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Abstract: This article presents evidence for married saints, which can be dated to the early ninth century, and compares such material with hagiographical data about chaste laymen from the tenth century. This approach makes it possible to define more clearly the different concepts of sanctity that were current at these times and thus to gauge the changes that occurred during the intervening years. The article concludes with a brief discussion of possible reasons for the changes in the discourse about sainthood that set the eighth and early ninth centuries apart from both the preceding and the following periods.

After the end of the persecutions in the early fourth century AD the Christian communities of the Roman Empire shaped a new concept of personal sanctity that was no longer based on voluntary death for one’s faith but instead demanded a complete withdrawal from the network of social relations, which found its most striking expression in the refusal to marry and procreate.1 This concept survived the breakdown of the social and political structures of Late Antiquity and was passed on to the Middle Ages. Hagiographical texts produced in Early Medieval Western Europe are in agreement that the state of sainthood precludes sexual activity even if sanctioned by marriage.2 Only rarely does one encounter exceptions and in these cases the hagiographers were acutely aware that they were dealing with anomalous situations that required an explanation.3 Strikingly similar views

3 One such exception was Bishop Arnulf of Metz († c. 640), who had been married and fathered two sons before he took holy orders; cf. van Uytfanghe, M., “Le remploi dans l’hagiographie: une ‘loi du genre’ qui étouffe l’originalité?” in: Ideologie e pratiche del reimpegno nell’alto medioevo. Dirk Krausmüller, “Chastity or Procreation? Models of Sanctity for Byzantine Laymen During the Iconoclastic and Post-Iconoclastic Period,” in: Journal for Late Antique Religion and Culture 7 (2013) 51-71; ISSN: 1754-517X; Website: http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/clarc/jlarc
can be found in writings from Byzantium, the successor state of the Roman Empire in the East. During the Golden Age of Byzantine hagiography after the end of Iconoclasm the overwhelming majority of \textit{lives} was devoted to monastic saints. The authors of these texts invariably maintain that virginity is infinitely preferable to married life, which they present as an obstacle on the path to sainthood. Such statements had been commonplace in Late Antique \textit{vitae} and thus one might conclude that an unbroken continuity linked tenth-century Byzantium to the time when the nexus between chastity and sanctity was first established. However, a look at hagiographical writings from the intermediate period reveals that this is not the case because there we find clear evidence that the roles of saint and of husband and father were not always considered mutually exclusive.

Scholars have long recognised that at least one Byzantine saint from that period failed to conform to the virginal ideal, Philaretus of Amnia († 792), an Anatolian landowner and head of a large family, whose biography later became the subject matter of a \textit{vita}.

In this article I present further evidence for married saints, which can be dated to the early ninth century, and I compare this material with hagiographical data about chaste laymen from the tenth century. I have chosen this approach because it permits me to define more clearly the different concepts of sanctity that were current at these times and thus to gauge the changes that occurred during the intervening years. I start with a discussion of the negative attitudes towards marriage expressed in post-Iconoclastic \textit{lives} of holy monks and in the \textit{sermons} of Patriarch Photius and then turn to an analysis of \textit{vitae} of lay saints from the tenth century. Focusing on the Metaphrastic \textit{Life} of Eudocimus the Just and on the figure of Callistus in the \textit{Passio Γ} of the Forty-Two Martyrs of Amorion by Michael the Synkellos, I show that both texts present an ideal of sainthood based on chastity and almsgiving that is clearly derived from a monastic model. Having determined the prevailing views on monastic and lay sanctity in the tenth century I then turn to the Second Iconoclasm as the period during which Eudocimus and Callistus lived. A passage in \textit{Passio Γ} that mentions miracles at the tomb of Callistus’ father provides the starting point for a discussion of saints who were both husbands and fathers. I compare this passage with the \textit{Life} of Philaretus and conclude that both figures reflect the same concept of sanctity, which is exclusively based on almsgiving. Then I present the case of Philotheus of

\begin{quote}
Settimane 46 (Spoleto, 1999), pp. 359-411, esp. p. 394, about the hagiographer’s treatment of Arnulf’s marriage: he attributes it to God’s will and then adds for good measure the apologetic comment that Arnulf was not given to lust.

This article does not deal with “pious housewives,” women who were married and had children and nevertheless attained saintly status. For this group of saints cf. Angeliki E. Laiou’s introduction to her translation of the \textit{Life of St. Mary the Younger}, in Talbot, A.-M. (ed.), \textit{Holy Women of Byzantium. Ten Saints’ Lives in English Translation} (Washington, D.C., 1996), pp. 249-252.
\end{quote}
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Opsikion, a married village priest who probably lived in the first half of the ninth century and who inspired a successful and lasting cult. After a discussion of the surviving evidence I focus on the notice about the saint in the tenth-century Synaxarium Sirmondianum. From this text it appears that, unlike Philaretus and Callistus’ father, Philotheus performed miracles already during his lifetime. Analysis of the narrative in the synaxarium reveals a bipartite structure in which the acquisition of sanctity status is followed by a display of the powers that pertain to this status. I show that this structure is traditionally found in vitae of monastic saints but that in these texts renunciation of sexuality is presented as a precondition for wonderworking whereas in Philotheus’ case it is charity and almsgiving. This leads me to the conclusion that Philotheus’ hagiographer consciously deviated from a long-established convention in order to proclaim an alternative model of sanctity. In the last part of this article I briefly discuss possible reasons for the changes in the discourse about sainthood that set the eighth and early ninth centuries apart from both the preceding and the following periods.

