

CHASTITY OR PROCREATION? MODELS OF SANCTITY FOR BYZANTINE LAYMEN DURING THE ICONOCLASTIC AND POST- ICONOCLASTIC PERIOD

Dirk Krausmüller

(dkrausmuller@hotmail.com)

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

¹ The secondary literature on this topic is vast. Cf. e.g. Brown, P., *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York, Oxford, 1988).

² Cf. e.g. Graus, F., *Volk, Herrscher und Heiliger im Reich der Merowinger. Studien zur Hagiographie der Merowingerzeit* (Prague, 1965), 468: "Alle Heiligentypen waren im Grunde 'ehfeindlich'." Cf. also Skinner, M. S., "Lay Sanctity and Church Reform in Early Medieval France," in: Astell, A. W. (ed.), *Lay Sanctity, Medieval and Modern. A Search for Models* (Notre Dame, Indiana, 2000), pp. 27-45.

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 Uytanghe, M., "Le remploi dans l'hagiographie: une 'loi du genre' qui étouffe l'originalité?" in: *Ideologie e pratiche del reimpiego 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 *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 *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 *vita*.⁴ 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 *lives* of holy monks and in the *sermons* of Patriarch Photius and then turn to an analysis of *vitae* of lay saints from the tenth century. Focusing on the Metaphrastic *Life* of Eudocimus the Just and on the figure of Callistus in the *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 *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 *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

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.

⁴ 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 *Life of St. Mary the Younger*, in Talbot, A.-M. (ed.), *Holy Women of Byzantium. Ten Saints' Lives in English Translation* (Washington, D.C., 1996), pp. 249-252.

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>

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 saintly 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,⁵ or to abscond from the wedding chamber before the marriage is consummated.⁶ If all else fails and the control of the family cannot be evaded the reluctant husband persuades his bride to remain virginal.⁷ 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.⁸ There we read that when Demetrianus was fifteen years

⁵ Cf. e.g. the *Life* of Gregory the Decapolite by Ignatius the Deacon (BHG 711), ch. 3, in: Makris, G. (ed.), "Ignatios Diakonos und die Vita des Hl. Gregorios Dekapolites," *Byzantinisches Archiv* 17, Leipzig, 1997, p. 64.

⁶ Cf. Lotter, F., "Intactam sponsam relinquens. À propos de la vie de S. Alexis," *Analecta Bollandiana* 65 (1947), pp. 157-195.

⁷ Cf. e.g. *Life of Theophanes Confessor* by Patriarch Methodius (BHG 1787z), chs 11-14, ed. V. V. Latyšev, *Methodii Patriarchae Constantinopolitani Vita S. Theophanis Confessoris* (Zapiski rossijskoj akademii nauk. viii. ser. po istoriko-filologičeskomu otdeleniju, 13.4, Petrograd, 1918), pp. 7-10.

⁸ *Life* of Demetrianus of Chytri (BHG 495), ed. H. Delehaye, *Acta Sanctorum Novembris* III (Brussels, 1910), pp. 300-308. The only certain date we have for Demetrianus of Chytri is his mission to Baghdad dated to 913/914. Cf. Grégoire, H., "Saint Démétrianos évêque de Chytri (île de Chypre)," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 16 (1907), pp. 217-237, esp. p. 211. The most likely date for the composition of the *Life* is the mid-tenth century, cf. Delehaye, *Commentarius praeuius*, 9, p. 299E.

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>

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

⁹ *Life* of Demetrianus of Chytri, ch. 4, ed. Delehaye, p. 302B: καὶ τὸν ἀναντίλογον τοῦτον ὡς ἐν ἅπασιν κατὰ πάντα ὑπήκοον ἔχοντες πείθουσι καὶ μὴ βουλόμενον τῷ γαμικῷ ὑποκῶσαι ζυγῷ καὶ δουλείαν τῆς ἐλευθέρου ζωῆς ἠγήσασθαι κρείττονα.

¹⁰ *Life* of Demetrianus of Chytri, ch. 4, ed. Delehaye, p. 302C: τῷ νέῳ τὴν γαμήλιον ἐορτὴν ἐπετέλεσαν κόρην τινὰ τῆ ὥρα καὶ τῷ κάλλει διαφέρουσαν καὶ ἀξίαν ἐν τοῖς ἡθεσὶ τῆς τούτου ψυχῆς τούτῳ συζεύξαντες.

