

Breathings also actively circulated during Roman rule in Egypt. Long-plundered tombs

in the Valley of the Kings and elsewhere about Egypt displayed the *Book of the Dead*,

and the Gatekeepers, on their walls to any who entered. Between the papyri and

tombs with their images for the illiterate, and their words for the literate, the

Gatekeepers ensured their continuance in the Egyptian thoughtworld. The

Gatekeepers did not simply remain in the *Book of the Dead* or the three *Breathings*,

however.

The *Coptic Apocalypse of Paul* was composed in Egypt sometime in the second

to early third centuries CE.[112] *Coptic Paul* shows evidence of first Greek authorship

then translation into Boharic Coptic followed by translation into the Sahidic Coptic, the

language in which the only surviving manuscript exists. This indicates that *Coptic Paul*

first established itself in Lower Egypt then moved into Upper Egypt to the ascetic

---

[111] Ibid., 504.

[112] George W. MacRae and William R. Murdock, trans., "The Apocalypse of Paul (V,2)," in Robinson, James M., ed., *The Nag Hammadi Library* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1988), 257. The *Coptic Apocalypse of Paul* bears no literary relationship to the better known *Apocalypse of Paul*, also composed in Greek but translated into Latin.

communities in the desert.[113] Unfortunately, this data only hints at *Coptic Paul*'s

transmission history but not at where in Egypt its author composed it.[114]

The *Coptic Apocalypse of Paul* expands upon a soul flight taken by the Apostle

Paul, and mentioned in II Corinthians 12:1-10. The text begins with Paul at the third

heaven where the Holy Spirit invites him to look down upon the earth at himself and

the other apostles. Paul then ascends to the fourth heaven where he sees angels

taking a soul from the 'land of the dead' and taking it to the gate of the fourth heaven.

The angels whip the soul as it asks after which sin it committed to deserve such

punishment. According to *Coptic Paul* 20:16-20: *The toll-collector who dwells in the*

fourth heaven replied, saying, "It was not right to commit all those lawless deeds that

are in the world of the dead".[115] The soul challenges the allegation, and the 'toll

collector' produces witnesses to the sin. Finally, the soul hangs its head in shame and

as its punishment (21:18-21): *It was cast down. The soul that had been cast down*

went to a body which had been prepared for it.[116]

In this episode, a Gatekeeper maintains the gate to the fourth heaven. He

seems to have received a promotion and a staff, along with a new title: ⲦⲈⲖⲰⲚⲎⲤ

(*telōnēs*), a Coptic word borrowed from the Greek τελώνης (*telōnēs*) meaning 'toll

collector' or 'tax collector.'[117] Otherwise, the Gatekeeper still keeps the gate, still

judges the soul, and still casts it to punishment if it fails its trial.

---

[113] Michael Kaler, Louis Painchaud, and Marie-Pierre Bussières, "The Coptic *Apocalypse of Paul*, Irenaeus' *Adversus Haereses 2.30.7*, and the Second-Century Battle for Paul's Legacy," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 12 (2004): 191.

[114] The Greek language had been actively used all over Egypt for over 400 years before *Coptic Paul*'s composition, and does not imply that its author composed it in Alexandria any more than a Latin text from the same time would imply that its author composed it in Rome.

[115] MacRae and Murdock, "Apocalypse of Paul," 258.

[116] Ibid., 258.

[117] From the Coptic text in James M. Robinson, ed., *The Facsimile Editions of the Nag Hammadi Codices: Codex V* (Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1975), 28.

Paul sees another judgment by the Gatekeeper of the fifth gate (22:2-10):

> And I saw a great angel in the fifth heaven holding an iron rod in his hand. There were three other angels with him, and I stared into their faces. But they were rivalling each other, with whips in their hands, goading the souls on to the judgment.[118]

The Gatekeeper allows Paul to pass to the sixth heaven, where that Gatekeeper, also called a *telōnēs*, opens his gate at Paul's command. At the seventh heaven, a Gatekeeper with the appearance of an old man wearing a white robe sat upon a throne seven times brighter than the Sun and challenges Paul. The Holy Spirit helps the apostle (23:23-24:1):

> The Spirit spoke, saying, "Give him the sign that you have, and he will open for you." And then I gave him the sign. He turned his face downwards to his creation and to those who are his own authorities. And then the <seventh> heaven opened and we went up to the Ogdoad.[119]

Paul eventually makes his way to the tenth heaven.

In *Coptic Paul*, the Gatekeepers continue to perform their basic functions, only now instead of weeding out souls journeying to either the realm of Re or to the trial of Osiris, they work for the Christian god. Some of the Gatekeepers have a staff of fairly malevolent angels, but all are called by the new name: *telōnēs*.

Christ and the Gatekeepers

A slightly later work, possibly also originating in Egypt, the First Apocalypse of James appears to some scholars to presuppose Valentinian ideas. The work has a *terminus post quem* of composition in the late second century and a *terminus ante*

---

[118] MacRae and Murdock, "Apocalypse of Paul," 259.

[119] Ibid., 259. Wilkinson, *Complete Gods and Goddesses*, 77-78. Egyptians considered the number four to signify completeness or totality, and a double-four (eight) even more so. Groups of eight gods appear throughout Egyptian religion. The individual deities within the ogdoad vary, but the ogdoads always involve two groups of four gods. The greatest ogdoad was associated with the Middle Egyptian town of Khemnu (Greek Hermopolis, modern Arabic al Ashmunein), and received credit for creating and being the original mound which arose from the primordial waters thus initiating creation.

quem of the early fourth century, when someone translated it into Coptic from the Greek original.[120]

In *First James*, Jesus vouchsafes to his brother and future leader of the church James the secrets necessary to navigate the perils awaiting the post-mortem soul ascending into the heavens to reunite with "the Pre-Existent One."[121]

In 33:2-18, Jesus warns James that he will encounter violent spirits who arrest him:

> When you are seized, and you undergo these sufferings, a multitude will arm themselves against you that <they> may seize you. And in particular three of them will seize you - they who sit (there) as toll collectors. Not only do they demand toll, but they also take away souls by theft. When you come into their power, one of them who is their guard will say to you, 'Who are you or where are you from?' You are to say to him, 'I am a son, and I am from the Father.[122]

The examination continues as these *telōnai* probe the deceased for the correct information. Finally, Christ reveals in 34:15-20: *When he also says to you, 'Where will you go?', you are to say to him, 'To the place from which I have come, there shall I return.' And if you say these things, you will escape their attacks*.[123]

The Gatekeepers in *First James* fulfill their functions as always: they detain the soul, intimidate it, interrogate it, and finally allow it to pass or punish it. These job functions now occurred for a new god, and under a new name; Gatekeepers became tax collectors. The tax (ⲧⲉⲗⲱⲟⲥ) they now collect is in souls.

Why Tax Collectors?

The Gatekeepers terrified the Egyptians enough, but the association with tax collectors could only have made the intimidation worse (and insulted the Gatekeepers).

---

[120] Wolf Peter Funk, "The First Apocalypse of James," in Schneemelcher, Wilhelm *et al.*, *New Testament Apocrypha, vol.1* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Pr., 2003), 315.

[121] Ibid., 318.

[122] William R. Schoedel, "The (First) Apocalypse of James (V,3)," in Robinson, James M. (ed.), *The Nag Hammadi Library* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1988), 265.

[123] Ibid., 266.

Surviving evidence indicates that Roman Egypt may have been one of the most heavily taxed places in the ancient world.

After his victory over Marcus Antonius and Cleopatra VII (r.51-30 BCE) at Actium and their later suicides, Augustus executed the final Egyptian monarch, Ptolemy XV Caesarion (r.36-30 BCE), and annexed the Kingdom of Egypt to his Roman Empire as an imperial province. One of his first acts was to initiate a census of the Egyptian population to repeat every fourteen years.[124] In the interim, town clerks bore the responsibility for maintaining accurate census rolls annually.[125] The emperor intended to keep track of every taxable human asset within his province

The Romans proved more efficient at tax collection than had the Ptolemies. Yet efficiency alone did not result in the higher tax revenue; Egypt endured over one hundred individual taxes and imposts under Roman rule.[126] The state taxed agricultural produce, products made by artisans, prostitution, and transient labor along with the standard poll tax.[127] In addition, the state imposed corvée labor, called liturgy, upon the citizenry.[128]

With so many taxes, tax collectors easily became a major bane of existence. Well known around the Roman world for extorting more taxes than owed, tax collectors in Egypt gained a reputation for breaking and entering into private homes to collect taxes. Some even offered leniency in exchange for protection money.[129]

Such practices led many taxpayers to flee their homes. Villages became depopulated as citizens, already squeezed to capacity, chose to abandon their homes

---

[124] Naphtali Lewis, *Life in Egypt under Roman Rule* (Oxford: Clarendon Pr., 1985), 156.

[125] Ibid., 159.

[126] Ibid., 160.

[127] Ibid., 171-2.

[128] Ibid., 177.

[129] Ibid., 161-2.

and land rather than to endure more abuse. In the Ptolemaic Period, those fleeing ran

to temples such as the Serapeum in Memphis; in the Roman Period, some did head for

the temples but most either fled to the major cities or into the desert where the land's

many tombs and necropoleis offered shelter.[130] As decades of economic recession in

the late second to early third centuries decimated the Egyptian tax base, ever

increasing numbers of Egyptians sought refuge in the desert.[131]

Conclusion

The Egyptian Gatekeepers exercised their functions over two thousand years.

As far back as c.2345 BCE, the Gatekeepers guarded rope ladders and gates the king

had to pass to reach the otherworld.[132] They demanded the king's name so as to gain

magical power over him.[133] By the Middle Kingdom (1991-1782 BCE), the Gatekeepers

tested all deceased on what had previously only been a royal Soul Journey.[134] The

Gatekeepers seemed to organize into groups, sometimes of seven and sometimes of

twenty-one, by about 1500 BCE.[135] These organized Gatekeepers quizzed the dead to

determine whether they ought to continue to the otherworld by demanding the dead

know the names of the Gatekeepers.[136] This version of the Gatekeepers, found in the

Book of the Dead, continued to exert influence over the Egyptian imagination well into

the Roman Period (30 BCE–330 CE).

Around the reign of Akhenaten (r.1350-1334 BCE), changes in the Egyptian

thoughtworld created more intimidating Gatekeepers. The Nineteenth (1293-1185 BCE)

---

[130] Ibid., 163.

[131] Ibid., 182.

[132] Lehner, *Complete Pyramids*, 31.

[133] PT 194, 592. Davis, "The Ascension-Myth," 172-3.

[134] Mueller, "Early Egyptian Guide," 123.

[135] Hornung, *Books of the Afterlife*, 13. Assmann, *Death and Salvation*, 191.

[136] Faulkner, *Book of the Dead*, 33.

and Twentieth (1185-1070 BCE) saw the Gatekeepers gain the power to punish those dead who failed their interrogations with either hellish torments in lakes of fire or annihilation.[137] The Gatekeepers continued their duties during the Ptolemaic Dynasty (330-30 BCE) where they could take on theriomorphic forms.[138]

The Roman Period saw the Gatekeepers, who still performed their duties through the still actively produced *Book of the Dead* and the three *Breathings*, found new employment with the Christian god. In the second to third century *Coptic Apocalypse of Paul*, the Gatekeepers, now called *telōnēs*, controlled the gates of Heaven and can cast the dead who fail their interrogations either into torments or into another incarnation.[139] By the late second to early fourth centuries, the Gatekeeper/*telōnēs* could also physically arrest the dead during their heavenly ascent in order to interrogate them.[140]

The Gatekeepers evolved over thousands of years. They changed their questions, their appearance, their employer, and even their name from Gatekeeper to *telōnēs*. But before jumping from *telōnēs* to *telōnia*, this thesis must first investigate other constructs which fed into the *telōnia*. From Egypt, this thesis must next move north from the Black Land to Greece, and to the construct of the heavenly ascent.

<div align="center">Excursus 1: Mesopotamian Gatekeepers</div>

In Mesopotamia, the gates to the heavens, the Abzu, and the netherworld were guarded by Gatekeepers. In *The Descent of Inanna*, which dates from c.1750 BCE, Inanna passed through the seven gates of the netherworld.[141] At the first underworld

---

[137] Hornung, *Books of the Afterlife*, 97.

[138] Smith, *Traversing Eternity*, 504.

[139] MacRae and Murdock, "Apocalypse of Paul," 258-9.

[140] Schoedel, "Apocalypse of James," 265.

[141] Samuel Noah Kramer, *Sumerian Mythology* (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Pr., 1972), 91. Diane Wolkstein and Samuel Noah Kramer, *Inanna: Queen of Heaven* (New York: Harper & Row, 1983), 127.

gate, called Ganzir, the chief gatekeeper Neti, or Nedu, stood guard.[142] Although the myth does not describe Neti's physical appearance, the Gatekeepers, and in particular the Gatekeepers of the first gate, usually were portrayed in the form of animal-men.[143]

The Gatekeepers also appear in the Sîn-leqi-unninī version of the Epic of Gilgameš, which dates to the Middle Babylonian period, but no later than c.1200 BCE resulting in a range between 1600-1200 BCE.[144] In Tablet IX, Gilgameš set out on his search for Ut-Napištim, the one who survived the Flood and to whom the gods granted immortality.[145] In order to reach Ut-Napištim, Gilgameš had to pass through Mt. Mashu, the twin peaks where the sun rose and set.[146] At Mt. Mashu, Gilgameš found 'scorpion-men' Gatekeepers who wore mantles which draped the mountains and who had gazes which could kill.[147] Yet for all their power, the scorpiomorphic Gatekeepers merely engaged Gilgameš in conversation; in *The Descent of Inanna* they spoke to and took items from Inanna. Neither time did they try or judge. Why would the Babylonians have conceived of scorpiomorphic Gatekeepers who merely stood guard at their gates? The answer could lie in the origins of the Mesopotamian Gatekeepers.

The Babylonians conceived of the seven gates as located in the gaps between zodiacal constellations. The first gate, between Scorpio and Sagittarius, was the only gate in its section of the sky because it was flanked on one side by three constellations which touched one another: Sagittarius, Capricorn, and Aquarius; and on the other by

---

[142] Stephanie Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia* (New York: Oxford Univ. Pr., 2000), 325. Kramer, *Sumerian Mythology*, 90.

[143] Jeremy Black and Anthony Green, *Gods, Demons and Symbols of Ancient Mesopotamia* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2003), 86.

[144] John Gardner and John Maier, *Gilgamesh* (New York: Vintage, 1984), vii.

[145] Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia*, 96.

[146] Ibid., 96. Gardner and Maier, *Gilgamesh*, 199.

[147] Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia*, 96.

four: Scorpio, Libra, Virgo, and Leo.[148] The Gate Ganzir lay within the 5˚ gap between Scorpio and Sagittarius.[149]

By 1000 BCE, the Babylonians recognized 18 zodiacal constellations. Scorpio was The Scorpion, and Sagittarius was the centaur Pabilsaŋ.[150] The son of the god Enlil, Pabilsaŋ became associated with the city of Larag, one of the centers of antediluvian kingship.[151] He had a scorpion tail, as was a common representation of Babylonian centaurs; Babylonian boundary stones frequently portrayed Scorpio and Sagittarius as scorpiomorphic twins.[152]

Anthropomorphizing astrological constellations, Mesopotamian Gatekeepers merely guarded their gates. They could speak with any who passed their way, but they could not condemn.

Excursus 2: Guards at Hades: The Totenpässe

The Hellenic world also conceived of a kind of Gatekeeper construct. Funerary texts speak of *phulakes* (guards) who wait for the deceased soul at the Lake of Memory.[153] The guards allow the soul to drink only after answering a question. The guards can be gods, *daimones*, or mythical creatures such as Cerberus. The answer the guards demand could be a gift, a simple demonstration of knowledge, or the threat of revealing the secret names of the gatekeepers.[154]

---

[148] Harold A.T. Reiche, "Heraclides' Three Soul-Gates," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 123 (1993): 171.

[149] Reiche, "Heraclides' Three Soul-Gates," 171.

[150] Black and Green, *Gods, Demons and Symbols*, 190.

[151] Ibid., 147.

[152] Ibid., 51. Reiche, "Heraclides' Three Soul-Gates," 171.

[153] Fritz Graf and Sarah Iles Johnston, *Ritual Texts for the Afterlife* (London: Routledge, 2007), 111.

[154] Graf and Johnston, *Ritual Texts*, 112.

This information survives not in what the West would consider sacred texts, but in metal passports for the deceased which scholars call the *Totenpässe*.[155] Over thirty *Totenpässe* survive, some with as little as one partial word, but more complete texts survive. The four fullest texts which describe the *phulakes* are *Totenpass* 1, which dates to c.400 BCE from Hipponion in Calabria;[156] *Totenpass* 2, which dates to the 4C BCE from Petelia (modern Strongoli) in Calabria;[157] *Totenpass* 8, which dates to the 3C BCE from Entella in Sicily;[158] and, *Totenpass* 25, which dates to c.350-300 BCE from Pharsalos in Thessaly.[159]

Egypt, Greece, and Mesopotamia each evolved their own Gatekeepers, but only Egypt's could condemn the soul of the deceased to torments. This function of the Egyptian Gatekeepers would prove critical to the later construct of the *telōnia*.

---

[155] Morenz, *Egyptian Religion*, 228. Morenz sees the *Totenpässe* as derivatives from the Egyptian *Book of the Dead*. This would make the *phulakes* descendents of the Egyptian Gatekeepers. Such a relationship is not at all impossible, but it is for now not provable.

[156] Graf and Johnston, *Ritual Texts*, 4.

[157] Ibid., 6.

[158] Ibid., 16.

[159] Ibid., 34.

Chapter 3

Heavenly Ascents

Introduction

The second construct this thesis examines is that of the heavenly ascent. The construct appears in many cultures where it evolved independently of other heavenly ascent constructs, but for the *telōnia*, the Egyptian heavenly ascent first seen in the Pyramid Texts c.2345 BCE appears to have combined with the heavenly ascent from Greece.

In the 1950s, mythologist Joseph Campbell claimed to trace the construct of the heavenly ascent to a newfound concern with the stars and planets in mythology concurrent with the rise of the city-state in the late Neolithic or Chalcolithic periods. In this schema, the creation of the heavenly ascent paralleled increasing hierarchical stratification in the city-states of the ancient Near East.[1] Campbell saw the onset of astrology into human mythology dating to the transition between Uruk A and Uruk B phases in Mesopotamia, and to around 2800 BCE in Egypt, although he provides no convincing evidence.[2]

Early Greek Views

In order to understand the Greek heavenly ascent, one ought first to understand the religious milieu out of which it arose. Ancient Greek religion coalesced from a mixture of elements from both Indo-European religion and Aegean beliefs and cults. The religions of Anatolian peoples, along with additions from Canaanite, Mesopotamian, and Egyptian religions, also contributed to a greater or lesser extent.[3]

---

[1] Joseph Campbell, *The Masks of God, vol.3: Occidental Mythology* (New York: Viking, 1964), 505.

[2] Joseph Campbell, *The Masks of God, vol.1: Primitive Mythology* (New York: Viking, 1959), 146-8.

[3] Robert Parker, "Greek Religion," in Boardman, John *et al., The Oxford History of the Classical World* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Pr., 1988), 256.

By the time the *Iliad* took shape around 730 BCE, these elements had combined into a heterogeneous system expressed in various local cults worshipping one overall set of Olympian gods and various local deities and *numina*.[4]

No central authority ever imposed religious uniformity upon Greek religion; as a result, the local cults could differ from one another widely.[5] One thing the local cults all shared was a reverence for the *Iliad*, which in time came to constitute a sort of sacred scripture. In the mid-fifth century BCE, Herodotus regarded the *Iliad* has having defined Greek religion, an assessment with which later Greek and Hellenistic scholars concurred.[6]

The *Iliad* saw the gods as largely amoral. The gods tended to sympathize with the aristocrats, but not particularly with the *hoi polloi*.[7] There also appears to have been no connection between the gods and any post-mortem existence. With the exception of Hermes, who appears to be the only god to serve as a psychopomp, the gods largely seem to abandon a *psuchē* at death.[8] From the root for 'breath,' *psuchē* also implied 'consciousness,' 'self,' or 'personality.' Although *Iliad* 23 is the earliest example of a *psuchē* which survives death, the post-mortem *psuchē* which in the underworld retains some of the personality of the living person does not appear until *Odyssey* 11.[9] The morality or immorality of one's life seems to have had no impact upon one's afterlife whatsoever.[10] The gods never imposed any coherent ethical

---

[4] M.S. Silk, *The Iliad* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Pr, 1990), 4.

[5] Parker, "Greek Religion," 260.

[6] Silk, *Iliad*, 10.

[7] Ibid., 30, 80.

[8] M.C. Howatson, *The Oxford Companion to Classical Literature, 2nd ed* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Pr., 1990), 273.

[9] Ibid., 451.

[10] Ibid., 482.

judgment upon one's place in the underworld. They did, however, reserve the right to impose eternal punishments out of personal vengeance. Otherwise, the Homeric afterlife offered a gloomy subterranean post-mortem existence.[11] The Homeric religion remained a religion of the here and now.[12]

Pindar (c.522-443 BCE) is the earliest writer to hint at transmigration of the soul in his works *Olympian Odes* 2 & 3, and in fragments 129, 131, and 133.[13] After Pindar, although not necessarily because of Pindar, different destinations for the soul begin to arise. The heavenly ascent begins to find mention more often in Greek literature. Aristophanes (c.446 – c.386 BCE) in his play *Peace* 832f (c.421 BCE) employed the heavenly ascent to have the souls of the dead ascend to become stars.

Legitimation by Platonism

Born in Athens around 427 BCE to an aristocratic family, Plato entered a Hellenic world engulfed in the Peloponnesian War.[14] In 405 BCE, when Plato was about 22 years old, Sparta finally defeated Athens.[15] It was at this time during which Sparta dominated the Hellenic world that the central event of Plato's life occurred as the Athenian state executed his mentor Socrates in 399 BCE.[16] After the death of his mentor, Plato wrote some of the most influential works in Western philosophy. Two of his dialogues in particular, the *Symposium* and the *Timaeus*, show Plato employing the heavenly ascent construct.

---

[11] Parker, "Greek Religion," 267.

[12] Ibid., 266.

[13] Simon Hornblower, *Thucydides and Pindar* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Pr., 2004), 89. Thomas McEvilley, *The Shape of Ancient Thought* (New York: Allworth Pr., 2002), 107.

[14] Richard Mervyn Hare, *Plato* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Pr., 1996), 1.

[15] Ibid., 2.

[16] Ibid., 6.

Ascent through Beauty

  Written sometime after 385 BCE, the *Symposium* for centuries afterward was widely studied in the eastern Mediterranean for its ideas on the heavenly ascent.[17] Plato never discusses the heavenly ascent directly, but in *Symposium* 210a-212a he employs it as a metaphor for the attraction to beauty. The attraction to beautiful bodies causes the soul to gravitate towards particular lovers; in time, the soul recognizes that beauty exists in all bodies and thereby begins to understand that beautiful souls reside within beautiful bodies. That understanding of and love for beauty would then lead the soul to the various branches of knowledge as it contemplates how beauty expresses itself in laws and customs. From this beginning, the soul then encounters the greater world of beauty; Plato calls it the "main ocean of the beautiful." In the context of the dialogue, Plato envisions boy-love as the gateway to the true knowledge of higher beauty. The soul then ascends, as on a ladder, in a search for the quintessence of beauty. He likens the different bodies loved to the rungs of the ladder which the soul must climb to ascend. The ascent ends when the soul finds the quintessence of beauty. At that point, the true virtue of the quest for beauty, and the truth that is beauty, has led to immortality for the soul through the heavenly ascent from mere physical pederasty.

Enter the Demiurge

  In *Timaeus* 41D-42D, which may date to the last decade of his life (358-348 BCE), Plato does not discuss the heavenly ascent *per se*, but he does assume it.[18] He speaks of the Demiurge creating souls at the beginning of time. From the substance of which the Demiurge created souls, he also created stars. To each soul he appointed a

---

[17] Bentley Layton, ed., *The Gnostic Scriptures* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1987), 121. R.E. Allen, *The Symposium* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Pr., 1991), 5, n.6.

[18] Plato, *Timaeus and Critias*, trans., Desmond Lee (London: Penguin, 1977), 22, 146.

star in the heavens then assigned the soul to a mortal body upon the earth.[19] Every

soul which proves itself worthy to the Demiurge ascends back through the heavens to

its star after death.[20] Those souls not worthy suffer rebirth into other mortal bodies.

The fact that Plato could employ the heavenly ascent as a metaphor indicates

that the construct had become known in the Greek world by the time of the

Symposium's composition. Later generations would read the passage as an explanation

for the mechanism of the heavenly ascent. Be it for the love of beauty, or for the love

of truth, or for the love of the divine, the soul would work its way through the heavens

according to Plato's theory. Although Plato himself never systematized the heavenly

ascent or the soul journey, and may have intended the passage as only an illustration

of philosophical truth, his *Timaeus* passage would serve as oft-quoted proof for later

generations that the soul consisted of starstuff, and really belonged back in its

heavenly home.[21]

Ascent through the Stargates

Born around 387 BCE in Heraclea Pontica on the Black Sea coast of Asia Minor,

Heraclides left for Athens in the 360s where he studied at the Academy under Plato and

Speusippus.[22] The Academy accorded Heraclides a singular honor c.361 BCE when it

selected him to serve as head of the Academy while Plato left for his third and final

voyage to Syracuse.[23] Heraclides returned to his home in 339 after narrowly losing the

scholarate to Xenocrates.[24]

---

[19] Ibid., 58.

[20] Ibid., 42.

[21] Ibid., 9, 21-2.

[22] H.B. Gottschalk, *Heraclides of Pontus* (Oxford: Clarendon Pr., 1980), 2.

[23] Giovanni Reale, *A History of Ancient Philosophy: The Systems of the Hellenistic Age*, trans., John R. Catan (Albany: State Univ. of New York Pr., 1985), 65, 390, n.1.

[24] Gottschalk, *Heraclides of Pontus*, 2.

The heavenly ascent originally entered Heraclides' works either in his two books *On the Soul*, or in his *On Those in Hades*.[25] In the *Empedotimus*, the protagonist learned that the sphere of fixed stars was the domain of Zeus; Poseidon ruled over the sphere between the fixed stars and the Sun; and, Pluto controlled everything below the Sun.[26] The Milky Way was the path that post-mortem souls followed on their heavenly ascent to the stars since *aithēr* was the substance of the souls.[27] It appears that Heraclides himself created this innovation in Hellenistic thought.[28] As opposed to Plato who saw soul/starstuff as distinct from *aithēr*, Heraclides saw *aithēr* as the substance which composed the soul, thought, ocular vision, and the cosmos itself. To Heraclides, *aithēr* constituted the fifth element.[29]

Three gates allowed souls passage through the spheres. The first gate existed between Scorpio and Sagittarius then led through the claws of Scorpio (now the constellation Libra, but then seen as an extension of Scorpio); Heracles took this path to his ascent. The second gate existed between Leo and Scorpio, and the third between Aquarius and Pisces.[30] These astrological gates show possible influences of Babylonian thought upon Heraclides.

From Plato's idea of the soul seeking to return to its star, Heraclides refined the ascent to the Demiurge into a voyage through the astronomical gates. Interestingly, no Gatekeepers of any kind appear to man the three gates in the *aithēr*

---

[25] Ibid., 99n35.

[26] Ibid., 99.

[27] Charles H. Kahn, *Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans* (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co., 2001), 66-7. Fragments 93-9.

[28] Reale, *Systems of the Hellenistic Age*, 66.

[29] Harald A.T. Reiche, "Heraclides' Three Soul-Gates," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 123 (1993): 167.

[30] Gottschalk, *Heraclides of Pontus*, 99. Fragment 94.

in the surviving works of Heraclides. Nonetheless, the post-mortem soul now had a

more interesting heavenly ascent.[31]

Heavenly Slippage

The astronomer Hipparchus (c.190-126 BCE) remains a mystery to scholars.

Almost nothing reliable is known of his life. That he spent most of his life in Rhodes is

one of the few solid facts known about him.[32]

Hipparchus discovered the precession of the equinoxes around 128 BCE.

Ptolemy in the *Almagest* stated that Hipparchus discovered the precession after

comparing his observations with those taken by the astronomer Timocharis.[33] The

precession of the equinoxes is the apparent effect of a slow wobble in Earth's rotation

which causes the North Pole to trace a circle in the sky every 25,920 years.[34]

Hipparchus saw the precession of the equinoxes as a second movement of the sphere of

fixed stars to the eastward which occurred over 36,000 years, but he also considered

that the precession indicated that the polar axis actually moved vis-à-vis the sphere of

fixed stars.[35]

The precession of the equinoxes violated Aristotelian ideas, expressed in *On*

the Heavens, that the regular rotation of the sphere of fixed stars proved it of the

highest divinity with all else in creation predicated upon it.[36] This seemingly arcane

---

[31] Reale, *Systems of the Hellenistic Age*, 66. On a parenthetical note, Heraclides also first challenged geocentricity. He not only denied that the earth stood at the center of the cosmos, but maintained that it rotated from west to east. This contribution would open the way for a later revelation in both Hellenistic astronomy and in Hellenistic religion.

[32] David Ulansey, *The Origins of the Mithraic Mysteries* (New York: Oxford Univ. Pr., 1991), 76.

[33] Ulansey, *Mithraic Mysteries*, 76.

[34] Ibid., 77.

[35] Ibid., 78.

[36] Ibid., 79.

discovery impacted Mediterranean religion, and the construct of the heavenly ascent. Hipparchus' discovery meant that the spheres were not eternally regular, and it shattered the Aristotelian proof of divinity. But if the precession of the equinoxes disproves Aristotle's proof, then what becomes of the soul in its ascent? Scholars such as David Ulansey see Hipparchus' discovery as having opened the floodgates for ascending souls. Ulansey in particular, however, rests this assertion upon the surmise that Stoics of the time may have viewed Hipparchus' discovery as proof that some powerful, and possibly previously unknown, god must have set the precession in motion from a formerly static cosmos.[37] Ulansey does not present any convincing evidence to support the surmise.