When, after the end of the Second Iconoclasm Byzantine hagiography entered its most productive phase, the vast majority of vitae were devoted to holy monks. In these texts the topic of married life has a fixed place in the part of the narrative that immediately precedes the saints’ departure from the world. At this point one often finds an episode in which their parents attempt to arrange marriages for them. The standard reaction to this imposition is either to run away before the wedding, or to abscend from the wedding chamber before the marriage is consummated. If all else fails and the control of the family cannot be evaded the reluctant husband persuades his bride to remain virginal. However, such scenarios must not be read as condemnations of sexual activity during marriage in general. An episode from the Life of Demetrianus of Chytri, a Cypriot saint who lived in the second half of the ninth century, gives an insight into the complexity of the hagiographical discourse on marriage. There we read that when Demetrianus was fifteen years  

---

7 Cf. e.g. Life of Theophanes Confessor by Patriarch Methodius (BHG 1787z), chs 11-14, ed. V. V. Latyşev, Methodii Patriarchae Constantinopolitanit Vita S. Theophanis Confessoris (Zapiški rossijkoj akademii nauk. viii. ser. po istoriko-filologičeskому otdeleniju, 13.4, Petrograd, 1918), pp. 7-10.
old his parents found him a bride and married him off to her. The hagiographer does not simply state this as a fact but launches into an elaborate justification. An appeal to the Christian commandment that children obey their parents permits him to argue that Demetrianus was constrained to act in this way although “he did not want to submit to the yoke of marriage nor prefer slavery to freedom.”9 In addition, the hagiographer also presents the perspective of the saint’s parents.10 He stresses that they chose as his bride a beautiful and virtuous girl and he ascribes to them the following reasoning: “his parents decided on what they believed to be the less dangerous road concerning the guarding of the soul even if it comes second to the good of virginity and they gave him into an exceedingly lawful marriage.”11

The characterisation of marriage as the safest life-style for Christians is based on Paul’s avowal that it provides a legitimate outlet for the sexual urges of those who cannot contain them otherwise.12 This permits the hagiographer to present Demetrianus’ parents as acting responsibly. However, by adding the parenthesis “as they believed” he at the same time makes it clear that their decision was based on a faulty assessment of their son’s capacity. It is evident that, despite being accepted in principle, marriage is not given a positive significance and thus becomes little more than a concession to human frailty. The qualification “exceedingly lawful” has an exclusively apologetic function: it exculpates the saint who by giving in to his parents seems to accept his role as a sexually active male, even if only out of a sense of filial duty. The fact that Demetrianus’ wife died three months after the wedding gives the hagiographer a means to resolve the possible conflict between sanctity and married life. He avers that the marriage had not yet been consummated and attributes this turn of events to an intervention of God, which ensured that Demetrianus was a virgin when he embarked on the path to sainthood.13

Hagiographical texts such as the Life of Demetrianus focus on individuals who opted for a monastic life-style and they were often composed for monastic audiences. As a consequence one can argue that they present a partisan view, which is not representative of Byzantine attitudes towards marriage and procreation in the post-Iconoclastic period. In order to arrive at a more balanced

---


10 Life of Demetrianus of Chytri, ch. 4, ed. Delehaye, p. 302C: τῷ νέῳ τὴν γαμήλιον ἑορτὴν ἐπετέλεσαν κόρην τινὰ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ τῷ κάλλει διαφέρουσαν καὶ ἄξιαν ἐν τοῖς ἤθεσι τῆς ψυχῆς τούτου συζεύξαντες.


13 Life of Demetrianus of Chytri, ch. 4, ed. Delehaye, p. 302C: καὶ γὰρ ἀμφότερον τὰ τῆς παρθενίας σῶμα φυλάξας σήμερανι οὕτω τὴν διαζεύξας ὑποκομίσες.
assessment I therefore extend the discussion to the Sermons of Patriarch Photius (858-867 and 877-886) who had himself been a layman and who preached to congregations that would have consisted overwhelmingly of lay people. Despite this fact Photius shows little interest in marriage as a topic. Moreover, in the rare passages where he voices his views he makes it clear that procreation is the only acceptable purpose for marriage and that sexual activity should end once this aim is achieved, and he is especially opposed to second marriages. His Ninth Homily about the burial of Christ gives an insight into his evaluation of chastity and of sexual activity in marriage as alternative Christian lifestyles. At the end of this speech Photius addresses different groups of people, among them the married and the unmarried, to whom he gives the following exhortation: “You who still draw the yoke of marriage, (sc. offer up to him) harmony in the good and dignity, for thus marriage should preserve its worth! You who have been unyoked from this sweet necessity, as if liberated from some burdensome slavery, turn towards the racecourse of chastity! You who have transcended these states, (sc. offer up) virginity with pity and a humble mind in order that you may not lack being called prudent and your lamp may never be troubled by the spirit of arrogance!”

The views expressed here are strikingly similar to those found in the Life of Demetrianus. While Photius exhorts the married members of his congregation to conduct themselves properly, he leaves no doubt that this is the lowest form of Christian life when he then congratulates those who have left this state behind and winds up with a praise of those who have never been sexually active. He accords only one positive quality to married life, humility, which is directly related to the deficiency of this state. Unsurprisingly Photius gives marriage a marginal status within the Christian belief system. When he concludes from the virgin birth that the incarnation is a liberation of man from all sexual activity, be it lawful or otherwise, he makes it clear that marriage belongs to the Old Testament practices that have been superseded by the new covenant.