¹¹ *Life* of Demetrianus of Chytri, ch. 4, ed. Delehaye, p. 302B: γενομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ πεντεκαίδεκαετοῦς καὶ ἠβήσαντος ἐκ ταύτης τῆς ἡλικίας βουλὴν οἱ τούτου γεννήτορες βουλευσάμενοι τὴν ἀκινδυνότεραν ὁδὸν ὡς ᾤοντο πρὸς τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς φυλακὴν εἰ καὶ δευτέραν πρὸς τὸ τῆς παρθενίας καλὸν νομίμῳ καθ’ ὑπερβολὴν προσέθεντο γάμῳ.

¹² Cf. esp. I Corinthians 7:8-9.

¹³ *Life* of Demetrianus of Chytri, ch. 4, ed. Delehaye, p. 302C: καὶ γὰρ ἀμφοῖν τὰ τῆς παρθενίας σῶα φυλάξας σήμαντρα οὕτω τὴν διάζευξιν ᾤκονόμευσεν.

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.¹⁴ 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.¹⁵ 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!”¹⁶

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.¹⁷

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 nativitate BMV*, ed. B. Laourdas, *Φωτίου Ὁμιλίας* (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 γάμω συνδεθέντες τὸ πείραν λαβεῖν τοῦ βίου καὶ πρὸς γονὰς ἐνδοῦναι τῇ φύσει καὶ τὴν σωφροσύνην εἰς τὸ ἔπειτα σῶμα 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 ὁ γάμος τὸ τίμιον διασώσειεν· οἱ ταύτης τῆς ἡδυπαθοῦς διαζυγέντες ἀνάγκης ὥσπερ ἐπιμόχθου τινὸς διαλυθέντες δουλείας πρὸς τὸν τῆς σωφροσύνης δρόμον ἰθύνεσθε· οἱ τούτων κρείσσους γενόμενοι τὴν ἐν ἑλέῳ παρθενίαν καὶ ταπεινῷ τῷ φρονήματι ἵνα καὶ τοῦ φρόνιμοι κριθῆναι μὴ ἀμοιρήσητε καὶ ἡ λαμπὰς μηδαμῶς εἴη παρενοχλουμένη τῷ πνεύματι τῆς οἰήσεως.

¹⁷ Photius, *Homilia IX in nativitate BMV*, ed. Laourdas, p. 97.3-9: μητέρα ἄρα ἔδει κάτω διευτρεπισθῆναι τοῦ πλάστου εἰς τὸ τὸ συντριβέν ἀναπλάσασθαι καὶ ταύτην παρθένον ... ἵνα 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 abstention 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

μηδεμία μηδ' ἐννόμου πάροδος ἡδονῆς μηδ' ἐπινοηθεῖη τῷ τόκῳ τοῦ κτίσαντος· ἡδονῆς γὰρ ἦν αἰχμάλωτος ὃν ὁ δεσπότης ἐλευθερῶσαι τὴν γέννησιν κατεδέξατο.

¹⁸ *Life* of Euthymius the Younger (BHG 655), in: L. Petit (ed.), "Vie et office de saint Euthyme le Jeune. Texte grec," *Revue de l'orient chrétien* 8 (1903), pp. 155-205.

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.

²² The tales were edited by John Wortley, *Les récits édifiants de Paul, évêque de Monembasie et d'autres auteurs* (Paris, 1987). For an English translation cf. Wortley, J., *The Spiritually Beneficial Tales of Paul, Bishop of Monembasia, and other authors. Introduction, translation and commentary* (Cistercian Studies Series 159, Kalamazoo, 1996).

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.”²³

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.²⁴ 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.²⁵ 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.”²⁶ 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.”²⁷ This passage with its sequence of chastity and almsgiving could equally

²³ Paul of Monembasia, *Tale V* (BHG 1075d), ed. Wortley, *Les récits édifiants*, pp. 52-56, esp. p. 56.59-68.

²⁴ *Life* of Eudocimus the Just (BHG, 607), ed. Chr. Loparev, “Βίος τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ δικαίου Εὐδοκίμου (Žítie 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: πολὺς ἦν περὶ τὴν τοῦ λαοῦ πρόνοιαν οὐ πατρικῶς μόνον αὐτῶν προϊστάμενος ... ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὥσπερ εἰκὸς ἔριδας ἐν ἄρρεπῇ λύων τῷ τοῦ δικαίου ζυγῷ.