Whether or not Hipparchus' astronomy altered the views of the fate of the post-mortem soul, mentions of the heavenly ascent increasingly occur in the eastern Mediterranean in such systems as Mithraism and Stoicism within one century after Hipparchus' discovery. Roughly sixty years after the discovery of the precession of the equinoxes, the earliest evidence for Mithraism appears.[38] Mithraism employed the precession of the equinoxes as a key element of its cosmology, and as a mechanism for the heavenly ascent by rising through Mithras (the constellation Perseus) to the Milky Way.[39]

Skirting Christianity

The Greek heavenly ascent proliferated throughout the Mediterranean world, and in many cases fused with the more general heavenly ascent construct. In others, such as the case in II Corinthians 12:2-4, the soul flight remained only a soul flight but later generations interpreted it as a heavenly ascent. In II Corinthians 12:2-4, the Apostle Paul relates:

---

[37] Ibid., 83.

[38] Ibid., 77.

[39] Ibid., 86-7.

12:2I know such a man in Christ fourteen years ago, (either in the body, I don't know, or out of the body, I don't know; God knows), snatched into the third heaven. 12:3And I know that this man (whether in the body, or separate from the body, I don't know; God knows), 12:4was snatched into Paradise, and heard inexpressible phrases, which are not for man to speak.
[Translation by author]

II Corinthians is not a single epistle but a pastiche of different letters Paul sent to the Corinthian church. Paul's soul flight belongs to the letter scholars call Corinthians E (II Corinthians 10-13). Most likely written in the summer of 56 CE, Corinthians E addressed specific issues that the Corinthian church faced at that time.[40] Paul had found his credentials and authority questioned by some in the Corinthian church who claimed apostolic authority. Paul answered this charge by explaining that those who claimed the authority of the apostles preached a different gospel than his.[41] Paul mentions this soul flight (he never definitively states whose) as having occurred fourteen years before he wrote of it in 56, which would place this soul flight to the third heaven about 42 CE.[42] Paul, of course, does not call his experience a soul flight but an *optasia* ('vision,' 'appearance'), a word he uses only here.[43] This soul flight echoes Isaiah's call to prophecy in Isaiah 6.[44] Yet, Paul refused to claim the vision as any proof of his apostolic authority.[45]

Paul's experience, however, is in the end a soul flight and not a heavenly ascent, and he never claims to have undertaken the journey of the post-mortem soul. Yet the fact that Paul, no matter how unwillingly, wrote about a soul flight to the third

---

[40] Victor Paul Furnish, *II Corinthians* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1984), 46.

[41] Ibid., 45.

[42] Ibid., 524.

[43] William Baird, "Visions, Revelation, and Ministry: Reflections on 2 Cor 12:1-5 and Gal 1:11-17," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104 (1985): 653.

[44] C.R.A. Morray-Jones, "Paradise Revisited (2 Cor 12:1-12): The Jewish Mystical Background of Paul's Apostolate. Part 2: Paul's Heavenly Ascent and Its Significance," *The Harvard Theological Review* 86 (1993): 286.

[45] Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 544.

heaven opened the doors for later writers to allow non-Christian heavenly ascents and soul flights into Christianity.

The View from Gaul

Born in Asia Minor, possibly in Smyrna, in 130-140, Irenaeus was a disciple of Polycarp (d. c.155), himself a disciple of John the Evangelist.[46] In time, Irenaeus moved to Gaul. At Lyons, Irenaeus would have participated in a church dedicated to ministering to the Gauls, while retaining strong ties to Asia Minor and Rome.[47] Lyons dominated Gallic Christianity in late second and early third century Gaul due to a well developed Christian community.[48] Traditions about Irenaeus' death suggest that he might have been martyred c.202/3 during a persecution by Septimius Severus (r.193-211).[49]

By the time of Irenaeus, some Christian heresies had begun to merge with various non-Christian beliefs and practices.[50] These strands which wove themselves with elements of Christianity at that time included Enochianism and late antique Egyptian religion.[51] The Mediterranean by this time had become a Roman lake, with the various cultures around the littoral cross-pollinating one another. A fascination with Egyptian culture which gripped the Roman world combined with the existing dominance of Hellenistic culture in the eastern Mediterranean to ensure that Greek and Egyptian ideas flowed to all provinces of the Roman Empire. No aspect of Roman

---

[46] Frank D. Gilliard, "The Apostolicity of Gallic Churches," *The Harvard Theological Review* 68 (1975): 26.

[47] Robert McQueen Grant, *Irenaeus of Lyon* (London: Routledge, 2003), 4. Eric Osborn, *Irenaeus of Lyons* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ, Pr., 2001), 2.

[48] Gilliard, "Apostolicity," 31.

[49] Osborn, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 2.

[50] Frederick Wisse, "The Nag Hammadi Library and the Heresiologists," *Vigiliae Christianae* 25 (1971): 223.

[51] Ibid., 222.

culture remained unaffected by this exchange of information, and the products of this syncretism showed themselves in works of some early church figures like Valentinus.[52]

Born at Phrebonis in Lower Egypt c.100 CE, Valentinus studied under Theudas the disciple of Paul of Tarsus. He began teaching at Alexandria sometime between 117 and 138, then moved to Rome c.136-140.[53] Arriving sometime during the reigns of the emperors Hadrian and his successor Antoninus Pius, Valentinus quickly built a reputation within the church as a teacher. According to Tertullian in *Adversus Valentinianos* IV, the Roman church considered Valentinus as a potential successor to Pope Hyginus in 140-142; however, Pius I secured the patriarchal election and Valentinus continued teaching doctrines which over time diverged from those of the early church orthodoxy.

The *Gospel of Truth* stands as the most complete surviving exposition of Valentinus' beliefs.[54] After Valentinus' death, two strands of Valentinian tradition quickly emerged. In the Italic strand of Valentinianism, his followers viewed Christ as having a physical body with which the Holy Spirit united at baptism, while Alexandrian Valentinianism viewed Christ as having a spirit body conceived by the Holy Spirit.[55] With Valentinianism spreading around the Roman world, Irenaeus needed to warn his fellow Christians of the dangers of the heresy. He composed *Adversus Haereses* as that warning.

Irenaeus wrote *Adversus Haereses* over a period of time apparently ending around 189.[56] He wrote during the last years of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius (r.161-

---

[52] Layton, *Gnostic Scriptures*, 271.

[53] Ibid., 217.

[54] Ibid., 220.

[55] Ibid., 267.

[56] Dominic J. Unger and John J. Dillon, *St. Irenaeus of Lyons Against the Heresies* (Mahwah NJ: Newman Pr., 1992), 4.

180) and the early years of his son Commodus (r.180-192), a time which brought to a close the *Pax Romana*, when Roman hegemony went largely unchallenged. In 184, Roman forces abandoned the Antonine Wall in Britannia, and uprisings against Roman authority arose in Britannia in 186 and in Germania in 188.[57] This time also benefited from over a century of cross-pollination between the different cultures within the empire.

In Book I of the *Adversus Haereses*, Irenaeus discusses the beliefs of certain groups of Valentinians regarding the heavenly ascent. These groups saw the post-mortem soul as employing various invocations pronounced at the death of its body in order to avoid various "principalities and powers" (1.21.5) as it rose into the realm of the Demiurge. Through the use of passphrases, the soul proceeded past these powers so that it could continue its journey. After passing several of these "principalities and powers," the soul reached the companions of the Demiurge, where more passphrases allowed the soul access and caused commotion within the companions.

Irenaeus' description demonstrates that the heavenly ascent had evolved by 189 into a soul journey involving passcodes and the soul rising through different realities and entities. Interestingly, the Valentinian soul passed Gatekeeper figures on the way to its final destination. Although these Gatekeepers appear to be the Egyptian constructs, Irenaeus does not specify where the specific Valentinians he refuted resided. Egyptian ideas permeated the Mediterranean, and Valentinus had matured in Alexandria and been exposed to Egyptian ideas, but this merely constitutes circumstantial evidence without any clear idea from where the Gatekeepers came that Irenaeus refuted. Additionally, one cannot be sure of Valentinus himself believed and taught this doctrine, or whether his followers employed it after his death. Irenaeus may well have encountered the Egyptian Gatekeepers mixed with the heavenly ascent

---

[57] M. Cary, and H.H. Scullard, *A History of Rome, 3rd ed* (New York: St. Martin's, 1991), 568.

in Valentinianism, but more data would be preferred before declaring this relationship causal.

Irenaeus considered those who held these beliefs heretics, but heretics powerful enough to pose a threat to the church. This could indicate that the beliefs which Irenaeus feared, including the heavenly ascent, had become popular all across the Roman Empire.

<div align="center">Ascents in the Third Century</div>

The third century of the common era proved one of the most trying for the empire. The Roman Empire fell into almost fifty years of instability which history remembers as the crisis of the third century.[58] Several religious works emerged during this period. Of these, the *Contra Celsum* and the *Zōstrianos* may be the most salient to the heavenly ascent construct.

Planetary Ascent

One of the most powerful intellects in the early church, Origen formulated many constructs which still define Christian thinking. Born c.185 in Alexandria, Origen lived through many persecutions by the Roman state, such as the one which claimed his father's life c.203 under Septimius Severus.[59] Origen studied under a heretic named Paul, who might have imparted knowledge of Valentinianism and Marcionism to his pupil.[60] In time, Origen ran afoul of the bishop of Alexandria Demetrius (r.189-232) and in c.215 left for Rome. In Rome, he met the man who would become his patron: Ambrosius, a former Valentinian converted by Origen.[61] During his time in Rome, the mother of Emperor Alexander Severus (r.222-235), Julia Mammaea, requested him to

---

[58] Cary and Scullard, *History of Rome,* 568.

[59] Joseph W. Trigg, *Origen* (New York: Routledge, 1998), 5.

[60] Ibid., 7-8.

[61] Edward Moore, *Origen of Alexandria and St. Maximus the Confessor* (Boca Raton: Dissertation.com, 2005), 19.

attend her at Antioch c.231.[62] In 233, Bishop Demetrius died and Origen's student

Heraclas succeeded as Patriarch of Alexandria, but Origen still could not return home.

Finally, he settled in Caesarea under the invitation of Bishop Theoctistus, where he

spent the rest of his life as a presbyter.[63]

Origen wrote *Contra Celsum* around 249 CE.[64] Within the work, he credits the

Persians, specifically the Mithraists, with the heavenly ascent. In *Contra Celsum* 6.22,

he writes of the spheres, the movements of the fixed stars, and the movement of the

planetary spheres, and the soul's post-mortem soul journey through them. His

information includes eight gates: the first gate leads to the path along which the soul

finds the other seven. The second gate consists of lead and operates under the

auspices of Saturn; the third gate of tin under Venus; the fourth gate of copper under

Jupiter; the fifth gate of iron under Mercury; the sixth gate of mixed metals under

Mars; the seventh gate of silver under the Moon; and, the eighth of gold under the Sun.

The soul ascends through these gates and contemplates the reasons why creation is so

arranged.

Origen did not endorse the heavenly ascent, or the planetary Gatekeepers

which appeared in the account he related.

The Family of Zoroaster

Written sometime before 268, *Zōstrianos* is a Sethian text which features a

heavenly ascent. Sethianism had its origins in the same Second Temple milieu as

Nicene Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism. From its Second Temple roots, it inherited

the construct of the *logos*, but where Christians identified Jesus of Nazareth as the

logos, Sethians identified the female Barbelō as the *logos*. Barbelō's son Seth was the

---

[62] Trigg, *Origen*, 15.

[63] Ibid., 16.

[64] W.H.C. Frend, "The Failure of the Persecutions in the Roman Empire," *Past and Present* 16 (1959): 10. Pierre Nautin, *Origène: Sa Vie et Son Œuvre* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1977), 412.

Christ who descended to Earth and possessed Jesus of Nazareth.[65] Porphyry of Tyre

states in his *Life of Plotinus* (16.1) that Christians were employing the *Zōstrianos* in the

third century.[66]

The main character, Zōstrianos, the grandfather or uncle of Zoroaster, ponders

ontological questions about himself and about the aeons. After failing to receive

answers from his god, he attempts suicide only to have the "angel of the knowledge of

eternal light" interrupt him.[67] The angel then takes Zōstrianos on a soul flight to see

the post-mortem heavenly ascent, where Zōstrianos finds that as the soul ascends to

each new level, it must be baptized in the name of the entity ruling over that level.[68]

Caught up into a light-cloud, Zōstrianos ascends to the different levels of the

heavens to be baptized in the names of the different aeons who rule therein.[69] After

leaving his physical body behind, Zōstrianos reaches the level where he accepts the

first baptism in the name of the Autogenes then becomes a "root-seeing angel."[70] At

the second level, he becomes through another baptism an "angel of the male race;" at

the third, a "holy angel."[71] Afterward, he undergoes three more baptisms in the name

of the Autogenes; each time ascending and progressing to a higher order of angel until

after the fourth baptism he becomes a "perfect angel."[72] Finally after more

adventures unfortunately lost due to the state of preservation of the manuscript,

---

[65] John D. Turner, *Sethian Gnosticism and the Platonic Tradition* (Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 2001).

[66] Layton, *Gnostic Scriptures*, 122, 184.

[67] John N. Sieber, trans., "Zōstrianos (VIII,1)," in Robinson, James M., ed., *The Nag Hammadi Library*. (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1988) 256-404. *Zōstrianos* 3:29-30.

[68] Ibid., 182.

[69] *Zōs.* 4:20-25.

[70] *Zōs.* 6:7-32.

[71] *Zōs.* 7:1-16.

[72] *Zōs.* 7:17-22.

Zōstrianos returns to earth where he takes up his physical body. He composes three tablets to preserve the knowledge he has gained from his soul flight.[73]

Zōstrianos' soul flight revealed that the post-mortem soul engaged in a heavenly ascent in which each level required baptism in order for the soul to progress in its evolution. The beings it encounters at each level on its way to the Autogenes are benign, even helpful, figures, and do not appear to have descended from the Egyptian Gatekeepers. Although Porphyry of Tyre mentions that some third-century Christians used *Zōstrianos*, he does not record how their use of the book may have affected their interpretations of the Septuagint and the Christian writings, or influenced their views of the heavenly ascent.

Conclusion

The Greek heavenly ascent became a major belief in the Mediterranean world. Yet before the construct could come into its own, the Greeks had to create the construct of the discrete soul (*psuchē*) which survived death. The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in the eighth century BCE show the beginnings of a soul which survived death only to make a chthonic descent to a shadowy underworld.[74] In the late sixth to early fifth century BCE, Pindar hinted that the soul could have another possible post-mortem fate, namely transmigration.[75] Finally around 421 BCE, the comic playwright Aristophanes wrote of post-mortem souls engaging in a heavenly ascent to become stars.[76]

The heavenly ascent became fodder for Plato's philosophical musings in the early fourth century BCE. In the *Symposium*, the soul's contemplation of beauty could

---

[73] *Zōs*. 129:27-130:4.

[74] Howatson, *Oxford Companion*, 451.

[75] Hornblower, *Thucydides and Pindar*, 89. McEvilley, *Ancient Thought*, 107.

[76] *Peace* 832f.

lead it to higher beauty and immortality.[77] In the later *Timaeus*, the soul possessed an innate desire to ascend at death to its associated star, with reincarnation as the price of failure.[78] The heavenly ascent also appeared in the works of Plato's disciple Heraclides, who in the mid to late fourth century envisioned post-mortem souls made of *aithēr* following the Milky Way on their way to pass through three zodiacal gates.[79]

Although the Apostle Paul wrote about a soul flight in II Corinthians around 56 CE, the passage lent itself to later Christian musings on the heavenly ascent.[80] Irenaeus of Lyons around 189 warned against Valentinians who espoused a heavenly ascent complete with passcodes to journey through the powers to the Demiurge.[81] Around the year 249, Origen wrote about a heavenly ascent he attributed to the Mithraists with eight gates, each controlled by a planet.[82] Finally sometime before 268, *Zōstrianos*, a work read by some third-century Christians, envisioned a heavenly ascent in which baptism played a key role in the ascent of the soul to each level.[83]

The next construct arose from an area often under the domination of the Kingdom of Egypt. The next chapter of this investigation moves to the land of Canaan to find the aerial demons.

---

[77] *Symposium* 210a-212a.

[78] Plato, *Timaeus and Critias*, 42.

[79] Reale, *Systems of the Hellenistic Age*, 66. Gottschalk, *Heraclides of Pontus*, 99. Fragment 94.

[80] Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 45. Morray-Jones, "Paradise Revisited, Part 2," 286.

[81] *Adversus Haereses* 1.21.5.

[82] *Contra Celsum* 6.22.

[83] *Zōs.* 7:1-22.

Chapter 4

Aerial Demons

Introduction

The construct of the aerial demons envisions demons that operate in the atmosphere and among their duties harass or hinder the post-mortem soul in its heavenly ascent. This duty usually falls to these aerial spirits by direct order of God himself in most versions of the construct. This interference of the heavenly ascent of the post-mortem soul would become a key component of the later *telōnia* construct, which would see a tribunal (or several tribunals) try the post-mortem soul only after its ascent had been interrupted. The aerial demons join the Gatekeepers and the heavenly ascent in combining to provide the raw materials for the *telōnia* construct.

Hebrew Mythology

In Hebrew/Canaanite mythology, the chief deity ‘Ēl presided over a court in constant flux, where courtiers such as Ba’l and Yam battled one another for primacy.[1] From Ugarit before the city’s destruction c.1200 BCE come the Ras ash-Shamra tablets, which contain some of the earliest myths of ‘Ēl’s celestial court.[2]   The myths record that in time Ba’l established himself as the greatest of the courtiers, just about to the point of claiming himself chief of the Canaanite gods in place of ‘Ēl.[3] Later, the Hebrews would draw upon this mythological material common to the Northwest Semitic speaking peoples.

In the J narrative, which dates to around the tenth century BCE and may have served as a propagandistic narrative legitimizing the Davidic dynasty, courtiers called the *bene hā‘Ēlōhiym* (lit. ‘sons of god’) leave their places in the heavens to mate with

---

[1] Walter Beyerlin, ed., *Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster Pr., 1978), 203-4.

[2] Ibid., 186.

[3] Ibid., 211-2.

human women.[4] In another episode, the Hebrew god addresses his court while the humans construct the Tower of Babel, and announces that man cannot be allowed to complete his tower to reach the heavens.[5] In the vision of Micaiah ben Imlah in I Kings 22:19-23 in the Deuteronomic History, the first recension of which dates to the reign of King Josiah (r.641-609 BCE),[6] the prophet Micaiah sees the Hebrew god as king of the gods.[7] The court of the Hebrew God thus mirrors the *'adat 'Ēl*: the court of the Canaanite 'Ēl.[8] A *ben hā'Ēlōhiym* volunteers to lie to the prophets of Ahab (r.873-852), king of Israel, in order to lure the Israelite king to his death at Ramoth-gilead. This deceiving courtier is the clearest example of one of the *'adat YHWH* at the Hebrew god's behest enticing a human to undertake actions not in that human's best interests. This courtier serves to explain political matters in Samaria since the composer of the Deuteronomic History intended his narrative to show Josiah as the culmination of prophecy meant to reunite Israel and Judah, and to show that the sins of the northern kingdom had resulted in its destruction.[9]

One of the *bene hā'Ēlōhiym* establishes his own identity by the third century BCE at the latest, when he appears in the book of Job.[10] Job 1:6-12, 2:1-6 has the *ben hā'Ēlōhiym*, known as 'the adversary,' *hāSāṭān*, presents himself to report to and to receive orders from the Hebrew god.[11] The word *sāṭān* 'to accuse' is related to, if not

---

[4] E.A. Speiser, *Genesis* (New York: Doubleday, 1964), 44. Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Harvard: Harvard Univ. Pr., 1997), 260-1. Genesis 6:1-4. All dates for Israelite and Judahite kings are approximate.

[5] Gen. 11:1-9.

[6] Mordechai Cogan, *I Kings* (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 97.

[7] Marvin H. Pope, *Job* (New York: Doubleday, 1973), 9.

[8] Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, 186.

[9] Cogan, *I Kings*, 97.

[10] Pope, *Job*, xl.

[11] Ibid., 9.

derived from, the root *šuṭ* meaning 'to roam,' 'to rove.' The semantic shift appears to

have created the word to describe a spy, like one from the Persian royal court, who

wanders the land and seeks to accuse of wrongdoing.[12] Thus, *hāSāṭān*'s roaming "going

to and fro in the earth, and . . . walking up and down in it" in Job 1:7b is a word play

upon his title.[13]

Further developments in the construct appear in the book of Daniel.

Completed by c.140 BCE, the relevant portions of the book (chapters 1-6) predate the

persecutions of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (r.175 – 164 BCE). These portions most likely

were committed to writing in the third century BCE, although the oral cores of the

tales appear to extend back to the Persian period.[14] Daniel mentions a particular

group of *bene hā'Ēlōhiym* called the Watchers (*'îr* 'watcher.') whom Nebuchadnezzar

sees.[15] The word translated as Watcher, *'îr* or *'ûr* meaning 'to awake,' 'to wake up'

and possibly indicating a being who was always awake, first occurs in this context in

Daniel, where they act as heavenly court spies.[16] Daniel also records that these

courtiers could visit the earth to protect the followers of the Hebrew god, as in Dan.

3:25-28 when one of the *bene hā'Ēlōhiym*, possibly a Watcher, walks about in

Nebuchadnezzar's fiery furnace to protect Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego.[17]

---

[12] Ibid., 10.

[13] Ibid., 11.

[14] Louis E. Hartman and Alexander A. DiLella, *The Book of Daniel* (New York: Doubleday, 1978), 13.

[15] Ibid., 16. Pope, *Job*, 11. Dan. 4:13(10), 17(14), 23(20).

[16] Hartman and DiLella, *Daniel*, 172. George W.E. Nickelsburg, *Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins* (Minneapolis: Fortress Pr., 2003), 98.

[17] Ibid., 98-102. Archie T. Wright, *The Origin of Evil Spirits* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 62, 71. Other *bene hā'Ēlōhiym* emerge into their own as well during this time. Michael (*Mikā'ēl* – 'Who is like 'Ēl?' or 'One like 'Ēl') becomes general-in-chief of Heaven's army (Dan. 10:13, 21), and assumes a dual sacerdotal function of cleansing the Earth of impurities (I En. 10:20-22). Raphael (*Rāfā'ēl* – ''Ēl Heals') becomes a healer with responsibilities over all diseases and wounds of man (I En. 40:9). Gabriel (*Gavri'ēl* – 'Strong One of 'Ēl') announces and interprets YHWH's will to humans (Dan.

The third century BCE saw the Levant caught between the Seleucid Empire and the Egyptian Empire under the Ptolemaic Dynasty. Over the course of the century at least five wars between these empires made the Levant, technically territory of Ptolemaic Egypt, into a battleground. The Fourth Syrian War saw Antiochus III (r.241-187 BCE) capture most of the Levant in 219 BCE only to have Ptolemy IV Philopater (r.221-205 BCE) recapture the area two years later.[18] The warfare on earth seems to have been transferred to the heavens. Daniel 10:13-14 records an instance when the courtier Michael had to engage in battle against another courtier, called the Prince of Persia, in order to allow a third to visit Daniel. In this passage, Michael acts as the courtier who protects the Judeans.[19] Traces of such battles also appear in Psalm 82 and in Isaiah 24:21, in which the Hebrew god threatens to punish the *bene hā'Ēlōhiym*, although whether for rebellion is not stated.[20]

The Bene hā'Ēlōhiym Evolve

Comprising chapters 6-36 in the book of I Enoch, the *Book of Watchers* expands upon the story of the *bene hā'Ēlōhiym* who mated with human females in Genesis 6:1-4.[21] The earliest version of the *Book of Watchers* (chapters 6-11, 12-16) dates from the late third to the early second centuries BCE.[22] In the Enochian account, the Watcher Šemiḥazah rebels by having sex with human women in order to produce offspring.[23] Other Watchers follow suit and become unclean. The half-divine half-human offspring

8:16 & 9:21-27). Uriel (*'Uri'ēl* – 'Fire of 'Ēl') has one of the most interesting tasks: he oversees the abyss into which disobedient *bene hā'Ēlōhiym* have been cast (I En. 21).

[18] Günther Höldl, *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*, trans., Tina Saavedra (London: Routledge, 2001), 330.

[19] Hartman and DiLella, *Daniel*, 282.

[20] Ibid., 283.

[21] Wright, *Origin of Evil Spirits*, 2, 15.

[22] Ibid., 15.

[23] Ibid., 17. I En. 6:3-8.

they produce, called *gibborim* and *nephilim*, become an abomination to Heaven.[24] For

this, God binds the rebellious Watchers and casts them into Tartarus.[25]

 In addition to the Rebellion of Šemiḥazah, the *Book of Watchers* includes two

soul flights by Enoch, the great-grandfather of Noah. Enoch never died but ascended

directly into Heaven. The *Book of Watchers* also includes the names of the archangels,

and the story of the fallen Watcher Asa'el.[26] God had originally sent Asa'el to earth to

teach humanity the arts of civilization, but human misuse of the gifts results in the

punishment of the Watchers and the corruption of man. As it turns out, however,

Asa'el was not blameless as he had taught humans the forbidden secrets of Heaven.[27]

Asa'el's punishment turns him against Heaven.

 The *Book of Watchers* shows some of the *bene hā'Ēlōhiym* in open rebellion

against Heaven; some of the courtiers have become evil entities within a dualistic

cosmos. This development had slowly evolved since at least the Persian period (539 –

331 BCE).[28] From the first appearance of *hāSāṭān*, the courtier who serves his king by

acting as chief spy, the *bene hā'Ēlōhiym* see some of their number break with Heaven.

<div align="center">Hodos Mythology</div>

 Boundaries are porous. At which point in history did the Second Temple

Judean sect who considered Jesus of Nazareth the *logos* and Messiah become the

---

[24] Francis Brown, *The New Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon* (Peabody MA: Hendrickson Pub., 1979), 150, 658. The Hebrew word *gibbōrîm* means 'mighty ones' or 'strong ones.' *Nĕphilîm* is usually translated as 'giants.' The word is related to the verbal root NPHL meaning 'to fall' or 'to lie,' although the relationship is not entirely clear. The related Aramaic word *nĕphîlā'* was the name for the constellation Orion.

[25] 1 En. 10:12.

[26] Wright, *Origin of Evil Spirits*, 14. Gen. 5:22-29.

[27] Ibid., 21. I En. 9:6.

[28] Nickelsburg, *Ancient Judaism* , 63-4.

Christians?[29] Later Christian historiography saw the destruction of the Second Temple

by Titus in 70 CE as the defining event, even more so than the creation of the word

khristianoi c.44 CE in Antioch to describe the followers.[30] But before the Roman

authorities imposed the Latin-Greek hybrid neologism upon the believers of the group,

those followers had already given themselves another name: followers of the *hodos*:

the way.[31]

While Jesus of Nazareth himself lived and taught during the relatively peaceful

reigns of Augustus (r.27 BCE – 14 CE) and Tiberius (r.14-37) in Rome, and of Herod

Antipas (r.4 BCE – 39 CE) in Galilee, the *hodos* community lived in a Roman Empire at

war with itself. For the first time since Augustus had defeated Mark Antony at the

Battle of Actium in 31 BCE, effectively ending the civil wars of the late Roman

Republic, the Roman world saw generals and legions turn on one another for control of

the empire. After the death of Nero (r.54-68) on 9 June 68, the Julio-Claudian Dynasty

became extinct; generals from all parts of the empire marched to Rome to seize the

throne.[32] After a period remembered as the Year of Four Emperors, Vespasian (r.69-

79) finally ascended the throne and restored some measure of peace to the empire; his

sons Titus (r.79-81) and Domitian (r.81-96) followed him to the throne. During this

---

[29] Daniel Boyarin, *Border Lines* (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Pr., 2004), 93-105. The *logos* construct arose from haggadic readings of the Hebrew Bible, such as (and perhaps most importantly for the *logos*) from reading Genesis 1 through the lens of Proverbs 8. Such a reading equates the spirit/breath of YHWH which hovered over the waters of the void in Genesis 1 with the Wisdom figure (*sophia* in Greek) in Proverbs 8. This creates a second person, a *deuteros theos*, who becomes a companion to and an agent of YHWH. YHWH creates in Genesis 1 through this figure, called the *logos* after its appearance in John 1. In the first century CE, some of the *hodos* community, such as the Johannine *hodos* community in Asia Minor, interpreted Jesus of Nazareth as the *logos*. The original interpretation of the *logos* as an agent of YHWH's will, not identified with Jesus, seems to have remained in the *hodos* community to become the later Holy Spirit.

[30] Acts 11:26.

[31] Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 471, 478.

[32] Michael Grant, *The Roman Emperors* (New York; Barnes & Noble, 1997), 39.

time, the *hodos* community had endured a persecution of its followers in the city of

Rome in 64 after Nero had blamed the sect, which Romans considered dissident

Judeans, for the great fire.[33] It had also watched as Titus had conquered Jerusalem

and destroyed the second Temple in the First Revolt (66-73). Afterward, Vespasian

initiated a program to hunt down and exterminate all surviving members of the House

of David in Judaea.[34] Titus continued this policy after his father's death.