---

14 Significantly, he does not even address the topic in his sermon on the birth of Mary where other preachers took the opportunity to praise Mary’s parents Joachim and Anna: Photius, Homilia IX in nativitatem BMV, ed. B. Laourdas, Φωτίου Ὀμιλίαι (Salonica, 1959), p. 95.20.
15 In his sermon on the annunciation Photius exhorts his listeners to show such behaviour in honour of Mary: Homilia VII in annuntiationem, ed. Laourdas, p. 79.25: οἱ γάμῳ συνδεθέντες τὸ πεῖραν λαβεῖν τοῦ βίου καὶ πρὸς γονὰς ἐνδοῦναι τῇ φύσει καὶ τὴν σωφροσύνην εἰς τὸ ἐπείτα σώμα συντηρῆσαι μηδὲ δευτέροις γάμοις ἐνυβρίζειν τὸν φθάσαντα.
16 Photius, Homilia XI in sepulturam Domini, ed. Laourdas, p. 121.2-8: οἱ τὸν τοῦ γάμου ζυγὸν ἔτι ἔλκοντες τὴν ἐν τῷ καλῷ συμφωνίαν καὶ σεμνότητα· οὕτω γὰρ ὃ γάμος τὸ τίμιον διασώσειν· οἱ ταύτης τῆς ἡδυπαθοῦς διαζυγέντες ἀνάγκης ὀπίσθεν ἐπιμόχθου τινὸς διαλυθέντες δουλείας πρὸς τὸν τῆς σωφροσύνης ὑπόνοιαν θυνεῖσθε· οἱ τούτων κρείσσους γενόμενοι δουλέας πρὸς τὴν τῆς σωφροσύνης δρόμον ἴθυνεσθε· οἱ τούτων κρείσσους γενόμενοι τὴν ἐν ἐλέῳ παρθένην καὶ ταπεινῶν τὸ φρονόμητα ἰσα ἡν καὶ τοῦ φρόνιμος κριθῆναι μὴ ἀμοιρήσητε καὶ ἡ λαμπάς μηδαμῶς εἰ ἐκ παρενοχλουμένην τὸ πνεύματι τῆς οἰήσεως.
17 Photius, Homilia IX in nativitatem BMV, ed. Laourdas, p. 97.3-9: μητέρα ἄρα ἔδει κάτω διωτερευθῆναι τοῦ πλάσμου εἰς τὸ τοῦ συντριβὲν ἀναπλάσασθαι καὶ ταύτῃ τὴν παρθένον ... ἢν Dirk Krausmüller, “Chastity or Procreation? Models of Sanctity for Byzantine Laymen During the Iconoclastic and Post-Iconoclastic Period,” in: Journal for Late Antique Religion and Culture 7 (2013) 51-71; ISSN: 1754-517X; Website: http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/clarc/jlarc
Despite the uncompromising views of churchmen like Photius there can be no doubt that the Byzantine laity had a high regard for marriage, which provided a tightly controlled framework within which procreation took place and which thus ensured the survival of the family into the next generation. The power of the family over its individual members can be seen from the Life of the ninth-century saint Euthymius the Younger.\(^{18}\) Like Demetrianus, Euthymius had given in to the demands of his family and got married before he left his home to become a monk.\(^{19}\) However, in this case the marriage was consummated and resulted in a daughter, a fact that the hagiographer attributes to Euthymius’ obedience to his mother and not to sexual desire.\(^{20}\) Having spent several years in a monastery, the saint re-established contact with his family. At that point a decision was made that his wife and sisters should enter the monastic life whereas his daughter should remain in the world to continue the family line.\(^{21}\) Though mentioned in a saint’s life it is evident that this decision has no relation to the discourse of sanctity: the spiritual perfection of the saint’s lay offspring is not an issue. What is missing in this text and in other vitae of the post-Iconoclastic period is a concept that would present the roles of husband and father as reconcilable with the quest for sanctity and thus of the same value as a lifestyle characterised through abstinence from sexual activity.

The absence of such a concept is evident not only in the lives of monastic saints but also in the few texts that have saintly laymen as their subject matter. Comparison between the two models of sainthood leaves no doubt that monastic sanctity was the standard and that notions of lay sanctity were derived from it. One model available to laypeople was marriage without sexual intercourse. Such a saintly couple appears in one of the edifying stories of the tenth-century author Paul of Monembasia.\(^{22}\) The narrator of this story observes the exceptional devotion of a poor man in several churches of Constantinople and then questions him about his life. The man first states that he works for a living and that he gives away as alms one third of his income before continuing with the words: “We fast every day until evening, I and she who is your servant, eating nothing but bread

\[\text{μηδεμία μηδ’ ἐννόμου πάροδος ἡδονῆς μηδ’ ἐπινοηθείη τῷ τόκῳ τοῦ κτίσαντος· ἡδονῆς γὰρ ἦν ἀιχμάλωτος ὃν ὁ δεσπότης ἐλευθερῶσαι τὴν γέννησιν κατεδέξατο.}\]


\(^{19}\) Life of Euthymius the Younger, ch. 5, ed. Petit, p. 173.1-7.

\(^{20}\) Life of Euthymius the Younger, ch. 6, ed. Petit, p. 173.8-13.

\(^{21}\) Life of Euthymius the Younger, ch. 16, ed. Petit, p. 182.16-22.

and drinking only water, and we pray all night long. It is now twenty-seven years that we have been married and the Lord God has preserved us in virginity.”

The affinity with the monastic ideal is even more apparent in hagiographical texts about unmarried laymen. The best-known of these texts is the Life of Eudocimus the Just since it is included in the popular menologion that the state official Symeon Metaphrastes produced in the late tenth century. Eudocimus, a member of an Anatolian aristocratic family, entered imperial service under Emperor Theophilus (829-842) and then served as a governor in the Eastern Anatolian province of Charsianon where he “took much care of the people, not only presiding in the manner of a father … but also fittingly solving controversies between them on the unwavering scales of justice,” and after his death he was graced with a string of miracles. The metaphrasis opens with the claim that the saint surpassed others “insofar as living in the middle of turmoil and unstable affairs filled with all manner of trouble and filth he preserved his soul free of flooding and tranquil and undefiled and thus showed that it is the sign of cowards and unmanly people to opt for the flight from the world and to use the wilderness as a prop.” However, despite this astonishing invective against monks Eudocimus’ biography follows strictly conventional lines. After a reference to his psalm singing during journeys to the imperial palace the text continues with the following list of his virtues: “he loved chastity … to such an extent … that he laid down a law for his eyes not to be with virgins at all and he guarded himself against conversations with women to such an extent that only his mother was allowed to approach him … and with chastity he joined almsgiving … so that his face was illumined by the light of the one and his heart fattened by the oil of the other.”

24 Life of Eudocimus the Just (BHG, 607), ed. Chr. Loparev, “Βίος τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ δικαίου Εὐδοκίμου (Žiti e svjatago Evdokima pravednago),” Pamjatniki drevnej pismennosti 96 (St Petersburg, 1893), pp. 1-23. Symeon was responsible for a vast project of rewriting hagiographical texts according to the literary tastes of the time, which was then published in the form of a menologion.
25 Life of Eudocimus the Just, ed. Loparev, p. 7.28-8.3: πολύς ἦν περὶ τῆς περί τῆς μεσίς τοῦ λαοῦ πρόνοιαν ὑπὸ πατρικῶν μόνον αὐτῶν προετοιμασμοὺς ... ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν πρὸς ἀνάθλως ὀφθαλμῶν εἶναι διὰ καὶ εἰς ἀλλήλους ἀλατομελῶς ἔν ἄρρητοβελόν τοῦ τοῦ δικαίου ζωῆς.
27 Life of Eudocimus the Just, ed. Loparev, p. 5.17 – p. 6.12: σωφροσύνην δὲ ... οὕτως ἔστερξε ... ὡς ... διαβήκην ἡθίστα τοῖς ὀρθόλογοι καὶ μὴ συνείναι μυθόλογος ἐπὶ παράδειγμα τοσοῦτον τὸ γιγαντικὸς φυλαξότατον ὡς μόνον τῇ μηρῆ ἀκολούθον εἶναι τὸ πρὸς αὐτῶν παρίεναι ... τῇ σωφροσύνῃ
well have appeared in the \textit{vita} of a holy monk. In the tenth-century \textit{Life} of Luke the Stylite, for example, a description of the saint’s fierce asceticism is followed by a passage “about his almsgiving and his exceedingly great compassion and his love for men, brothers and strangers.”\textsuperscript{28} This permits the conclusion that while Eudocimus’ lifestyle is presented as greater than that of monks, the criteria by which his saintly status is gauged are exactly the same.