²⁶ *Life* of Eudocimus the Just, ed. Loparev, p. 1.14-2.4: καὶ τὸ ἐν μέσῳ θορόβων ζῶντα καὶ τῶν ἀστάτων τούτων καὶ σάλου παντὸς καὶ ῥύπου πεπληρωμένον ἄκλυστόν τε καὶ γαληνὸν καὶ ἄρρυπον τὴν ἑαυτοῦ τηρῆσαι ψυχὴν καὶ δεῖξαι δειλῶν ὥσπερ καὶ ἀνάνδρων εἶναι τὸ τὴν φυγὴν τοῦ κόσμου μεταδιώκειν καὶ βοηθῶ χρηθῆσαι τῇ ἔρημίᾳ. Cf. *Vita epitomata* of Eudocimus (BHG 607e), ed. V. V. Latyšev, *Menologii anonymi byzantini ... quae supersunt*, II (St Petersburg, 1912), pp. 228-232, esp. p. 228.26-28.

²⁷ *Life* of Eudocimus the Just, ed. Loparev, p. 5.17 – p. 6.12: σωφροσύνην δέ ... οὕτως ἔστερξε ... ὡς ... διαθήκη θέσθαι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ μὴ συνείναι μηδὲν ἐπὶ παρθένῳ τοσοῦτον τε γυναικὸς φυλάξασθαι ὁμίλιαν ὡς μόνον τῇ μητρὶ ἀκάλυτον εἶναι τὸ πρὸς αὐτὸν παριέναι ... τῇ σωφροσύνῃ

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>

well have appeared in the *vita* of a holy monk. In the tenth-century *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."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 *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.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.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 *Life* of Eudocimus.³¹

The second tenth-century text that presents a model for lay sanctity is the *Passio Γ* of the Forty-Two Martyrs of Amorion by the monk and *synkellos* Michael,³² most

δὲ καὶ τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην παρέζευξε ... ὡς τῆς μὲν τῷ φωτὶ τὸ πρόσωπον ἐλλαμπρύνεσθαι τῆς δὲ τῷ ἐλαίῳ τὴν καρδίαν πταίνεσθαι. Cf. *Vita epitomata* of Eudocimus, ed. Latyšev, p. 229.11-15.

²⁸ *Life* of Luke the Stylite (*BHG* 2239), ch. 7, ed. H. Delehaye, *Les Saints Stylites* (Subsidia Hagiographica 14, Brussels, Paris, 1923), p. 201.28-30: τὸ δὲ περὶ τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ λίαν ἐκείνου συμπαθὲς καὶ φιλάνθρωπον φιλάδελφόν τε καὶ φιλόξενον.

²⁹ On Symeon cf. Høgel, Chr., *Symeon Metaphrastes: rewriting and canonization* (Copenhagen, 2002).

³⁰ Nicephorus Ouranos was an aristocrat who served Emperor Basil II (976-1025) in various functions, finally becoming governor of the province of Antioch on the Orontes. For an overview of his life cf. McGeer, E., "Ouranos, Nikephoros," *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. 3 (1991), pp. 1544-1545. Nicephorus was a deeply religious man; cf. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, A., "Βυζαντινὰ ἀνάλεκτα, I: ἀλφάβητος Οὐρανοῦ μαγίστρου," *Byantinische Zeitschrift* 8 (1899), pp. 66-70.

³¹ Mercati, G., "Versi di Niceforo Uranos in morte di Simeone Metafraste," *Analecta Bollandiana* 68 (1950), pp. 126-134, esp. p. 131, vv. 20-23: κεναὶ πενήτων χεῖρες ἢ καὶ γαστέρες τῆς ἐμπιπλώσης χειρὸς ἐστερημένων ἢ χρηστότητος ἢ ἀποκρύφους δόσεις ἀριστερὰ χεῖρ τοῦ διδόντος οὐκ ἔγνω, v. 25: σὰρξ ἀγνοοῦσα σαρκικοὺς πάντας ῥύπους, v. 27: τρόπος μονήρης ἐν σάλῳ τῶν πραγμάτων. Cf. Ševčenko, I., "Hagiography of the Iconoclast Period," in: Bryer, A. A. M. and J. Herrin (eds), *Iconoclasm* (Birmingham, 1977), pp. 113-131, esp. p. 127: "Metaphrastes, of all writers, lets fly one or two arrows against the monks."