The *hodos* community inherited the Enochian dualism which first appeared in

the *Book of Watchers*. *HāSāṭān* becomes an important figure in *hodos* mythology as

Satan, and he becomes the leader of the rebellious angels. Mark 1:11-12, dating to 69-

75 CE, sees Satan tempting Jesus of Nazareth in the wilderness after his baptism by

John the Baptist.[35] The Gospel of Luke, dating to 80-85 CE, sees Satan as still a

creature of the air.[36] In Luke 10:18, Jesus said that he saw Satan 'falling out of Heaven

like lightning.' The aorist participle *pesonta* (from *piptō*) can also mean 'attack;' Jesus

made a play on words with Satan both 'falling out of Heaven like lightning' and

'attacking out of Heaven like lightning.' Luke's version of the temptation (4:1-13) sees

Satan offering the kingdoms of the earth to Jesus if he would only transfer his

allegiance from the Hebrew god to Satan. The later epistles of the *hodos* community

state more clearly Satan's aerial nature. Ephesians 2:2 (c.75-90 CE) speaks of Satan as

'the ruler of the authorities of the air.'[37]

In a dramatic portrayal of Satan as an aerial demon, Revelation 12:7-9 relates a

vision of a war in heaven between Michael and his angels on one side, and Satan and his

---

[33] Ibid., 38.

[34] Ibid., 63.

[35] Joel Marcus, *Mark 1-8* (New York; Doubleday, 2000), 39.

[36] Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX* (New York: Doubleday, 1970), 57.

[37] Walter F. Taylor, Jr., *Ephesians* (Minneapolis; Augsburg Pub. House, 1985), 25.

angels on the other. Having defeated Satan, Michael casts him out of heaven to the

earth. Many scholars consider Revelation 12:7-12 to be a later, and possibly non-

Christian, interpolation into the text. The two main reasons adduced are that Michael

and the war in heaven only occur here in the entire book, and because the episode

interrupts the flow of the narrative around it. This means that the exact date of the

composition of the section cannot be determined precisely, but a *terminus ante quem*

at the end of the first century, when Revelation reached its final form, is likely.[38]

The *hodos* community saw Satan as the aerial demon *par excellence*; a courtier

who now wanted to overthrow his rightful patron.

<center>Birth of Lucifer</center>

Roman society in the mid-third century appeared to implode. Emperors rose

and fell with dizzying rapidity, and socio-political and economic upheavals wracked the

empire. During these tumultuous times, Origen composed his two works most

influential to the aerial demon construct: the *De Principiis* c.220 CE[39], and the *Contra

Celsum* c.248 CE.[40]

When Origen composed the *De Principiis*, Elagabalus (r.218-222) sat on the

throne of the empire; he also held the hereditary high-priesthood of El Gabal (from an

Aramaic original meaning "ʻĒl of the Mountain") at Edessa. Upon ascending the throne,

the new emperor transferred his cult to Rome where he appears to have attempted to

force the Romans to accept El Gabal as the main state god. He went as far as holding a

ceremony in which El Gabal married Minerva to unite his cult to the Roman state cult,

and the emperor ordered the construction of a temple to El Gabal on the Palatine Hill

---

[38] Josephine Massyngberde Ford, *Revelation* (New York: Doubleday, 1975) 193, 205-206.

[39] Henry Ansgar Kelly, *Satan: A Biography* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Pr., 2006), 194.

[40] W.H.C. Frend, "The Failure of the Persecutions in the Roman Empire," *Past and Present* 16 (1959): 10.

to hold the black meteorite sacred to his god.[41] The attempts to force the Semitic

deity upon the Romans may have contributed to his assassination in 222, after which

the Romans sent the black meteorite back to Edessa.[42] His successor and cousin

Alexander Severus (r.222-235) also held a priesthood in the cult of El Gabal, but kept

his devotion distinctly low-key. During his reign, he transformed the temple of El

Gabal into the Temple of Jupiter the Avenger.[43]

Around the time Origen wrote *Contra Celsum* c.248, the empire had just

finished an inconclusive war against the Sassanian emperor Shapur I (r.241-272). In

249, the new Emperor Decius (r.249-251) initiated a program to return the Roman

Empire to traditional values. Decius issued an edict in fall or early winter 249 after

taking the throne, which resulted in the first empire-wide persecution of Christians.[44]

While Decius conducted the harshest persecution the Christians had ever endured,

Origen maintained his confidence that Christianity would triumph over the Empire even

while imprisoned during the Decian persecution, an imprisonment which destroyed his

health and may have contributed to his death.[45] Yet Decius (and his successor)

unwittingly aided Christianity's survival, and justified Origen's faith, as Christian

bishops exiled to distant lands became essentially Roman state-propelled missionaries

---

[41] Grant, *Roman Emperors*, 128.

[42] Ibid., 129.

[43] Ibid., 130, 134.

[44] J.B. Rives, "The Decree of Decius and the Religion of Empire," *The Journal of Roman Studies* 89 (1999): 135, 137.

[45] Jeffrey Burton Russell, *Satan: The Early Christian Tradition* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Pr., 1981), 124. Frend, "Failure," 11.

who spread the gospel to their lands of exile.[46] Had Decius not forced the bishops to

flee for their lives, many in those lands would never have heard the Christian gospel.[47]

Decius' persecution ended with his death in 251, but one of his successors,

Valerian (r.253-260), instituted another in 257.[48] Valerian's persecution, however,

specifically targeted the Christians. Valerian's two edicts primarily targeted the higher

clergy and Christians in the upper classes.[49] The first edict allowed clergy to worship

Christ in private provided that they sacrificed to the state gods; the second imposed

capital punishment on those who refused to sacrifice, and provided for the confiscation

of property from Christian laymen, particularly Christian senators and *equites*.[50] As the

empire's military crisis deepened, Valerian started raising domestic *numina*, such as

Venus and Vesta, to warrior deities.[51] Valerian appears to have attempted to eliminate

Christianity from the upper classes, traditionally the main financial supporters of the

Roman state religion.[52] By the time Valerian's persecution had ended after his capture

---

[46] Frend, "Failure," 11.

[47] Rives, "Decree of Decius," 142-152. Decius' edict had far reaching consequences for the Roman Empire and for Christianity. For the first time, the emperor successfully dictated religious policy instead of allowing local authorities broad autonomy. Before Decius, the Roman Empire had no official cult; most emperors worshipped the Olympian Gods but on a personal level only. And although Decius' edict only specified one empire-wide religious practice, it presaged a future when emperors would order an empire to worship one particular god, and even to accept one particular doctrine about that god. The possibility exists that Decius intended to mark the 1000th birthday of Rome by the edict, but no evidence directly supports this contention. Interestingly although Decius persecuted the Christians harshly, he never moved against ecclesiastical authorities, and never forbade the praxis of Christianity. He seems to have held no particular animus against the institution of the church. This lack of a coherent program indicates that the edict may have been an *ad hoc* measure, and possibly even a spontaneous action.

[48] Ibid., 135.

[49] Christopher J. Haas, "Imperial Religious Policy and Valerian's Persecution of the Church, A.D. 257-260," *Church History* 52 (1983): 136.

[50] Grant, *Roman Emperors*, 167-8.

[51] Haas, "Imperial Religious Policy," 141.

[52] Ibid., 143.

by Shapur I, the Roman bishopric had stood vacant for almost two years since the execution of Xystus II.[53] Only four priests remained in the entire bishopric of Alexandria, and those four remained in hiding.[54]

During these violent years, Origen composed in Alexandria and combined Platonism and Christianity in his works. Alexandria had long proven fertile ground for such syncretism as adduced in the first-century CE by Philo Alexandrinus' combination of Platonism and Judaism, and as even far back as the second-century BCE *Letter of Aristeas.*[55]

Origen ignores the Watchers in his demonology and eliminates the story of their lust.[56] He also gives Satan a new genealogy. Satan becomes an amalgam of several figures such as Leviathan, and the Prince of Tyre.[57] In *Contra Celsum* 6.44, Origen expounds on Isaiah 14 as the origin of Satan.[58]

Composed around 625-612 BCE, Isaiah 14:12-17 speaks of an unnamed earthly ruler who fell from power.[59] Commentators have never agreed on the ruler to whom Isaiah refers: Tiglath-Pileser III (r.744-727 BCE), Sargon II (r.721-705 BCE), Sennacherib (r.704-681 BCE), or an Aramaean ruler. The passage draws upon Canaanite mythological motifs to portray the ruler as having ascended to the heavens in a bid for power, but failing in his quest and falling to earth. In Canaanite mythology, the courtier 'Athtar had tried to sit upon the throne of 'Ēl but slid off and down to the

---

[53] J.N.D. Kelley, *Oxford Dictionary of Popes* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Pr., 2005), 22.

[54] Frend, "Failure," 16.

[55] Ibid., 12.

[56] Russell, *Satan*, 132.

[57] Ibid., 171, n.92.

[58] Kelly, *Satan*, 197.

[59] Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39* (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 92.

earth.[60] Isaiah calls this figure *Helēl*, from the Hebrew root meaning 'to shine

brightly.' In the Greek Septuagint, *Helēl* becomes *Heōsphoros*: 'light-bearer.' In

Latin, 'light-bearer' translates as Lucifer.[61] Origen is the first to equate Satan with the

Helēl figure in Isaiah 14:12-17; in so doing, Origen stands as the most likely originator

for the equation of Satan with Lucifer.[62]

 At times, Origen is unclear on whether he is discussing aerial, chthonic, or

terrestrial demons, although such distinctions might not have been important to him.

When he does discuss the demons as aerial, he conceptualizes them with wings. His

aerial demons have insubstantial bodies which can change size and shape, and

commonly enter human bodies via the air humans inhale.[63] They sustain themselves

off of the smoke and odor of pagan sacrifices.[64] Yet Origen's apparent confusion freed

the demon construct from its previous aerial home. From Origen's time forth, demons

would increasingly become chthonic demons. Aerial demons would continue to exist,

but over time they would appear less often in the literature; nevertheless, important

works would still employ the aerial demon construct, which would never entirely

disappear. In time, Origen's demonology would dominate Christian ascetic thought,

such as would be found in the *Life of Antony*, traditionally ascribed to Athanasius of

Alexandria.

<p style="text-align:center">Synthesis at Alexandria</p>

 Born c.296, Athanasius began his ecclesiastical career serving as a secretary to

bishop Alexander of Alexandria. During his early years, he had watched Christianity

progress from a persecuted faith to a tolerated cult. In 311, the Edict of Serdica had

---

[60] Beyerlin, *Near Eastern Religious Texts*, 216-7.

[61] Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39*, 286-288.

[62] Russell, *Satan*, 130, n.59.

[63] Ibid., 179.

[64] Ibid., 133, n.65.

granted Christians freedom of worship, and in 313, the Edict of Milan had granted

Christianity formal imperial toleration.[65] As a young deacon, Athanasius had served

Alexander as his secretary at the Council of Nicaea in 325. On 17 April 328, he

succeeded his bishop as bishop of Alexandria, but found his succession contested.[66] In

335, Athanasius found himself answering charges of threatening to withhold Egypt's

grain shipments from the capital.[67] The scandal caused Constantine I (r.306-337) to

send him into exile at Augusta Trevirorum.[68] During this, the first of what would

become five exiles from his see, riots erupted in Alexandria. But the *vox populi* of his

bishopric did not influence the emperor, and Athanasius remained in Gaul until

Constantine died in 337.[69] He had to appear before Emperor Constantius II (r.337-361)

in 338 to answer charges of selling Egypt's grain ration for personal gain.[70] Under

Constantius II, Athanasius served a second exile in Rome from 339 until 346, and a third

in the Egyptian desert from 356 until 362 when Julian II "the Apostate" (r.361-363)

allowed all exiled bishops to return to their sees.[71] In time, Julian II would send

Athanasius to his fourth exile in the Egyptian desert on 23 October 362 where he

remained until the following year. His fifth exile, also to the Egyptian desert, occurred

---

[65] Grant, *Roman Emperors*, 230.

[66] Thomas Gerard Weinandy, *Athanasius: A Theological Introduction* (Burlington VT: Ashgate, 2007), 1-2.

[67] Michael J. Hollerich, "The Alexandrian Bishops and the Grain Trade: Ecclesiastical Grain Commerce in Late Roman Egypt," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 25 (1982): 190.

[68] Weinandy, *Athanasius:*, 3.

[69] Ibid., 3.

[70] Hollerich, "Alexandrian Bishops," 191.

[71] Weinandy, *Athanasius*, 4-5.

for a brief period when Valens (r.364-378) tried to have him arrested in his see. Athanasius died on 2 May 373 in Alexandria.[72]

From his first appearance on the historical stage at the Council of Nicaea, Athanasius had participated in an empire recreating itself. Summoned by the Emperor Constantine I, the council found itself charged with dealing with, among other things, Arianism and creating a canonical body of scripture.[73] The council fit into Constantine's program of unifying the Roman Empire. After a civil war in which he defeated Emperor Maxentius (r.306-312) at the Milvian Bridge in 312, Constantine marched into Rome where the Senate recognized him as the senior Augustus.[74] Later, he defeated the Emperor Licinius (r.308-324) to become the sole emperor.

Even if Athanasius himself did not compose the *Life of Antony*, it was during Athanasius' time that the author told the story of one Antony, a man from a wealthy family near Herakleopolis Magna in Lower Egypt, who had fled to the Egyptian desert sometime after 270 during the reign of Aurelian (r.270-275).[75] Born possibly c.251, he lived in a desert fortress from c.285 until c.305. Jerome claims that this monastic pioneer died in 356.[76] When Antony retreated into the desert around 270, however,

---

[72] Ibid., 7.

[73] Rowan Williams, *Arius: History and Tradition* (Grand Rapids MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2001), and: Justo L. Gonzalez, *The Story of Christianity vol. I: The Early Church to the Dawn of the Reformation* (New York: Harper Collins, 1984). A variant Christianity named after its founder. Born in Libya c.280, Arius lived his life under, and in tension with, the bishopric of Alexandria. He first enters the historical record c.318 when, as an already popular and ascetic presbyter in the bishopric, he entered into a Christological debate against Bishop Alexander regarding the nature of the *Logos*. Arius conceived of the *Logos* as not the same as God, but the first creation of God through whom all subsequent creation occurred. To Arius, considering the *Logos* to be God arrogated the *Logos*, in this case Jesus of Nazareth, to a second god. To Alexander, this demeaned Jesus of Nazareth to a mere creature. This view of the *Logos* as a creation of God and not God Himself formed the basis for later Arianism.

[74] Grant, *Roman Emperors*, 228.

[75] Frend, "Failure," 22.

[76] Samuel Rubenson, *The Letters of St. Antony* (Lund, Sweden: Lund Univ. Pr., 1990), 42.

Rome did not control Egypt; the Kingdom of Palmyra under Zenobia had seized the Black Land.[77] The author of the *Antony* did not write a history of the ideas of Antony, nor did he intend to do so. Instead, he infused the *Antony* with his own theology.

In the *Life of Antony* 65, Antony engages in a soul flight where he sees aerial demons, whom he calls the "bitter and cruel ones," blocking the ascent of his soul. The demons demand an accounting of the soul's life from birth. God apparently set the rules by which the aerial demons could operate. As well, God through his angels would only allow the aerial demons to judge Antony's actions since becoming a monk. When the aerial demons prove unable to indict Antony, they must let him pass.[78]

The *Antony* has Antony engage other demons as well, not just aerial demons. In *Antony* 8-9, Anthony decides to retreat to the opened tombs in the Egyptian desert in order to pursue an anchoritic lifestyle. Satan and his chthonic demons, however, do not wish to allow him peace. Antony spends nights sealed inside one of these tombs when chthonic demons appear from the walls to whip him ruthlessly. These demons transform into lions, bulls, asps, serpents, scorpions, and other theriomorphic forms to torture him after beatings fail to break him. Eventually, they beat him so brutally that he loses his ability to speak. The next day, his friend finds him near death and takes him to the safety of a local village. That night, however, Antony convinces his friend to carry him back to the tomb and lock him in.[79]

The *Antony* author saw the desert as the home of demons.[80] In this, he drew upon an Egyptian construct with thousands of years of development. The ancient Egyptians saw the desert, or as they called it the Red Land which opposed the fertile

[77] Grant, *Roman Emperors*, 183.

[78] Robert C. Gregg, trans., *Athanasius: The Life of Antony and the Letter to Marcellinus* (Mahwah NJ: Paulist Pr., 1980), 78-9.

[79] Ibid., 37-8.

[80] James E. Goehring, *Ascetics, Society, and the Desert* (Harrisburg PA; Trinity International Pr., 1999), 75.

Black Land, as the home of powers much more powerful than and sometimes threatening to man, even if the construct of 'the demon' did not exist in the Egyptian thoughtworld.[81] The Red Land belonged to deities such as Ash, who was the god of the western desert, sometimes called the "Lord of Libya."[82] Another deity, Onuris, was an ancient hunting god who lived in the desert at the end of the world. Each day, he retrieved the eye of the sun.[83] But primarily, the Red Land belonged to Set, the god of chaos in the desert and of chaos in the margins of the ordered world.[84] Not an evil god for most of Egyptian history, since Egyptians had no gods of evil, Set personified rage, anger, and violence.[85] Set was associated with storms and with the raging sea, but he was also a deity of great cunning.[86] He was an ambivalent figure, albeit one often feared, until the Late Period. Only after Egypt had endured Nubian invasion, Libyan occupation, two Persian dominations, and finally Macedonian and Roman rule, did Set become evil. The *Antony*'s demons had a noble pedigree.

This noble pedigree also saw the demons merge with the ancient Egyptian Gatekeepers. Antony's demons seem to divide their duties: chthonic demons torture the monk while aerial demons obstruct the post-mortem soul's ascent to Heaven unless the soul can provide an acceptable accounting of itself. The *Antony* of c.357-358, shows the acceptance into Christianity of the Gatekeepers, the heavenly ascent, and the aerial demons, and the combination of all three constructs into something new for orthodox Christianity.

---

[81] Richard H. Wilkinson, *The Complete Gods and Goddesses of Ancient Egypt* (New York: Thames & Hudson, 2003), 197.

[82] Erik Hornung, *Conceptions of God in Ancient Egypt: The One and the Many*, trans., John Baines (Ithaca: Cornell Univ., Pr., 1996), 275.

[83] Ibid., 280.

[84] Ibid., 282.

[85] Wilkinson, *Complete Gods and Goddesses*, 197.

[86] Ibid., 198.

The *Life of Antony* shows the culmination of the *Coptic Apocalypse of Paul*, Origen, and the *Book of the Dead*. Chthonic demons might become more widely written about in Christianity in the centuries to come, but this new construct comprised of aerial demons, the heavenly ascent, and Egyptian Gatekeepers stood poised to carve out a niche for itself in the orthodox Christian thoughtworld. Yet only one thing more remained for this new construct. That one last element would also arise out of Egypt, but that story must wait for one chapter. In the meantime, the *Antony* author's demonology would resound throughout the Roman world as the *Antony* became a widely read work throughout the empire. The *Antony* expounded an Egyptian-inspired demonology, and the aerial and chthonic demons, from one end of the Mediterranean to the other.

Conclusion

From the courtiers of the Canaanite deity 'Ēl, the *bene hā'Ēlōhiym* evolved until some of them became aerial demons.[87] The legend preserved in Genesis 6 showed they could act independently of their sovereign and even against his will.[88] By the third century BCE, one of their number, Satan, had become a courtier who worked to indict humans for their sins.[89] One group of these courtiers organized as the Watchers by c.140 BCE; they observed humans and reported their activities to the Hebrew god.[90]

The *Book of Watchers* took the Genesis 6 reference and evolved the courtiers into rebellious angels at war with Heaven.[91] Origen during a thirty-year period (c.220-248) equated Satan with the figure of Leviathan and the fallen king in Isaiah 14 to

---

[87] Beyerlin, *Near Eastern Texts*, 186.

[88] Speiser, *Genesis*, 44. Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, 260-1.

[89] Pope, *Job*, xl.

[90] Ibid., 11. Hartman and DiLella, *Daniel*, 16.

[91] Wright, *Origin of Evil Spirits*, 2, 15.

create the head demon who fell as a result of his war against the Christian god.[92] His

followers became demons which Origen saw in the air, under the earth, and in the lives

of men.[93] The aerial demons, in particular, not only warred with the Christian god but

by the time of the *Life of Antony* in the mid third century, hindered the heavenly

ascent of, and interrogate, souls.[94] The aerial demons of the *Antony* thus become

Gatekeepers who could deny post-mortem souls from continuing their heavenly ascent.

The aerial demons, for the most part, seem to operate at the sufferance of the

Christian god. The Book of the Watchers and Revelation 12:7-9 appear to contradict

this tradition with aerial demons in full revolt against heaven, but most of the texts

seem to envision the demons as ultimately fulfilling the will of the Christian god. This

function of the aerial demons as, possibly unwilling, servants of heaven becomes an

important component in the later *telōnia*.

With demons, both aerial and chthonic, now so dangerous to one's soul, the

Christian had to remain on constant guard. The demons used many weapons against an

individual, from floggings and beatings to mere whispers. These whispers lead to the

next construct in this investigation: the construct of the *logismoi*.

---

[92] Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39*, 286-288. Russell, *Satan*, 130, n.59.

[93] Russell, *Satan*, 179.

[94] Gregg, *Athanasius*, 78-9.

Chapter 5

Logismoi

Introduction

The Greek noun *logismos* can translate as 'reasoning,' 'reckoning,' 'reasoning power,' and/or, perhaps best for this thesis, as 'intention.' Plato used the word often in his works. In the plural, *logismoi* can refer to an early Christian monastic construct which conceptualized thoughts or intentions, which demons could introduce (sometimes persistently or emphatically) into human minds either to seduce individuals to sin, or to simply interrupt an individual's monastic contemplations. The names of the *logismoi* served as technical vocabulary for the monks. From the *logismoi* derives the construct of the Capital Vices: A construct of the eight chief categories of sinfulness leading to concrete acts. The later refinement of the Capital Vice construct became the Seven Deadly Sins in the Latin West.

In 1952, Morton Bloomfield posited that the *logismoi* evolved in the fourth century CE from the *telōnia*, or an ancestral, construct.[1] Bloomfield's explanation in this case has not found universal acceptance, even though the *logismoi* construct to date has defied any satisfactory explanation of its creation. Scholars can only agree that the *logismoi* construct seems to find first, and full, expression in the works of Evagrius Ponticus.

Evagrius conceived of the *logismoi* as both the intentions which demons can use, and as the personalities of the demons who can act individually, work together, or work at cross-purposes to one another. These demons are usually incorporeal, and cannot force the human to sin, but only introduce the intentions to entice them. For the origin of the grouping of intentions, this study travels to Greece.

---

[1] Morton Bloomfield, *The Seven Deadly Sins* (East Lansing: Michigan State College Pr., 1952), 16-17.

Athenian Vice

Aristotle's work on virtues and vices has influenced western thought for millennia. Born in Stagira, Macedon in 384 BCE, Aristotle moved to Athens to study under Plato in 367 where he remained until his mentor's death in 347.[2] He eventually made his way to Macedon where he accepted an appointment from King Philip II (r.382-336 BCE) to tutor his 13 year old son Alexander.[3] In 336, the new king ascended the throne as Alexander III (r.336-323 BCE), and Aristotle returned to Athens two years later. Once in Athens, he broke with the Academy under the scholarate Xenocrates, and founded the Peripatetic school at the Lyceum. Aristotle found himself forced to flee Athens for Chalcis in 323. Alexander's death in Babylon sparked an anti-Macedonian uprising led by Athens; as a friend of both Alexander and of his satrap Antipater, Aristotle became the focus of Athenian rage. He died the next year in Chalcis.[4]

Aristotle composed what survives as the *Nicomachean Ethics* as a series of lectures delivered sometime during his second stay in Athens from 334-323 BCE. In the *Nicomachean Ethics*, he proposes as the purpose of life *eudaimonia*, translated as 'prosperity, good fortune,' and often translated (less accurately) as 'happiness.' Moral virtue through intellectual means of the Golden Mean can help secure *eudaimonia*. The Golden Mean is the way whereby individuals can choose between extremes to find the happy medium in nearly all things. Roughly, if anachronistically, speaking, one must choose between asceticism and impulsiveness. Moral virtue cannot be practiced

---

[2] Terence Irwin, trans., *Nicomachean Ethics* (Indianapolis: Hackett Pub. Co., 1985), xiv.

[3] H. Rackham, trans., *The Nicomachean Ethics* (Harvard: Harvard Univ. Pr., 1962), x.

[4] Rackham, *Nicomachean Ethics*, xi. Irwin, *Nicomachean Ethics*, xiv.

in isolation, however, but only within and among human society.[5] Nobody achieves or

earns *eudaimonia* in isolation.

Some actions or emotions, such as taking pleasure in others' misfortune,

shamelessness or impudence, envy, adultery, theft, and murder, have no means; these

vices are simply evil.

Table 1

<center>The Six Aristotelian Vices without Means[6]</center>

Vice
Epikhairekakia
Anaiskhuntia
Phthonos
Moikheia
Klopē
Androphonia

The rest of Aristotle's vices arise from either a deficit or an excess of emotions

or acts. None of these vices are inherently evil, but simply a lack of or an excess of

something. Rendering Aristotle's means, excesses, and deficiencies into a table of

Greek terms would be difficult since, as Aristotle himself states, many of the vices

have no names but are simply descriptions. Of those with names which Aristotle does

give, however, a few deserve mention in the current discussion.

The mean *sofrosunē* (temperance) stands between the excess *akolasia*

(licentiousness) and the deficiency *anaisthēsia* (insensibility). The ethical person had

to walk between these two excesses in order to keep to the middle way of *sofrosunē*.

The mean *praotēs* (patience, even-temperedness) stands between the excess *orgilotēs*

(irascibility) and the deficiency *aorgēsia* (imperturbability, lack of response). The

concept of vices did not originate with Aristotle, but it did receive perhaps its first

systematic treatment by the Peripatetic founder. Later writers would use Aristotle's

---

[5] M.C. Howatson, *The Oxford Companion to Classical Literature, 2nd ed* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Pr., 1990), 59.

[6] *Nicomachean Ethics* II.vi.18.

<center>74</center>

vices as a starting point for thinking about vice and the intentions, but only much later writers.

After Aristotle's death, Greek/Hellenistic philosophy changed. No longer did philosophers inquire after the nature and feasibility of a just social order, questions with which Aristotle and Plato concerned themselves, but with the individual's relationship to the cosmos and with the individual's quest for inner peace.[7] In such an atmosphere, the audience for Aristotle's works dwindled in the third and second centuries BCE. However, Aristotle would not remain gone forever.

<div align="center">Judean Reasonings I: The Alexandrian Community</div>

The word *logismoi* had been in Judean thought for as far back as the third century BCE. At that time, Alexandrian Judeans began to translate their Hebrew and Aramaic writings into Greek. Collected together with Judean writings composed in Greek (e.g. I Maccabees and Ben Sira), the new grouping became known as the Septuagint, and became a critical collection to the Alexandrian community.[8]

The Aramaic-speaking Judean community in Judaea had its own group of writings which differed from the Alexandrian group, for instance in the inclusion of the book of Jubilees, but it does not appear to have assembled them into a collection like the Septuagint.[9] Another difference between the communities lay in the versions themselves; the Greek translations sometimes worked from different manuscript traditions than those in Judaea, and the Greek translations themselves incorporated Greek philosophical ideas into the translations from Hebrew and Aramaic.[10]

---

[7] Cicero, *The Nature of the Gods*, trans., Horace C.P. McGregor (London: Penguin, 1972), 35.

[8] Martin S. Jaffee, *Early Judaism* (Bethesda: Univ. of Maryland Pr., 2006), 64-65.

[9] Ibid., 65.

[10] Ibid., 98. Günther Hölbl, *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*, trans., Tina Saavedra (London: Routledge, 2001), 190. Gideon Bohak, *Joseph and Aseneth and the Jewish Temple in Heliopolis* (Atlanta: Scholars Pr., 1996), 23. Of course other differences separated the Alexandrian Judeans from their relatives in Judaea, such as the use of

Both *logismos* and the closely related *dialogismos* occur in the Septuagint in the full range of their meanings, from 'argument' to 'dialogue' to 'reasoning, reckoning, reasoning power,' and 'intentions.'[11] Some of their appearances, however, directly address the intentions.

In Ezekiel 38:10, the *logismoi* refer to Gog's evil intentions against the land of Israel. Proverbs 19:21 sees the heart as the origin of *logismoi*, but man can override any intention by remembering the counsel of the Lord. In Nahum 1:11, the Assyrian Empire plots a *logismos* counseling evil things against the Lord. The penalty for Assyria, according to Nahum, will be not only destruction but desolation. The word *dialogismos* appears to serve similar meanings in some contexts. In Jeremiah 4:14, the Lord, through Jeremiah, encourages Jerusalem to eliminate the *dialogismoi* within.

<center>Spirits of Deceit</center>

Sometime around 109 to 106 BCE, an anonymous author composed the *Testament of Reuben* in Greek.[12] Part of the collection *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *Reuben* purports to give the last words of the son of Jacob to his descendants. In his final words, Reuben warns against what he calls the 'seven spirits of deceit' in the text, even though they actually number eight.

---

separate temples. Sometime during the years 163-145 BCE, expatriate priest Ḥoni IV had received permission from Ptolemy VI Philometor to construct a temple to YHWH on the site of an abandoned temple of Bastet in or near the city of Iunu in Lower Egypt. Ptolemy VI had granted the expatriate Judeans permission to settle in the Iunu area in order to fortify a strategic site on the road from Alexandria to Mennefer.

     Ḥoni IV, besides being the grandson of High Priest Shimon the Righteous, could claim direct descent from the lineage of Zadok, high priest under King Solomon. With such an ancestor, Ḥoni and his descendants could claim greater legitimacy for themselves and for their temple than could the high priests in Jerusalem, especially after King John Hyrcanus I, a non-Zadokite, usurped that high priesthood in 134 BCE.

[11] Although *dialogismos* is sometimes employed as a synonym for *logismos*, *dialogismos* also became technical judicial vocabulary by the second century CE in Egypt to mean 'trial' or 'judicial proceeding.'

[12] Bloomfield, *Seven Deadly Sins*, 44.