The \textit{Life} of Eudocimus is most likely a reflection of views held in the circle of the high state official Symeon Metaphrastes who was responsible for its production.\textsuperscript{29} The ethos of Symeon’s circle finds its expression in a poem that his younger friend Nicephorus Ouranos wrote on the occasion of Symeon’s death.\textsuperscript{30} In this poem Nicephorus praises his dead mentor for his service to the state, for his charity and for the fact that “his flesh did not know any form of carnal filth,” and then credits him with a “monastic character in the turmoil of worldly affairs,” a characterisation that closely resembles the views expressed in the \textit{Life} of Eudocimus.\textsuperscript{31}

The second tenth-century text that presents a model for lay sanctity is the \textit{Passio \Gamma} of the Forty-Two Martyrs of Amorion by the monk and \textit{synkellos} Michael,\textsuperscript{32} most
likely to be identified with the monk of the same name who held this function under Patriarch Nicholas Mystikos (901-907 and 912-925). When Michael created his version of the story he made substantial changes to his model, the anonymous Passio B. Rather than on the Byzantine generals captured during the fall of Amorion in the year 838 he focused on the figure of Callistus, a military governor of Colonia in the Pontus, who was caught in an independent Arab raid but later joined the generals in prison and was eventually executed together with them. Additionally, he gave a lengthy account of Callistus’ life prior to his imprisonment, which takes up the first half of the text and thus transforms the original martyrdom into a vita of this saint. Callistus was born in Anatolia to aristocratic parents and held various military commands under Emperor Theophilus. Michael avows that while in the Pontus Callistus showed himself as a model official with an acute sense of his duties to the weak and poor. Even more striking, however, is the strong stress on Callistus’ piety: during his stay in the capital he did not converse with his colleagues when travelling to the palace but instead spent his time singing psalms, and while discharging his official duties he read theological and spiritual texts. In addition to his fervent devotion Callistus is credited with “chastity and charity towards the needy”, the two basic qualities that we saw attributed to Eudocimus. Again this characterisation
reappears in a catalogue of virtues according to which Callistus “moderated his life in complete attention to and study of the divine law, taking the utmost care of the habit of virginity, and also pursued charity towards the poor.”

However, in this case the emphasis is firmly on sexual abstinence, which is given considerably more room than almsgiving. This imbalance is particularly evident in the statement “since he had gained the wealth of dispersion from his earliest youth and since he had the spirit of sanctification dwelling inside him, he was recognised by all as a treasure of virginity and compassion,” which is found at the beginning of the narrative. Having thus inculcated the notion that his hero never engaged in sexual activity Michael then relates how Callistus managed to preserve his virginity against the demands of Emperor Theophilus that he get married. Callistus’ chastity is part and parcel of his ascetic life-style, which leads him to neglect his outward appearance and sport the unkempt beard of a monk. The parallel is explicitly drawn in a series of questions addressed to the saint: “Shall I call you monk? But you are accoutred with spear and helmet and sword and armour like the champion of an army! Shall I name you one of those who mix with others? But you illumined your subjects with the beauties of virginity and the flashes of chastity!”

We can conclude that here, too, the monastic model provides the template for the life of a layman. If anything, it is even more predominant than in the Metaphrastic Life of Eudocimus, which is hardly surprising when we consider that the author Michael was himself a monk.

The striking similarity between Michael’s portrait of Callistus and the characterisation of Eudocimus suggests that the two texts advocate a concept of lay sanctity that was predominant at the time of their composition. However, it

41 Passio Γ of the 42 Martyrs of Amorium, ed. Nikitin, p. 25.11-13: ἐν πάσῃ προσοχῇ καὶ μελέτῃ τοῦ θείου νόμου τὸν ἑαυτοῦ βίον ἐρρύθμιζε τῆς παρθενίας ὅτι μάλιστα τὴν ἕξιν ἐπιμελούμενος· ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ τὸ πρὸς τοὺς πένητας εὐμετάδοτον πολὺς ἦν μεταδότην.


43 Cf. Passio Γ of the 42 Martyrs of Amorium, ed. Nikitin, p. 25.7-10.


45 Passio Γ of the 42 Martyrs of Amorium, ed. Nikitin, p. 28.9-12: μοναστή σε καλέσω; ἀλλὰ δόρο καὶ κράνος καὶ ῥομφαίαν καὶ θώρακα ὡς πρωταγωνιστή τρυποτεῖχοι περίκεισιν ἕνα τῶν μυγάδων σε λέξα; ἀλλὰ παρθενίας κάλλεσθαι καὶ σωφροσύνης ἀστραπαῖς καταλάμπει τὸ ὑποκείμενον.

46 For example, Michael relates that Callistus gave away all his possession before he went to Koloneia. While this is explained with his foreknowledge of his martyrdom the pattern is clearly that of a monk leaving the world. Cf. Passio Γ of the 42 Martyrs of Amorium, ed. Nikitin, p. 28.26-27: οὕτως οὖν ἀποταξάμενος κόσμῳ τε καὶ τοῖς ἐκ γένους καὶ τοῖς σταυρῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ νοστῶς ἀνθ’ ὅπλον ἀράμενος τὸν ὕποκλειοθέντας λαμβάνει τόπον τῆς ἔξοδος.
needs to be stressed that the two protagonists predated their hagiographers by several decades and that they had acquired their saintly status during their lifetimes. Both men clearly represent a type: as we have seen, they were members of Anatolian aristocratic families who ended their careers as governors in the Eastern provinces. This raises the question: what were the criteria by which their contemporaries determined saintly status?

