

# THE BOSWELL THESIS

*Essays on Christianity, Social Tolerance,  
and Homosexuality*

Mathew Kuefler

*The University of Chicago Press · Chicago & London*

2006

## Impossible Translation: Antony and Paul the Simple in the *Historia Monachorum*

Mark Masterson

The desert literature of the fourth and early fifth centuries CE presents the desert as primarily a place for men. There was the occasional woman in this homosocial space,<sup>1</sup> but she would have been the exception.<sup>2</sup> Of interest, then, is the sensible assertion that homosocial environments increase the incidence of homosexual desire.<sup>3</sup> But the testimony of the literature of the desert features relative silence about male homosexual behavior.<sup>4</sup> Observe some exceptional moments of talk about homosexual behavior in the desert (buried in the many rules Pachomius wrote to supervise behavior in his establishment):

Rule 94: No one should speak to another after lights out. No one should sleep with another on a rush mat. No one should hold another's hand; but whether he stands, walks, or sits, let him be separated from another by one cubit.<sup>5</sup>

Rule 95: No one will dare remove a thorn from the foot of another, with the exception of the head of the house, or in the second place, another who has been ordered to do so.<sup>6</sup>

Clearly what is at issue here is the emergence of homosexual desire. Why else, really, would the removal of a thorn from a foot attract such attention? But as I have noted, these rules are exceptional. Much of what we have in the literature from the

desert is depiction of self-denial not at all invested in telling what I imagine to be a truth about the realities of sexual desire in the desert and the probable effects of homosociality.

Perhaps a scholar's focus on desire in the desert can seem somewhat beside the point in the face of this literature that does have additional things on its mind.<sup>7</sup> Athanasius's *Vita Antoni*, for example, played an important role in his political objectives as bishop.<sup>8</sup> In a work to be considered below, Rufinus's translation of the *Historia monachorum*,<sup>9</sup> Rufinus arguably intervened in the Origenist controversy through alterations he made to the text as he translated it from Greek to Latin.<sup>10</sup> But all the same, politics are only a part of the story (albeit an important one). As these texts help secure a bishop's episcopal throne or intervene to favor a particular construal of doctrine, they also are always reaching out to the reader. Indeed, we commonly see at the beginning of works from the desert explicit awareness that the readers of these works will (and should) be moved to imitate what they are reading.<sup>11</sup> This stress on imitation must be read for the powerful thing it is. Resonantly reaching back to Paul (e.g., 1 Corinthians 4:16),<sup>12</sup> and perhaps even further back to Platonic discussions of mimesis, the injunction to imitation powerfully inscribes hierarchy and, simultaneously, both valorizes sameness and devalues difference.<sup>13</sup> The offering of a model for imitation, as an injunction to mold oneself to the measure of an ideal, holds out the promise of identity, a melding of wish and reality to be realized at some point in the future.<sup>14</sup> And the management of desire of all kinds plays an important part in the consolidation of identity in this hierarchical scene of imitation.

I would like to discuss my method before we begin in earnest. To some readers my mode of argumentation may at times seem (very nearly) intolerably speculative. Indeed, since I am endeavoring to demonstrate the presence of something, homosexual desire, which we cannot measure directly, my method is inescapably speculative. Virginia Burrus speaks of avoiding "a particular performative mode of interpretation that tends, in the service of directly reproducing a 'world,' to elide the creative work of texts and the critical agency of (other) readers and writers."<sup>15</sup> To get at the play of homosexual desire at and just beyond the margins of these texts we need to think of creative and critical readers and writers. Not doing so, we run the risk of presenting the norms and idealized personages contained in a text as the total reality, when they are surely only part of it.<sup>16</sup> In looking at these interventionist texts, with their mimetic injunctions an inheritance from prior centuries, we must therefore consider how the individual who may have felt such desire (or who thought others could feel such desire) might have received these

texts. Furthermore, we are lucky because we have access to an actual contemporary reception with which to supplement my more speculative moves. In arguments to come, I will be investigating the story of Antony of the desert and Paul the Simple in an anonymous Greek text, the *Historia monachorum in Aegypto* ("The Narration of the Monks in Egypt"; henceforth *HM*) with the goal of revealing the action of homosexual desire. I will also be comparing this Greek text to a contemporary Latin translation of it. Written about 400 CE, the *HM* is a resume of a journey through Egypt, a sort of travelogue, filled with stories of monks who are remarkable in various ways. Within ten or so years, Rufinus, one of the Latin fathers, made a translation of the *HM* into Latin. His translation significantly alters the content of the story of Paul and Antony and thus provides a way into judging the way the Greek text was received on at least one occasion.

In section 24 of the *HM* we read the story of Antony and his disciple Paul the Simple. Once Antony established himself as an exemplar of monastic self-discipline, he attracted the attention of others. One such—on the testimony of anonymous—was Paul the Simple. Paul catches his wife in adultery and goes immediately to the desert to be with Antony. He begs Antony to be allowed to stay with him. Antony agrees, provided Paul display total obedience:

Having caught his wife in the very act of adultery, saying nothing to anybody, he headed out to the desert to Antony. Falling to Antony's knees, he declared that he wanted to reside with him because he wanted to be saved. Antony answered him: "You can be saved provided you have obedience and whatever you hear from me, this you must do." Paul answering said, "whatever you order, I will do it all."<sup>17</sup>

And Antony means what he says; he is full of orders and is so demanding that the story is unbelievable.

To test Paul's obedience and mental devotion (*gnōmē*, 24.2) to monastic discipline, he makes Paul stand in the same place for a week and it is specified that it is the hot season. Neither food nor water is mentioned. At the end of the week, Antony sets a table with food and drink and makes Paul sit at it without eating or drinking. Then he sends Paul off to bed. Antony then awakens Paul for prayers in the middle of the night. After the prayer session, Paul is allowed to eat a little but is given no water. Antony subsequently sends Paul to wander in the desert for three days. When Paul comes back from the desert Antony makes him serve some visiting brothers food. He is not allowed to eat or speak. Three weeks later—three weeks!—when Paul has

eaten nothing and said nothing, the brothers ask Paul why he says nothing. Paul will not answer. He is obedient. Intervening, Antony asks Paul why he is quiet and then, without waiting for an answer, Antony tells Paul to converse with the visiting brothers. Being the obedient one that he is, Paul converses:

Finally, when the third week had passed and Paul had eaten nothing, the brothers kept asking him why he was silent. Since he wouldn't answer, Antony said to him: "Why are you silent? Converse with the brothers." He conversed.<sup>18</sup>

In addition to these impossible demands on Paul's actual physical being, Antony requires Paul to perform ostensibly meaningless tasks—further tests of Paul's commitment to obedience. Antony makes Paul break open a jar of honey, pour the honey out onto the ground and then gather it up again without bringing up any dirt with it. Other tasks include weaving baskets and then unweaving them, drawing water all day, and stitching and unstitching Antony's cloak (24.8–9).