Table 2

Deceit Spirits in the *Testament of Reuben*[13]

Deceit Spirit
Porneia
Aplēsteia
Makhē
Areskeia kai Mangania
Huperēphaneia
Pseudos
Adikia
Hupnos

The author of *Reuben* obviously did not copy Aristotle's vices from the *Nicomachean Ethics*, but the fact that he formulates these intentions into a grouping indicates that he could have been familiar with the Peripatetic school's systematic study of vices, even if indirectly. More importantly, however, the *Reuben* author attributes his eight intentions to 'spirits of deceit;' spirits who even made the Watchers go astray in Genesis 6.

Reuben's spirits of deceit seem to exist solely to tempt man and angel. That could hint that these spirits of deceit were not related, at least functionally, to the aerial demons evolving at the time. These spirits of deceit seem to descend from the vision of Micaiah ben Imlah in I Kings 22:19-23 where one of the Hebrew god's courtiers volunteers to lie to the prophets of King Ahab in order to lure the Israelite king to his death at Ramoth-gilead. These spirits exist to feed sinful intentions into human (and non-human) minds. They directly serve Beliar in *Reuben*, but Beliar received them ultimately from the Hebrew god.

The *Testament of Reuben* links the spirits of deceit with a grouping of intentions; each spirit is linked with a particular intention. In *Reuben* something new occurs: spirits, neither aerial nor chthonic, employ or personify intentions and seduce individuals to sin.

One final question remains: why would *Reuben* mention the seven spirits of deceit then list eight? Of course, there is no way to truly know what the author

---

[13] Ibid., 44.

intended when he composed the *Reuben* or why he wrote what he did, but perhaps he was predisposed to do so. The number seven was a sacred number in the Septuagint. The Septuagint offers many examples of sevens, such as the seven days of creation in Genesis 1-2, the seven years of plenty followed by seven years of famine in Egypt in Genesis 41:29-30, the seven days the Nile turned to blood in Exodus 7:25, and the seven times the priests sprinkled blood upon the Ark of the Covenant at Yom Kippur in Leviticus 16:14, among others. The *Reuben* author himself employed the number seven in his work such as when he has Reuben reveal to his descendants that he was mortally ill for seven months following his rape of his father's concubine Bilhah.[14] Reuben then repented for seven years for the deed.[15] The *Reuben* also mentions seven spirits through whom Hebrew god had planned every work of man was to be done.[16] For a Judean author to think in sevens presents no difficulties, which is why his decision to list eight remains particularly puzzling.

The *Reuben* author could have composed his work anywhere in the eastern Mediterranean, but the city of Alexandria may be the most likely locale for the book's creation. Alexandria hosted a very large, and well educated, Hellenized Jewish population. That the author did not see his spirits of deceit as eight but seven also would accord with authorship in Alexandria, a city which did not look towards Egypt but towards the Hellenized eastern Mediterranean.

<center>Sulla and the Passions of War</center>

The systematic study of vices, which had remained essentially stillborn since Aristotle, received new life in the middle of the first century BCE. The series of civil wars which had engulfed the Roman Republic saw Lucius Cornelius Sulla Felix,

---

[14] *Reuben* 1:7-8. Gen. 35:22.

[15] *Reuben* 1:9.

[16] *Reuben* 2:3-8. Although as with the spirits of deceit, these spirits really number eight.

occasional consul and dictator of Rome, sack Athens in 86 BCE. During the campaign, the Lyceum took heavy damage and subsequently closed. Sulla confiscated all of Aristotle's manuscripts and took them back to Rome where the grammarian Tyrannion transcribed the works, sometimes haphazardly.[17]

Aristotle's works had languished since the Stagirite's death. Some copies of his works had made it to Rhodes and to the library at Alexandria, but they do not appear to have influenced any philosophers during this time.[18] This changed after Sulla sacked Athens. A new scholarch, the eleventh, reopened and reinvigorated the peripatetic school: Andronicus of Rhodes ran the Lyceum from around 70 until about 50 BCE.[19] Andronicus visited Rome and secured copies of Aristotle's works from Tyrannion then created a master critical edition of the Stagirite's works: the edition upon which all known manuscripts are based.[20] Rightly credited for reintroducing Aristotleanism to the ancient world, Andronicus also received credit for works he almost certainly did not compose.[21] One such work is *On the Passions*.

The *Passions* survives in two unequal parts. The first part, called in Latin *De affectibus*, has usually been attributed to Andronicus; the second part, *De virtutibus et vitiis*, has usually been attributed to Aristotle.[22] These two parts often circulated separately since the work's translation into Latin by Robert Grosseteste in the thirteenth century.[23] The *De virtutibus* shows the influence of Platonic, Aristotelian,

---

[17] Giovanni Reale, *A History of Ancient Philosophy: The Schools of the Imperial Age*, trans., John R. Catan (Albany: State Univ. of New York Pr., 1990), 12.

[18] Ibid., 14.

[19] Ibid., 18.

[20] Ibid., 13.

[21] A. Glibert-Thierry, ed., *Peri Pathōn* (Leiden: Brill, 1977), 30.

[22] Ibid., 31.

[23] Richard Newhauser, *A Treatise on the Vices and Virtues in Latin and the Vernacular* (Turnout: Brepols, 1993), v.

and Stoic thought, particularly in its use of the cardinal virtues.[24] The *De affectibus* appears to lack any Stoic ideas, but shows only Platonic and Aristotelian influences; it employs a Peripatetic cataloguing of the vices.[25]

The *Passions* betrays no hints as to its date of composition. The cataloguing of vices, very similar to that in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, demands a time after the rediscovery of Aristotle's works in the mid-first century BCE. The employment of Stoic ideas in the *De virtutibus* would seem to enforce this. The best one can state is that the *Passions* is most likely a product of the Roman Imperial period.[26] During this time, an author, competent in the philosophical currents of his time, could blend the teachings of the Academy, the Lyceum, and the Stoa together.[27] As well, Aristotle's ideas would have needed time to diffuse throughout the Mediterranean world; although possible, it is unlikely that a work like *Passions* would have been composed immediately after the rediscovery of Aristotle. Time would have been required to process the rediscovered works and to relate them to better known Platonic and Stoic ideas. This makes Bloomfield's guess of a first century BCE date unlikely (albeit the best guess he could hazard when he wrote), but a date in the first or second centuries CE would fit much better.[28]

In that part of the *Passions* attributed to Andronicus, the *De affectibus*, appears a list of vices. The grouping in the *Passions* does not follow Aristotle's explanation in considering vices excesses or deficiencies of particular virtues. It appears to assume that the four named vices are vices by nature; it also breaks down the four main vices into several subvices. Added together, vices with subvices, the

---

[24] Glibert-Thierry, *Peri Pathōn*, 32.

[25] Ibid., 33.

[26] Ibid., 32.

[27] Ibid., 34.

[28] Bloomfield, *Seven Deadly Sins*, 335n317.

Passions (*De affectibus*) gives a total of seventy-one vices, which one opposes with the
four major virtues.

Table 3

Vices and Subvices in the *Peri Pathōn*

Epithumia	Phobos	Hēdonē	Lupē
Dusmeneia	Agōnia	Asmenisos	Akhos
Dusnoia	Aiskhunē	Epikhairekakia	Akhthos
Eris	Deilia	Goēteia	Ania
Erōs	Deima	Kēlēsis	Asē
Gastrimargia	Deisidaimonia	Terpsis	Athumia
Hapsikoria	Ekplēxis		Baruthumia
Himeros	Kataplēxis		Dusphoria
Kholos	Mellēsis		Duskheransis
Kotos	Oknos		Dusthumia
Lagneia	Orrōdia		Eleos
Mēnis	Psophodeeia		Goos
Oinophlugia	Thorubos		Klausis
Orgē			Nemesis
Philēdonia			Odunē
Philokhrēmatia			Oiktos
Philosōmatia			Okhlēsis
Philotimia			Penthos
Philozōia			Phrontis
Pikria			Phthonos
Pothos			Sphakelismos
Prospatheia			Sumphora
Rhipsophthalmia			Sunkhusis
Spanis			Metameleia
Thumos			Zēlos
Trakhutēs			Zēlotupia

The grouping of vices in the *Passions* shows definite Aristotelian influence,
even if it does not borrow Aristotle's definition of vice. For example *nemesis*, an
Aristotelian virtue, becomes a subvice of *lupē*. The unknown author of this work did
not consider himself bound to copy Aristotle's ideas but reworked them. Where
Aristotle took more interest in the reasons vices exist and how to correct them, the
Passions author is more interested in creating a comprehensive list of vices.

The *Testament of Reuben* and the *Passions* show that people around the turn of
the era began to take more of an interest in questions of vice and virtue. Beginning in
19 BCE, the emperor Augustus initiated a state-directed morality program.[29] This
program saw several pieces of social legislation issue from Rome, including tightened
state control of marriage, and increased state-enforced penalties for various vices such
as adultery. The Augustan program is no doubt incidental, and not causal to the

---

[29] Pat Southern, *Augustus* (London: Routledge, 2001), 144.

Passions, but it does demonstrate that around the Roman world, vices and virtues became an active concern.

Judean Reasonings II: The Hodos Community

The first century CE *hodos* Judean community built upon the Septuagint. Whenever the community quoted their ancient writings in their own works, they did not employ the Hebrew versions but the Greek Septuagint translations (sometimes creatively). The *hodos* concept of the intentions also was built upon Septuagint uses.[30]

In Romans 2:15 (c.55-56),[31] the *logismoi*, along with the personal conscience, serve to defend or convict those who have not heard the Gospel. In II Cor. 10:4 (part of Corinthians E c.56),[32] Paul puts a slightly militant twist upon the intentions as something requiring action to eliminate.

In the *dialogismos* form in Mark 7:21-22 (c.69-75)[33]: Mark lists a series of evil intentions which he views as proceeding from human hearts. The author of the Gospel of Matthew 15:19 (c.80-100 CE)[34] preserves a similar homily but with a different list:

---

[30] The Greek New Testament was formally, and mostly finally, assembled only at the First Council of Nicaea in 325 CE under Emperor Constantine I. Although itself a fourth century creation, the Greek New Testament preserves first and second century *hodos* writings.

[31] Helmut Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 2000), 111.

[32] Victor Paul Furnish, *II Corinthians* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1984), 46.

[33] Joel Marcus, *Mark 1-8* (New York; Doubleday, 2000), 39.

[34] Koester, *Introduction*, 177.

Table 4

Intentions in GMk 7:21-22 vs. GMt 15:19

GMk 7:21-22	GMt 15:19
Porneiai	*Porneiai*
Klopai	*Klopai*
Phonoi	*Phonoi*
Moikheiai	*Moikheiai*
Pleonexiai	
Ponēriai	
Dolos	
Aselgeia	
Ophthalmos ponēros	
Blasphēmia	*Blasphēmiai*
Huperēphania	
Aphrosunē	
	Pseudomarturiai

The addition of *pseudomarturiai* (false witnessings) to Matthew's late first century

work could indicate that this *logismos* had become particularly prevalent in the years

since Mark wrote, yet *logismoi* such as envy and pride did not concern Matthew's

community nearly as much as they had concerned Mark's audience.

<div align="center">Shepherding the Spirits</div>

The *Shepherd of Hermas* achieved final form around 148 CE. One caveat

regarding *Hermas* is in order, however. Nowhere in the work do the words *logismoi* or

dialogismoi occur, yet many scholars of the *logismoi*, such as Columba Stewart,

consider *Hermas* to be a key text in the evolution of the intentions.[35] This may be

because Mandate 6:2.5 discusses the *epithumia*, 'desires,' of an 'angel of wickedness'

who enters the heart and causes the person violated to experience ill-temper or

bitterness. An 'angel of wickedness' that enters a human heart and somehow implants

desires resembles *Reuben*'s 'spirits of deceit' who tempt man and angel.

Hermas discusses these desires in Mandate 6:2.5. Discernment of spirits

becomes a key point as the *Hermas* author teaches how one may diagnose a visit by the

---

[35] Kirsopp Lake, trans., *The Apostolic Fathers II* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Pr., 1950), 3. Columba Stewart, "Evagrius Ponticus and the 'Eight Generic Logismoi,'" in Newhauser, Richard, ed., *In the Garden of Evil: The Vices and Culture in the Middle Ages* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2005), 8.

angel of wickedness by its effect upon one.[36] Ill temper or bitterness is the first sign of the angel's presence, followed by desires of many deeds, the extravagance of (or rather the amount of care put into preparing) much eating and drinking, of many feasts, and of various and unnecessary foods (all apparently part of the desire of extravagance), desires for women, covetousness, haughtiness, and pride (along with whatever is like them). Once one correctly interprets these signs, one must do everything possible to keep from acting upon the angel's desires.[37]

Table 5

<center>Desires in Hermas</center>

Mandate 6:2.5
Epithumia praxeōn pollōn
Poluteleiai edesmatōn pollōn
Poluteleiai methusamatōn
Poluteleiai kraipalōn pollōn
Poluteleiai poikilōn trophōn kai oudeontōn
Epithumiai gunaikōn
Pleonexia
Huperēphania pollē tis
Alazoneia

Mandate 8:5 also contains a grouping which has at times been considered a second list of desires, specifically: theft, lying, robbery, false witness, covetousness, evil desire (literally desire as a deed), deceit, vainglory, pride, and "whatever is like these." The text of 8:5, however, does not call these desires, like it does the grouping in 6:2.5, but *ponēra erga*: evil deeds.

Even excluding the grouping of evil deeds in Mandate 8:5, the grouping in Mandate 6:2.5 is sufficient to show that the second century author of *Hermas* saw the need to warn his audience about an entity which could introduce desires directly into the human heart.

---

[36] Stewart, "Evagrius Ponticus," 9, n.23.

[37] Mand. 6:2.5.

Demonic Passions

Spirits of deceit came to the fore in the works of Origen of Alexandria. Origen develops his demonology primarily in four works: *De Principiis* (229-230); *Homilies on Numbers*, *Homilies on Joshua*, and *Homilies on Ezekiel* (all 239-242).[38]

Origen's demonology descended from his view of a fall from an original unity. To Origen, all pre-angelic intelligences once existed in a unity near God. At some point, certain intelligences chose to leave the divine unity, which led to the first fall. Those proto-angelic intelligences who fell the least became the angels; those who fell moderately eventually became human; and, those who fell furthest became demons.[39] A later fall amongst the angels also occurred, resulting in more humans and demons among the fallen intelligences.[40] Later students of Origen, including Evagrius, would conflate these two falls.[41] God created the material world to compensate for the loss of goodness due to Satan's loss in the first fall.[42]

The demons might have rejected the original divine unity and purpose, but they quickly assigned themselves a new purpose. Individually specializing in particular intentions, the demons set to work tempting humans to sin through succumbing to their intentions and thus to fall further from the Divine.[43]

In *De Principiis* 3, Origen discusses the operation of the spirits of deceit and of their intentions. To Origen, the initial intention is a seed of sin which will germinate unless the individual resists its first movement. Once the demon notices that the seed

---

[38] Pierre Nautin, *Origène: Sa Vie et Son Œuvre* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1977), 410-11.

[39] David Brakke, *Demons and the Making of the Monk* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Pr., 2006), 12.

[40] Jeffrey Burton Russell, *Satan: The Early Christian Tradition* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Pr., 1987), 126.

[41] Ibid., 126.

[42] Ibid., 130.

[43] Brakke, *Demons*, 12.

intention is not resisted, which Origen considers the first transgression on the part of the individual, then the demon presses and incites the individual as much as possible. The demon then provides opportunities to commit the actual sin. Origen considers those beset by such intentions, such as immoderate love, uncontrollable anger, or excessive sorrow, to be as oppressed and to suffer as much as those physically harassed by demons.[44] These intentions do not only proceed from demons, however. Humans can create their own intentions, which then have the same effect of causing the individual to sin and fall further from God.[45]

Under each spirit of deceit exists a hierarchy of intentions with spirits for each subintention.[46] Origen's system rests upon the predication that all intelligences were one in unity with the Divine, and hence all work essentially the same way. Various intelligences may have fallen further than others, but they all share the same thought processes: demons and humans are essentially cousins.[47]

Origen's intentions may have received some possible influence from the *Testament of Reuben*. At the least, Origen and *Reuben* share three intentions (*porneia*, *hupnos*, and *huperēphania*). Origen names many other intentions which the demons of deceit propose to humans. Such spirits of deceit whispered intentions to Judas Iscariot to cause him to betray Jesus of Nazareth to the Roman authorities.[48] Origen and *Reuben* also share the idea that humans can refuse intentions. Origen does conceive of good intentions which a human can accept to cause him to draw closer to God, but he spends most of his time in the surviving works analyzing the evil ones.

---

[44] *De Principiis* 3.2.2.

[45] Russell, *Satan*, 137, n.81.

[46] Ibid., 138, n.85.

[47] Brakke, *Demons*, 12.

[48] De Principiis 3.2.4.

One thing to note about Origen's intentions is the word by which he refers to them. Whereas almost all other authors in this study employ the word *logismoi* for the intentions, Origen uses the word *dialogismoi*. In the subsequent literature about the intentions, this is often not commented upon; many historians see *dialogismoi* as simply an idiosyncratic word choice of Origen's which is synonymous with *logismoi*. This is entirely possible, but one ought to note that to date no comprehensive study of Origen's use of the word *dialogismoi* has been made to either confirm or deny this assumption. This leaves open the possibility that Origen may have understood the intentions differently from, or understood different intentions from, other authors on the construct. Therefore, one might more safely say that Origen's *dialogismoi* are *potentially* synonymous with the *logismoi* before and after him.

Some possible hint of Aristotelian influence may exist in Origen's system of subintentions for main intentions, or subdemons for demons. Yet Origen need not have read Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, or even the Peripatetics, to have ingested the concept of grouping the intentions; the Alexandrian shows distinct Stoic influences on his work, and the Stoics had adopted many Aristotelian ideas. By the time of Origen, the idea of grouping intentions may also simply have become part of the Roman culture. The concept of the spirits of deceit using or representing a group of intentions would influence not only Alexandrian theology, but also the theology of those who at Origen's death were already beginning to disperse out of Upper and Lower Egypt and into the Egyptian desert.

Intentional Expansion

Origen's ideas about spirits of deceit and the intentions did not remain confined to Alexandria, but spread throughout the Roman Empire. In the 380s in Mesopotamia or Asia Minor, an unknown writer whom history would later confuse with

87

Macarius of Egypt composed the *Fifty Spiritual Homilies*.[49] In the homilies, the author

discusses some of Origen's intentions.

In homilies 5.6 and 15.50, the writer mentions:

Table 6

<div align="center">Passions in Pseudo-Macarius</div>

Homily 5.6, 15.50
Kenodoxia
Klopē
Methē
Moikheia
Philarguria
Philarkhia
Pleonexia
Porneia
Thumos
Tuphos
Zēlos

Pseudo-Macarius wrote that everybody has some intention they love so much

that they cannot detach themselves from it. Those who follow God, however, take no

pleasure in the pleasures or intentions of the world. Pseudo-Macarius envisioned the

intentions as operating as Origen had described: demons plant intentions in the mind,

the individual takes pleasure in the intention and that pleasure leads to action on the

intention if steps are not taken to repulse the intention.[50] The prudent individual turns

their mind in anger upon the intention as soon as it is introduced.[51] To allow the

unclean fire of the intention to burn would incinerate the mind and lead to eternal acts

of impurity.[52]

Origen's ideas also moved south from Alexandria into the Egyptian desert. The

late fourth century *History of the Monks in Egypt* purports to relate a visit to the

---

[49] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, trans. George A.
Maloney (Mahwah NJ: Paulist Pr., 1992), xii.

[50] Homily 5.6.

[51] Homily 15.51.

[52] Homily 15.50.

monasteries along the Nile.[53] Whether or not a real voyage prompted the writing of

the *Monks*, it does preserve the spirit of the Egyptian monasticism of the late fourth

century. According to the *Monks*, Origen's ideas survived in the monastic communities.

In *Monks* VII.4, the monk Apollo at Eshmunen is credited with struggling against

the demon of the sin of pride, who appears as an African.[54] Apollo taught the other

monks to drive away the 'evil thoughts' of Satan. The key to victory, according to

Apollo, is to refuse to even entertain the 'wicked and indecent' thoughts.[55] In XV.2-3,

the monk Pityrion at Deir al-Menun taught the discernment of spirits, particularly of

demons who correspond to particular intentions. The author specifically mentions the

demon of gluttony.[56] Defeating the intention of the demon defeats the demon itself.

Origen's joining of the intentions to spirits of deceit remained alive and well

for over a century after the Alexandrian's death. Somewhere in Mesopotamia or Asia

Minor, the author of the *Fifty Spiritual Homilies* knew of at least eight *logismoi*, and

the author of the *Historia Monachorum in Ægypto* specifically named two, but implied

more.

The letters of Antony present a different demonology than does the author of

the *Vita Antonii*. The letters show hints of composition during the late 330s into the

340s.[57] They also show the historical Antony's debt to Origen. Unlike the *Vita Antonii*

author later, Antony does not believe demons can be seen with the human eye.[58] They

---

[53] Norman Russell, trans., *The Lives of the Desert Fathers* (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Pub., 1981), 4-5.

[54] Ibid., 70.

[55] Ibid., 72.

[56] Ibid., 99.

[57] Samuel Rubenson, *The Letters of St. Antony* (Lund, Sweden: Lund Univ. Pr., 1990), 44-6.

[58] Letter VI.49-51.

operated by stirring the intentions in the mind of the monk.[59] These *dialogismoi* of

Origen appear in VI.46-48 and I.35-41. Antony conceived of the demons very much as

had Origen.

Other writers and monks knew about the *logismoi* as well. Perhaps the most

important lived during this time in Lower Egypt at Kellia and Nitria.

<p style="text-align:center">Synthesis in the Red Land</p>

The *logismoi* construct comes into its own in the works of Evagrius Ponticus, an

anchorite in the Egyptian desert. Born around 345 in Ibora in Helenopontus Province in

the Diocese of Pontus, Evagrius took a circuitous route to the Egyptian cells. Ordained

lector in the late 350s by Basil of Caesarea, and deacon in the 370s by Gregory

Nazianzus, he lived in Constantinople where he had an affair with a married

aristocratic woman. In light of the scandal, Evagrius left the city around 382.[60] The

next year he arrived in Egypt where he spent two years in the monastic cells in Nitria

then the final fourteen years or so of his life in Kellia until he died in 399 or 400.[61]

Evagrius learned of and refined his ideas on the intentions during his monastic life in

Egypt. For example, he attributed his teachings on wrath to one of his monastic

teachers: Macarius of Egypt.[62] How many other monks taught him the other *logismoi*,

he does not say. Regardless, Evagrius learned his lessons well. To Evagrius, demons

attack "men of the world" through deeds; coenobitic monks they attack through the

irritating habits of their brethren; and, anchorites through their thoughts. The attack

through intentions, Evagrius considered the worst kind of attack.[63] Evagrius saw these

---

[59] Rubenson, *Letters*, 87.

[60] William Harmless, *Desert Christians* (Oxford; Oxford University Pr., 2004), 314.

[61] Robert E. Sinkewicz, trans., *Evagrius of Pontus: The Ascetic Greek Corpus* (Oxford: Oxford University Pr., 2003), xvii-xviii.

[62] Ibid., xviii.

[63] Harmless, *Desert Christians*, 327.

demons as powerless, however, since although they could read hearts and thoughts, they could not force an individual to do anything against their will.[64]

Evagrius in the *Praktikos* conceived of the intentions as a construct of eight main intentions with subintentions following the main eight. A search through his ascetic corpus shows some of these subintentions and subdemons.

Table 7
<div align="center">Evagrius' Logismoi</div>

Praktikos Eight	Others
Akēdia	Anaisthesia
Gastrimargia	Aselgeia
Huperēphania	Deilia
Kenodoxia	Doxia tōn anthrōpōn
Lupē	Elaphria
Orgē	Kategoria
Philarguria	Merimna
Porneia	Mnesikakia
	Philautia
	Pikria
	Planos
	Phthonos
	Thumos

The works sampled show at least twenty-one intentions, with Evagrius likely recognizing more in other surviving works or in works which do not survive.[65]

Evagrius developed a monastic psychology from the spirits of deceit and the intentions which served to explain human actions and human decision making. In his surviving works, Evagrius shows the fullest development of the spirits of deceit as an organized spiritual force opposing man, and of the intentions as their ideas and weapons which could, if humans allowed, influence human actions. Evagrius owes a greater or lesser debt to all who preceded him from Aristotle, to Origen, to the *Reuben* author.

---

[64] Ibid., 328.

[65] The works sampled are: *Foundations of the Monastic Life, Eulogios, On the Vices Opposed to the Virtues, On the Eight Thoughts, Praktikos*, *On Thoughts*, and *Reflections*.

Evagrius attempted to explain the workings of the intentions and, in his own way, human psychology; yet, he did not write for an audience so large as all humanity. Evagrius wrote for monastic communities; everything he wrote specifically addressed a monastic audience.[66] Evagrius saw a small number of intentions as particularly dangerous for Egyptian monks. He mostly had decided upon these monastic *logismoi*, but always reserved the right to alter or rearrange their order.[67]

Excursus 3: Into the West

Evagrius composed most of his works on the intentions from cells in the Bishopric of Hermopolis, which included the ancient millennia-long capital of Egypt: Mennefer (Memphis). Around the time Evagrius died, the bishop of Alexandria engaged in an all-out war for control over the Memphite bishopric, and the monastic cells within. Many monks fled the intra-Christian persecution in the desert. One of these monks, named John Cassian (c.360-435), fled Egypt to spread the Evagrian intentions to the Latin West where they became enshrined in the construct of the Capital Vices through his two works the *Institutes* and the *Conferences*. Cassian applied the term *vitia* (usually translated as 'vices') to explain Evagrius' intentions to a Latin speaking audience and thence to a wider world.

Born around 360 in Dacia, Cassian would serve in Constantinople and Rome under the Patriarch of Constantinople John Chrysostom. Appointed to the priesthood in Rome by Pope Innocent I, Cassian founded two monasteries in the port of Massilia in southern Gaul before dying in the 430s.[68] Having moved to Gaul c.415, Cassian adapted the intentions to a Gaulish monastic movement becoming increasingly

---

[66] Richard Newhauser, *The Early History of Greed* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Pr., 2000), 49.

[67] Stewart, "Evagrius Ponticus," 18, n.79.

[68] John Cassian, *The Institutes* , trans., Boniface Ramsey (Mahwah NJ: The Newman Press, 2000), 3.

cœnobitic.[69] John Cassian developed from Evagrius' *Praktikos* eight intentions a list of eight *vitia* for the use of the Gaulish monks.[70]

Table 8

Cassianic *Vitia*[71]

Conferences 5.2
Gastrimargia
Fornicatio
Philargyria
Ira
Tristitia
Acedia
Cenodoxia
Superbia

This now stable list of eight *vitia* derives ultimately from Cassian's mind. Evagrius provided inspiration with the original, but fluid, eight intentions, but Cassian deserves the credit for codifying the intentions into eight set *vitia*. The rest of the intentions did not disappear, however, but survived to become *subvitia* in the new Cassianic genealogy of vice.[72]

John Cassian's codification of Evagrius' intentions dominated ecclesiastical thinking after its introduction into the Gaulish monasteries.

Conclusion

Aristotle in the fourth century BCE may be the earliest person to categorize the vices so as to systematically study them. While his idea to group the vices into categories influenced the construct of the *logismoi*, however, his Golden Mean, the path between impulsiveness and asceticism, did not.[73] In the third century BCE, the

---

[69] Newhauser, *Greed*, 61.

[70] Ibid., 64.

[71] Bloomfield, *Seven Deadly Sins*, 69. Carole Straw, "Gregory, Cassian, and the Cardinal Virtues," in Newhauser, Richard, ed., *In the Garden of Evil: The Vices and Culture in the Middle Ages* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2005), 38.

[72] Newhauser, *Greed*, 64.

[73] Howatson, *Oxford Companion*, 59.

Septuagint would see the concept of the intentions as arising in the human mind.[74]

The *Testament of Reuben* from the end of the second century BCE took the intentions and grouped them into eight intentions (although the author claimed them to be seven) and attributed them to spirits of deceit, with one deceitful spirit per intention.[75] Aristotle's influence returned in the first to second centuries CE work *On the Passions* inasmuch as the vices are systematized; the Golden Mean has disappeared entirely, however. The *Passions* groups the vices into four major categories, with all other vices as derivatives of the main vices.[76]

Some of the New Testament writing saw further development of the *logismoi* construct in the mid-first century CE. In the mid-first century, Mark saw evil intentions as proceeding from the human mind, like the Septuagint, but Corinthians E proposed that human action was needed to eliminate the intentions.[77] The mid- second century *Shepherd of Hermas* developed *Reuben*'s attribution of the intentions to demons and called for the discernment of spirits, with demons being recognized by the bitterness and ill temper they inspired.[78]

Origen in the mid-third century adopted *Reuben*'s concept of spirits of deceit linked to particular intentions. These demons then introduce the intentions into human minds. Once Origen's demons notice that their intentions are not squelched, they push the individual to act upon the intention.[79] The late third century pseudo-Macarius shared Origen's understanding, and urged individuals to turn in anger against

---

[74] Prov. 19:21. Jer. 4:14.

[75] *Reuben* 3:1-7.

[76] Glibert-Thierry, *Peri Pathōn*, 32-3.

[77] Mark 7:21-22. II Cor. 10:4.

[78] Lake, *Apostolic Fathers II*, 3. Stewart, "Evagrius Ponticus," 8. Mand. 6:2.5.