³² Alexander Kazhdan undertook a comparative study of the different versions of the martyrdom from which he concluded that the *Passio Γ* was composed c. 900, cf. Kazhdan, A., "Hagiographical Notes. 14. Collective Death and Individual Deaths," *Byzantion* 56 (1986), pp. 150-160, esp. p. 153. Kazhdan's argument has been rejected by S. Kotsambassi, "Τὸ μαρτύριο τῶν μβ' μαρτύρων τοῦ Ἀμορίου. Ἀγιολογικὰ καὶ ὑμνολογικὰ κείμενα," *Epistemonike Epeterida Philosophikes Scholes Panepistemiou Thessalonikes (Teuchos Tmematos Philologias)* 2 (1992), pp. 121-126. Kotsambassi reasserted – without presenting a convincing argument – the traditional ninth-century date of the text. Cf. also Vlyssidou, V. N., "'Chérissant les nations'," in: Kountoura-Galake, E. (ed.), *Οἱ σκοτεινοὶ* 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>

likely to be identified with the monk of the same name who held this function under Patriarch Nicholas Mystikos (901-907 and 912-925).³³ When Michael created his version of the story he made substantial changes to his model, the anonymous *Passio B*.³⁴ 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.³⁵ 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.³⁶ Callistus was born in Anatolia to aristocratic parents and held various military commands under Emperor Theophilus.³⁷ 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.³⁸ 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.³⁹ 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.⁴⁰ Again this characterisation

αἰώνες του Βυζαντίου (7ος - 9ος αι.), (National Hellenic Research Foundation. Institute for Byzantine Research. International Symposium, 9, Athens, 2001), pp. 443-453.

³³ As Kazhdan has already pointed out, the late date of the text excludes identification of the author with the Iconophile agitator Michael the Synkellos. The *synkellos* Michael who was buried in Galakrenai, the monastic foundation of Patriarch Nicholas Mystikos, is the only known holder of the office who can be considered as the author of the text. He is known from an inscription on his tombstone, ed. Ševčenko, I., "An Early-Tenth-Century Inscription from Galakrenai," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 41 (1987), pp. 461-463, cf. esp. v. 2: Σύγκελλος Μιχαήλ μοναχός, vv. 4-5: πιστότατος θεράπων μεγαλύτερος ἀρχιερῆος Νικόλεω γεγαώς, and Ševčenko's commentary: "Michael was ... an important person, congenial to an educated patriarch; this explains why his tomb bears an inscription in high literary style." Ševčenko argues convincingly that Michael held his position during Nicholas' second term of office.

³⁴ *Passio Γ* of the 42 Martyrs of Amorium (*BHG* 1213) ed. B. Vasil'evskij, P. Nikitin, *Skazanija o 42 Amorijskih mučikenah* (Zapiski Russkago imperatorskago akademii nauk. viii. ser. po istoriko-filologičeskomu otdeleniju 8.2, St Petersburg, 1905), pp. 22-36, *Passio B* (*BHG* 1212), ed. Vasil'evskij, Nikitin, *Skazanija o 42 Amorijskih mučikenah*, pp. 8-22. For the relation between the two texts cf. esp. *Passio Γ*, 32.19-20 and *Passio B*, 15.24-25.

³⁵ This is especially evident in the long exhortation that precedes the martyrdom. Whereas in *Passio B* the speech is attributed to the general Basoes, in *Passio Γ* it is given to Callistus, cf. *Passio Γ* of the 42 Martyrs of Amorium, ed. Nikitin, p. 33.4 – p. 34.21.

³⁶ Cf. *Passio Γ* of the 42 Martyrs of Amorium, ed. Nikitin, p. 27.25 – p. 29.28.

³⁷ Cf. *Passio Γ* of the 42 Martyrs of Amorium, ed. Nikitin, p. 23.14-24.

³⁸ Cf. *Passio Γ* of the 42 Martyrs of Amorium, ed. Nikitin, p. 28.28-36.

³⁹ Cf. *Passio Γ* of the 42 Martyrs of Amorium, ed. Nikitin, p. 23.28-24.12.

⁴⁰ *Passio Γ* of the 42 Martyrs of Amorium, ed. Nikitin, p. 27.27-28: διὰ προσευχῆς καὶ ψαλμοῦδιας σωφροσύνης τε καὶ εὐποιίας τῶν δεομένων.