But in the end Paul has such obedience that God gives him powers that are greater than Antony's own:

And to so great an extent did the man [sc. Paul the Simple] possess obedience, that a grace from God, the power to drive out demons, was bestowed on him. The demons the blessed Antony was not able to drive out, these he sent to Paul and they were cast out immediately.<sup>19</sup>

A usual way the story of Paul and Antony can be understood, and it's sensible—I see what I am doing in this paper as supplementing such a reading—is that this story is a hyperbolic representation of the ideal relationship between a master/*abba* and his disciple. The hyperbole is to be understood as clarifying the respective positions of mastery and subservience that master and disciple occupy. The disciple learns from his master/*abba* how to transform himself into a successful faster/prayer who will have the ability to spend time alone in the uninhabited places. To accomplish the transformation, the disciple makes the *abba* privy to his most inward thoughts. He also shows absolute obedience. He also endeavors to increase his endurance in fasting, to cultivate silence, to limit food and water intake, and to extinguish sexual desire to the extent possible. The disciple also utterly suppresses his self-will and does not presume to believe that he can assess his own spiritual progress.<sup>20</sup>

The story of Paul and Antony can be profitably understood in this way. Present are obedience, endurance, and a refusal to judge one's progress for oneself. There is omission of the confession of inmost thoughts, but since Paul seemingly arrives without a thought in his head, he arguably models the complete mental surrender desirable in the disciple throughout the story. We are liable, however, to miss something if we see the odd story of Paul and Antony as primarily an allegory of obedience. Given that the final destination in this story is the homosocial sphere of the desert, I have questions about homosexual desire. And since this story has an intended audience that is larger than men of simple demeanor who have caught their wives with another man *in flagrante delicto*, we should consider the wider tastes, propensities, and life experiences of the audience too. How would have others read this story? Would they ask whether the sublimation of one desire stands for all; whether homosexual desire's sublimation is assured by a sort of general law to be drawn from this account that *all* sexual desires will be left behind in the retreat to the desert? And what about the sexual tensions that will arise in the homosocial environment of the desert? These questions destabilize the default heterosexuality that can all too easily be assumed in accounting for possible receptions of this story. With these questions in mind, let's pull the homosexual out of the homosocial in the story of Antony and Paul. So, from the top again, and this time subversively.

Paul witnesses his wife's adultery and, traumatized by the sight, says goodbye to home, wife, and sex once and for all. In the emphatic first position in the story, the traumatizing sight of Paul's wife's adultery and all he is leaving behind stays in the mind of the reader. It is possible, of course, to view Paul's past life with the climactic betrayal as providing both comment on the inherent depravity of the *saeculum* and spur to Paul's immediately commenced life of sanctity. But the fact that it took the betrayal to break Paul out of his prior married life encourages another approach to the two halves of Paul's life. While not denying the critique of the *saeculum*, I suggest that we additionally view Paul's new life as a reconstruction and replication of the wholeness (though illusory it may have been) that he lost at the moment of his wife's betrayal. Viewing Paul's new life with Antony as a sort of replication of prior married life leads, then, to questions about desire—questions that the Greek employed in the story encourages.

Passages discussed above contain suggestive verbs. When Paul asks to "reside" with Antony and when Antony tells Paul to "converse" with the brothers, it is well to remember that the verbs used (*syneinai* and *homilein* respectively) can function as euphemisms for sexual activity. The sexual meanings of "reside"/*syneinai* (and the related *synousia*) and "converse"/*homilein*

(and *homilia*) are in use from the classical period on.<sup>21</sup> Hence, the combination of suggestive language with the notion that marriage is replicated in the desert suggests that perception of homosexual desire is possible in ancient reception of this text. Furthermore, the notion that homosexual desire would have been perceived in ancient reception of this text is strengthened when we consider the miraculous abilities of Paul. The impossibility of these actions of course provides an ideal, but it also has the effect of highlighting the all too human nature of any reader of the text, since the model on offer is inimitable.

The superhuman exploits in the account will cause a reader to reject it as being strictly applicable to him- or herself. Paul's surviving seven-day exposure to the hot Egyptian sun and living so long without food and water are unbelievable. Paul is capable of so much! We mere humans of so little. So how do we humans (ancient and modern) make sense of this account? One way to do so is to regard the story of Paul as a model for emulation, an ideal model transcending of human weakness. This ideal model is ever there to urge on and ever there to find fault. Hence, if we think of the story in this way, the impossibilities perhaps enhance the story's value—the impossibilities enfigure for the ascetic the impossibility of ever ceasing from his or her practice.

But at the same time, when the model is revealed as so excessive of human capability, the reader rejects it as a literal human truth and discontinuity between reader and story results. This rejection and the resultant discontinuity both encourage allegorical interpretation and forcefully emphasize the reader's insufficiency; compelled to look through the surface of the account for other meaning by the impossibility of replicating Paul's acts and with a feeling of lack continually reinforced through the mere fact of allegory's inevitably divisive presence, the reader inhabits a place forever alienated from Paul's. Furthermore, the effort to interpret a miracle connected to desire has the counterproductive result of increasing desire's hold on the reader. To illustrate these effects of the inimitable model, I will now perform a thought experiment. I will read the scene of Paul with his honey (in the context of my larger concern with homosexual desire) with sections of Porphyry's *On the Cave of the Nymphs in the Odyssey* (henceforth *On the Cave*) and the Old Testament. These comparative readings will suggest how the effort to allegorize the impossible can increase desire's power and thereby sabotage the drive for sublimation.

We now return to the scene of the useless tasks Antony sets for Paul:

On another occasion, when he had given Paul a jar of honey, Antony said to him, "break the container and let the honey pour out." Paul did so. Then

Antony said to him, "bring the honey back up from the ground with a little spoon so that you don't gather up any dirt with it."<sup>22</sup>

Here we have an instance of the miraculous; how in the world can honey be brought up from the Egyptian dust clean of dirt? It cannot and so the account compels interpretation. Following Averil Cameron, I suggest that we focus on the fact that what Paul does here is miraculous. Cameron suggests that instances of the miraculous should be read as a late-ancient/Christian rhetorical device that directs the reader to look at the text symbolically:

Miracle, the suspension of normal laws of nature, is to be seen less as an example of "irrationality" or credulity than as an instance of the symbolic interface of human and divine: it functions as a rhetorical device to express what is otherwise inexpressible.<sup>23</sup>

The question to which the miracle directs the reader, then, centers on that which is inexpressible and, as a result, symbolized.<sup>24</sup> A possible reception of this scene will surely suggest that Paul's miraculous mastery of the honey is a symbolization of God's ineffable and transcendent consideration for Paul's piety. But to a reader fallible, weak, and aware of the presence of homosexual desire, the honey will stubbornly symbolize the desire that will stubbornly persist as surely as it is impossible to fast for three weeks.