[79] De Principiis 3.2.2. Brakke, *Demons*, 12.

the intentions as the way to fight them.[80] By the late fourth century, Egyptian monks were employing Origen's understanding of the intentions along with the pseudo-Macarius' advice on how to fight them.[81] It was in this milieu of the anchoritic communities in late fourth century Lower Egypt that Evagrius Ponticus wrote. He systematized the intentions into eight main intentions. From the main eight intentions/demons, all subintentions and subdemons derived.[82]

This thesis' investigation has not concluded, however, as one thing remains: the *telōnia*. The final part of this investigation requires a return to Egypt at the closing years of the fourth century, where two controversies, the latest in a long line, threaten to rip the Christian religion and the Roman Empire asunder.

Excursus 4: The Vices of the Spheres

Sometime around 420 CE, Maurus Servius Honoratus wrote a magisterial commentary on Virgil's *Æneid*. This commentary would exert a significant influence on later medieval understanding of the Latin poem.[83] In the commentary on 6:714, Servius gives a list of vices and links them to the spheres:

Table 9

Servian Vices and Planets	
Vice	Planet
Torpor	Saturn
Iracundia	Mars
Libido	Venus
Cupiditas	Mercury
Desiderium	Jupiter

Morton Bloomfield calls this the "earliest direct evidence" for an astral origin for grouping the vices, and hence the *logismoi*.[84] Two major objections stand in the way

---

[80] Homily 5.6; 15.51.

[81] Russell, *Desert Fathers*, 70, 72.

[82] Sinkewicz, *Evagrius*, xvii-xviii. See also the *Praktikos*.

[83] Jan M. Ziolkowski and Michael C.J. Putnam, *The Virgilian Tradition*. (New Haven: Yale Univ. Pr., 2008), 623.

[84] Bloomfield, *Seven Deadly Sins*, 49.

of Servius' work representing direct evidence for an astral influence in the *logismoi* construct. The first major obstacle is that of date; Servius wrote around 420 CE. By this time, John Cassian was already working on, if he had not already completed, his codification of the *vitia*, and Evagrius had been dead for almost a quarter of a century. No evidence for heavenly spheres or planets appears in the ancestral constructs in Aristotle, or the *Testament of Reuben*, or the *On the Passions*.

The second objection lies in the vices themselves.

Table 10

Reuben vs. Evagrius' *Praktikos* Eight vs. Cassian vs. Servius

Reuben	Evagrius	Cassian	Servius
Adikia			
	Akēdia	*Acedia*	
Aplēsteia			
Areskeia kai Manganeia			
			Cupiditas
			Desiderium
	Philarguria	*Filarguria*	
	Gastrimargia	*Gastrimargia*	
Hupnos			
Huperēphaneia	*Huperēphania*	*Superbia*	
			Iracundia
	Kenodoxia	*Cenodoxia*	
			Libido
	Lupē	*Tristitia*	
Makhē			
	Orgē	*Ira*	
Porneia	*Porneia*	*Fornicatio*	
Pseudos			
			Torpor

Servius' vices seem to bear little resemblance to Cassian's or to Evagrius'. Even the *Testament of Reuben* seems to have no relation to Servius' astral vices.

The dates do not line up, and the vices seem to bear merely a coincidental relationship to the *vitia* and the intentions. Servius' construct of astral vices would influence later writers, perhaps in some way influencing Dante Alighieri's circles of Hell or spheres in Heaven, but to say that this fifth century writer presents the "earliest direct evidence" for an astral origin for a grouping of the intentions goes too far on too little evidence.

Chapter 6

Telōnia

Introduction

A folk belief still current in many Orthodox Christian nations, the *telōnia* are a series of tax booths on the road to Heaven. Within the sacred space of the *telōnia* construct, the soul feels intimidation, and possibly terror, as it stands trial at each *telōnion* for a particular sin. The *telōnia* function as a mechanism of the Particular Judgment: the personal judgment immediately post-mortem of each soul. Conviction at any *telōnion* means that the soul is dispatched to the temporary Hades until the Final Judgment. This chapter examines the origins of the construct and something of its evolution in eastern Christian culture.

Taxman

The construct of the *telōnia* had begun to take shape in the *Coptic Apocalypse of Paul* in the second to early third centuries CE where the Egyptian Gatekeeper, now called a *telōnēs,* stopped souls on their heavenly ascent. The *telōnēs,* particularly at the gate of the fourth heaven, could dispatch the guilty souls back to earth to reincarnate.[1] At the fifth gate, the *telōnēs* held an iron rod and his angelic staff used whips to herd the souls to judgment.[2]

By the mid-fourth century, the author of the *Life of Antony* saw not just Gatekeepers performing the tax collecting function, but aerial demons conflated with Gatekeepers: In the *Antony*, Antony sees aerial demons, which he calls the "bitter and cruel ones," blocking the ascent of his soul. The demons demand an accounting of the

---

[1] George W. MacRae and William R. Murdock, trans., "The Apocalypse of Paul (V,2)," in Robinson, James M., ed., *The Nag Hammadi Library* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1988), 258.

[2] Ibid., 259.

Antony's, and any post-mortem soul's, life from birth. When the aerial demons prove

unable to indict Antony, they must let him pass.[3]

The late fourth-century author of the Pseudo-Macarian *Fifty Spiritual Homilies*

knew of the Aerial Demons/Gatekeepers and their trials of post-mortem souls. In

Homily 43.9, he mentions aerial demons and how like 'tax collectors' (*telōnai*) they

wait to grab souls on the heavenly ascent.[4] John Chrysostom (349-407), Bishop of

Constantinople, wrote homilies in which he demonstrated knowledge of the post-

mortem demonic trial. In his homily *De Lazaro*, he even uses the word *telōnas*.[5] The

construct expressed in *Coptic Apocalypse of Paul* and the *Antony* continued to produce

comment, and from these works, the post-mortem trial continued to evolve.

Enter the Trial

Theophilus of Alexandria was born in Memphis around 345.[6] Theophilus took

his younger sister from Memphis after the death of their parents and took her to

Alexandria where they came to the attention of Athanasius of Alexandria, who cared

for them. Theophilus became the Alexandrian bishop's secretary, while his sister

married a young man from Theodosiou, where the couple would live and produce a son:

---

[3] Robert C. Gregg, trans., *Athanasius: The Life of Antony and the Letter to Marcellinus* (Mahwah NJ: Paulist Pr., 1980), 78-9.

[4] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, trans. George A. Maloney (Mahwah NJ: Paulist Pr., 1992), 222. Maloney translates the manuscript tradition known as Collection II. Collection II includes 50 homilies and is the manuscript tradition most employed in both Greek East and Latin West since the sixteenth century. The critical edition (Erich Klostermann, ed., *Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1964).) represents Collection III which has the pseudo-Macarius' work organized into 43 homilies called *logoi*. In Collection III, this passage is found at 14.15.

[5] Macaire, *Théologie Dogmatique Orthodoxe* (Paris: Librairie de Joel Cherbuliez, 1860), 627.

[6] Norman Russell, *Theophilus of Alexandria* (London: Routledge, 2007), 3.

Cyril.[7] By his 25th year in 370, Theophilus was already a member of the Alexandrian clergy. On 20 July 385, he succeeded Timothy I as bishop of Alexandria.[8]

Theophilus' hometown had remained a bastion of the old ways in an increasingly Christianized Roman Empire. Memphis housed many foreign quarters; influences from all around the eastern Mediterranean had flowed into Memphis since before the Macedonian period.[9] The Memphite Serapeum, the great stronghold of the ancient gods, lay four miles west of the city; mostly an uphill walk.[10] Both religious centers and economic engines, Serapeia had become critical to Late Antique Lower Egyptian cities. The Serapeum at Pemdjé (Oxyrhynchus) served as the center of the city's business district.[11] As early as the second century BCE it had become the main banking area, and by the second century CE the Serapeum had become home to the municipal office of taxation on sales in the surrounding market.[12] The spoliation of such rich targets proved a lucrative enterprise for the Christian bishopric at Alexandria.

Alexandria, the city of the Christian bishops, contained between 180-200,000 inhabitants in Theophilus' time, with Christians constituting a slim majority.[13] Alexandria's domain consisted of roughly 100 bishoprics: 56 in the province of Egypt, 19

---

[7] Ibid., 4.

[8] Ibid., 4. The Bishops of Alexandria were only called Archbishops in the fifth century, and Patriarch in the sixth century, but exercised patriarchal power by the early fourth century. See: William Harmless, *Desert Christians* (Oxford; Oxford University Pr., 2004), 16.

[9] Kent J. Rigsby, "Founding a Serapeum," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 42 (2001): 121.

[10] Ibid., 122.

[11] Russell, *Theophilus*, 23.

[12] John Whitehorne, "The Pagan Cults of Roman Oxyrhynchus," in Temporini, Hildegard (ed.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (Barlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1995), 3078-9.

[13] Russell, *Theophilus*, 4.

in the Thebaid, and 23 in Libya and the Pentapolis.[14] The bishop of Alexandria lived

in a former temple to the deified Caesar called the Caesareum, which sat on an

outcrop overlooking the Eastern Harbor. The bishopric held interests in Nile shipping,

and possessed agricultural land in every nome in Egypt due to the fact that bishopric

had never received tax exemption like the ancient temples, so the Roman government

never attempted to restrict its growth. The bishopric's business interests also

extended into the spoliation of Egyptian temples.[15] Hostile relations between

Alexandria and the Serapeia marked the period of the late fourth and early fifth

centuries. Part of Christian hostility against Sarapis might have stemmed from a

popular legend that Mark the Evangelist had met his death in Alexandria in 62 CE for

opposing the worship of the deity.[16]   Theophilus presided over the destructions of the

Serapeia at Alexandria and at Canopis. By decade's end, he had ensured the transfer

of relics of John the Baptist to a new martyrion founded upon the site of the

Alexandrian Serapeum.[17]

The last decade of the fourth century saw Theophilus consolidate his

bishopric's power over the other bishoprics within Egypt. In the Hermopolite bishopric,

Isidore and the Tall Brothers constituted the main organized opposition to Theophilus

from Nitria, too close to Alexandria for the patriarch's comfort. He could not get at

them directly so he attacked their beliefs in Origen as unorthodox.[18]

Theophilus' Festal Letter of 399 (now lost) may have been the spark that

ignited the Anthropomorphist Controversy, a heresy which grew out of the mystical

worship of many Egyptian monks who envisioned God in human form during their

---

[14] Ibid., 6.

[15] Norman Russell, *Cyril of Alexandria* (London: Routledge, 2000), 10.

[16] Bojana Mojsov, *Osiris: Death and Afterlife of a God* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), 116.

[17] Russell, *Theophilus*, 10.

[18] Ibid, 27.

contemplations and visions. Many aspects of this mystical contemplation traced back

to the works of Origen.[19] Contemporaneous accounts mention this letter as anti-

anthropomorphic in tone to the extent that monks in the Egyptian desert became

agitated and demonstrations against Theophilus erupted in Alexandria. The monastic

communities in Nitria promptly fell into a sort of civil war with factions forming to

defend Anthropomorphism and Origenism. Accounts from the time hint that Theophilus

might have encouraged the chaos at Nitria. In late 399 or early 400, Theophilus

summoned his bishops to Nitria for a synod to consider the question of the orthodoxy of

Origen's teachings. Thanks to a highly selective case presented by the patriarch, the

synod condemned Origen and his teachings.[20] After the ruling, the Origenist monks

barricaded themselves inside Nitria. Theophilus called for troops from the *praefectus*

augustalis to storm Nitria, but Isidore and the Tall Brothers escaped and made for the

frontier as Roman troops burned their cells.[21]

The Anthropomorphic Controversy led into the Origenist Controversy, very

likely due to the efforts of Theophilus himself.[22] The bishop, despite demonstrations in

Alexandria against his policies, appears to have used the 'trumped up'

anthropomorphic issue to justify Alexandrian intervention into Nitrian affairs

specifically, and into the affairs of the Bishopric of Hermopolis generally.[23] That which

Theophilus unleashed in Egypt in 399 would by 553 lead to the official condemnation of

---

[19] Massey Hamilton Shepherd, "The Anthropomorphic Controversy in the Time of Theophilus of Alexandria," *Church History 7* (1938): 265-6.

[20] Russell, *Theophilus*, 21.

[21] Ibid., 22.

[22] Ibid., 21.

[23] Ibid., 21.

Origen and Evagrius at the Second Council of Constantinople, and their *damnatio memoriæ* in the church.[24]

Theophilus emerges as a man adept at using judicial settings and 'trumped up' charges to get his way. Perhaps he imposed his judicial views upon the cosmos. In the *Sermon on Death and Judgment*, Theophilus writes of 'hostile powers' who arrest the post-mortem soul and indict it for its sins committed both knowingly and in ignorance. A formal trial ensues with angels acting as defense attorneys for the deceased who adduce the good deeds the soul committed in life. The post-mortem soul must wait in the custody of the demons until the final verdict. As Theophilus writes; "This is the hour of its anguish until it knows what the outcome is for it." If acquitted, the soul proceeds to Paradise and its demon prosecutors are censured. If guilty, the soul hears the phrase, "Let the impious be taken away, that he may not see the glory of the Lord," and it finds itself carried to Hades.[25] Theophilus does not specifically mention the heavenly ascent, though it is implied, neither does he mention which demons (aerial or chthonic) arrest the soul, but he does give the construct a formal trial setting within which to occur. Intimidation of the post-mortem soul now becomes the order of the day as the soul finds itself formally arrested and charged by demons within a sacred, if demonic, space.

Theophilus uses the trial to remind monks of the type of life they should live knowing the post-mortem trial awaits. His emphasis on the hour of death appears in other contexts such as when he tells a dying monk; "You are blessed, Abba Arsenius, because you have always had this hour in mind."[26]

---

[24] Ibid., 24.

[25] Ibid., 60-1. For the conviction statement, see Isaiah 26:10.

[26] Benedicta Ward, trans., *The Sayings of the Desert Fathers: The Alphabetical Collection* (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Pub., 1984), 82.

All of the elements of the *telōnia* construct had fallen into place by the death of Theophilus of Alexandria. An unknown writer in Egypt would combine all of the elements into a new alchemy.

Mysterium Coniunctionis

Tradition ascribes *On the Departure of the Soul* to Cyril of Alexandria, Theophilus' nephew and successor in the bishopric. Born around 378 in the Lower Egyptian town of Theodosiou, Cyril's mother had the benefit to have Theophilus, secretary to Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, and later himself Bishop of Alexandria, as her older brother.[27] Cyril succeeded to his maternal uncle's office with almost indecent speed: Theophilus died on Tuesday 15 October 412, and Cyril ascended to the bishopric on Friday 18 October. A taint of illegitimacy haunted Cyril's bishopric for the rest of his life.[28] Cyril died on 27 June 444.[29]

The style of the author of the *Departure* resembles texts from the Shenouda tradition in Egyptian ascetical literature, and a composition date of sometime during the fifth century appears likely.[30] *On the Departure of the Soul* presents the culmination of the aerial demons, heavenly ascent, and the Gatekeepers. Whether Pseudo-Cyril creatively combined the constructs into their final *telōnia* form, or whether he borrowed them from Theophilus whose surviving works do not show it, or borrowed them already developed either from the Egyptian religion or from Egyptian ascetic thought, one cannot say for certain.

---

[27] Russell, *Cyril*, 4.

[28] Lionel R. Wickham, *Cyril of Alexandria: Selected Letters* (Princeton: Oxford Univ. Pr., 1983), xii, xvi.

[29] Russell, *Cyril*, 58.

[30] Brian E. Daley, ""At the Hour of our Death": Mary's Dormition and Christian Dying in Late Patristic and Early Byzantine Literature," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 55 (2001): 76, n.25. G.J.M. Bartelink, "Τελωναι (Zöllner) als Dämonenbezeichnung," *Sacris Erudiri* 27 (1984): 13.

Pseudo-Cyril envisions six demon-manned *telōnia* obstructing the post-mortem

soul's heavenly ascent. The first five *telōnia* adjudicate sins relating to particular

senses: sins whatever comes through the mouth and tongue by lying, sins of vision, sins

of hearing, sins of smell, and sins of touch, with the sixth *telōnion* of miscellaneous

sins

Table 11

<div align="center">Pseudo-Cyril's Telōnia and Evagrius' Logismoi</div>

Pseudo-Cyril's *Telōnia*	Evagrius' *Praktikos* Eight
1. <u>***Telōnion*** of whatever comes through the mouth and tongue by lying</u>[31]	
Katalalia	
Horkos	
Epiorkia	
Argologia & *Phluaria*	
Mataiologia	
Gastrimargia parakhrēsis	*Gastrimargia*
Asotposia te oinou	
Ametrous gelōtas kai aprepeis	
Philēmatoi asemnoi kai aprepai	
Asmatai pornikai	
2. <u>***Telōnion*** of Vision</u>	
Aprepai theaseis[32]	
Periergos kai akhalinos horan	
Neumatōi dolioi	
3. <u>***Telōnion*** of Hearing</u>	
"*Ta akatharta pneumata dekhontai*"	
4. <u>***Telōnion*** of Smell</u>	
"*hē hosphrēsis osmēs te euōdous aleimmatōn, kai hēdonikēs osphrēseōs*"	
5. <u>***Telōnion*** of Touch</u>	
"*hosa di' haphēs kheirōn ponēra kai khalepa eprakhthēsan*"	
6. <u>Miscellaneous ***Telōnia***</u>	
Phthonos & *Zēlos*	
Kenodoxia & *Huperēphania*	*Kenodoxia* & *Huperēphania*
Pikria & *Orgē*	*Orgē*
Oxukholia & *Thumos*	
Porneia	*Porneia*
Moikheia	
Malakia	
Phonos & *Pharmakeia*	
"*kai tōn loipōn theostugōn kai miarōn praxeōn*"	

The first *telōnion* adjudicates sins such as slander, failing to keep oaths,

unmeasured and improper laughter, irreverent and improper kissing, and singing

pornographic songs. The second *telōnion* tries the sins of voyeurism and of "tricky

(head) nods" or sending deceptive signals. At the third *telōnion*, Pseudo-Cyril relates

---

[31] The original lacks a verb so this is a 'best guess' of the sense of the Greek.

[32] This thesis reads *theaseis* for *theai*. The text literally reads "things from an unfitting goddess."

that the sin under consideration is that of receiving impure spirits through hearing. This *telōnion* indicates that Pseudo-Cyril was familiar with at least the general concept of the intentions as connected with demons whether or not he was aware of the full *logismoi* construct. The fourth *telōnion* adjudicates sins of smell, specifically sweet-smelling smells associated with actresses and courtesans.

At the sixth *telōnion*, that of miscellaneous sins, the judges try souls for sins such as fornication, vainglory, arrogance, envy, anger, bitter (almost resentful) anger, sorcery, softness (from too much sex), and murder. Some of the sixth *telōnion*'s sins coincide with Evagrius' *logismoi*. This does not prove direct dependence, but it does indicate that Pseudo-Cyril and Evagrius likely both drew from sources accessible to both writers.

Pseudo-Cyril's *telōnia* also display a concern for relations within a monastic society. Failing to keep oaths, speaking nonsense and engaging in sophistry, unmeasured and improper laughter, and singing pornographic songs would be issues of particular concern to a monastic community concerned with minimizing distractions and maintaining discipline. The second *telōnion* with its sins of voyeurism and tricky nods could indicate a perceived need to regulate any potentially sexual behavior in a monastic environment. *Telōnia* four and five with sweet-smelling smells and wicked and unrestrained things done through touch of hands speak to sensual sins which can be the result of not avoiding the sins in the first *telōnion*. The sixth *telōnion* appears to be a 'catch all' where recognized sins not specifically related to the monastic concerns in *telōnia* 1, 2, 4, and 5 are relegated. Of particular interest are the fine distinctions in the sins of anger (i.e. bitterness, anger, bitter (almost resentful) anger, and wrath), which speak to the destruction anger can cause within a small (or enclosed monastic) community. The third *telōnion* of receiving impure spirits through hearing indicates that Pseudo-Cyril was familiar with the construct of impure spirits feeding or offering

sinful intentions to humans through hearing. The noun *logismos* is not employed in this context, but the idea is very much the same.

<div align="center">Diffusion throughout the Empire</div>

The idea of the post-mortem trial by demons continued to spread in the fifth century. Already known in Egypt, Constantinople, and in Mesopotamia or Asia Minor, the post-mortem demonic trial moved into the Balkans as well.

Diadochus served as bishop of Phōtikē in northern Epirus, modern northwest Greece and Albania, between roughly 451 and 486.[33] Almost nothing is known about Diadochus except he served as bishop at northern Epirus; he authored two known works: the *Century of Gnostic Chapters* and the *Vision of St. Diadochus*; and, he opposed the monophysites.[34] The *Century* shows that Diadochus had a secure knowledge of Evagrius' works, as well as of the post-mortem demonic trial.

Diadochus sees demons operating in the Evagrian style: demons feed *logismoi* to Christians in order to stir their passions into sin (*Century* 26).[35] The Christian must learn how to discern the good *logismoi* from the evil. These demons are not the only dangers for the Christian, however. *Century* 100 mentions the dangers awaiting the post-mortem soul. Upon death, the demons and angels gather; the demons detain the soul for trial. The *logismoi* and the demonic trial, even if not the name *telōnia*, survived into the Balkans.

Egypt, Constantinople, Mesopotamia (or Asia Minor, the location is uncertain), and the Balkans all discuss the demonic trials by the end of the fifth century. Interestingly enough, however, the literary trail seems to go cold after Diadochus. The next unequivocal reference to the *telōnia* appears in the tenth century. Does this

---

[33] Marcus Plested, *The Macarian Legacy* (New York: Oxford Univ. Pr., 2004), 133.

[34] Andrew Louth, *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition* (New York: Oxford Univ. Pr., 1983), 122.

[35] Édouard Des Places, ed., *Diadoque de Photicé: Œuvres Spirituelles* (Paris: Les Éditions du CERF, 1955), 161-3.

mean that belief in a post-mortem demonic trial died out? Belief may be the wrong

word. Pseudo-Cyril does not give any indication that he actually believed in the

ontological reality of the *telōnia*. Theophilus of Alexandria might have believed in the

telōnia, and the sole mention of the construct by Diodochus does not allow for any

definitive conclusion regarding his beliefs. This much is clear: unequivocal mentions of

the *telōnia* disappear from Greek after the end of the fifth century.

<div align="center">Excursus 5: Up the Ladder</div>

In current Orthodox debate regarding the *telōnia*, proponents often adduce the

Ladder of Divine Ascent by John Climacus to show knowledge of the construct in the

seventh century. This seventh century work described the ascetical life as progressing

through a series of steps as though steps on a ladder. Scholars know very little of John

himself save that he entered St. Catherine's Monastery at age 16, and eventually

became abbot of the monastery from c.630-650.[36]

In Step Seven, Climacus discusses the case of one Hermit Stephen.[37] During

this monk's dying days, he slipped into a visionary state, which appears very much like

a modern near death experience, in which he engaged with a lengthy question and

answer session with an unseen entity or entities. Climacus relates that the monk

Stephen died during one of these interrogation sessions, thus leaving behind confused

witnesses.[38] Proponents cite Step Seven as evidence that Climacus knows of the

telōnia construct, but Climacus leaves too few clues to make this identification stick.

Climacus does not use the word *telōnia* or any variant; he does not identify the entities

with whom the dying monk speaks; and, the interrogation occurs before the monk has

died. What Climacus records does seem to indicate some sort of interrogation, which

---

[36] John Climacus, *The Ladder of Divine Ascent*, trans., Colm Luibheid (Mahwah NJ: Paulist Pr., 1982), 5.

[37] Hierotheos, Metropolitan of Nafpaktos (Williams & Esther tr.), *Life after Death* (Levadia: Birth of the Theotokos Monastery, 1996), 71.

[38] Climacus, *Ladder*, 142.

one could interpret as a trial, but not enough constituent parts of the *telōnia* construct are present in the account to consider the monk Stephen's experience an experience of the *telōnia*.

Excursus 6: The Particular or Personal Judgment

In time, the *telōnia* became the mechanism for the Particular Judgment: the post-mortem personal judgment before the Final Judgment at the end of history. The Particular Judgment arose in the wake of the disillusionment that the *parousia* had failed to occur as the early Christians had hoped. The failure of the *eschaton* to arrive prompted the explanation that two judgments had really been meant.[39] In the Greek East particularly, the view arose that the soul and the body together form the self. Both the body and the soul commit sin, and when a person obeys God, both the body and the soul are obeying God. Immediately after death, the soul is ripped violently from the body. This lack of a physical body results in a soul "cut in half."[40] The *imago dei* resides not in the mind or the soul alone but in the union of the body and soul.[41] For that reason, God does not judge only the soul at the Last Judgment for to do so would constitute a judgment of only part of a person. A personal, or particular, judgment became necessary.

Tertullian (c.160-220) first conceptualized this interim judgment. He coined the phrase *refrigerium interim* to denote the interim state until the final judgment. In this state, souls had no bodies and so could not experience full joy or pain.[42] Jerome (c.347-420) considered the Particular Judgment eternal and unalterable. In his

---

[39] Jeffrey Burton Russell, *Satan: The Early Christian Tradition* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Pr., 1981), 136.

[40] Nicholas Constas, ""To Sleep, Perchance to Dream": The Middle State of Souls in Patristic and Byzantine Literature," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 55 (2001): 115.

[41] Ibid., 98.

[42] Jeffrey Burton Russell, *A History of Heaven* (Princeton; Princeton Univ. Pr., 1997), 69.

writings, he conflated the Particular Judgment with the Final Judgment, which merely

confirmed the personal judgment at the moment of death. He did not abolish the

Particular Judgment, but he seems to have rendered it irrelevant in later Latin

theology.[43] Jerome's ideas on this subject never penetrated the Greek East, however,

where the particular Judgment remained an active concern in Orthodox theology.

Revenge of the Tax Collectors

The *telōnia* reemerged in Constantinople in the mid-tenth century. This time

saw an explosion in the production of apocalyptic texts. These texts gave vivid

descriptions of otherworldly domains, as well as in depth analyses of the sins of the

citizens of the empire and how God would punish those sins. The *telōnia* construct

features in one of the most important works of this time: the *Life of Basil the

Younger*.[44]

The composition of the *Basil* dates to 956-959, during the last years of the reign

of Constantine VII Porphurogennētos (r.913-959).[45] Three episodes comprise the text:

first, an introduction to Basil the Younger which doubles as a criticism of Roman

society and politics in the 930s to 950s; second, the vision of Gregory and Basil's

---

[43] Ibid., 80.

[44] François Halkin, *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca, 3ème éd., Tome I: Aaron – Ioannes Baptista* (Bruxelles: Société des Bollandistes, 1957), 93-94. The earliest known manuscripts of the *Basil* are the Esphigmenou 44 (Esphigmenou Monastery, Mt. Athos) which dates to the twelfth century, the Paris 1547 (Bibliothèque nationale de France) which dates to 1286, and the Iviron 478 (Iviron Monastery, Mt. Athos) which dates to the thirteenth century. This thesis relies primarily upon the Athon. Ivir. 478, found in: S.G. Vilinskii, *Zhitie Sv. Vasiliya Novago* (Odessa: Tipografia "Tekhnik'", 1911), 5-142. Also consulted was the A.N. Veselovskii, *Razskaniya Olasti Russkago Dukhovnago Stikha* XI-XVII (St. Petersburg: Tipografia Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk', 1889), which reflects the sixteenth century Moscow 249 and Moscow 250. The Esphigmenou 44 remains unpublished as of the time of this writing. Also see Christine Angelidi, *O Bios tou Basileiou tou Neou* (Ioaninna, Greece: University of Ioannina, 1980); Evelyne Patlagean, "Sainteté et Pouvoir," in Hackel, Sergei, ed., *The Byzantine Saint* (Crestwood NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Pr., 2001), 90-91; and, Lennart Rydén, "The Life of St. Basil the Younger and the Date of the Life of St. Andreas Salos," *Okeanos* 7 (1983): 569.

[45] Rydén, "Life of St. Basil," 576.

common friend Theodora and the *telōnia* and finally, an apocalypse of the Last Judgment.

The purported author of the *Basil*, Gregory of Thrace, portrayed himself as a young man of wealthy means who possessed a small estate in the country.[46] In the story Gregory met and detailed his interactions with an elderly Basil the Younger, although Basil often disappears from the *Basil* for long periods of time.[47] Within the narrative, Basil only revealed his true nature as a holy man to a chosen few; to the rest, he appeared mad.[48]

In the second episode, Basil's recently deceased servant Theodora reveals to Gregory her experience with twenty-one *telōnia*. Fearsome angels at each *telōnion* employ the recorded acts/deeds of the deceased in order to reach a verdict. If at any *telōnion* the otherworldly judges return a verdict of guilty, then they drag the soul down into Hell. Souls that have properly repented of the sin adjudicated, or who have a saint willing to bribe the judges at the *telōnion* for them, may advance to the next tribunal.[49] Any sins confessed properly in life, the Holy Spirit would render invisible in the *telōnia* scrolls. The judges might know that the sins had been recorded, but they could neither see them nor use them in their verdicts. Those who took communion as frequently as possible, and who believe and pray correctly, could rise to Paradise immediately upon death. On the other hand, those souls entirely too impure and sinful descend straight to Hades at death to await their final damnation at the Last Judgment, when their bodies and souls would be reunited in Hell. At these tribunals,

---

[46] George Every, "Toll Gates on the Air Way," *Eastern Churches Review* 8 (1976): 142.

[47] Rydén, "Life of St. Basil," 576.

[48] Paul Magdalino, "'What We Heard in the Lives of the Saints We Have Seen with our own Eyes:' The Holy Man as Literary Text in Tenth-century Constantinople," in Howard-Johnson, James and Paul Antony Hayward, ed., *The Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Pr., 1999), 90.

[49] Every, "Toll Gates," 146.

the judges used every trick possible to convict the soul. The soul found these tribunals an assault upon its senses as the demons at each tribunal confronted the soul with its sins in multisensory tribunals designed to intimidate the soul and condemn it to Hades.