I start the discussion with Eudocimus for whom we possess independent evidence. The Metaphrastic Life was not an original composition but was based on an older model. Unfortunately this text is lost but we possess a summary in the synaxarium of the saint. Although greatly abbreviated this synaxarium contains a passage about Eudocimus’ virtues: “He was a just balance and a yardstick that preserved exact equality, giving daily great amounts of alms, embellishing and providing for churches, caring for widows and orphans and in short pursuing every form of virtue.” As we have seen this stress on the saint’s righteousness and charity is also found in the tenth-century metaphrasis. By comparison, the synaxarium does not contain a single reference to Eudocimus’ chastity. One could argue that the absence of this aspect is due to the shortening of the original but it is also possible that the ninth-century Life did not yet put as much stress on sexual abstinence as the metaphrasis.

Such juxtaposition with an earlier text is not possible for Callistus where additional information is limited to mentions of his name in chronicles. However, in this case the tenth-century Passio Γ contains data that qualify the concept of lay sanctity exemplified in Callistus’ life. At the beginning of his narrative the author Michael the Synkellos briefly introduces the saint’s parents. Having remarked on their wealth and social standing he then adds the following comment: “His (sc. Callistus) father especially had shone in life through hospitality and sobriety and cleverness and after his departure from here or rather his return to God he was glorified with gifts of healing when he liberated a great many

50 In the Metaphrastic Life and in the Vita epitomata the praise of Eudocimus’ virginity is part of a rhetorical elaboration, which may well have been absent from the original text.
people from unclean spirits and all kinds of illnesses.”

Comparison with other hagiographical texts shows that this passage follows the standard pattern for short biographical notices about subsidiary holy figures. In the sixth-century *Life* of Patriarch Eutychius, for example, the author Eustratius states that the saint entered a monastery that had been founded by two local bishops and then continues: “These two, I mean Meletius and Seleucus, had been shepherds of the most holy church of the Amaseans where they died piously, and they perform healing miracles there until today.” However, such potted biographies are usually dedicated to monastic saints whereas Michael the Syncellus presents us with a case where the manifestation of sanctity through wonderworking is exclusively based on social virtues and does not require chastity: in this context the Greek term *sophrosyne* clearly does not mean abstention from sexual activity but rather moderation in its exercise.

This view contrasts oddly with the strong stress on virginity as a precondition for sainthood in the account of Callistus’ life. Callistus’ father died in the first quarter of the ninth century and like his younger contemporary Eudocimus he was buried in the Anatolian provinces. Since there is no reason to doubt Michael’s information about the cult at his tomb we must conclude that despite his roles as husband and father the local populace was prepared to attribute saintly powers to his corpse. Such behaviour is less surprising when we consider that in his time Callistus’ father was not an isolated figure. A much more famous case is that of Philaretus of Amnia († 792) who had also been married and fathered several children but was nevertheless accorded saintly status after his death. In the early ninth century his grandson composed a *Life*, which

---

52 Passio Γ of the 42 Martyrs of Amorium, ed. Nikitin, p. 23.15-18: ... Κάλλιστος ... ἐξ ὄρφας ... ὁρμώμενος γονέων ἐκκύκτητο περιφανεῖς οὗ μάλιστα ὁ πατήρ φιλοξενίας καὶ σωφροσύνη καὶ ἀγνόημον τῷ βίῳ διαμένας μετὰ τὴν ἐνθένδε ἐκδημίαν ἢ πρὸς θεὸν ἐπανάλυσιν χαρίσματος ἱαμάτων δεδόξαστο παντοίων.  


54 For a similar use of the term cf. the *Life* of Euthymius the Younger, 6, ed. Petit, p. 173.8-9: ταύτῃ τοι καὶ πατήρ θυγατρὸς μιᾶς τῇ συζύγῳ συνευνασθεὶς ὁ τῆς σωφροσύνης πυρσὸς ἄποδείκνυται. Michael gives no indication that Callistus’ father became a monk before his death. It appears that Callistus’ mother remained a laywoman throughout his life.  

puts strong emphasis on Philaretus’ social virtues and which attributes to him a posthumous miracle. Since all these features have parallels in Michael’s remarks about Callistus’ father we can conclude that both figures represent the same concept of sanctity, which is not based on chastity or even an ascetic life-style but on almsgiving and generosity and which thus meets only one half of the traditional criteria for sainthood.

Philaretus’ Life with its one recorded miracle gives the impression that this type of sanctity did not translate into wonderworking and while Michael seems to accord greater powers to Callistus’ father he gives no sign that this miraculous activity had already started during his lifetime. Thus the biographies of the two men differ considerably from contemporary lives of monastic saints whose fame as wonder-workers was often established long before they died. However, it needs to be stressed that not all lives of lay saints conform to this pattern. A notable exception is Philotheus of Opsikion, a married village priest from North West Anatolia. Philotheus is best known from an Encomium by the metropolitan Eustathius of Salonica (c. 1125-1193/1198). This text has already attracted the attention of the scholars Alexander Kazhdan and Robert Browning who regarded it as an expression of changing views on sainthood in the twelfth century. However, Eustathius’ Encomium is not the first account of the life of this saint. Biographical notes on Philotheus are already found two centuries earlier in the Synaxarium of Sirmond and in the Menologium of Basil II. The entry in the Menologium is of little historical value: Kazhdan has rightly characterised it as a “standardised


59 Eustathius of Salonica, Laudatio S. Philothei Opsiciani (BHG 1535) PG, 136, cols 141-161.


61 Menologium of Basil II, Sept. 15, PG, 117, col. 49BCD.
portrayal” that is “devoid of any information”.62 For this reason I limit the discussion to the Synaxarion of Sirmond, which contains the following account:

On the same day commemoration of our pious father and wonderworker Philotheus who hailed from the thema Opsikion and from a village called Myrmex. Having been sanctified from his mother’s womb and having received a name that corresponded to the name of his mother who was called Theophila, this man was in all respects a votive gift to God; he spent his time in fasting, persevered in prayers, was never absent in divine gatherings, pursued his reading with understanding, assisted the poor and became all things to all people. Having got married and become the father of children he was deigned worthy of priesthood. From then on there were again psalms in his mouth and his hands did not neglect to work the earth. His almsgiving was without limit wherefore he was also deigned worthy of very great miracles: he provided bread for the hungry from empty storerooms through prayer alone and furthermore changed river water into wine and moved a very great stone through his word alone. And a year after his death when he was transferred to a different place he himself stretched out his hands as if alive and gripped by the shoulders the two priests who wanted to transfer him and rose and walked three steps and deposited himself in the place where he now lies and where he pours forth a source of unceasing unguent, thus giving a wonderful and strange proof of his lifestyle.63