Writing at the end of the third century CE, Porphyry associates bees and honey with souls and the joys/enticements of embodiment respectively in his *On the Cave*.<sup>25</sup> The reader will see this association clearly in Porphyry's discussion of Zeus, Kronos, and Ouranos:

Suggesting the trick of the honey, Night says the following to Zeus: "When you see him (Kronos) under the high-leafed oaks drunk on the labor of the loud-buzzing bees, bind him." Kronos suffers this and, bound, he is castrated, just as Ouranos was. The theologian tells in riddling fashion here how divine principles are bound through pleasure and bring themselves down to genesis and how, dissolved into pleasure, they emit their powers as semen. So in this way Kronos castrates Ouranos who came down to Gaia through desire for intercourse. To the ancients the sweetness of the honey with which Kronos was deceived before his castration expresses the same idea as the pleasure of intercourse.<sup>26</sup>

Honey designates the *telos* of male sexual desire. Success in realizing this *telos* means castration according to the story (and, temporarily, according to

the bodily mechanics to which the human male is subject). Sweet honey also symbolizes the pleasure divine principles feel when they join themselves to the world of things that are born and die (*genesis*). Elsewhere, speaking generally of souls, Porphyry notes that "blood and moist semen are dear to them," again closely associating embodiment with the pleasure of intercourse.<sup>27</sup>

If the reader of the *HM* turns his or her attention from honey's association in Porphyry with sexual desire and intercourse (and post-coital disorientation and two castrations) back to Paul and his honey, what might he or she make of Paul's abilities now? Paul's superhuman glamor is surely reinscribed as he succeeds in handling that which defeated the all too carnal archaic gods. (And Christianity, incidentally, triumphs yet again.) We may also interpret Paul's ability to overcome the adhesive qualities of honey as an ability to transmute desire in spite of itself into something else; Paul dissolves dusty dirty desire for a wife (and/or for Antony) into a cleanly adhesive and sweetly pure obedience in the context of sublime homosociality.

While seeing the honey in terms similar to Porphyry's suggests that a desirable sublimation of Paul's prior way of being has occurred (and as such it harmonizes nicely with the notion that Paul's new life is in some sense a replication), a paradox has now been substituted for the forbidding miracle. If we allegorize the honey as Porphyry does, the desire that moves Paul in his new life is one whose *telos* is no longer carnal and yet this desire is allegorically (and paradoxically) related to carnally directed desire. Paul's desire to be the perfect disciple leads him to handle that which defeated the semen-spewing, archaic father-gods. At a symbolic level, then, Paul embraces unchastity to secure chastity. At this point, any reader envisioning his or her life in the desert will see it as a place surely infused with desire that will, it would seem, take a miracle to manage. This particular effort to interpret Paul's miracle, even as it suggests the power of God's favor, also hints at a desert full of desire. One might say that a symbolization of the inexpressible action of divine grace coexists with a symbolization of unspeakable carnal desire.

The search for meaning could also lead a reader to an episode from the life of Samson in Judges 14 of the Old Testament. As he is on the way to meet his future wife (an unnamed woman of the Philistines [14:1-3]), Samson barehandedly kills a lion (14:5-6). Later, returning to take his new wife home, he discovers bees and honey in the lion's carcass (14:8). Samson consumes some of the honey. Later, he uses this miracle in a wager with some Philistines. He poses a riddle, "what edible thing came from the eater, what sweet thing from the strong" (14:14)? At a loss, the Philistines threaten Samson's new wife. She extorts the answer to the riddle from Samson through tears and the Philistines, told by her, are able to give Samson an answer: "What is sweeter

than honey and what is stronger than the lion?" (14:18). Realizing he has been betrayed, he responds with more riddling words: "If you had not plowed with my heifer, you would not know my riddle" (14:18). Samson then disavows his new wife, giving her to one of his friends (14:20).

If we think of Samson's honey in terms of desire, we can with ease connect the miracle of the carcass-born honey to Samson's repudiation of his wife. Samson's destruction of the lion, equivalent to the mastering of his bestial impulses, brings him a sweet reward. Such mastering prefigures the rejection of his wife, whom he compares to a farm animal and who, it could be argued, is the site for the play of bestial impulses. And so, Samson, now a paragon of self-control, prefigures the ascetic who enjoys chastity's sweetness. Such an interpretation is strained in the face of the phallic man-of-action Samson (and Delilah waits in the wings!), but such a reading was a way of approaching this text in the fourth century. In a recent discussion of Ambrose's reception of this passage (*De sancto spiritu* 2 *praef.*), Virginia Burrus notes that Ambrose sees a rejection of masculine assertion and a valorization of (a surely feminine) receptivity:

... as he was going to his marriage, about to enjoy the wished-for wedlock, Samson discovered in the sundered leonine body of his hypermasculine desire a habitation for bees and a receptacle for honey's yielding sweetness.<sup>28</sup>

Later in her discussion of Ambrose's works (and Paulinus's *Vita Ambrosii*), Burrus identifies honey with the virginity that Ambrose idealized in women and himself:

... we understand that the body of Ambrose's masculinity has, like Samson's ... lion, been transformed in Paulinus's text into a receptacle for bees, a producer of virginity's sweet honey.<sup>29</sup>

Following Ambrose and Paulinus (and Burrus) as they read Judges 14, the reader of the *HM* may find in Paul's honey chastity realized through *askesis*. It is also possible, however, that the use of this story, with Samson's brawny insistence on marriage and the spectacle of a wife handed off to be the wife of another, may provoke desire more than calm it. Furthermore, the discovery of a "yielding sweetness" in a male body may suggest a man ready to give his body for penetration to another.

Both resorts to text outside of the *HM* in an effort to understand the significance of the honey (and thereby put Paul's miracle to use for the purpose of imitation) proliferate desire. Furthermore, any symbolization of the

honey effected to interpret Paul's miracle sabotages imitation of Paul. The symbolization of the honey, insinuating more difference (the honey is no longer just honey, it is something else too), *ipso facto* disrupts imitation's drive toward the production of sameness and drives the model farther out of reach. Indeed, the mere fact of trying to understand the miracle in symbolic terms perhaps makes the verbs "converse" and "reside" more susceptible to double-entendre; things quickly become other than what they seem. Paul can gather up his honey and get about his business while we, trying to understand, deal with a sticky dirty mass of meanings that we will never get straight. Homosexual desire's possibility in the actual space of homosocial monastic withdrawal is emphasized as the model, inaccessible, ever drives the reader to fall back on his or her own resources in vain attempt to effect a miraculous and paradoxical conversion of desire. It is at this point that I want to bring in my second text, Rufinus's translation of this story.