The ordeal, and the assault upon the senses, begins just before the moment of death. Pitch-black demons, called 'Ethiopians' by Gregory, visit the dying. The deathbed demons howl and bark at the dying in an attempt to frighten and confuse the soon-to-be deceased soul. Death personified then approaches the dying and begins to sever the soul from the body piecemeal; the dying soul feels numbness in each body part severed from it. The sense of taste becomes involved in the dying process as Death personified forces the dying to drink a potion so bitter that it revolts the soul itself. After the bitter draught, Death takes the soul. After the soul is ripped, unpleasantly, from its body, the deathbed demons fight the angels over it. These pitch-black demons argue with the angels that the soul is too reprobate to even bother going through the *telōnia*.

Assuming that the deathbed demons lose their argument, the soul then proceeds to the *telōnia*. At the tribunals, the judges assault the rest of the soul's senses. In the *telōnion* which adjudicates fornication, the demon judge in charge wears a garment covered with bloody foam which gives off an offensive stench. Smell also emerges at the *telōnion* which adjudicates sodomy and incest where the main demon judge appears covered with stinking pus.

The judges assault the sense of hearing as well. The demons offended the soul's hearing mainly by reading to the accused lists of its sins, which through twenty to twenty-two *telōnia* could exhaust anybody's ears. At the *telōnion* adjudicating anger and ruthlessness, the chief magistrate angrily barks orders at the lesser demons to confront the soul with its anger. In some tribunals, the demons scream the charges at the soul; in others, they taunt the soul with their confidence that the soul will fail and fall into Hades. Upon surviving a *telōnion,* the demons may even shout parting shots at

the soul. Throughout the trials, the demons often grab the soul and attempt to violently wrench it away from the angels accompanying it through its journey.

The judges assault the hearing by shouting at and taunting the soul; they offend the olfactory sense with the bodily fluids covering them; they fight with the angels and try to rip the soul from their angelic chaperones; and Death itself force feeds the dying a bitter potion after severing the soul from its body. But without a doubt, the sense of sight provides the major stimulation of the *telōnia* experience. The judges confront the soul with many scrolls upon which they have recorded every unconfessed sin committed during life. Every hasty or blasphemous word ever uttered appears on these scrolls for the soul to read. At the *telōnion* judging gluttony, the demons parade before the deceased the very cups from which it drank when either consuming more than its share or becoming intoxicated. And as already mentioned, the very appearances of the demons inspire fear and revulsion. At the *telōnion* which judges murder and other forms of physical violence, the judges appear in serpent and toad forms. Some entities along the way have the appearance of bronze, with wrathful looks;[50] other beings, specifically those who man the final seven *telōnia* have the faces of serpents, adders, and horned beasts.[51] At the final *telōnion*, that of hard-heartedness, the main judge appears as a desiccated figure.

The ordeal of standing before the *telōnia* judges, if not the journey from death through the *telōnia*, acts to intimidate the soul. The intimidation, terror, and sensual stimuli all act to keep the soul off balance. In short, the moment of death ushers the soul into a liminal period of potential terror and sensual overload; a liminal period which Theodora survives, because of Basil's intercession, to enter Paradise.[52]

---

[50] Ibid., 146.

[51] Ibid., 147.

[52] Fletcher S. Bassett, *Legends and Superstitions of the Sea and of Sailors in All Lands and at All Times* (Chicago: Belford, Clarke & Co., 1885), 314-315. Although the *telōnia* construct has not survived as an afterlife belief in Greece as strongly as it has in other

The Sins of Empire

In the *Basil*, Gregory deals at length with what he perceives to be the sins of the Roman Empire. In the first episode, he deals with sins which he personally has committed (at least in the narrative). In the second episode he details, through the *telōnia*, the sins with which all human beings must wrestle. In the third, he takes aim at the sins of emperors, patriarchs, and other government officials.

Gregory appears to have employed the *telōnia* of Pseudo-Cyril and the *logismoi* of Evagrius Ponticus in his *telōnia*. In all, seven of Evagrius' *Praktikos logismoi*, and more of Pseudo-Cyril's *telōnia*, found their way into Gregory's tenth-century *telōnia*.

Orthodox nations, it has found its own afterlife. Medieval Greek sailors appear to have credited the eerie electrical phenomenon to the demons judging souls at the *telōnia*. Through semantic shift, the word for the sacred space where demons judged souls became the word for St. Elmo's Fire which the sailors thought the work of those demon judges.

Table 12

Gregory's Telōnia vs. Pseudo-Cyril's sins vs. Evagrius' *Praktikos* Eight

Gregory (Cod. Athon. Ivir. 478)[53]	Pseudo-Cyril (*Telōnion*)	*Praktikos* Eight
1. *Katalalia*	*Katalalia* (1)	
2. *Loidoria*		
3. *Phthonos*	*Phthonos* (6)	
4. *Pseudos*		
5. *Thumos, Orgē*	*Thumos* (6), *Orgē* (6)	*Orgē*
6. *Huperēphania*	*Huperēphania* (6)	*Huperēphania*
7. *Mōrologia, Aiskhrololgia*		
8. *Tokos, Dolos*		
9. *Akēdia, Kenodoxia*	*Kenodoxia* (6)	*Akēdia, Kenodoxia*
10. *Philarguria*		*Philarguria*
11. *Methē*		
12. *Mnēsikakia*		
13. *Epaoidē, Pharmakoi, Magoi, Magissai, Kludōniotai*[54]	*Pharmakeia* (6)	
14. *Gastrimargia*	*Gastrimargia parakhrēsis* (1)	*Gastrimargia*
15. *Eidōlolatreia*		
16. *Andromania, Paidophthoros*		
17. *Moikheia*	*Moikheia* (6)	
18. *Phonos*	*Phonos* (6)	
19. *Klopē*		
20. *Porneia*	*Porneia* (6)	*Porneia*
21. *Asplagkhnia, Sklērokardia*		

In the recent Orthodox polemical debate, some have maintained that the *Departure of the Soul* cannot date to Cyril of Alexandria's time but must date to at least the tenth century. Such authors point to similarities between Pseudo-Cyril's *telōnia* and those of Gregory of Thrace's. The conclusion is drawn that Gregory of Thrace created the *telōnia* in the tenth century, and another author used the *Basil* to write the *Departure of the Soul*. The arguments adduced to disprove fifth-century authorship of the *Departure of the Soul* are unconvincing. Most scholars of the *Departure of the Soul* date it as a fifth century work. Whoever Pseudo-Cyril was, he understood addressed the Egyptian monastic thoughtworld of the fifth century.

---

[53] The version of the *Basil* employed is the Iviron Monastery MS 478 from Mt. Athos, which dates to sometime in the thirteenth century. The Cod. Athon. Iver. 478 is the oldest known manuscript of the *Basil* to contain the *telōnia* episode.

[54] The noun *kludōniotai*, possibly meaning 'tossers,' is a difficult noun rendering an unclear meaning in this passage. It is possible that *kludōniotai* is a scribal error for *kludōnistai*, meaning 'knockers' or 'dashers.' This emendation would still give an unclear meaning, but *kludōnistai* is known magical vocabulary which would fit in the context of the thirteenth *telōnion* along with chance, sorcery, warlocks, and witches.

The similarities do suggest, however, that Gregory of Thrace might have known of Pseudo-Cyril's homily and employed it as a basis for his *telōnia* in the *Basil*. Where Pseudo-Cyril's fifth century *telōnia* adjudicated sins/passions/*logismoi* of concern to Egyptian monks, Gregory reworked them to include vices common to tenth century Constantinople. Where Pseudo-Cyril had grouped collections of sins/passions/vices into six *telōnia*, Gregory spread them out, with his new vices, into twenty or twenty-two (depending upon the manuscript tradition) *telōnia*. This could explain how such specifically monastic *logismoi* such as *kenodoxia* wound up in Gregory's tenth-century work. On the other hand, the presence of *akēdia*, which Pseudo-Cyril did not include among his *telōnia*, hints that Gregory may well have read Evagrius' works himself.

But the world of tenth-century Constantinople, the commercial hub under control of the Macedonian Dynasty, was not the world of the anchorites in Lower Egypt. The pagan ancient Egyptian religion did not lurk in Constantinople's recesses and did not still see its rites performed at temples at Elephantine. That religion had long since dissolved. New temples to mercantilism competed with churches to Christ Pantokrator. Gregory's *telōnia* expanded the love of money *logismos* to include usury, which he linked with treachery, and fraud. Mercantilism had flooded the empire with sin.

The urge to overtake if not control one's competitors might also have expressed itself in the sins of sorcery and incantations at the thirteenth *telōnion*. The overloaded thirteenth *telōnion* could also reflect the spiritual turmoil that afflicted the Balkans during Gregory's time in the form of Bogomilism. The Bogomils arose in the First Bulgarian Empire during the reign of Tsar Peter I (c.927-969).[55] Initially the group may have mainly opposed the Constantinopolitan patriarchate, but in time Bogomil beliefs differed considerably from Orthodox to include strict dualism, total rejection of the

---

[55] George Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, trans. Joan M. Hussey (New Brunswick NJ: Rutgers U. Pr., 1969), 268.

Theotokos, and an adoptionist Christology. Bogomils practiced a harshly ascetic

lifestyle which rejected all pomp and ecclesiastical ritual. The sect also rejected all

aristocracies linked to the patriarchal church.[56] Gregory might have considered such a

sect as little better than a coven, and its doctrines and rites as sorcery and black

magic.

Holding grudges became another major sin in Gregory's schema, as did lying,

verbal abuse, slander, and foul language. One senses that Gregory saw a breakdown in

civility in his Roman Empire. Also in disarray to Gregory was self-discipline. In a city in

which mercantilism bred treachery and ill manners, sensual sins ran amok. Gregory

saw homosexual lust and pederasty infesting his empire. Finally, the last *telōnion*

reveals the worst of the empire's sins: hard heartedness and lack of compassion. To

Gregory, the Macedonian Renaissance under the emperor Romanus I Lakapēnos (r.920-

944) had come at the expense of the souls of the citizens.

One of the best admirals in the empire, Romanus ended the regency of Patriarch

Nicolas I Mysticus on 29 May 919 when he marched his forces into Constantinople.

Supplanting Nicolas' role as regent to the 14 year old emperor, Romanus married his

daughter Helena to Constantine the next month.[57] Romanus' ambitions did not stop

with the regency. On 24 September 920, Romanus ascended to the rank of Caesar; and

on 17 December of that year, he raised himself to Augustus to become co-emperor with

Constantine.[58] In time, he raised three of his sons to the purple as well: Christopher

(r.921-931), Stephen (r.924-945), and Constantine Lakapēnos (r.924-945). Christopher

he arrogated to co-emperor over Constantine VII himself.[59]

---

[56] Ibid., 269.

[57] John Julius Norwich, *Byzantium: The Apogee* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1994), 136.

[58] Ostrogorsky, *Byzantine State*, 264.

[59] Andrew Sharf, *Byzantine Jewry: From Justinian to the Fourth Crusade* (New York: Schocken Books, 1971), 96.

Romanus battled the Muslims and Bulgars to revive the empire's fortunes. Internally, he engaged in a struggle against the landed aristocracy who bought the peasant landholdings upon which the empire based its taxation and military strength. Much of his reign he spent refashioning the aristocracy into a legally recognized class he could confine if not control.[60] Although a capable emperor, Romanus never became a beloved monarch; his illegal seizure of the throne from Constantine VII rankled the people of Constantinople throughout his reign. After his removal from power in 944 by his two surviving sons Stephen and Constantine Lakapēnos, Romanus retired to a monastery while the people of Constantinople demanded through public demonstrations their rightful emperor.[61]

The patriarchs of Constantinople fare little better in the *Basil*'s denunciations. The *Basil* takes particular aim at Patriarch Nicolas I Mysticos. Holding the patriarchate twice, the first time from March 901 to February 907 and the second time from May 912 until his death in 925, Nicolas served as regent for the young Constantine but considered him an illegitimate emperor.[62] When Tsar Symeon I (r.893-927) of Bulgaria had attacked Constantinople in August 913, Nicolas capitulated to the attacker then crowned him emperor in the presence of Constantine. Soon thereafter, a palace *coup* deposed Nicolas as regent and nullified Symeon's coronation.[63] Nicolas enthusiastically supported Constantine's effective usurpation by Romanus Lakapēnos; Nicolas remained close to the upstart until his own death in 925.[64] To bolster Romanus I's claim to the throne, Nicolas convened a church council in July 920 which declared Leo VI's (r.886-912) fourth marriage illicit and thus the result of that union, Constantine VII, of

---

[60] Steven Runciman, *Byzantine Civilization* (Cleveland: Meridian Books, 1956), 83.

[61] Norwich, *Byzantium*, 157.

[62] Ostrogorsky, *Byzantine State*, 261.

[63] Ibid., 262-3.

[64] Ibid., 271.

questionable provenance.[65] In the end the church council declared Constantine

legitimate, but in such a way so as to leave a stain against his claim to the purple.

Perhaps this explains Basil's condemnation of Nicolas as a perjurer and something of a

sadist. In the *Basil*, Gregory rails against the patriarch, to whom he refers as a

destroyer or defeater of the people (*hēttelaos*) and a rustic (*agricola*).[66]

Nicolas' eventual successor Patriarch Theophylact served as a figurehead

pontiff.[67] Denounced as uncanonically elected by Basil, Theophylact owed his position

entirely to his father: Emperor Romanus I, who had raised him to the patriarchate on 2

February 933.[68] Ascending to the patriarchal throne at age 16, Theophylact had

demonstrated no interest in theological or ecclesiastical matters; only his 2000 horses

kept his attention.[69] Nonetheless, Pope John XI sent legates to his installation.[70] After

half a century of such patriarchs, one does not wonder why Basil only associated with

one priest who refused to celebrate the liturgy because of the corruption of the

patriarchs.[71]

As a remedy, Gregory espouses the idea later championed by Symeon the New

Theologian of individual salvation. To Gregory, only monks ought to care for others;

laymen ought to concentrate upon their own salvation.[72] At the time of the

---

[65] Ibid., 271.

[66] Alexander Kazhdan, *A History of Byzantine Literature: 850-1000* (Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation, 2006), 187.

[67] Steven Runciman, *The Byzantine Theocracy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 103.

[68] Ostrogorsky, *Byzantine State*, 272.

[69] Norwich, *Byzantium*, 160.

[70] Sharf, *Byzantine Jewry*, 97.

[71] Magdalino, "'What We Heard,'" 94.

[72] Kazhdan, *Byzantine Literature*, 189. Veselovskii, *Razskaniya*, 2,103.4-5. Vilinskii, *Zhitie*, 328.28-31.

composition of the *Basil*, Symeon served Constantine VII as one of his courtiers. This could indicate that this idea of Symeon's had already become a topic for debate during future theologian's formative years.

The *Basil* does not stand as the sole apocalypse or sociopolitical commentary from its period. The mid-tenth century witnessed the production of several such works. The *Vision of Kosmas the Monk*, the *Apocalypse of Anastasia*, and the *Vision of Daniel* represent only three more samples from this genre.

The *Vision of Kosmas the Monk* dates to the second quarter of the tenth century.[73] In the story Kosmas died only to have the Aerial Demons attempt to steal his soul.[74] Liberated by the apostles Andrew and John, Kosmas tours the heavenly realm (which strongly resembles the court at Constantinople) and also sees the torments of the sinners in seven lakes on the way back to his resuscitation.[75] In the *Apocalypse of Anastasia*, which likely dates to the reign of Basil II Boulgaroktonos (r.976-1025), Anastasia dies for three days during which time she tours the Other World.[76] She sees the formal sin recording bureau of Heaven, visits the Throne, and tours Hell where she discovers that emperors, bishops, officials, and priests receive their eternal punishments separately from the rest of the sinners.[77] The *Vision of Daniel*, a Jewish apocalypse written around the end of Constantine VII's reign in 959, seems intent on proving Jewish loyalty to the Macedonian Dynasty.[78] The *Daniel*

---

[73] Kazhdan, *Byzantine Literature,* 192. Christine Angelidi, "La Version Longue de la Vision du Moine Cosmas," *Analecta Bollandiana* 101 (1983): 73.

[74] Angelidi, "Vision du Moine Cosmas," 76.

[75] Kazhdan, *Byzantine Literature*, 192.

[76] Jane Baun, *Tales from Another Byzantium: Celestial Journey and Local Community in the Medieval Greek Apocrypha* (Cambridge: Cambridge U. Pr., 2007), 18.

[77] Ibid., 13-15.

[78] Andrew Sharf, "A Source for Byzantine Jewry under the Early Macedonians," *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher* 20 (1970): 316.

remembers Romanus I as a persecutor of the Jews and as an emperor "who will set his face against God but he will not succeed."[79] Constantine, on the other hand, the *Daniel* pronounces worthy of divine protection as "many foes . . . gather about him to ensnare him."[80] The Daniel ends with a description of God's wrath causing thunderstorms, earthquakes, famine, and piles of unburied corpses about the Roman Empire.[81]

The mid-tenth century clearly witnessed an increase in the production of apocalyptic literature, but why? Why did so much interest in sin and eschatology at this time as opposed to other times in the Empire's life?

Why so many Apocalypses?

By the death of Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogennētos in 959, the Roman Empire had endured a half century of turmoil. Crowned in 912 at age 7, Constantine VII presided over a reign that saw multiple attempts to marginalize him if not eliminate his dynasty. Besides Romanus I and Patriarch Nicolas I Mysticus, Symeon, tsar of the Bulgarian Empire, also attempted to assume Constantine's throne.

After having assumed the style 'Symeon, in Christ, Emperor of the Romans' in 913, the Bulgarian tsar maintained a campaign against the empire.[82] He invaded northern Greece and reached the Gulf of Corinth in 918.[83] Besides claiming the imperial dignity and trying to conquer the Roman Empire, the self-proclaimed emperor also defied the church and on his own authority raised the Archbishop of Bulgaria to a Patriarch. But Symeon's pretensions crumbled due in part to a failed invasion of

---

[79] Sharf, *Byzantine Jewry*, 101.

[80] Sharf, "Source for Byzantine Jewry," 305.

[81] Ibid., 305-306.

[82] Ostrogorsky, *Byzantine State*, 266. His title in Greek: *Sumeōn en Khristō Basileus Rhōmeōn*.

[83] Ibid., 264.

Roman-allied Croatia in 926, followed by his death in May 927.[84] By 930, the Roman

Empire had restored its sovereignty over Serbia and reduced the Bulgarian Empire to

virtual vassalage.[85]

Deliverance from Bulgar pretensions and conversions of Slavic peoples to

Christianity, with other factors, combined to give the Roman kingship a messianic

luster during the Macedonian Dynasty. Romans began to call Constantinople 'New

Jerusalem' or 'Second Jerusalem' in line with the messianic *Zeitgeist*.[86] More

importantly, that messianic luster stuck to the Macedonian royal family. Literature

during this period reflected an interest in spiritual concerns, and an obsession with sin.

One other factor may have influenced Constantinopolitans to dwell upon matters of sin

and the other world.

In the summer of 934, just as harvests around the empire were returning to

normal, the Eldgjá volcano in Iceland erupted. The largest basaltic flood eruption in

historic time caused global climatological changes.[87] Estimates based upon Greenland

core data and near source ejecta suggest that the Eldgjá eruption belched about 220

megatons of sulfur dioxide and roughly 450 megatons of sulfuric acid into the

atmosphere over a period of three to eight years.[88] Literate societies worldwide

reported unusual meteorological phenomena.

---

[84] Dimitri Obolensky, "The Empire and its Northern Neighbors, 565-1018," in Obelensky, Dimitri, *Byzantium and the Slavs: Collected Studies* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1971), II 508.

[85] Ibid., II 509.

[86] Dimitri Stremooukhoff, "Moscow the Third Rome: Sources of the Doctrine," *Speculum* 28 (1953): 85.

[87] Richard B. Stothers, "Far Reach of the Tenth Century Eldgjá Eruption, Iceland," *Climatic Change* 39 (1998): 723.

[88] T. Thordarson *et al.*, "New Estimates of Sulfur Degassing and Atmospheric Mass-Loading by the 934 AD Eldgjá Eruption, Iceland," *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research* 108 (2001): 51.

In December 934, temperatures in Constantinople plummeted and many fields froze for up to four months. Severe famine resulted in the city to the point where the survivors found themselves too few to bury the dead expeditiously. Romanus had to construct temporary housing to shelter the city's homeless from the harsh winter, and he instituted government handouts of food and money to the rest of the citizens.[89] Unusually heavy snowfalls in winter 934-5 plagued Baghdad; chilly rains fell upon Nisibus, and the fields proved unproductive at Susa in Persia.[90] In what is now northeastern Germany, Widukind of Corvey recorded that sometime before the death of the Holy Roman Emperor Henry I in July 936, a day occurred in which a cloudless sky obscured the sun, which had cast a red light.[91] The Irish *Annals of Clonmacnoise* recorded the same phenomenon. The winter after the blood-red sun, the lochs of Ireland froze over so solidly that invading Danes used them as invasion routes throughout the island.[92] In 940, the unusually heavy winter had created snowpacks which melted to cause the Tigris River to widely flood Mesopotamia.[93] Famines afflicted Frankish Germany, Upper Burgundy, and Italy, and epidemics broke out in 941 in Baghdad and Cairo.[94] Even China experienced swings between unusually harsh to unusually mild winters well into the 950s.[95]

Yet, ecological determinism cannot explain *in toto* the rise of works such as the *Life of Basil the Younger*, and a revival of the *telōnia* dialogue, even if climatological

---

[89] Stothers, "Far Reach," 720.

[90] Jie Fei and Jie Zhou, "The Possible Climactic Impact in China of Iceland's Eldgjá Eruption Inferred from Historical Sources," *Climactic Change* 76 (2006): 445.

[91] Stothers, "Far Reach," 718.

[92] Ibid., 719.

[93] Fei and Zhou, "Possible Climactic Impact," 445.

[94] Stothers, "Far Reach," 721.

[95] Fei and Zhou, "Possible Climactic Impact," 448-450.

distress did constitute a major component in the ascendance of the genre. The confluence of the Bulgar threat, the usurpation of Romanus Lakapēnos, the loss of ethics and morals in the face of prosperous mercantilism, the heresy of Bogomilism in Thrace and Bulgaria, and what must have appeared as inexplicable climatological changes, might have suggested a world turning upside down and an apocalypse approaching. One would fully expect the people of the Roman Empire to have looked to their religious worldview for answers, to have found sin as the root cause, and to have produced the *Basil* and other apocalypses.

With the messianic Constantine VII firmly at the helm, the late 950s in Constantinople found the Roman Empire at the beginning of resurgence. The empire had retaken Anatolian territory from the Muslims; Roman culture was penetrating the Balkans and transforming the hitherto barbarian Slavs into little Constantinopolitans; the Macedonian Dynasty under Constantine VII had reasserted its imperial prerogatives after decades of suppression by an upstart family and possible overthrow; and, the climate had finally begun to stabilize.

So why did the apocalyptic literature arise after matters had begun to improve? A modified J-Curve theory of revolution may shed some light in this instance. Briefly, the J-Curve theory states that revolutions, as a rule, do not occur when matters are in decline, nor do revolutions occur as long as matters remain at their worst. Only once things improve then suffer even a slight setback do pent up frustrations and aggression break forth into revolution.[96] In the case of the mid tenth-century Roman Empire, a spiritual revolution broke out. After two decades of climate change, war, and political instability, the forces of discontentment found expression only after the death of Romanus I in 943. The setback which rankled could have been the bureaucracy. Basil condemns the bureaucrat Simonas on more than one occasion in the *Basil*.

---

[96] James C. Davies, "Toward a Theory of Revolution," *American Sociological Review* 27 (1962): 5-7.

Gregory gave vivid descriptions, as did the other composers of apocalypses, of the sins of the citizens of the empire and how God would punish those sins. Yet for all of his efforts *vis-à-vis* sin, Gregory did not think that hope had abandoned Constantinople. In the *Basil*, he saw opportunity for salvation for the Roman Empire now that two decades of darkness had finally passed. In the *Basil*, Gregory employed descriptions of Theodora's journey through the *telōnia* to emphasize to his audience the severity of the problems facing the Roman Empire and the rewards for overcoming them according to God's law. To this end, the *telōnia* proved particularly effective.

Lament for the Sinful Soul

The *telōnia*, provided new life by Gregory of Thrace, continued in the Byzantine thoughtworld. The *Dioptra* of Philip Monotropos dates to two recensions by the poet in 1090 and 1096-7.[97] A lament, the *Dioptra* deals with the unwilling severing at death of the sinful soul from its body.[98] The Particular and Final Judgments also serve as material for the poem. Scholars know almost nothing about Philip other than he lived in an interesting time. Philip wrote the *Dioptra* while Alexius I Komnēnos (r.1081-1118) ruled the Roman Empire. During the initial writing of the *Dioptra*, Tzachas, Emir of Smyrna, and his Patzinak allies besieged Constantinople by land and by sea. Emperor Alexius hired Cuman mercenaries from south Russia to engage the besiegers in battle. The 29 April 1091 battle at Mt. Levunion resulted in the annihilation of the Patzinaks and the end of the siege.[99] But the Cumans turned on the Romans and by 1094 had joined the Serbian leader Vukan, Župan of Rascia in his campaign against Constantinople, which Alexius managed with difficulty to defeat.[100]

---

[97] Baun, *Another Byzantium*, 128.

[98] Ibid., 127.

[99] Ostrogorsky, *Byzantine State*, 360.

[100] Ibid., 361.

Philip wrote the second recension at a time when the First Crusade funneled

through Constantinople. Alexius had to deal with a mob which threatened imperial

security, but he managed to ship the crusaders through his domain while preserving the

city.[101] The emperor even managed to turn the crusade to the empire's advantage as

he used the chaos and fear spread by the crusaders to recapture Smyrna, Sardis, and

Ephesus. He had even managed to reattach Nicaea to the empire after the crusaders

had captured it in June 1097.[102]

During this tumultuous time, Philip wrote his poem. The *Dioptra* deals only

briefly with the *telōnia*. "You found the rulers of the air, my soul, / you found the

telōnia of the vicious demons," begins the portion of the poem in which the construct

appears.[103] Philip may not list all of the sins that the telonia adjudicate, just as he

does not mention the total number of *telōnia*, but he does mention specifically the sins

of *zēlos*, *phthonos*, *huperēphania*, *pseudos*, *kathexis pathōn* (retention of passion), and

porneia. The *Dioptra* does not engage in a discussion of the *telōnia* construct, but its

selection of sins does appear deliberate. It shows that the *telōnia* construct remained

alive and well at the end of the eleventh century and still served for poetic criticisms

of a writer's world.

Terror of the Theotokos

The fall of Constantinople on 29 May 1453 did not stop the *telōnia* from

spreading around the Orthodox world. The Cretan recension of the *Apocalypse of the*

Theotokos, found in manuscript is Cl.11 Nr.19 in the Marcian Library in Venice, was

written in a Cretan dialect of Greek, but in the Latin alphabet.[104] The particular

---

[101] Ibid., 363.

[102] Ibid., 364.

[103] Emmanuel Auvray (ed.), *Les Pleurs de Philippe* (Paris: Librairie A. Franck, 1875), 44-45. Lines 123-130. Translation by the author.

[104] Richard M. Dawkins, "A Cretan Apocalypse of the Virgin," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 30 (1929-30): 300-1.

Cretan dialect locates the redactor as hailing from east of Ida in eastern Crete.[105]

Richard Dawkins analyzed the dialect and placed the composition between 1645 and

the end of the Venetian occupation of Crete in 1669.[106]

Venice had taken Crete from the Roman Empire in 1211 after the sacking of

Constantinople in the Fourth Crusade. The maritime republic created Crete into a

microcosm of Venice itself, with most of the land divided as feudal estates in the hands

of Venetian families, and even a governor of the island called a Doge.[107] At the time of

the composition of the Cretan *Apocalypse of the Theotokos*, the Ottoman Empire

threatened Venetian control of the island. The port of Canea fell to the Turks in

August 1645; the port of Rettimo fell in November 1646.[108] In the summer of 1647, the

Ottoman Empire began a 22 year siege of Candia. On 6 September 1669, Candia

surrendered.[109] Venice left the island forever twenty days later.[110]

The Cretan recension differs from all other known recensions of the *Apocalypse*

of the Theotokos in adding a dialogue (after f.237r) between a monk and an angel

regarding the *telōnia*. According to the angel, three days after death the soul

proceeds up a ladder at each step of which the soul encounters demons (*dhemones ta*

opia legussi telognia) who judge the soul from the books of the soul's sins. If the soul

survives the *telōnia* then it has a vision of Heaven and adores God.[111] If the soul does

---

[105] Ibid., 303.

[106] Ibid., 304.

[107] John Julius Norwich, *A History of Venice* (New York: Random House, 1989), 546.

[108] Ibid., 547, 550.

[109] Ibid., 547, 551.

[110] Ibid., 547, 557.

[111] Dawkins, "Cretan Apocalypse," 302.

not survive then demons drag the souls off of the ladder of heaven to hell.[112] The

Cretan *Theotokos* does not concern itself with lists of sins adjudicated at the *telōnia*,

or with the number of *telōnia*, but with the terror that the sacred space induces in the

souls judged. The apocalypse mentions the "grievous *telōnia*" more than once, as well

as the demons who scream their charges at the souls.[113] By the seventeenth century in

Crete, the adjudication of sins seems to have taken a backseat to the inculcation of

terror.

Conclusion

The nearly fully-formed *telōnia* appear in the second to third century CE in the

Coptic Apocalypse of Paul. A Gatekeeper (now called *telonēs*), such as the Gatekeeper

of the fourth heaven, could dispatch souls from their gates back to Earth to

reincarnate.[114] In the fourth century, Theophilus of Alexandria composed a homily to

Egyptian monks about hostile powers that arrest the post-mortem soul and indict it.