Comparison reveals a striking similarity between the account in the synaxarium and Eustathius’ Encomium.64 Both texts have the same sequence of episodes and in the parts that are narrated more fully in the synaxarium they often share the same words and phrases.65 Thus, there can be no doubt that the two versions are closely

---

63 Synaxarium of Philotheus of Opsikion, ed. Delehaye, p. 47.10 – p. 48.11: τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ μνήμη τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ θαυματουργοῦ Φιλοθέου. Οὗ ὄρμημα δέκαμον μὲν Ἄφικιος, κόμης δὲ καλουμένης Μόρηκας, ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς ἁγιασθεὶς καὶ τοῦ μητρικοῦ ὄνοματος κατάλληλον τὴν κλῆσιν δεξάμενος· Θεοφίλα γάρ ἐλέγετο. οὗτος ἦν ὅλως τῷ θεῷ ἀνάθημα νηστείας σχολάζων, προσευχαῖς προσκαρτερῶν, ἐν ταῖς θείαις συνάξεσις ἀπολιμπανόμενος, ταῖς ἀναγνώσεσι νοονεχῶς προσομιλῶν, τοῖς πτωχοῖς ἐπαρκῶν, τοῖς πάσιν τὰ πάντα γενόμενος· γάμῳ δὲ προσομιλήσας καὶ παιδίων πατὴρ γενόμενος τῆς ἱεροσύνης καταξιοῦται. ἔκτοτε πάλιν οἱ ψαλμοὶ ἐπὶ στόματος, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ γεηπονεῖν οὐκ ἠμέλουν. ὡς δὲ ἐλεημοσύνην ἀμέτρητην ἵνα καὶ θαυμάσιον μεγίστων ἧμισθῆ, διὰ μόνης προσευχῆς ἐξ ἀπόρων ταμείων τῶν πεινῶσιν ἄρτον παρασχῦν· ἀλλὰ καὶ ποτάμιον ὑδάτων διὰ μόνης προσευχῆς ἐξ ἀπόρων ταμείων φυτεύειν καὶ λίθους πέταλα βουλομένων αὐτῶν καὶ μετατίθεντος τῆς κοιμήσεως αὐτοῦ ἀνέστη καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων δραμάζοντος τῶν δύο ἱερέων βουλομένων αὐτῶν μετατίθενται ἀνέστη καὶ τρεῖς βάσεις ἁμαρτίας κατετέθη ἐν ὧν τόπον κείμενος βλάβει πηγήν ἀνέκυτον μύρων θαυμαστῆς τινα καὶ ξένην τῆς αὐτοῦ πολιτείας παρέχειν ἀπόδειξιν.

64 By comparison there is no overlap with the version in the Menologium of Basil II.
65 The closest parallels are found in the three miracles stories and in the account of Philotheus’ translation. Cf. e.g. Synaxarium of Philotheus of Opsikion, ed. Delehaye, p. 48.4-11: τὰς χεῖρας ὡσεὶ ζῶν ἐκτείνας καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων δραμάζοντος τῶν δύο ἱερέων βουλομένων αὐτῶν μετατίθενται ἀνέστη καὶ τρεῖς βάσεις βιασμένες κατετέθη ἐν ὧν τόπον κείμενος βλάβει πηγήν ἀνέκυτον μύρων θαυμαστῆς τινα καὶ ξένην τῆς αὐτοῦ πολιτείας παρέχειν ἀπόδειξιν.
related. At first sight it seems likely that the relatively lengthy *Encomium* is based on an original extended *life*. Although we have no secure evidence one can assume that such a text once existed and that it was the source for the *synaxarium*. However, closer analysis shows that while Eustathius’ version is more verbose it does not contain any data that are not found in the *synaxarium*. Indeed, Eustathius gives clear indications that he had little information at his disposal. Moreover, the passages for which there are no counterparts in the *synaxarium* have close parallels in other writings of Eustathius and can therefore be regarded as his additions. As a consequence we cannot use Eustathius’ text in order to reconstruct a hypothetical original *vita* and must rely exclusively on the *Synaxarium* of Sirmond.

The absence of references to the historical context makes it difficult to establish secure dates for Philotheus. A certain *terminus ante quem* is the late tenth century when his name first appears in the sources. His identification as “Opsikiotes” permits the conclusion that he lived after the early eighth century when Opsikion

...
is first attested as a place-name.\textsuperscript{72} However, the references to a flourishing cult in the synaxaria let a later date appear more likely.\textsuperscript{73} The nature of the posthumous miracle may allow us to narrow the time-span even further. The self-movement of Philotheus’ corpse has a close parallel in the Life of Eudocimus the Just, which as we have seen goes back to the mid-ninth century.\textsuperscript{74} This motive is absent from later hagiographical texts and appears to be related to a debate about the posthumous activity of saints during the Second Iconoclasm.\textsuperscript{75} As a consequence Philotheus can be added to the list of married saints from the first half of the ninth century.

Despite its brevity the narrative is an important source for establishing the concepts of lay sanctity that were current at that time. The first relevant section is a description of Philotheus’ behaviour as a youth. The activities of fasting, praying and attending services with which he is credited are strictly conventional and have close parallels in the lives of holy monks. However, at the point when he reaches maturity the text departs radically from the monastic ideal. Instead of leaving the world or at least taking a vow of chastity, Philotheus marries and has children. He is then ordained and lives as a priest in his village where he supports himself through farming and becomes renowned for his generous almsgiving. This section of the synaxarium has close parallels in the Life of Philaretus whom his hagiographer also portrays as a farmer given to extravagant acts of charity. There is, however, one clear difference: whereas Philaretus only becomes a wonderworker after his death Philotheus performs his first miracles during his lifetime.\textsuperscript{76}

As a consequence the narrative is divided into two clearly separated stages: The first part presents Philotheus’ path to sainthood whereas the second shows him displaying the supernatural powers that pertain to his saintly status. As Evelyne Patlagean has pointed out such a bipartite structure is a typical feature of


\textsuperscript{73} The Synaxarium of Sirmond points out that the saint is still buried in the same place and that he continues to pour forth unguent, the standard sign of sanctity in the Middle Byzantine period. Similarly the Menologium of Basil II contains a reference to the discharge of oil, which takes place until this day, cf. Menologium of Basil II, Sept. 15, PG, 117, col. 49D: καὶ ταφεὶς βρύει παραδόξως ἐκ τῶν τιμίων ὀστέων αὐτοῦ ἰάσεων ἔλαιον μέχρι τῆς σήμερον.