Rufinus's Latin translation of the Greek text we have been discussing appeared within a few years of the original. Comparison of Rufinus's translation to the Greek original is revealing; Rufinus alters the text in ways that I see as sensitive to the effect the account could have had on the reader. He takes steps, seemingly, to circumvent the readings I just performed. Before proceeding to his translation, however, consideration of some of Rufinus's remarks on translating is to the point, for they most definitely open up a space for my interpretation.

Rufinus does not reflect on translation as an activity in his translation of the *HM* (he in fact almost completely effaces himself except for a mention of the eleventh book of his *Ecclesiastical History* at 29.5.5), but he does offer programmatic statements on translation elsewhere in his works. In general terms, a "practico-ethical aim" motivates Rufinus to give "useful works . . . suitable presentation."<sup>30</sup> This "practico-ethical aim" licenses a number of procedures on the part of Rufinus the translator. To begin with, Rufinus believes that some looseness in translation is allowed:

I have been asked to show to those who speak Latin how [this text] is understood among Greek speakers. I merely have given Latin words to Greek thoughts.<sup>31</sup>

He is not looking to translate merely word for word. Taking the thought as a whole instead, Rufinus endeavors to reproduce it in Latin. Indeed, with his goal the recreation of the impression the words would have made in Greek, Rufinus looks for conceptual frameworks that will guide periphrasis:

Accordingly then I—on account of the sparseness of our language, the novelty of these matters, and . . . because the speech of the Greeks has more words and their language is more fertile—I will not try so much to translate word for word (which is impossible) as I will try to tease out the force of the words in a certain roundabout way.<sup>32</sup>

In this teasing out, in this explication in a circuitous manner combined with the need to attend to the sense as well, the original in Greek to varying degrees is left behind.

Concern for sense was not the only possible standard to which Rufinus appeals. The needs of orthodoxy could license more invasive alterations than mere periphrasis:

In the short prefaces to each of those two works, however, and especially in the one to the booklet for Pamphilus (which I translated first), I put on display first of all my faith and bore witness to the fact that I believe according to the catholic faith; I also bore witness to the fact that if anything were read or translated by me I did such activity in harmony with my faith. And truly in those volumes of [Origen's] *Peri Archōn*, I served notice there that, while in those very volumes some things might be found to be written according to the dictates of the catholic faith (as the church prescribes), certain other things, however, may be found to be contrary to the teachings of the church, although they may be speaking about the same thing. It seemed best to me that those matters [in Origen] ought to be offered to readers according to the constant standard that he offered in his exposition of orthodoxy and it also seemed best to me that I remove those things which might be discovered to be contrary to catholic doctrine on his own testimony—things either added by others . . . or without a doubt [contrary to orthodoxy], so that I omit nothing constructive in the matter of supporting faith.<sup>33</sup>

After Rufinus's initial assertion of his unwavering orthodoxy, which he insists he manifests in his faith, reading, and translating, he explains how it guides him in his handling of the text of the notoriously controversial Origen. Rufinus notes that he will change Origen's text merely to remove the appearance of unorthodox doctrine. When such smoothing of superficialities will not work, Rufinus resorts to excision from the text on the basis of what he identifies as an internal contradiction, which he then resolves in favor of making the text orthodox in its assertion. He blames others for tampering with the text or even grants that Origen was at fault. (There is a "good" Origen and a "bad"

Origen as far as Rufinus is concerned.) Rufinus will alter the text as he sees fit, and an appeal to *fides catholica* justifies all. Rufinus's procedures here are similar to the ones he employs in his translation of the *Historia ecclesiastica* by the doctrinally suspect Eusebius of Caesarea. There, his cannily adjusting translation produces "a more orthodox Eusebius."<sup>34</sup>

On another occasion, Rufinus views translation as a sort of clarifying exposition:

... as I have done in the homilies or in the short prayers on Genesis or Exodus, or especially in those passages that are spoken in the style of a prayer by him [Origen] on the book of Leviticus, the words have been translated by me with the goal of making the content manifest.<sup>35</sup>

Eschewing reproduction of Origen's prayers or prayer-like passages, Rufinus brings to the fore (presumably) Origen's interpretations of the Old Testament that he perceives as underlying the prayers. Rufinus also sees his work as translator as one of making the texts he is translating as *useful* as possible:

It was not my goal to seek out the applause of readers but rather benefit for those who are making [moral] progress.<sup>36</sup>

Virtuosic reproduction is not Rufinus's goal. He is concerned, instead, with the place of his translation in an economy of moral improvement. Indeed in pursuing his goals of reproducing sense (as opposed to words), remaining faithful to orthodoxy, clarifying, and being useful to those on their spiritual journeys, Rufinus flat out states that he had to use whatever means necessary:

... I have thus attempted through certain words taken away, changed, or added to render the sense of the author with the objective of providing a straighter path for understanding.<sup>37</sup>

The objective here, understanding, we must view as already implicated in a moral economy. The straighter path to this goal is one inflected by the needs of orthodoxy and moral improvement. Another objective a translation could serve was a polemical one. Elizabeth Clark has discussed additions made to the translations of the *Cogitationes* of Sextus and the *HM* that seemingly are driven by Origenist partisanship.<sup>38</sup>

On his own testimony, then, Rufinus intervenes when he translates more than we might expect a translator to. But as his goal was not to provide a copy, our possibly unmet expectations are our problem. Rufinus's goals,

rather, included making the text function in a similar fashion among those who spoke Latin *and* rendering the text useful in matters of both orthodoxy and spiritual improvement of readers. So with Rufinus's faceted and invasive approach to translation in mind, we now pass to his translation of the story of Paul and Antony.

The beginning of the story shows some indicative alterations, especially in the matter of attributing agency to Paul:

When Paul had seen with his own eyes his wife having sex with another man, saying not a thing to anyone he left the house. Driven by heartsickness, he gave himself [to wander] into the desert, where, while he was wandering agitatedly, he came to Antony's monastery and there through the suggestion [arising seemingly of its own accord] from the place and through the happenstance of being there, he adopts the plan [of living there with Antony].<sup>39</sup>

Not the virtual automaton we see in the Greek original, Rufinus's Paul has an interior life. Rufinus presents Paul's heartsickness and agitation. Furthermore, Paul's initial goal is not Antony. The need to get away is. The final goal of being the disciple of Antony only emerges when he comes upon Antony's establishment.