Angels act as defense attorneys introducing evidence of good deeds. The final verdict

can be conviction, which results in the soul falling into perdition, or acquittal, which

sees the soul loosed to continue its journey, and its prosecutors censured.[115]

Early fifth-century Egypt provides the birthplace for the full construct as

Pseudo-Cyril expounded six *telōnia* adjudicating entire categories of sins, and

significantly some *logismoi* as well. With the exception of Diadochus of Phōtikē in the

Balkans, the *telōnia* construct seems to become largely quiescent until the tenth

century when the *Life of Basil the Younger* presented Constantinopolitans with a

systematized framework of twenty-one *telōnia*. Even though it directly borrowed from

---

[112] Richard M. Dawkins, "Soul and Body in the Folklore of Modern Greece," *Folklore* 53 (1942): 133.

[113] Richard M. Dawkins, "Krētikē Apokalupsis tēs Panagias," *Herakleion* 2 (1948): 495.

[114] MacRae and Murdock, "Apocalypse of Paul," 258-9.

[115] Russell, *Theophilus*, 60-1.

Pseudo-Cyril's *telōnia*, the *Basil* reworked the construct into something unique where demonic judges taunt, intimidate, and physically assault the post-mortem soul at the tribunals. Conviction at any single *telōnion* means expulsion to the temporary Hades until the Final Judgment.[116] The *telōnia* continue in the Greek-speaking world through the eleventh-century *Dioptra*, the seventeenth-century *Apocalypse of the Theotokos*, and in several Greek redactions of the *Basil* created between the twelfth and nineteenth centuries.[117]

This inquiry has presented all the elements necessary to answer both the primary and secondary theses. It only remains for the conclusion to state the answers.

---

[116] Every, "Toll Gates," 146-7.

[117] Dawkins, "Cretan Apocalypse," 303. Dawkins, "Krētikē Apokalupsis," 495. For a list of Greek redactions of the Basil, see Angelidi, *Bios tou Basileiou*, 3-4.

Chapter 7

Conclusion

This thesis investigated constructs across Greece, Canaan, Babylon, and Egypt in order to find the answers to two major questions: 1) What are the origins of the *telōnia*; and, 2) Did the *logismoi* evolved from the *telōnia*?

Answer to the Primary Thesis

The *telōnia* have never received official sanction from any of the seven ecumenical councils, or from any modern synod. At least one bishop of Alexandria in the late fourth through early fifth centuries, and one bishop of Constantinople in the fourth century, betray knowledge of the construct, but they never declared it official doctrine.

Yet the *telōnia* did not arise from either of these bishops, but evolved slowly from three major constructs: the heavenly ascent from Greece, the aerial demons from Canaan, and the Gatekeepers, who extend in time back to the earliest days of Egyptian civilization. The *Life of Antony*, the *On the Departure of the Soul*, the *Sermon on Death and Judgment* by Theophilus of Alexandria, and the *Coptic Apocalypse of Paul* stand as key surviving works for the *telōnia* construct. Four works composed in Egypt from the mid-second to the early-fifth centuries gave final shape to the *telōnia* construct, a construct predicated primarily upon the Egyptian Gatekeeper construct which evolved over thousands of years.

Answer to the Secondary Thesis

The *logismoi* construct evolved from constructs mainly in Canaan and Egypt, but it is not nearly as old as the *telōnia*'s ancestral constructs. One would have expected the older constructs to have influenced the younger. The evidence, however, does not support such a contention. Only five authors show knowledge of both the *telōnia* (or proto-*telōnia*) construct and the *logismoi* (or proto-*logismoi*) constructs: the

129

author of the *Life of Antony*, Diadochus of Phōtikē, pseudo-Macarius, Origen, and the author of the *On the Departure of the Soul*.

The *Antony* author mentions *logismoi* in separate sections from the episode of the soul flight. Neither episode relates to the other. If the *Antony* author connected these constructs then he left no indication of it. The same applies to pseudo-Macarius. The constructs appear in different homilies and appear to have no relation to one another. Diadochus of Phōtikē discusses the constructs in separate chapters. Origen, on the other hand, deals with these constructs at length.

Origen knows of both the heavenly ascent and the *logismoi*, but nothing in Origen indicates that the heavenly ascent influences the *logismoi*. Origen's *dialogismoi* descend directly from the *Testament of Reuben*. The Alexandrian developed his ideas on the *dialogismoi* in works such as the *De Principiis* and the *Homilies on Numbers* beginning in the 220s; he reckons with the heavenly ascent construct while debating Celsus in the 240s. This is not to say that Origen knew no version of the heavenly ascent construct in the 220s; he certainly did as his concept of the fall of the intelligences and their potential to rise back to the Divine shows. His *dialogismoi*, however, show the influence of *Reuben*. At no time do the *dialogismoi* show any evidence of being descended from or related to any heavenly ascent or planetary spheres. The evidence does not support a conclusion that any heavenly ascent, much less the *telōnia*, influenced Origen's *dialogismoi*.

Only the author of the *On the Departure of the Soul* knows of both the *telōnia* and *logismoi* constructs and uses them together. This use leads to a problem, however; the *Departure* author used the *logismoi* and *telōnia* together only after Evagrius had formulated the *logismoi* and while Cassian worked with the *vitia*. Cassian's works betray no knowledge of the *telōnia*; if he knows of the construct, he does not mention it.

130

All of this leads to one conclusion: neither the *telōnia* nor any of its ancestral

constructs influenced the creation of the *logismoi*

APPENDIX

CHRONOLOGY OF TEXTS

Table 14

Chronology of All Texts

Date	Text	Author	Where Composed	Construct
c.3050 BCE[1]	Pyramid Texts		Egypt	G
2200-1991 BCE[2]	Coffin Text 404		Egypt	G
Pre-1550 BCE[3]	*Book of the Dead* 125		Egypt	G
1350-1334 BCE[4]	*Book of Gates*		Egypt	G
c.1200 BCE[5]	Ras al-Shamra Tablets		Ugarit	A
Pre-1213 BCE[6]	*Book of Caverns*		Egypt	G
c.1000-935 BCE[7]	J		Jerusalem	A
641-609 BCE[8]	Deuteronomic History		Jerusalem	A
c.421 BCE[9]	*Peace*	Aristophanes	Athens	H
Post-385 BCE[10]	*Symposium*	Plato	Athens	H
c.361-339 BCE[11]	*Empedotimus*	Heraclides	Athens	H
c.361-339 BCE[12]	*On the Soul*	Heraclides	Athens	H
c.361-339 BCE[13]	*On Those in Hades*	Heraclides	Athens	H
c.360-348 BCE[14]	*Timaeus*	Plato	Athens	H
334-323 BCE[15]	*Nicomachean Ethics*	Aristotle	Athens	L
Pre-300 BCE[16]	*Job*			A
299-200 BCE[17]	Septuagint		Alexandria	L
c.225-175 BCE[18]	*Book of Watchers*			A
Pre-175 BCE[19]	*Daniel*			A
109-106 BCE[20]	*Testament of Reuben*			L
Post-30 BCE[21]	*First Letter of Breathings*		Egypt	G
1-299[22]	*Peri Pathōn*	Ps.-Andronicus	Athens (?)	L
55-56[23]	*Romans*	Paul of Tarsus		L
56[24]	*Corinthians* E	Paul of Tarsus		SF
69-75[25]	*Gospel of Mark*		Caesarea Philippi (?)	A
73-92[26]	*I Peter*			A
75-90[27]	*Ephesians*			A
80-85[28]	*Gospel of Luke*			A
80-100[29]	*Gospel of Matthew*			L
Pre-148[30]	*Shepherd of Hermas*			L
150-155[31]	*Second Apology*	Justin Martyr	Rome	A
150-255[32]	*Coptic Apoc. of Paul*		Egypt	G, H
c.180[33]	*Adversus Haereses*	Irenaeus	Gaul	H
180-250[34]	*First Apoc. of James*		Egypt(?)	G, H
c.220[35]	*De Principiis*	Origen	Alexandria (?)	A
239-242[36]	*Homilies on Numbers*	Origen	Alexandria (?)	L
239-242[37]	*Homilies on Joshua*	Origen	Alexandria (?)	L
239-242[38]	*Homilies on Ezekiel*	Origen	Alexandria (?)	L
c.249[39]	*Contra Celsum*	Origen	Alexandria (?)	A
Pre-268[40]	*Zōstrianos*			H
Late 330s-340s[41]	Letters of Antony	Antony	Egypt	L
350-399[42]	*Historia Monachorum in Ægypto*		Egypt	L
357-8[43]	*Vita Antonii*	Athanasius	Alexandria	A, G, H
c.380[44]	*Fifty Spiritual Homilies*	Ps.-Macarius	Asia Minor(?)	L
383-400[45]	*Eulogios*	Evagrius	Egypt	L
383-400[46]	*Foundations*	Evagrius	Egypt	L
383-400[47]	*On the Eight Thoughts*	Evagrius	Egypt	L
383-400[48]	*On the Vices*	Evagrius	Egypt	L
383-400[49]	*On Thoughts*	Evagrius	Egypt	L
383-400[50]	*Praktikos*	Evagrius	Egypt	L
383-400[51]	*Reflections*	Evagrius	Egypt	L
385-412	*On Death and Judgment*	Theophilus Alex.	Alexandria	T
385-412	*On Repentance*	Theophilus Alex.	Alexandria	T
412-444	*Peri Echodou Psuchēs*	Cyril Alex.	Alexandria	T
415-430[52]	*Conferences*	John Cassian	Gaul	L
415-430[53]	*Institutes*	John Cassian	Gaul	L
451-486[54]	*Centuries*	Diadochus Fōtikē	Epirus	L, T

Table 14
Chronology of All Texts (Cont.)

Date	Text	Author	Where Composed	Construct
956-959[55]	*Bios tou Basileiou tou Neou*	Gregory of Thrace	Constantinople	T
1090-7[56]	*Dioptra*	Philip Monotropos	Constantinople	T
1645-1669[57]	Cretan *Apocalypse of the Theotokos*		E. Crete	T
1952	*Seven Deadly Sins*	Morton Bloomfield		L
1980	*The Soul After Death*	Seraphim Rose		T

[Indicate the constructs in each text: Aerial Demons = A; Gatekeepers = G; Logismoi = L; Soul Journey = S; Telonia = T]

Table 15

Chronology of Gatekeeper Texts

Date	Text	Author	Where Composed	Construct
c.3050 BCE[58]	Pyramid Texts		Egypt	G
2200-1991 BCE[59]	Coffin Text 404		Egypt	G
Pre-1550 BCE[60]	*Book of the Dead* 125		Egypt	G
1350-1334 BCE[61]	*Book of Gates*		Egypt	G
Pre-1213 BCE[62]	*Book of Caverns*		Egypt	G
Post-30 BCE[63]	*First Letter of Breathings*		Egypt	G
150-255[64]	*Coptic Apoc. of Paul*		Egypt	G, H
180-250[65]	*First Apoc. of James*		Egypt(?)	G, H
357-8[66]	*Vita Antonii*		Alexandria	A, G, H

Table 16

Chronology of Heavenly Ascent Texts

Date	Text	Author	Where Composed	Construct
c.421 BCE[67]	*Peace*	Aristophanes	Athens	H
Post-385 BCE[68]	*Symposium*	Plato	Athens	H
c.361-339 BCE[69]	*Empedotimus*	Heraclides	Athens	H
c.361-339 BCE[70]	*On the Soul*	Heraclides	Athens	H
c.361-339 BCE[71]	*On Those in Hades*	Heraclides	Athens	H
c.360-348 BCE[72]	*Timaeus*	Plato	Athens	H
150-255[73]	*Coptic Apoc. of Paul*		Egypt	G, H
c.180[74]	*Adversus Haereses*	Irenaeus	Gaul	H
180-250[75]	*First Apoc. of James*		Egypt(?)	G, H
Pre-268[76]	*Zōstrianos*			H
357-8[77]	*Vita Antonii*	Athanasius	Alexandria	A, G, H

[Indicate the constructs in each text: Aerial Demons = A; Gatekeepers = G; Logismoi = L; Soul Journey = S; Telonia = T]

Table 17

Chronology of Aerial Demon Texts

Date	Text	Author	Where Composed	Construct
c.1200 BCE[78]	Ras ash-Shamra Tablets		Ugarit	A
c.1000-935 BCE[79]	J		Jerusalem	A
641-609 BCE[80]	Deuteronomic History		Jerusalem	A
Pre-300 BCE[81]	*Job*			A
c.225-175 BCE[82]	*Book of Watchers*			A
Pre-175 BCE[83]	*Daniel*			A
69-75[84]	*Gospel of Mark*		Caesarea Philippi (?)	A
73-92[85]	*I Peter*			A
75-90[86]	*Ephesians*			A
80-85[87]	*Gospel of Luke*			A
150-155[88]	*Second Apology*	Justin Martyr	Rome	A
c.220[89]	*De Principiis*	Origen	Alexandria (?)	A
c.249[90]	*Contra Celsum*	Origen	Alexandria (?)	A
357-8[91]	*Vita Antonii*	Athanasius	Alexandria	A, G, H

[Indicate the constructs in each text: Aerial Demons = A; Gatekeepers = G; Logismoi = L; Soul Journey = S; Telonia = T]

Table 18

Chronology of *Logismoi* Texts

Date	Text	Author	Where Composed	Construct
334-323 BCE[92]	*Nicomachean Ethics*	Aristotle	Athens	L
299-200 BCE[93]	Septuagint		Alexandria	L
109-106 BCE[94]	*Testament of Reuben*			L
1-299[95]	*Peri Pathōn*	Ps.-Andronicus	Athens (?)	L
55-56[96]	*Romans*	Paul of Tarsus		L
80-100[97]	*Gospel of Matthew*			L
Pre-148[98]	*Shepherd of Hermas*			L
239-242[99]	*Homilies on Numbers*	Origen	Alexandria (?)	L
239-242[100]	*Homilies on Joshua*	Origen	Alexandria (?)	L
239-242[101]	*Homilies on Ezekiel*	Origen	Alexandria (?)	L
Late 330s-340s[102]	Letters of Antony	Antony	Egypt	L
350-399[103]	*Historia Monachorum in Ægypto*		Egypt	L
c.380[104]	*Fifty Spiritual Homilies*	Ps.-Macarius	Asia Minor(?)	L
383-400[105]	*Eulogios*	Evagrius	Egypt	L
383-400[106]	*Foundations*	Evagrius	Egypt	L
383-400[107]	*On the Eight Thoughts*	Evagrius	Egypt	L
383-400[108]	*On the Vices*	Evagrius	Egypt	L
383-400[109]	*On Thoughts*	Evagrius	Egypt	L
383-400[110]	*Praktikos*	Evagrius	Egypt	L
383-400[111]	*Reflections*	Evagrius	Egypt	L
415-430[112]	*Conferences*	John Cassian	Gaul	L
415-430[113]	*Institutes*	John Cassian	Gaul	L
451-486[114]	*Centuries*	Diadochus Fōtikē	Epirus	L, T
1952	*Seven Deadly Sins*	Morton Bloomfield		L

[Indicate the constructs in each text: Aerial Demons = A; Gatekeepers = G; Logismoi = L; Soul Journey = S; Telonia = T]

Table 19

Chronology of *Telōnia* Texts

Date	Text	Author	Where Composed	Construct
385-412	*On Death and Judgment*	Theophilus Alex.	Alexandria	T
385-412	*On Repentance*	Theophilus Alex.	Alexandria	T
412-444	*Peri Echodou Psuchēs*	Cyril Alex.	Alexandria	T
451-486[115]	*Centuries*	Diadochus Fōtikē	Epirus	L, T
956-959[116]	*Bios tou Basileiou tou Neou*	Gregory of Thrace	Constantinople	T
1090-7[117]	*Dioptra*	Philip Monotropos	Constantinople	T
1645-1669[118]	Cretan *Apocalypse of the Theotokos*		E. Crete	T
1980	*The Soul After Death*	Seraphim Rose		T

[Indicate the constructs in each text: Aerial Demons = A; Gatekeepers = G; Logismoi = L; Soul Journey = S; Telonia = T]

Notes for Appendix

[1] Hornung, Erik. (Lorton, tr.) *The Ancient Egyptian Books of the Afterlife*. (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Pr., 1999) 1. Lehner, Mark. *The Complete Pyramids*. (New York: Thames & Hudson, 1997) 31.

[2] Mueller, Dieter. "An Early Egyptian Guide to the Hereafter." *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 58 (1972): 124.

[3] Hornung, Erik. (Lorton, tr.) *The Ancient Egyptian Books of the Afterlife*. (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Pr., 1999) 13.

[4] Hornung, Erik. (Lorton, tr.) *The Ancient Egyptian Books of the Afterlife*. (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Pr., 1999) 55.

[5] Beyerlin, Walter. (ed.) *Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. (Philadelphia: Westminster Pr., 1978) 186.

[6] Hornung, Erik. (Lorton, tr.) *The Ancient Egyptian Books of the Afterlife*. (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Pr., 1999) 83.

[7] Speiser, E.A. *Genesis*. (New York: Doubleday, 1964) 44. Cross, Frank Moore. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*. (Harvard: Harvard Univ. Pr., 1997) 260-1.

[8] Cogan, Mordechai. *I Kings*. (New York: Doubleday, 2001) 97.

[9] Guthrie, W.K.C. *Orpheus and Greek Religion*. (New York: W.W. Norton, 1966) 185.

[10] Layton, Bentley. *The Gnostic Scriptures*. (Garden City: Doubleday, 1987) 121. Allen, R.E. *The Symposium*. (New Haven: Yale Univ. Pr., 1991) 5n6.

[11] Gottschalk, H.B. *Heraclides of Pontus*. (Oxford: Clarendon Pr., 1980) 2.

[12] Gottschalk, H.B. *Heraclides of Pontus*. (Oxford: Clarendon Pr., 1980) 2.

[13] Gottschalk, H.B. *Heraclides of Pontus*. (Oxford: Clarendon Pr., 1980) 2.

[14] Plato. (Lee, tr.) *Timaeus and Critias*. (London: Penguin, 1977) 22, 146.

[15] Aristotle. (Irwin, tr.) *Nicomachean Ethics*. (Indianapolis: Hackett Pub. Co., 1985) xiv.

[16] Pope, Marvin H. *Job*. (New York: Doubleday, 1973) xl.

[17] Jaffee, Martin S. *Early Judaism*. (Bethesda: Univ. of Maryland Pr., 2006) 64-65.

[18] Wright, Archie T. *The Origin of Evil Spirits*. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005) 15.

[19] Hartman, Louis E. and Alexander A. DiLella. *The Book of Daniel*. (New York: Doubleday, 1978) 13.

[20] Bloomfield, Morton. *The Seven Deadly Sins*. (East Lansing: Michigan State College Pr., 1952) 44.

[21] Smith, Mark. *Traversing Eternity: Texts for the Afterlife from Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt*. (New York: Oxford Univ. Pr., 2009) 499.

[22] Pseudo-Andronicus of Rhodes. (Glibert-Thierry, ed.) *Peri Pathōn*. (Leiden: Brill, 1977) 32.

[23] Koester, Helmut. *Introduction to the New Testament*. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 2000) 111.

[24] Furnish, Victor Paul. *II Corinthians*. (Garden City: Doubleday, 1984), 46.

[25] Marcus, Joel. *Mark 1-8*. (New York; Doubleday, 2000) 39.

[26] Elliott, John H. *I Peter*. (New York: Doubleday, 2001) 138.

[27] Taylor, Walter F. Jr. *Ephesians*. (Minneapolis; Augsburg Pub. House, 1985) 25.

[28] Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*. (New York: Doubleday, 1970) 57.

[29] Koester, Helmut. *Introduction to the New Testament*. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 2000) 177.

[30] Lake, Kirsopp. (tr.) *The Apostolic Fathers II*. (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Pr., 1950) 3. Stewart, Columba. "Evagrius Ponticus and the 'Eight Generic Logismoi.'" In: Newhauser, Richard. (ed.) *In the Garden of Evil: The Vices and Culture in the Middle Ages* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2005) 8.

[31] Blunt, A.W.F. (ed.) *The Apologies of Justin Martyr*. (Cambridge; Cambridge Univ. Pr., 1911) 110-111.

[32] Robinson, James M. (ed.) *The Nag Hammadi Library*. (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1988) 257.

[33] Unger, Diminic J. and John J. Dillon. *St. Irenaeus of Lyons Against the Heresies*. (Mahwah NJ: Newman Pr., 1992) 4.

[34] Funk, Wolf-Peter. "The First Apocalypse of James." In: Schneemelcher, Wilhelm, *et al. New Testament Apocrypha, vol.1*. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Pr., 2003) 315.

[35] Kelly, Henry Ansgar. *Satan: A Biography*. (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Pr., 2006) 194.

[36] Nautin, Pierre. *Origène: Sa Vie et Son Œuvre*. (Paris: Beauchesne, 1977) 410-11.

[37] Nautin, Pierre. *Origène: Sa Vie et Son Œuvre*. (Paris: Beauchesne, 1977) 410-11.

[38] Nautin, Pierre. *Origène: Sa Vie et Son Œuvre*. (Paris: Beauchesne, 1977) 410-11.

[39] Frend, W.H.C. "The Failure of the Persecutions in the Roman Empire." *Past and Present* 16 (1959): 10. Nautin, Pierre. *Origène: Sa Vie et Son Œuvre*. (Paris: Beauchesne, 1977) 412.

[40] Layton, Bentley. *The Gnostic Scriptures*. (Garden City NY: Doubleday, 1987) 122.

[41] Rubenson, Samuel. *The Letters of St. Antony*. (Lund, Sweden: Lund Univ. Pr., 1990) 42.

[42] Russell, Norman. (tr.) *The Lives of the Desert Fathers*. (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Pub., 1981) 4-5.

[43] Grant, Michael. *The Roman Emperors*. (New York; Barnes & Noble, 1997) 244.

[44] Pseudo-Macarius. (Maloney, tr.) *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*. (Mahwah NJ: Paulist Pr., 1992) xii.

[45] Sinkewicz, Robert E. (tr.) *Evagrius of Pontus: The Ascetic Greek Corpus*. (Oxford: Oxford University Pr., 2003) xvii-xviii.

[46] Sinkewicz, Robert E. (tr.) *Evagrius of Pontus: The Ascetic Greek Corpus*. (Oxford: Oxford University Pr., 2003) xvii-xviii.

[47] Sinkewicz, Robert E. (tr.) *Evagrius of Pontus: The Ascetic Greek Corpus*. (Oxford: Oxford University Pr., 2003) xvii-xviii.

[48] Sinkewicz, Robert E. (tr.) *Evagrius of Pontus: The Ascetic Greek Corpus*. (Oxford: Oxford University Pr., 2003) xvii-xviii.

[49] Sinkewicz, Robert E. (tr.) *Evagrius of Pontus: The Ascetic Greek Corpus*. (Oxford: Oxford University Pr., 2003) xvii-xviii.

[50] Sinkewicz, Robert E. (tr.) *Evagrius of Pontus: The Ascetic Greek Corpus*. (Oxford: Oxford University Pr., 2003) xvii-xviii.

[51] Sinkewicz, Robert E. (tr.) *Evagrius of Pontus: The Ascetic Greek Corpus*. (Oxford: Oxford University Pr., 2003) xvii-xviii.

[52] Cassian, John. (Ramsey, tr.) *John Cassian: The Institutes*. (Mahwah NJ: The Newman Press, 2000) 3.

[53] Cassian, John. (Ramsey, tr.) *John Cassian: The Institutes*. (Mahwah NJ: The Newman Press, 2000) 3.

[54] Plested, Marcus. *The Macarian Legacy*. (New York: Oxford Univ. Pr., 2004) 133.

[55] Rydén, Lennart. "The Life of St. Basil the Younger and the Date of the Life of St. Andreas Salos." *Okeanos* 7 (1983) 576.

[56] Baun, Jane. *Tales from Another Byzantium: Celestial Journey and Local Community in the Medieval Greek Apocrypha*. (Cambridge: Cambridge U. Pr., 2007) 128.

[57] Dawkins, Richard M. "A Cretan Apocalypse of the Virgin." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 30 (1929-30) 304.

[58] Hornung, Erik. (Lorton, tr.) *The Ancient Egyptian Books of the Afterlife*. (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Pr., 1999) 1. Lehner, Mark. *The Complete Pyramids*. (New York: Thames & Hudson, 1997) 31.

[59] Mueller, Dieter. "An Early Egyptian Guide to the Hereafter." *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 58 (1972): 124.

[60] Hornung, Erik. (Lorton, tr.) *The Ancient Egyptian Books of the Afterlife*. (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Pr., 1999) 13.

[61] Hornung, Erik. (Lorton, tr.) *The Ancient Egyptian Books of the Afterlife*. (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Pr., 1999) 55.

[62] Hornung, Erik. (Lorton, tr.) *The Ancient Egyptian Books of the Afterlife*. (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Pr., 1999) 83.

[63] Smith, Mark. *Traversing Eternity: Texts for the Afterlife from Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt*. (New York: Oxford Univ. Pr., 2009) 499.

[64] Robinson, James M. (ed.) *The Nag Hammadi Library*. (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1988) 257.

[65] Funk, Wolf-Peter. "The First Apocalypse of James." In: Schneemelcher, Wilhelm, *et al*. *New Testament Apocrypha, vol.1*. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Pr., 2003) 315.

[66] Grant, Michael. *The Roman Emperors*. (New York; Barnes & Noble, 1997) 244.

[67] Guthrie, W.K.C. *Orpheus and Greek Religion*. (New York: W.W. Norton, 1966) 185.

[68] Layton, Bentley. *The Gnostic Scriptures*. (Garden City: Doubleday, 1987) 121.
Allen, R.E. *The Symposium*. (New Haven: Yale Univ. Pr., 1991) 5n6.

[69] Gottschalk, H.B. *Heraclides of Pontus*. (Oxford: Clarendon Pr., 1980) 2.

[70] Gottschalk, H.B. *Heraclides of Pontus*. (Oxford: Clarendon Pr., 1980) 2.

[71] Gottschalk, H.B. *Heraclides of Pontus*. (Oxford: Clarendon Pr., 1980) 2.

[72] Plato. (Lee, tr.) *Timaeus and Critias*. (London: Penguin, 1977) 22, 146.

[73] Robinson, James M. (ed.) *The Nag Hammadi Library*. (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1988) 257.

[74] Unger, Diminic J. and John J. Dillon. *St. Irenaeus of Lyons Against the Heresies*. (Mahwah NJ: Newman Pr., 1992) 4.

[75] Funk, Wolf-Peter. "The First Apocalypse of James." In: Schneemelcher, Wilhelm, *et al. New Testament Apocrypha, vol.1*. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Pr., 2003) 315.

[76] Layton, Bentley. *The Gnostic Scriptures*. (Garden City NY: Doubleday, 1987) 122.

[77] Grant, Michael. *The Roman Emperors*. (New York; Barnes & Noble, 1997) 244.

[78] Beyerlin, Walter. (ed.) *Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. (Philadelphia: Westminster Pr., 1978) 186.

[79] Speiser, E.A. *Genesis*. (New York: Doubleday, 1964) 44. Cross, Frank Moore. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*. (Harvard: Harvard Univ. Pr., 1997) 260-1.

[80] Cogan, Mordechai. *I Kings*. (New York: Doubleday, 2001) 97.

[81] Pope, Marvin H. *Job*. (New York: Doubleday, 1973) xl.

[82] Wright, Archie T. *The Origin of Evil Spirits*. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005) 15.

[83] Hartman, Louis E. and Alexander A. DiLella. *The Book of Daniel*. (New York: Doubleday, 1978) 13.

[84] Marcus, Joel. *Mark 1-8*. (New York; Doubleday, 2000) 39.

[85] Elliott, John H. *I Peter*. (New York: Doubleday, 2001) 138.

[86] Taylor, Walter F. Jr. *Ephesians*. (Minneapolis; Augsburg Pub. House, 1985) 25.

[87] Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*. (New York: Doubleday, 1970) 57.

[88] Blunt, A.W.F. (ed.) *The Apologies of Justin Martyr*. (Cambridge; Cambridge Univ. Pr., 1911) 110-111.

[89] Kelly, Henry Ansgar. *Satan: A Biography*. (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Pr., 2006) 194.

[90] Frend, W.H.C. "The Failure of the Persecutions in the Roman Empire." *Past and Present* 16 (1959): 10. Nautin, Pierre. *Origène: Sa Vie et Son Œuvre*. (Paris: Beauchesne, 1977) 412.

[91] Grant, Michael. *The Roman Emperors*. (New York; Barnes & Noble, 1997) 244.

[92] Aristotle. (Irwin, tr.) *Nicomachean Ethics*. (Indianapolis: Hackett Pub. Co., 1985) xiv.

[93] Jaffee, Martin S. *Early Judaism*. (Bethesda: Univ. of Maryland Pr., 2006) 64-65.

[94] Bloomfield, Morton. *The Seven Deadly Sins*. (East Lansing: Michigan State College Pr., 1952) 44.

[95] Pseudo-Andronicus of Rhodes. (Glibert-Thierry, ed.) *Peri Pathōn*. (Leiden: Brill, 1977) 32.

[96] Koester, Helmut. *Introduction to the New Testament*. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 2000) 111.

[97] Koester, Helmut. *Introduction to the New Testament*. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 2000) 177.

[98] Lake, Kirsopp. (tr.) *The Apostolic Fathers II*. (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Pr., 1950) 3. Stewart, Columba. "Evagrius Ponticus and the 'Eight Generic Logismoi.'" In: Newhauser, Richard. (ed.) *In the Garden of Evil: The Vices and Culture in the Middle Ages* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2005) 8.

[99] Nautin, Pierre. *Origène: Sa Vie et Son Œuvre*. (Paris: Beauchesne, 1977) 410-11.

[100] Nautin, Pierre. *Origène: Sa Vie et Son Œuvre*. (Paris: Beauchesne, 1977) 410-11.

[101] Nautin, Pierre. *Origène: Sa Vie et Son Œuvre*. (Paris: Beauchesne, 1977) 410-11.