\textsuperscript{74} Cf. Life of Eudocimus the Just, ed. Loparev, p. 19.3-32. Similar but less elaborate incidents are recorded in the Lives of Athanasia of Aegina and Eustratius of the Agauroi.

\textsuperscript{75} References to this debate can be found in the hagiographical writings of Patriarch Methodius, especially his Life of Euthymius of Sardes (\textit{BHG} 2145), in: Gouillard, J. (ed.), “La vie d’Euthyme de Sardes († 831), une œuvre du patriarche Méthode,” \textit{Travaux et Mémoires} 10 (1987), pp. 1-101, esp. pp. 53-59.

\textsuperscript{76} Both the Synaxarium Sirmondianum and the Menologium of Basil II accord him the title θαυματουργός.
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lives of holy men who like Philotheus had become wonderworkers long before they died.77 Examples can be found in many vitae of monks from the Iconoclastic and post-Iconoclastic periods. However, at this point the similarity ends. Whereas Philotheus remained firmly rooted in lay society these figures owed their holiness to their withdrawal from the world.78 The discrepancy is most obvious in the phrases that link the two stages with one another. In the synaxarium of Philotheus the transition is achieved through the sentence: “His almsgiving was without measure; wherefore he was also deigned worthy of very great miracles.”79 By comparison the lives of monastic saints focus on the victory over passions and demons, often with a strong stress on sexual temptation. A typical example for transitional phrases in such texts can be found in the synaxarium of the ninth-century abbot Thomas Dephourkinos: “From then on the Father was released from temptations and received from God the grace of healing and foretelling.”80 The hagiographer of Demetrianus of Chytri creates an even closer link with sexual abstinence when he lets a list of the saint’s ascetic feats culminate in his attainment of “dispersion in the flesh, which dwells in heaven” and then draws the conclusion: “Because of these and similar achievements he became a partaker of the gifts of the Spirit.”81 From this comparison it is evident that the biographer of Philotheus used an established hagiographical pattern in order to present a concept of sainthood that ran counter to tradition. Indeed, the formal parallels with other hagiographical texts make the unconventional nature of the content even more visible to the reader. Thus one can argue that the hagiographer consciously chose


78 Patlagean, “Ancienne hagiographie,” pp. 113-116, calls this the “modèle démoniaque”, based on abstention and separation from human society and from sexual intercourse.

79 Synaxarium of Philotheus of Opsikion, ed. Delehaye, p. 47.23-24: ἢ δὲ ἐλεημοσύνη ἀμέτρητος· ὅθεν καὶ θαυμάτων μεγίστων ἠξιώθη. Eustathius’ Encomium has a similar transition, cf. Eustathius of Salonica, Encomium of Philotheus, ch. 17, PG, 136, col. 156D: ὅθεν γὰρ τοῦ ἄλλου βοηθεῖν τὸς χρήζωσι διὰ τε εὐχῶν καὶ ἀλοιφῆς ... καὶ χειρῶν ἐπιθέσεως καὶ τεράστια κατείργαζετο θαύματο. By comparison, the Menologium of Basil II has a radically different text. Here the miracles follow the reference to the meditation of death and punishment and the saint’s teachings on these subjects in his role as a priest, cf. Menologium of Basil II, PG, 115, col. 49C.


81 Life of Demetrianus, chs 6-7, ed. Delehaye, p. 303EF: ἡ οὐφανοποιίησιν ἐν σαρκὶ ἀπάθεια ... ἐκ δὲ τούτων καὶ τῶν τοιούτων οὐδὲ τῶν τυφλίσματος χαρισμάτων γέγονον ἀμοίρα. Dirk Krausmüller, “Chastity or Procreation? Models of Sanctity for Byzantine Laymen During the Iconoclastic and Post-Iconoclastic Period,” in: Journal for Late Antique Religion and Culture 7 (2013) 51-71; ISSN: 1754-517X; Website: http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/clarc/jlarc
the bipartite model because it allowed him to pit almsgiving against renunciation of sexuality and the struggle against temptations as the traditional prerequisites for miraculous powers.

This impression can be confirmed through analysis of the second part of the narrative. We have seen that like the monastic saints of the ninth and tenth centuries Philotheus is presented as a wonderworker already during his lifetime. However, whereas holy monks tend to exercise their powers in order to cure diseases or expel demons the miracles of Philotheus are of a markedly different kind. The synaxarium specifically mentions the sudden appearance of bread for the hungry, the change of water into wine and the moving of a rock. Since it is obvious that the first two of these miracles are closely related to Philotheus’ previous behaviour they can be considered as divine approbation of his charitable activity.

Discussion of the hagiographical data for Philaretus, Callistus’ father and Philotheus has revealed common features and discrepancies. All three figures were married and sexually active and owed their saintly status exclusively to social virtues like hospitality and almsgiving. Moreover, their saintly status was confirmed through miracles. However, in the first two cases the miracles are of a conventional nature, healing of diseases and expulsion of demons, and only occur after the death of the saints. By comparison Philotheus while displaying his powers already during his lifetime only performs miracles with a clear social dimension, which sets him apart from the hagiographical mainstream. Yet this does not mean that there is a discrepancy between the texts. As we have seen, Philotheus’ miracles are closely related to the ideal of charity, which looms so large in the Life of Philaretus. This nexus has already been highlighted in a recent article by Marie-France Auzépy who compared the Life of Philaretus with Ignatius the Deacon’s Life of George of Amastris, an early ninth-century bishop who during his term of office performed various miracles in aid of his flock.82 In her article Auzépy compares four texts, the Lives of George, Philaretus, Eudocimus and Leo of Catania. Since none of these texts contain references to the cult of images she maintains that they are representative of a specifically “Iconoclastic hagiography”.83 Accordingly she argues that charity and not asceticism was the

83 Cf. Auzépy, “L’analyse littéraire,” pp. 57-58. Other common characteristics highlighted by Auzépy are frequent references to the Old Testament and avoidance of the epithet “holy”.
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hallmark of Iconoclast saints. By contrast, she does not consider the parallel theme of chastity because three of the four saints whose vitae she discusses are unmarried.