There are other differences between the Greek original and Rufinus's translation. Rufinus excises mention of the three weeks of no food or water and the seven days and nights outside. In Rufinus's version, Antony merely tells Paul to stay outside for a day and a night (31.4). Certainly there was no pleasure in this, but it would have been possible. Nor does Paul have to bring up honey from the dirt with a little spoon. The plaiting/unplaiting of baskets and the stitching/unstitching of Antony's cloak do remain (31.13) however. In sum, Rufinus has written the impossible out of the account.

Elsewhere in Rufinus's version (and only in Rufinus's version), Antony instructs Paul in labor that will make the solitude less onerous (*quomodo opere manuum solitudinem solaretur*, 31.5), perhaps by making rope.<sup>40</sup> Antony also schools Paul in the old monastic standby of not eating too much or drinking too many liquids before bedtime; wet dreams may result.<sup>41</sup>

Antony also directed Paul to consume food at twilight but to have a care lest his eating come to a point of satiety and especially in the matter of drink; Antony stressed that *fantasias* [i.e. dreams that cause nocturnal emissions] of the soul happen through an abundance of water just as through wine the body's heat increases.<sup>42</sup>



In this passage, Paul receives instruction that will enable him to live on his own. Paul's eventual independence is imagined and prepared for. Later, in still another passage not in the Greek, when Antony's instruction of Paul is at an end, he sends Paul to live some distance away from him:

And when Antony had fully instructed Paul in how he should act in the case of individual matters, he designated a cell for him in the neighborhood (i.e., three miles away), and he ordered him to practice what he had learned. Coming to see him frequently, Antony rejoiced to discover him persevering with total concentration and care in those things that had been taught to him.<sup>43</sup>

If we consider all the divergences between the two versions of the story of Antony and Paul, it seems as though Rufinus wants to pry Paul and Antony apart. Rufinus's Paul possesses more personhood; he has the interior life that his Greek counterpart lacks. We also see Rufinus's Paul acquire skills (labor and canny habits concerning drink and food) that will enable him to live and make decisions on his own. Also, crucially, Paul will be able to imitate Antony—and the reader will be able to imitate Paul. In the process of making his translation, Rufinus has made the Greek text more of a "benefit for those who are making [moral] progress" (*fructum proficientium*).<sup>44</sup>

The possibility for homosexual desire/behavior is to be found in this story, however, and this in spite of Rufinus's seeming determination to ensure that it does not emerge through making Antony *not* Paul's first goal as he flees the sight not to be seen and through his specification of a separation between them. The making of the famous Antony the un-goal of Paul's non-search raises a question as to why it is that such an obvious objective has been covered up. It seems to me that Rufinus is sensitive to the spectacle (emerging, as I have argued, in the reception of the Greek version) of an unseemly closeness between Paul and Antony because of the immediate substitution of Antony for the wife. Furthermore, the homosociality of life in the desert likewise remains; it will generate at least the suspicion of homosexual desire, and this desire's possibility may explain Rufinus's specification of a three-mile separation between Antony and Paul and Paul's training in skills that will help him live on his own. Finally, the frank discussion of the possibility of nocturnal emissions makes Rufinus's desert a place where sexual desire survives and with it the possibility of homosexual desire.

In conclusion, then, the Greek version of the story of Paul and Antony counsels *via* miracle (and therefore problematically) that perfect sublimation of erotic desires is possible. On offer is a perfect model that compels imitation for the length of the imitator's life. Because this version uses the miraculous,

however, it has the effect of proliferating desire at the point of reception as the reader is made acutely aware of his or her own mortal insufficiency. Furthermore, the homosocial sphere of the desert, as pure and golden as it is in the account, will surely be impossible to realize as even the effort to interpret the miracle fails; the symbol of Paul's success, a miraculous act legible as evidence of God's grace, can also be read as a symbol of possibility for failure by mere humans living in an all too real desert.

Rufinus, on the other hand, excises Paul's miraculous feats and increases his agency. In Rufinus's account sexual desire does not vanish into miraculous sublimation. We see it directly in Antony's directions to Paul about nocturnal emissions. And reception of the text reveals specifically homosexual desire in Rufinus's care to make Antony *not* Paul's initial goal and Antony's care to move Paul to a cell three miles away. A scene in which measures need to be taken in response to homosexual (and other) desire replaces the certainty of the Greek version that sexual desire can be converted without remainder into a new life of perfect sublimation. Or put differently, with the arrival of Paul's agency, humanity, and the real possibility of imitation by the readership, the guarantee of a sexuality-free homosocial sphere is lost—a guarantee that the utopian absoluteness and inaccessibility of the Greek version problematized anyway.

#### Notes

All translations, except where noted, are my own. Citations of PG and PL are, respectively, to *Patrologiae cursus completus, series Graeca*, and *series Latina*, ed. J.-P. Migne (Paris, 1857–66 and 1844–91, respectively), with volume and section numbers.

For readers wishing to read the *Historia Monachorum* in English, Norman Russell has translated it under the title *The Lives of the Desert Fathers* (Oxford: Mowbray, 1980).

This chapter began its life as one of the papers in the Lambda Classical Caucus Panel at the 2002 meeting of the American Philological Association. I thank Georgia Frank and Steven Smith for their valuable advice and Amy Richlin for her unfailing encouragement. I am most grateful to Mathew Kuefler for asking me to contribute to this volume. Timothy Heardt and Niels, as usual, were most helpful.

1. I must say a word here about my use of the word "homosocial" in this paper. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, in *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), writes: "'Homosocial' is a word occasionally used in history and the social sciences, where it describes social bonds between persons of the same sex; it is a neologism, obviously formed by analogy with 'homosexual,' and just as obviously meant to be distinguished from 'homosexual.'" (1). Reaction to homosexuality since the nineteenth century marks this word indubitably. Indeed, David Van Leer, in "The

Beast of the Closet: Homosexuality and the Pathology of Manhood," *Critical Inquiry* 15 (Spring 1989): 587–605, sees in "homosocial" not merely dependence on but hostility to homosexuality: "[T]he term 'homosocial' moves in conflicting directions. Constructed after and in answer to the term 'homosexual,' it is simultaneously parasitic on the word and hostile to the sexual preference. Thus, as a category, it contains by definition what it means to deny. As always, the etymological paradox is resolved in favor of the socially normative, until there is no positive place within 'homosociality' for 'homosexuality'" (603). In the face of these issues, I debated whether this word is more trouble than it is worth in the context of an investigation into late antiquity. I decided to keep "homosocial" precisely because of its association with desire between men that it ever tries to keep at bay—the desert was a space in which men were not supposed to be having sex with each other, after all. I also don't agree with Van Leer's pessimistic estimation that there can be no positive place for homosexuality within homosociality. I think rather that we should insist that the resistance to the sexual contained in the term predisposes any future subversion to be a homosexual one.