[102] Rubenson, Samuel. *The Letters of St. Antony*. (Lund, Sweden: Lund Univ. Pr., 1990) 42.

[103] Russell, Norman. (tr.) *The Lives of the Desert Fathers*. (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Pub., 1981) 4-5.

[104] Pseudo-Macarius. (Maloney, tr.) *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*. (Mahwah NJ: Paulist Pr., 1992) xii.

[105] Sinkewicz, Robert E. (tr.) *Evagrius of Pontus: The Ascetic Greek Corpus*. (Oxford: Oxford University Pr., 2003) xvii-xviii.

[106] Sinkewicz, Robert E. (tr.) *Evagrius of Pontus: The Ascetic Greek Corpus*. (Oxford: Oxford University Pr., 2003) xvii-xviii.

[107] Sinkewicz, Robert E. (tr.) *Evagrius of Pontus: The Ascetic Greek Corpus*. (Oxford: Oxford University Pr., 2003) xvii-xviii.

[108] Sinkewicz, Robert E. (tr.) *Evagrius of Pontus: The Ascetic Greek Corpus*. (Oxford: Oxford University Pr., 2003) xvii-xviii.

[109] Sinkewicz, Robert E. (tr.) *Evagrius of Pontus: The Ascetic Greek Corpus.* (Oxford: Oxford University Pr., 2003) xvii-xviii.

[110] Sinkewicz, Robert E. (tr.) *Evagrius of Pontus: The Ascetic Greek Corpus.* (Oxford: Oxford University Pr., 2003) xvii-xviii.

[111] Sinkewicz, Robert E. (tr.) *Evagrius of Pontus: The Ascetic Greek Corpus.* (Oxford: Oxford University Pr., 2003) xvii-xviii.

[112] Cassian, John. (Ramsey, tr.) *John Cassian: The Institutes.* (Mahwah NJ: The Newman Press, 2000) 3.

[113] Cassian, John. (Ramsey, tr.) *John Cassian: The Institutes.* (Mahwah NJ: The Newman Press, 2000) 3.

[114] Plested, Marcus. *The Macarian Legacy.* (New York: Oxford Univ. Pr., 2004) 133.

[115] Plested, Marcus. *The Macarian Legacy.* (New York: Oxford Univ. Pr., 2004) 133.

[116] Rydén, Lennart. "The Life of St. Basil the Younger and the Date of the Life of St. Andreas Salos." *Okeanos* 7 (1983) 576.

[117] Baun, Jane. *Tales from Another Byzantium: Celestial Journey and Local Community in the Medieval Greek Apocrypha.* (Cambridge: Cambridge U. Pr., 2007) 128.

[118] Dawkins, Richard M. "A Cretan Apocalypse of the Virgin." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 30 (1929-30) 304.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Aland, Kurt *et al*. *The Greek New Testament, 3rd Corrected Ed*. Stuttgart: United
    Bible Societies, 1983.

Allen, R.E. *The Symposium*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Pr., 1991.

Alt, A. *et al*. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft,
    1990.

Angelidi, Christine. "Douloi stēn Kōnstantinoupolē ton 10o A1: Hē Marturia tou Biou to
    hosiou Basileiou tou Neou." *Summeikta* 6 (1985): 33-51.

Angelidi, Christine. "La Version Longue de la Vision du Moine Cosmas." *Analecta
    Bollandiana* 101 (1983): 73-99.

Aristotle. (Irwin, tr.) *Nicomachean Ethics*. Indianapolis: Hackett Pub. Co., 1985.

Aristotle. (Rackham, tr.) *The Nicomachean Ethics*. Harvard: Harvard Univ. Pr., 1962.

Auvray, Emmanuel. (ed.) *Les Pleurs de Philippe*. Paris: Librairie A. Franck, 1875.

Beyerlin, Walter. (ed.) *Ancient Near Eastern Religious Texts Relating to the Old
    Testament*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Pr., 1978.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Isaiah 1-39*. New York: Doubleday, 2000.

Blunt, A.W.F. (ed.) *The Apologies of Justin Martyr*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Pr.,
    1911.

Boyce, Mary. *Textual Sources for the Study of Zoroastrianism*. Chicago: Univ. of
    Chicago Pr., 1990.

Brianchaninov, Ignatii. *Collected Works, vol.III*. Moscow: Izdatelstvo, 1993.

Cassian, John. (Ramsey, tr.) *John Cassian: The Institutes*. Mahwah NJ: The Newman
    Press, 2000.

Cicero. (McGregor, tr.) *The Nature of the Gods*. London: Penguin, 1972.

Climacus, John. (Luibheid tr.) *The Ladder of Divine Ascent*. Mahwah: Paulist Press,
    1982.

Cogan, Mordechai. *I Kings*. New York: Doubleday, 2001.

Dalley, Stephanie. *Myths from Mesopotamia*. New York: Oxford Univ. Pr., 2000.

Dawkins, R.M. "Krētikē Apokalupsis tēs Panagias." *Herakleion* 2 (1948) 487-500.

Dawkins, Richard M. "A Cretan Apocalypse of the Virgin." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 30
    (1929-30) 300-4.

De Jonge, Marinus, ed. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Leiden: Brill, 1978.

Des Places, Édouard. (ed.) *Diadoque de Photicé: Œuvres Spirituelles*. Paris: Les Éditions du CERF, 1955.

Elliott, John H. *I Peter*. New York: Doubleday, 2001.

Faulkner, R.O. *The Ancient Egyptian Book of the Dead*. Austin: University of Texas Pr., 1993.

Faulkner, R.O. *The Ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts*. Oxford: Aris & Phillips, 2004.

Faulkner, R.O. *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1969.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Acts of the Apostles*. New York: Doubleday, 1998.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*. New York: Doubleday, 1970.

Funk, Wolf-Peter. "The First Apocalypse of James." In: Schneemelcher, Wilhelm, *et al. New Testament Apocrypha, vol.1*. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Pr., 2003) 313-326.

Furnish, Victor Paul. *II Corinthians.* Garden City: Doubleday, 1984.

Gardner, John and John Maier. *Gilgamesh*. New York: Vintage, 1984.

Gottschalk, H.B. *Heraclides of Pontus*. Oxford: Clarendon Pr., 1980.

Graf, Fritz and Sarah Iles Johnston. *Ritual Texts for the Afterlife*. London: Routledge, 2007.

Grant, Robert McQueen. *Irenaeus of Lyon*. London: Routledge, 2003.

Gregg, Robert C. (tr.) *Athanasius: The Life of Antony and the Letter to Marcellinus*. Mahwah NJ: Paulist Pr., 1980.

Hare, Richard Mervyn. *Plato*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Pr., 1996.

Harris, J.E. and E.F. Wente. *An X-Ray Atlas of the Royal Mummies*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Hartman, Louis E. and Alexander A. DiLella. *The Book of Daniel*. New York: Doubleday, 1978.

Herbin, François René. *Le Livre de Parcourir l'Éternité*. Leuven: Uitgeveru Peeters, 1994.

Kramer, Samuel Noah. *Sumerian Mythology*. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Pr., 1972.

Lake, Kirsopp. (tr.) *The Apostolic Fathers II*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Pr., 1950.

Layton, Bentley. *The Gnostic Scriptures*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1987.

Macaire. *Théologie Dogmatique Orthodoxe*. Paris: Librairie de Joel Cherbuliez, 1860.

MacRae, George W. and William R. Murdock. (tr.) "The Apocalypse of Paul (V,2)." In: Robinson, James M. (ed.) *The Nag Hammadi Library*. (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1988) 256-259.

Marcovich, M. (ed.) *Origenes: Contra Celsum, Libri VIII*. Leiden: Brill, 2001

Marcus, Joel. *Mark 1-8*. New York; Doubleday, 2000.

Massyngberde Ford, Josephine. *Revelation*. New York: Doubleday, 1975.

Mend, G.R.S. *Pistis Sophia: A Gnostic Gospel*. Whitefish MT: Kessinger Pub., 1997.

Moorhead, John. *Gregory the Great*. Routledge: London, 2005.

Mueller, Dieter. "An Early Egyptian Guide to the Hereafter." *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 58 (1972): 99-125.

Nautin, Pierre. *Origène: Sa Vie et Son Œuvre*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1977.

Peden, A.J. *The Graffiti of Pharonic Egypt*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Piankoff, Alexandre. *The Shrines of Tut-Ankh-Amon*. New York: Pantheon, 1955.

Pietersma, Albert and Benjamin G. Wright, ed. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. New York: Oxford Univ. Pr., 2007.

Plato. (Lee, tr.) *Timaeus and Critias*. London: Penguin, 1977.

Pope, Marvin H. *Job*. New York: Doubleday, 1973.

Pseudo-Andronicus of Rhodes. (Glibert-Thierry, ed.) *Peri Pathōn*. Leiden: Brill, 1977.

Pseudo-Macarius. (Maloney, tr.) *Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*. Mahwah NJ: Paulist Pr., 1992.

Rahlfs, Alfred. (ed.) *Septuaginta*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979.

Reiche, Harald A.T. "Heraclides' Three Soul-Gates." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 123 (1993): 161-180.

Ritner, Robert K. ""The Breathing Permit of Hôr" Among the Joseph Smith Papyri." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 62 (2003): 161-180.

Robinson, James M. (ed.) *The Facsimile Editions of the Nag Hammadi Codices: Codex V*. Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1975.

Robinson, James M. (ed.) *The Nag Hammadi Library*. San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1988.

Rousseau, Adelin and Louis Doutreleau. (ed.) *Irénée de Lyon: Contre les Hérésies, Livre I*. Paris: Les Éditions du CERF, 1979.

Rousseau, Adelin and Louis Doutreleau. (ed.) *Irénée de Lyon: Contre les Hérésies, Livre II*. Paris: Les Éditions du CERF, 1982.

Rubenson, Samuel. *The Letters of St. Antony*. Lund, Sweden: Lund Univ. Pr., 1990.

Russell, Norman. (tr.) *The Lives of the Desert Fathers*. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Pub., 1981.

Russell, Norman. *Cyril of Alexandria*. Routledge: London, 2000.

Russell, Norman. *Theophilus of Alexandria*. Routledge: London, 2007.

Schoedel, William R. (tr.) "The (First) Apocalypse of James (V,3)." In: Robinson, James M. (ed.) *The Nag Hammadi Library*. (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1988) 260-268.

Sharf, Andrew. "A Source for Byzantine Jewry under the Early Macedonians." *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher* 20 (1970): 302-318.

Sharf, Andrew. *Byzantine Jewry: From Justinian to the Forth Crusade*. New York: Schocken Books, 1971.

Sinkewicz, Robert E. (tr.) *Evagrius of Pontus: The Ascetic Greek Corpus*. Oxford: Oxford University Pr., 2003.

Smith, Mark. *Traversing Eternity: Texts for the Afterlife from Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt*. New York: Oxford Univ. Pr., 2009.

Speiser, E.A. *Genesis*. New York: Doubleday, 1964.

Taylor, Walter F. Jr. *Ephesians*. Minneapolis; Augsburg Pub. House, 1985.

To Mustērion tou Thanatou kai hē Nikē kata tou Diabolou. Athens: Bibliopōleion Mikhaē I. Saliberou, 1920.

Veselovskii, A.N. "Razyskaniya v' Oblasti Russkikh' Dukhovnykh' Stikhov'." *Sbornik' Otdileniya Russkago Yazyka i Slovesnosti Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk'* 20 (1879): 1-22

Veselovskii, A.N. "Razyskaniya v' Oblasti Russkikh' Dukhovnykh' Stikhov'." *Sbornik' Otdileniya Russkago Yazyka i Slovesnosti Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk'* 46 (1889) 1-102

Vilinskii, S.G. *Zhitie Sv. Vasiliya Novago*. Odessa: Tipografia "Tekhnik'", 1911.

Wickham, Lionel R. *Cyril of Alexandria: Selected Letters*. Princeton: Oxford Univ. Pr., 1983.

Wolkstein, Diane and Samuel Noah Kramer. *Inanna: Queen of Heaven*. New York: Harper & Row, 1983.

Secondary Works

Aldred, Cyril. *Akhenaten: King of Egypt*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1991.

Allen, James. "The Amarna Succession." In: Brand, Peter J. and Louise Cooper. (ed.) *Causing His Name to Live: Studies in Egyptian Epigraphy and History in Memory of William J. Murnane*. (Leiden: Brill, 2009): 9-20.

Anatolios, Khaled. *Athanasius: The Coherence of His Thought*. London: Routledge, 1998.

Angelidi, Christine. *O Bios tou Basileiou to Neou*. Ioaninna, Greece: University of Ioannina, 1980.

Assman, Jan. (Lorton, tr.) *Death and Salvation in Ancient Egypt*. Ithaca: Cornell U. Pr., 2005.

Assmann, Jan. *The Search for God in Ancient Egypt*. Ithaca: Cornell, 2001.

Azkoul, Michael. *The Toll-House Myth: The Neo-Gnosticism of Fr. Seraphim Rose*. Dewdney BC: Synaxis Pr, 1998.

Baird, William. "Visions, Revelation, and Ministry: Reflections on 2 Cor 12:1-5 and Gal 1:11-17." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104 (1985): 651-662.

Barnard, L.W. "The Date of S. Athansius' "Vita Antonii."" *Vigiliae Christianae* 28 (1974): 169-175.

Bartelink, G.J.M. "Τελωναι (Zöllner) als Dämonenbezeichnung." *Sacris Erudiri* 27 (1984) 5-18.

Bassett, Fletcher S. *Legends and Superstitions of the Sea and of Sailors in All Lands and at All Times*. Chicago: Belford, Clarke & Co., 1885.

Baun, Jane. *Tales from Another Byzantium: Celestial Journey and Local Community in the Medieval Greek Apocrypha*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Pr., 2007.

Bell, Lanny. "The New Kingdom "Divine" Temple: The Example of Luxor." In: Shafer, Byron E. (ed.) *Temples of Ancient Egypt*. (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Pr., 1997) 127-184.

Bengtson, Hermann. (Bloedow, tr.) *History of Greece from the Beginnings to the Byzantine Era*. Ottawa: Univ. of Ottawa Pr., 1988.

Black, Jeremy and Green, Anthony. *Gods, Demons and Symbols of Ancient Mesopotamia*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2003.

Bloomfield, Morton. *The Seven Deadly Sins*. East Lansing: Michigan State College Pr., 1952.

Bohak, Gideon. *Joseph and Aseneth and the Jewish Temple in Heliopolis*. Atlanta: Scholars Pr., 1996.

Boyarin, Daniel. *Border Lines*. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Pr., 2004.

Brakke, David. *Demons and the Making of the Monk*. Cambridge; Harvard Univ. Pr., 2006.

Brandon, S.G.F. "A Problem of the Osirian Judgment of the Dead." *Numen* 5 (1958): 110-127.

Brown, Francis. *The New Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon*. Peabody MA: Hendrickson Pub., 1979.

Campbell, Joseph. *The Masks of God, vol.1: Primitive Mythology*. New York: Viking, 1959.

Campbell, Joseph. *The Masks of God, vol.3: Occidental Mythology*. New York: Viking, 1964.

Carr, Christopher and D. Troy Case. *Gathering Hopewell*. New York: Birkhäuser, 2006.

Cary, M. and Scullard, H.H. *A History of Rome, 3rd ed*. New York: St. Martin's, 1991.

Clayton, Peter A. *Chronicle of the Pharaohs*. New York: Thames & Hudson, 2001.

Constas, Nicholas. ""To Sleep, Perchance to Dream": The Middle State of Souls in Patristic and Byzantine Literature." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 55 (2001): 91-124.

Cross, Frank Moore. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*. Harvard: Harvard Univ. Pr., 1997.

Daley, Brian E. ""At the Hour of our Death": Mary's Dormition and Christian Dying in Late Patristic and Early Byzantine Literature." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 55 (2001) 71-89.

Davies, James C. "Toward a Theory of Revolution." *American Sociological Review* 27 (1962): 5-13.

Davies, Nigel. *The Ancient Kingdoms of Peru*. London: Penguin, 1997.

Davis, Whitney M. "The Ascension-Myth in the Pyramid Texts" *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 36 (1977): 161-179.

Dawkins, R.M. "Soul and Body in the Folklore of Modern Greece." *Folklore* 53 (1942): 131-147.

Dunand, François, and Christine Zivie-Coche. (Lorton, tr.) *Gods and Men in Egypt, 3000 BCE to 395 CE*. Ithaca: Cornell U. Pr., 2004.

Every, George. "Toll Gates on the Air Way." *Eastern Churches Review* 8 (1976): 139-151.

Fei, Jie, and Jie Zhou. "The Possible Climactic Impact in China of Iceland's Eldgjá Eruption Inferred from Historical Sources." *Climactic Change* 76 (2006): 443-457.

Ferguson, Everett. *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 2003.

Forbes, Dennis. "Re Shining." *KMT* 16 (2005-6): 71-75.

Frend, W.H.C. "The Failure of the Persecutions in the Roman Empire." *Past and Present* 16 (1959): 10-27.

Gabolde, Marc. *D'Akhenaton à Toutânkhamon*. Lyon: Institut d'Archaéologie et d'Histoire de l'Antiquité, 1998.

Gilliard, Frank D. "The Apostolicity of Gallic Churches." *The Harvard Theological Review* 68 (1975): 17-33.

Goehring, James E. *Ascetics, Society, and the Desert*. Harrisburg PA; Trinity International Pr., 1999.

Gonzalez, Justo L. *The Story of Christianity vol. I: The Early Church to the Dawn of the Reformation*. New York: Harper Collins, 1984.

Grant, Michael. *The Roman Emperors*. New York; Barnes & Noble, 1997.

Grant, Robert McQueen. *Augustus to Constantine*. Louisville KY: Westminster John Knox Pr., 2004.

Grimal, Nicolas. (Shaw, tr.) *A History of Ancient Egypt*. Cambridge MA: Blackwell; 1995.

Haas, Christopher J. "Imperial Religious Policy and Valerian's Persecution of the Church, A.D. 257-260." *Church History* 52 (1983): 133-144.

Harmless, William. *Desert Christians*. Oxford; Oxford University Pr., 2004.

Hierotheos, Metropolitan of Nafpaktos. (Williams & Esther tr.) *Life after Death*. Levadia: Birth of the Theotokos Monastery, 1996.

Himmelfarb, Martha. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. New York: Oxford Univ. Pr., 1993.

Hölbl, Günther (Saavedra, tr.). *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*. London: Routledge, 2001.

Hollander, Harm W. and Marinus de Jonge. *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill, 1985.

Hollerich, Michael J. "The Alexandrian Bishops and the Grain Trade: Ecclesiastical Grain Commerce in Late Roman Egypt." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 25 (1982): 187-207.

Hornblower, Simon. *Thucydides and Pindar*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Pr., 2004.

Hornung, Erik. (Baines, tr.) *Conceptions of God in Ancient Egypt: The One and the Many*. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Pr., 1996.

Hornung, Erik. (Lorton, tr.) *The Ancient Egyptian Books of the Afterlife*. Ithaca: Cornell U. Pr., 1999.

Hornung, Erik. (Lorton, tr.) *Akhenaten and the Religion of Light*. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Pr., 1999.

Howatson, M.C. *The Oxford Companion to Classical Literature, 2nd ed*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Pr., 1990.

Jaffee, Martin S. *Early Judaism*. Bethesda: Univ. of Maryland Pr., 2006.

Kahn, Charles H. *Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co., 2001.

Kaler, Michael, Louis Painchaud, and Marie-Pierre Bussières. "The Coptic *Apocalypse of Paul*, Irenaeus' *Adversus Haereses 2.30.7*, and the Second-Century Battle for Paul's Legacy." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 12 (2004): 173-193.

Kaniewski, D. *et al*. "Middle East Coastal Ecosystem Response to Middle-to-Late Holocene Abrupt Climate Changes." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 105 (2008): 13941-13946.

Katz, Solomon. "Some Aspects of Economic Life in the Byzantine Empire." *The Pacific Historical Review* 7 (1938): 27-39.

Kazhdan, Alexander. *A History of Byzantine Literature: 850-1000*. Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation, 2006.

Kelley, J.N.D. *Oxford Dictionary of Popes*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Pr., 2005.

Kelly, Henry Ansgar. *Satan: A Biography*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Pr., 2006.

Koester, Helmut. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 2000.

Kononenko, Natalie. "Folk Orthodoxy: Popular Religion in Contemporary Ukraine." In: Himka, John-Paul and Andriy Zayarnyuk (ed.). *Letters from Heaven: Popular Religion in Russian and Ukraine*. (Toronto: University of Toronto Pr., 2006) 46-75.

Lehner, Mark. *The Complete Pyramids*. New York: Thames & Hudson, 1997.

Lewis, Naphtali. *Life in Egypt under Roman Rule*. Oxford: Clarendon Pr., 1985.

Loprieno, Antonio. *Ancient Egyptian: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Pr., 1995.

Louth, Andrew. *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition*. New York: Oxford Univ. Pr., 1983.

Magdalino, Paul "'What We Heard in the Lives of the Saints We Have Seen with our own Eyes:' The Holy Man as Literary Text in Tenth-century Constantinople." In: Howard-Johnson, James. and Paul Antony Hayward. (ed.) *The Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*.. James (Oxford, 1999), 83-114.

McEvilley, Thomas. *The Shape of Ancient Thought*. New York: Allworth Pr., 2002.

Meltzer, E.S. "The parentage of Tutankhamun and Smenkhkare." *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 62 (1978): 134-135.

Millaire, Jean-François. "The Manipulation of Human Remains in Moche Society: Delayed Burials, Grave Reopening, and Secondary Offerings of Human Bones on the Peruvian North Coast." *Latin American Antiquity* 15 (2004): 371-388.

Mojsov, Bojana. *Osiris: Death and Afterlife of a God*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2005.

Moore, Edward. *Origen of Alexandria and St. Maximus the Confessor*. Boca Raton: Dissertation.com, 2005.

Morenz, Siegfried. (Keep, tr.) *Egyptian Religion*. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Pr., 1992.

Morray-Jones, C.R.A. "Paradise Revisited (2 Cor 12:1-12): The Jewish Mystical Background of Paul's Apostolate. Part 2: Paul's Heavenly Ascent and Its Significance." *The Harvard Theological Review* 86 (1993): 265-292.

Newhauser, Richard. *The Treatise on Vices and Virtues in Latin and the Vernacular*. Turnout: Brepols, 1993.

Newhauser, Richard. *The Early History of Greed*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Pr., 2000.

Nickelsburg, George W.E. *Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins*. Minneapolis; Fortress Pr., 2003.

Norwich, John Julius. *A History of Venice*. New York: Random House, 1989.

Norwich, John Julius. *Byzantium: The Apogee*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1994.

Obolensky, Dimitri. "The Empire and its Northern Neighbors, 565-1018." In: Obelensky, Dimitri. *Byzantium and the Slavs: Collected Studies*. (Crestwood NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Pr., 1994) 23-74.

Osborn, Eric. *Irenaeus of Lyons*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ, Pr., 2001.

Ostrogorsky, George. (Hussey, tr.). *History of the Byzantine State*. New Brunswick NJ: Rutgers U. Pr., 1969.

Parker, Robert. "Greek Religion." In: Boardman, John *et al*. *The Oxford History of the Classical World*. (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Pr., 1988) 254-274.

Parrott, Douglas M. "Gnosticism and Egyptian Religion." *Novum Testamentum* 29 (1987): 73-92.

Patlagean, Evelyne. "Sainteté et Pouvoir." In: Hackel, Sergei. (ed.) *The Byzantine Saint*. Crestwood NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Pr., 2001. Pp. 88-105

Plested, Marcus. *The Macarian Legacy*. New York: Oxford Univ. Pr., 2004.

Puhalo, Lazar. *The Tale of Basil "the New" and the Theodora Myth: A Study of a Gnostic Document and General Survey of Gnosticism*. Dewdney BC: Synaxis Pr, 1996.

Quirke, Stephen. *The Cult of Ra*. London: Thames & Hudson, 2001.

Reale, Giovanni. (Catan, tr.) *A History of Ancient Philosophy: The Schools of the Imperial Age*. Albany: State Univ. of New York Pr., 1990.

Reale, Giovanni. (Catan, tr.) *A History of Ancient Philosophy: From the Origins to Socrates*. Albany: State Univ. of New York Pr., 1987.

Reale, Giovanni. (Catan, tr.) *A History of Ancient Philosophy: The Systems of the Hellenistic Age*. Albany: State Univ. of New York Pr., 1985.

Reed, Annette Yoshiko. *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity*. New York; Cambridge Univ. Pr., 2005.

Reeves, Nicholas. *Akhenaten: Egypt's False Prophet*. New York: Thames & Hudson, 2005.

Rigsby, Kent J. "Founding a Sarapeum." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 42 (2001): 117-124.

Rives, J.B. "The Decree of Decius and the Religion of Empire." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 89 (1999): 135-154.

Rose, Seraphim. *The Soul After Death*. Platina CA: Saint Herman of Alaska Brotherhood, 1993.

Runciman, Steven. *Byzantine Civilization*. Cleveland: Meridian Books, 1956.

Runciman, Steven. *The Byzantine Theocracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Russell, Jeffrey Burton. *A History of Heaven*. Princeton; Princeton Univ. Pr., 1997.

Russell, Jeffrey Burton. *Satan: The Early Christian Tradition*. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Pr., 1981.

Russell, Jeffrey Burton. *The Devil: Perceptions of Evil from Antiquity to Primitive Christianity*. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Pr., 1987.

Rydén, Lennart. "The Life of St. Basil the Younger and the Date of the Life of St. Andreas Salos." *Okeanos* 7 (1983) 568-586.

Shepherd, Massey Hamilton. "The Anthropomorphic Controversy in the Time of Theophilus of Alexandria." *Church History 7* (1938): 263-273.

Shinne, P.L. "The Nilotic Sudan and Ethiopia, c.660 BC to c.AD 600." In: Shinnie, P.L. (ed.) *The Cambridge History of Africa, vol.2: c.500 BC - c.AD 1050*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Pr., 1979.

Sicker, Martin. *The Pre-Islamic Middle East*. Westport CT: Greenwood, 2000.

Silk, M.S. *The Iliad*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Pr, 1990.

Silverman, David P. "Divinity and Deities in Ancient Egypt." In: Shafer, Byron E. (ed.) *Religion in Ancient Egypt*. (Ithaca: Cornell U. Pr., 1991) 7-87.

Southern, Pat. *Augustus*. London: Routledge, 2001.

Stewart, Columba. "Evagrius Ponticus and the 'Eight Generic Logismoi.'" In: Newhauser, Richard. (ed.) *In the Garden of Evil: The Vices and Culture in the Middle Ages*. (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2005) 3-34.

Stothers, Richard B. "Far Reach of the Tenth Century Eldgjá Eruption, Iceland." *Climatic Change* 39 (1998): 715-726.

Stremooukhoff, Dimitri. "Moscow the Third Rome: Sources of the Doctrine." *Speculum* 28 (1953): 84-101.

Thordarson, T. *et al*. "New Estimates of Sulfur Degassing and Atmospheric Mass-Loading by the 934 AD Eldgjá Eruption, Iceland." *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research* 108 (2001): 33-54.

Trigg, Joseph W. *Origen*. New York: Routledge, 1998.

Turner, John D. *Sethian Gnosticism and the Platonic Tradition*. Louvain: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 2006.

Ulansey, David. *The Origins of the Mithraic Mysteries*. New York: Oxford Univ. Pr., 1991.

Unger, Diminic J. and John J. Dillon. *St. Irenaeus of Lyons Against the Heresies*. Mahwah NJ: Newman Pr., 1992.

Van Dijk, Jacobus. "The Amarna Period and the Later New Kingdom (c.1352-1009 BC)." In: Shaw, Ian. (ed.) *The Oxford History of Ancient Egypt*. (New York: Oxford Univ. Pr., 2000): 272-313.

Verano, John W. *et al*. "Modified Human Skulls from the Urban Sector of the Pyramids of Moche, Northern Peru." *Latin American Antiquity* 10 (1999): 59-70.

Verner, Miroslav. (Rendall, tr.) *The Pyramids*. London: Atlantic, 2001.

Weinandy, Thomas Gerard. *Athanasius: A Theological Introduction*. Burlington VT: Ashgate, 2007.

Wente, Edward F. "Mysticism in Pharonic Egypt?" *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 41 (1982): 161-179.

Whitehorne, John. "The Pagan Cults of Roman Oxyrhynchus." In: Temporini, Hildegard (ed.). *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. (Walter de Gruyter & Co.: Berlin, 1995): 3050-3091.

Wilkinson, Richard H. *The Complete Gods and Goddesses of Ancient Egypt*. London: Thames & Hudson, 2003.

Williams, Rowan. *Arius: History and Tradition*. Grand Rapids MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2001.

Wisse, Frederick. "The Nag Hammadi Library and the Heresiologists." *Vigiliae Christianae* 25 (1971) 205-223.

Wortley, John. "Death, Judgment, Heaven, and Hell in Byzantine "Beneficial Tales."" *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 55 (2001) 53-70.

Wright, Archie T. *The Origin of Evil Spirits*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

Ziolkowski, Jan M. & Michael C.J. Putnam. *The Virgilian Tradition*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Pr., 2008.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Shawn Daniel McAvoy was born in Willoughby, Ohio on 5 December 1970. He graduated from Patrick Henry High School in Ashland, Virginia in 1989. In 1995, he graduated from Randolph-Macon College, after winning the Robert Epps Jones Prize in Classics, with a major in ancient Greek and two minors in German and Religious Studies. He entered New Mexico State University in 1996 to study US Diplomatic History and in 1998 wrote his thesis on American and Allied denazification policy in occupied Germany. In 2006 he entered Arizona State University to pursue a master's in Religious Studies. While at Arizona State, he served as a member of the Parking Citation Appeals Board since 2006, and as its intermittent chair since 2008.