This raises the question: can the married saints that have been analyzed in this article also be regarded as representative of “Iconoclast hagiography”? As I have pointed out before, none of the texts contain explicit references to Iconoclasm. However, it is well known that Constantine V was opposed to monasticism and there is evidence for continued rejection of the monastic life-style during the Second Iconoclasm and beyond. At the same time there are clear signs for the official promotion of marriage. This is most evident in the eighth century when Michael Lachanodrakon, governor of the Thrakesion theme under Constantine V, organised a spectacular mass wedding of monks and nuns. Less clear is the situation during the Second Iconoclasm of the early ninth century: the Life of Athanasia of Aegina mentions an imperial command that forced virgins and widows into marriage, but there is no independent evidence that would allow us to verify this allegation. Unfortunately, our understanding of the concerns that led to these measures is limited because the works of Iconoclast authors have disappeared and references to their attitudes in the writings of their adversaries are grossly distorted. However, there can be little doubt that the iconoclasts possessed a fully-fledged ideology to support their views on marriage and procreation.

Evidence for a debate on these issues can be found in the chapter on virginity in John of Damascus’ De fide orthodoxa. John’s own position is thoroughly

85 Similar observations have already been made about the Life of Philaretus, cf. Kazhdan, Sherry, “The Tale of a Happy Fool,” p. 361: “Philaretos is not a hermit. He had a large family. ... His abstinence is never mentioned.” Cf. also Ludwig, Sonderformen byzantinischer Hagiographie, p. 77, with a general characterisation of Philaretus as neither ascetic nor martyr or confessor.
86 It is noticeable that Philotheus and his mother Theophila do not bear saints’ names. This has a parallel in Philaretus, cf. Auzépy, “De Philarète, de sa famille,” p. 121, who highlights the preference for such names in the Iconoclastic period.
87 In the earliest Life of Joannicius (BHG 936) we find the story about a relative of the saint who adheres to the heresy of the Kopronymos and rails against the saints and the monastic state, cf. Life of Joannicius by Peter the Monk, ch. 35, ed. J. van den Gheyn, Acta Sanctorum Novembris II.1 (Brussels, 1894), pp. 403F-404A.
conventional and shows a strong resemblance to the views that Patriarch Photius expressed a century later. He extols virginity as the supreme form of human existence that exalts man to the rank of angels. Moreover, he points out that Christ himself was born from a virgin and lived a chaste life and that Christians hold virginity in high esteem. However, at the same time he stresses that he has no intention to denigrate marriage, which is sanctioned by Scripture, but that he is only concerned with putting it into its proper place. At the end of the chapter he sums up his position with the statement that marriage is good because it provides a lawful escape from unlawful lust but that to control this lust is even better. However, John does not merely state his own views. Much of the chapter is taken up with a defence of virginity against its detractors. On the whole there is little original about John’s argument, which relies heavily on Late Antique treatises on virginity. However, there are indications that the issue had a contemporary relevance. John states that his adversaries based their objections to chastity on the imprecation: “Cursed be all who do not raise a seed in Israel!” He rejects a “carnal” reading of this curse and instead offers an alternative interpretation according to which “raising seed” refers to the acquisition of spiritual children through love. This suggests that in the eighth century some Christians rejected a chaste lifestyle and considered sexual activity as a Christian duty and that they supported this position with references to the Old Testament. Unfortunately the testimony of John of Damascus is the only evidence for the existence of such a debate. Therefore we can no longer determine whether this debate provides the context for the texts from the late eighth and early ninth century that promote an ideal of sanctity without chastity. John of Damascus gives no indication that his adversaries should be identified with Iconoclasts. In this respect his chapter on virginity provides a parallel for the hagiographical material discussed in this article, from which references to iconoclasm are equally absent. Of course, one can argue that such references were deliberately excised at a later stage. However, the assertions of Iconophile authors should not blind us to the possibility that a

95 John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei*, ch. 97, ed. Kotter, p. 227.2-4: κακίζουσιν οἱ σαρκικοὶ τὴν παρθενίαν καὶ εἰς μαρτυρίαν προβάλλονται οἱ φιλήδονοι τό· ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὃς οὐκ ἐγείρει σπέρμα ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ. It is evident from the context that this statement has the authority of Scripture. However, no exact counterpart can be found in the Bible. It most likely a combination of Genesis 38:8-10 and Deuteronomy 25:5-10.
positive attitude to marriage was also found among people who stayed clear of the Iconoclast controversy.

Continuing veneration for the married saints of the early ninth century shows clearly that for later generations these figures held no negative connotations. As we have seen, the cult at Philotheus’ tomb was still very much alive in the tenth and eleventh centuries. Moreover, his name was entered into the official calendar of the church and in the eleventh century his feast was celebrated even in monasteries such as the Theotokos Evergetis, which possessed an akolouthia of the saint. However, such veneration cannot be taken as evidence that his lifestyle was still considered a valid model for Christian sanctity. The analysis of tenth-century texts in the first part of this article showed that the three holy husbands and fathers found no successors in the post-Iconoclastic period. By that time the monastic ideal of sanctity reigned supreme and devout laymen like Symeon Metaphrastes and his circle competed with monks in their pursuit of a lifestyle that was characterised not only by charity but also by chastity.


99 Dmitrievskij, Opisanie, I, p. 278: ζήτει τὴν πᾶσαν ἀκολουθίαν τοῦ ἁγίου Φιλοθέου ἐν τῷ τέλει τοῦ μηναίου. The note seems to imply that this akolouthia had not been part of the original menaion and that somebody had gone out of his way to add it to the already existing liturgical book. None of the hymns mentioned in the Evergetis Synaxarium seem to have survived, cf. Follieri, E., Initia hymnorum graecorum, V.2 (Studi e Testi, 215bis, Vatican City, 1966), p. 335.
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