2. The sayings of three desert mothers (Theodora, Sara, and Syncletica) are preserved in the *Apophthegmata patrum* (PG 65 201A–204B, 420B–21A, and 421A–28A, respectively). See, too, Susanna Elm, *Virgins of God: The Making of Asceticism in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), and Rebecca Krawiec, *Shenoute and the Women of the White Monastery: Egyptian Monasticism in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002) for further discussion.

3. See, e.g., Henning Bech, *When Men Meet: Homosexuality and Modernity*, trans. Teresa Mesquit and Tim Davies (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997), 20–25, or Steven Zeeland, *Sailors and Sexual Identity: Crossing the Line between "Straight" and "Gay" in the U.S. Navy* (New York: Harrington Park, 1995), 6, 8–9.

4. When I use the term "homosexual" in this paper, I am referring to sexual behavior and/or desire between persons of the same sex and that is all; there is no presumption of identity effects.

5. Jerome *Interpretatio regulae Sancti Pachomii* (PL 23 78A–B), 94: "Nemo alteri loquatur in tenebris: nullus in psiathio cum altero dormiat: manum alterius nemo teneat; sed sive steterit, sive ambulaverit, sive sederit, uno cubito distet ab altero."

6. Jerome *Interpretatio regulae Sancti Pachomii* (PL 23 78B), 95: "Spinam de pede alterius, excepto domus praeposito, et secundo, et alio cui iussum fuerit, nemo audebit evellere."

7. But thanks in large part to John Boswell's *CSTH*, issues of same-sex desire, both in the desert and in other early-Christian contexts, are never less than secondary and are often central. His book called into being important discussions which still continue and with which this paper engages.

8. Athanasius, *Vita Antoni* (*Vie d'Antoine*), ed. and trans. G. J. M. Bartelink, *Sources Chrétiennes*, no. 400 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf), 1994. A salient feature of the *Vita Antoni* is its demonstrable status as an intervention against the Christians Athanasius terms "Arians"; Athanasius repeatedly portrays Antony as a staunch defender of Nicene Christianity (see sections 68–69, 82, 86, 89, and 91). As a leading bishop on the side of Nicene orthodoxy, Athanasius was always working to delegitimize the "Arians," who more than once were able to secure his banishment from the Alexandrian episcopal throne. See

David Brakke, *Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995) for discussion of Athanasius's political use of asceticism; see Virginia Burrus, *Begotten, Not Made: Conceiving Manhood in Late Antiquity* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000), 69–70, and Robert C. Gregg and Dennis Groh, *Early Arianism: A View of Salvation* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981), 131–59, for discussion of Athanasius's portrayal of Antony as a defender of Nicene Christianity.

9. Tyrannus Rufinus, *Historia monachorum sive de vita sanctorum patrum*, ed. Eva Schulz-Flügel (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1990); hereafter Rufinus *HM*.

10. Elizabeth A. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 184.

11. B.g., see *Historia monachorum in Aegypto*, critical edition of the Greek text, ed. A.-J. Festugière (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1961; hereafter, *HM*), *praef.* 2: "trusting the prayers of those [who were asking for this account] I have dared to apply myself to this narrative so that (even for me) some benefit from their [i.e., the monks'] service should eventuate—through imitating their way of life, their complete withdrawal from the world, and their stillness acquired through virtues' steadfast endurance, endurance which they keep at until the end of life." ("... ταῖς αὐτῶν εὐχαῖς καταπιστεύσας ἐτόλμησα πρὸς τὴν διήγησιν ταύτην τραπῆναι, ἵνα κάμοι τι κέρδος γένηται τῆς αὐτῶν ὠφελείας, μιμησάμενον αὐτῶν τὴν πολιτείαν καὶ τὴν παντελὴ τοῦ κόσμου ἀναχώρησιν καὶ ἡσυχίαν διὰ τῆς ὑπομονῆς τῶν ἀρετῶν, ἧς μέχρι τέλους κατέχουσιν.") See also Athanasius *Vita Antoni praef.* 3, 89.1, 89.4; *Apophthegmata patrum praef.* (PG 65 72A); Rufinus *HM*, *praef.* 2.

12. "Παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς, μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε."

13. Elizabeth Castelli, in *Imitating Paul: A Discourse of Power* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991), persuasively illuminates connections between Paul's injunctions to his followers to imitate him and the construction of his authority. Paul's emphasis on mimesis creates an "economy of sameness" (or an "hegemony of the identical") that both provides a powerful source of legitimization to hierarchy and produces a coercive understanding of the nature of identity as inimical to difference (120, 124–25; see also 16–17). Or, in other words, through his emphasis on mimesis, Paul elaborates an "ideology of imitation . . . within the fields of both social relations (power) and metaphysics (identity)" (22) that offers the promise of identity (and the threat of abjection to those who refuse [cf. Judith Butler, *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex* (New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hall, Inc., 1993), 14–15]) in the context of asymmetrical social relations.

14. Of course, that future never comes because the ideal "is" in an eternal "present" beyond time and space while the ascetic must act in time and space. This ultimate failure of mimesis recalls what Judith Butler has to say about the ultimate failure haunting the efforts to be a man or a woman: "The 'real' and the 'sexually factic' are phantasmatic constructions—illusions of substance—that bodies are compelled to approximate, but never can . . . and yet this failure to become 'real' and to embody 'the natural' is, I would argue, a constitutive failure of all gender enactments for the very reason that these ontological locales are fundamentally uninhabitable" (*Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* [New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hall, Inc., 1990], 146).

15. Burrus, *Begotten, Not Made*, 11.

16. That norms and idealized representations are only part of the story is increasingly recognized. Peter Brown notes that he "fell into the trap prepared . . . by the disciples of the holy man" (*Authority and the Sacred: Aspects of the Christianisation of the Roman World* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995], 63) when he presented the holy man as a patron in 1971, in "The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity," *Society and the Holy in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1982), 103–52. Brown now recognizes that the various accounts' tales of holy men scolding the rich and interceding on behalf of the poor left out an economic reality: the holy man and his establishment were in fact a "costly amenity" that many regions could ill afford (*Authority and the Sacred*, 62)—cf. Elizabeth Castelli's remarks ("Gender, Theory, and the 'Rise of Christianity': A Response to Rodney Stark," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 6, no. 2 [1998]: 227–57, at 257) on Rodney Stark's offering the rhetorical presentation of Christian womanhood as the reality of it (*The Rise of Christianity: A Sociologist Reconsiders History* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996]). Criticizing Michel Foucault's reliance on didactic texts that resulted in the presentation of the norms of elite men as the sexual reality of the first- and second-century CE Roman empire, Simon Goldhill, in *Foucault's Virginité: Ancient Erotic Fiction and the History of Sexuality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), suggests that we consider the Greek novels and their readers in addition to the texts Foucault privileged (and this advice is valid for other genres as well). These narratives create their effects through a complicit reader whose "hesitations, appropriations, fantasies and blindnesses" interact with a narrative that presents and undercuts norms at the same time (*Foucault's Virginité*, 44–45). Indeed, examples of readerly complicity and agency are to be found in late antiquity. By way of an example, the emperor Julian, in his eighth oration, "To the Mother of the Gods," most probably written in 362 CE, sees the role of the reader as crucial whenever he or she is faced with the paradoxical contents of myths (Julian [emperor], *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. and trans. Gabriel Rochefort [Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2003], vol. 2, pt. 1). Julian remarks that men of old "clothed" the truths of the universe "in paradoxical myths, so that through paradox and incongruity the fiction, detected, might turn us toward the search for truth" (8.170A–B: "ἐσκεπάσαν . . . μύθοις παραδόξοις, ἵνα διὰ τοῦ παραδόξου καὶ ἀπεμφαίνοντος τὸ πλάσμα φωραθὲν ἐπὶ τὴν ζήτησιν ἡμᾶς τῆς ἀληθείας προτρέψῃ . . ."). The great unwashed will accept the myths as they are, of course (8.170B), but those who are wiser, because they recognize that these myths are a riddling representation of a higher reality, will search for meaning beyond them (8.170B: " . . . διὰ μὲν τῶν αἰνιγμάτων ὑπομνησθεῖς ὅτι χρὴ τι περὶ αὐτῶν ζητεῖν . . ."). And Julian most assuredly sees this work of interpretation as involving an engaged and active reader: "He should not be modest and he should not put faith in the opinion of others more than he does in his own mental powers" (8.170B–C: " . . . οὐκ αἰδοῖ καὶ πιστεῖται μάλλον ἄλλοτρίας δόξης ἢ τῇ σφετέρᾳ κατὰ νοῦν ἐνεργείᾳ").

17. HM 24.1: "Οὗτος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γαμετὴν ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ καταλαβὼν μοιχευομένην μηδὲν μηδὲν εἰπὼν ἐπὶ τὴν ἔρημον πρὸς Ἀντώνιον ὤρμησεν. Καὶ προσπεσὼν αὐτοῦ τοῖς γόνασιν παρεκάλει συνεῖναι αὐτῷ σωθῆναι βουλόμενος. Ἐβη δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Ἀντώνιος· Ἄδύνη σωθῆναι ἐὰν ἔχῃς ὑπακοήν, καὶ ὅπερ ἂν παρ' ἐμοῦ ἀκούσης, τοῦτο ποιήσης." Οὗ δὲ Παῦλος ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· Πάντα ποιήσω ὅσαπερ ἂν προστάξης."

18. HM 24.7: "Ὡς δὲ λοιπὸν τρίτῃ ἑβδομάδι ἐπληρώθη μὴ βεβρωκότος τοῦ Παύλου, οἱ

ἀδελφοὶ ἠρώτων αὐτὸν τίνας ἔνεκεν σιωπᾶ. Τοῦ δὲ μὴ ἀποκρινομένου λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Ἀντώνιος· Τί σιωπᾶς; ὁμίλησον τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς. Ὁ δὲ ὁμίλησεν."

19. HM 24.10: "Καὶ τοσαύτην ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐκτίσαστο ὑπακοήν, ὥστε καὶ χάριν αὐτῷ δεδῶσθαι θεόθεν τὴν κατὰ τῶν δαιμόνων ἐλασίαν. Οὐς γὰρ οὐκ ἡδύνατο ὁ μακάριος Ἀντώνιος ἐκβάλλειν δαίμονας, τοῦτους πρὸς Παῦλον ἀπέστελλεν καὶ αὐθωρον ἐξεβάλλοντο."

20. See Graham Gould, *The Desert Fathers on Monastic Community* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 26–87, for more on the pedagogical aspect of the relationship between *abba*/master and disciple.

21. Ὀμίλῳ is found with sexual meaning in classical sources (*LSJ* IV), as is the related noun ὁμίλια (*LSJ* I.2). Classical sources also feature sexual meaning associated with both σύνεμι (*LSJ* [συνεῖναι] II.2) and its related noun, συνουσία (*LSJ* I.4). Sexual meanings continue to be associated with these words later in the empire: ὁμίλῳ (G. W. Lampe, ed., *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, A4; *Apophth. patr.*, Paphnutius 1 [PG 65 377C]; John Chrysostom *Oppugn.* 2.10 [PG 47 346]; Athanasius *Ar.* 3 [348B7]; Guido Müller, *Lexicon Athanasianum* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1952), 984); ὁμίλια (Lampe A2a; John Chrysostom *Oppugn.* 3.15 [PG 47 375]); συνεῖναι (Lampe 4; Saloustios *De deis* 4.7 [Saloustios, *Des dieux et du monde*, ed. and trans. Gabriel Rochefort (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2003)]); συνουσία (Lampe 2; John Chrysostom *Oppugn.* 1.3 [PG 47 323], 2.3 [PG 47 335], 2.10 [PG 47 346]; Athanasius *De incarnatione* 8.23 [Robert W. Thomson, *Athanasius Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), 152]; Porphyry *Ant.* 16).

22. HM 24.8: "Ἄλλοτε δὲ στόμνου μέλιτος αὐτῷ ἐνεχθέντος εἶπεν ὁ Ἀντώνιος πρὸς αὐτόν· Κλάσον τὸ ἄγγειον καὶ ἐκχυθῆτω τὸ μέλι. Ἐποίησεν δὲ οὕτως. Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· Σύναξον πάλιν τὸ μέλι μυακίῳ ἄνωθεν, ἵνα μὴ ῥυπαρίαν τινα συνεισενέγκῃς."

23. Averil Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1991), 60.

24. Cameron elsewhere notes that a mix of manifest meaning and hidden significance was expected in literature meant to inspire imitation by ascetics: "Like visual art, early Christian discourse presented its audience with a series of images. The proclamation of the message was achieved by a technique of presenting the audience with a series of images through which it was thought possible to perceive an objective and higher truth. That the images carried a meaning, whether hidden or not, was not in doubt: 'now we see though a glass darkly, but then face to face; now I know in part, but then shall I know even as also I am known' [1 Cor. 13: 12]" (*Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire*, 57).

25. Robert Lamberton, "Sweet Honey in the Rock: Pleasure, Embodiment, and Metaphor in Late-Antique Platonism," in *Constructions of the Classical Body*, ed. James I. Porter (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999), *passim*, but see 321–23.

26. Porphyry *On the Cave* 16; translation, altered slightly, is from L. G. Westerlink et al., *Porphyry, The Cave of the Nymphs in the Odyssey: A Revised Text with Translation*. Arethusa Monographs, 1. (Buffalo: State University of New York, 1969): "Φησὶ . . . ἢ Νύξ τῷ Διὶ ὑποτιθεμένη τὸν διὰ μέλιτος δόλον· εὖτ' ἂν δῇ μιν ἴσθαι ὑπὸ δρυσὶν ὑπνικόμοισιν ἐργοῖσιν μεθύοντα μελισσῶν ἐριβομβέων,

δῆσον αὐτόν. "Ὁ καὶ πάσχει ὁ Κρόνος καὶ δεθεῖς ἐκτέμνεται ὡς ὁ Οὐρανός, τοῦ θεολόγου δι' ἡδονῆς δεσμεῖσθαι καὶ κατάγεσθαι τὰ θεῖα εἰς γένεσιν αἰνισσομένου ἀποσπερματίζειν τε δυνάμεις εἰς τὴν ἡδονὴν ἐκλύθεντα· ὅθεν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μὲν συνουσίας τὸν Οὐρανὸν κατιόντα εἰς Γῆν ἐκτέμνει Κρόνος· ταῦτόν δὲ τῇ ἐκ συνουσίας ἡδονῇ παρίστησιν αὐτοῖς <τῇ> τοῦ μέλιτος, ὅφ' οὐ δολωθεῖς ὁ Κρόνος ἐκτέμνεται."

27. "Αἰμά τε γὰρ ταύταις καὶ ὁ δῦργος γόνος φίλος . . ." (Porphyry *On the Cave* 10).

28. Burrus, *Begotten, Not Made*, 163.

29. Burrus, *Begotten, Not Made*, 181.

30. Sister M. Monica Wagner, *Rufinus, the Translator* (Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1945), 6. I have found Wagner's presentation of Rufinus's reflections on his practice as translator to be most helpful. See especially 4–11.

31. Rufinus *Apol. ad Anastasium* 7 (PL 21 626C): "Sicut in Graecis habetur, rogatus sum ut Latinis ostenderem. Graecis sensibus verba dedi Latina tantummodo."

32. Rufinus *Apol. adv. Hier.* 1.25 (PL 21 563C): "Unde et nos propter paupertatem linguae et rerum novitatem, et . . . quod Graecorum et sermo latior et lingua felicius sit, conabimur non tam verbum ex verbo transferre, quod impossibile est, quam vim verbi quodam explicare circuitu."

33. Rufinus *Apol. adv. Hier.* 1.12 (PL 21 549A–B): "In praefatiunculis tamen utriusque operis et maxime in Pamphili libellum, quem primum transtuleram, exposui primum omnium fidem meam, et protestatus sum me quidem ita credere sicut fides catholica est; si quid autem vel legeretur vel interpretaretur a me, id me salva fidei meae facere ratione. In istis vero Περὶ Ἀρχῶν libellis, etiam illud admonui, quod, cum in ipsis libris invenirentur quaedam de fide ita catholice scripta, ut Ecclesia praedicat, quaedam autem his contraria, cum de una eademque re dicantur: mihi visum sit haec secundum illam semper regulam proferenda, quam ipse catholicae sententiae expositione protulerat, et ea quae a semetipso invenirentur esse contraria, vel inserta ab aliis . . . abicerem, vel certe, ut nihil aedificationis in fide habenda praeterirem."

34. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy*, 181.

35. Rufinus *In explan. Origen. super Epist. ad Rom., peror. ad Heraclium* (PG 14 1293–94): "... sicut in homiliis sive in oratiunculis in Genesim et in Exodum fecimus, et praecipue in his quae in librum Levitici ab illo quidem perorandi stilo dicta, a nobis vero explanandi specie translata sunt."

36. Rufinus *In explan. Origen. super Epist. ad Rom., peror. ad Heraclium* (PG 14 1293–94): "Nobis enim propositum est non plausum legentium, sed fructum proficientium quaerere."

37. Rufinus *Apol. adv. Hier.* 2.46 (PL 21 622A): "... ita et nos vel ademptis, vel immutatis quibusdam vel additis, sensum auctoris adducere conati sumus ad intelligentiae tramitem rectiorem."

38. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy*, 168, 184.

39. Rufinus *HM* 31.2: "Cum uxorem suam oculis suis cum altero cubitantem vidisset, nulli quicquam dicens egressus est domum et maestitia animi actus in eremum semetipsum dedit, ubi cum anxius oberraret, ad monasterium pervenit Antonii ibique ex loci admonitione et opportunitate consilium capit."

40. See, e.g., the seventh of Pachomius's rules: "No one should look at another while he is making a rope, or praying; he should be intent in his work with his gaze averted." (VII.

"Nemo aspiciat alterum torquentem funiculum, vel orantem; sed in suo defixis luminibus opere sit intentus" [Jerome *Interpretatio regulae Sancti Pachomii* PL 23 69A]).

41. These directions make Rufinus's Antony sound much more like John Cassian in *De nocturnis illusionibus* 22 (*Collationes*, Sources Chrétiennes, no. 64 [Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1959]) than the Antony of the Greek original. See David Brakke, "The Problematization of Nocturnal Emissions in Early Christian Syria, Egypt, and Gaul," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 3, no. 4 (1995): 419–60, and Kenneth C. Russell, "John Cassian on a Delicate Subject," *Cistercian Studies Quarterly* 27 (1992): 1–12, for further discussion of nocturnal emissions in the desert.

42. Rufinus *HM* 31.6: "Cibum quoque sumere in vesperam praecepit, sed observare, ne usque ad saturitatem veniret et praecipue in potu, confirmans non minus per aquae abundantiam fantasias animae fieri quam per vinum calorem corporis incrementum."

43. Rufinus *HM* 31.7: "Et ubi plene eum, qualiter in singulis agere deberet, instruxit, in vicino ei, hoc est a tribus milibus, cellulam constituit ibique eum exercere quae didicerat iubet, ipse tamen frequentius visitans gratulabatur deprehendens eum in his, quae sibi tradita fuerant, tota intentione et sollicitudine permanentem."

44. Rufinus *In explan. Origen. super Epist. ad Rom., peror. ad Heraclium* (PG 14 1293–94).