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>

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.”⁴¹ 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 dispassion 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.⁴² 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.⁴³ 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.⁴⁴ 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!”⁴⁵ 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.⁴⁶

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 θεοῦ νόμου τὸν ἑαυτοῦ βίον ἐρρυθμίξε τῆς παρθενίας ὅτι μάλιστα τὴν ἐξὶν ἐπιμελούμενος· ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ τὸ πρὸς τοὺς πένητας εὐμετάδοτον πολὺς ἦν μεταδιώκων.

⁴² *Passio Γ* of the 42 Martyrs of Amorium, ed. Nikitin, p. 23.25-27: θεόθεν χάριν ἀπαθείας ἐκ νέας ἡλικίας πεπλουτηκῶς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀγιασμοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ σκηνοῦν ἐσχηκῶς παρθενίας τε καὶ συμπαθείας πᾶσι κειμήλιον ἐγνωρίζετο.

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

⁴⁴ Cf. *Passio Γ* of the 42 Martyrs of Amorium, ed. Nikitin, p. 24.30 – p. 25.19. Unsurprisingly for a tenth-century author, Michael is careful to exonerate his hero from any association with the official Iconoclasm of the time and instead presents him as a faithful worshipper of icons and as a friend of monks. Cf. *Passio Γ* of the 42 Martyrs of Amorium, ed. Nikitin, p. 25.20 – p. 26.11.

⁴⁵ *Passio Γ* of the 42 Martyrs of Amorium, ed. Nikitin, p. 28.9-12: μοναστήν σε καλέσω; ἀλλὰ δόρυ καὶ κράνος καὶ ῥομφαίαν καὶ θώρακα ὡς πρωταγωνιστῆς στρατοπέδων περικίσειαι· ἕνα τῶν μιγάδων σε λέξω; ἀλλὰ παρθενίας κάλλεσι καὶ σωφροσύνης ἀστραπαῖς καταλάμπεις 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 τὸν σταυρὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ νοητῶς ἀνθ’ ὀπλων ἀράμενος τὸν ἀποκληρωθέντα λαμβάνει τόπον τῆς ἐξουσίας.

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>

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.⁴⁷ 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.⁴⁸ 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."⁴⁹ 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*.⁵⁰

Such juxtaposition with an earlier text is not possible for Callistus where additional information is limited to mentions of his name in chronicles.⁵¹ 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

⁴⁷ Callistus was martyred in 845, cf. Kazhdan, A., N. Patterson Ševčenko, "Forty-Two Martyrs of Amorion," *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. 2 (1991), pp. 800-801. Eudocimus died in 840, cf. Kazhdan, A., N. Patterson Ševčenko, "Eudokimos," *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. 2 (1991), p. 740.

⁴⁸ *Synaxarium* of Eudocimus, in: Delehaye, H., (ed.), *Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* (Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum Novembris, Brussels, 1902), p. 857.2-26.

⁴⁹ *Synaxarium* of Eudocimus, ed. Delehaye, p. 857.12-16: ζυγός τις δίκαιος ὢν καὶ κανὼν ἰσότητα πᾶσαν φυλάττων ἐλεημοσύνας ὅτι πλείστας ἐκτελῶν καθ' ἑκάστην καὶ ἐν ἐκκλησίαις καλλιεργῶν τε καὶ καρποφορῶν χήραις καὶ ὀρφανοῖς ἐπαρκῶν καὶ ἀπλῶς πάσης ἀρετῆς ἰδέαν μετερχόμενος.

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.

⁵¹ Cf. Kazhdan, "Collective Death," p. 155.

people from unclean spirits and all kinds of illnesses.”⁵² 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.”⁵³ 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.⁵⁴ 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.⁵⁵ 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 ἑώας ... ὀρώμενος γονεῖς ἐκέκτητο περιφανεῖς οὐ μάλιστα ὁ πατήρ φιλοξενία καὶ σωφροσύνη καὶ ἀγχινοῖα τῷ βίῳ διαπρένας μετὰ τὴν ἐνθένδε ἐκδημίαν ἢ πρὸς θεὸν ἐπανάλυσιν χαρίσμασιν ἰαμάτων δεδόξαστο παμπόλλους ὡς εἰπεῖν πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων καὶ νοσημάτων ἐλευθερώσας παντοίων.

⁵³ *Life* of Eutychius by Eustratius the Priest (BHG 657), in: Laga, C. (ed.), *Eustratii presbyteri vita Eutychii patriarchae Constantinopolitani* (Corpus Christianorum. Series graeca 25, Turnhout, Leuven, 1992), pp. 17-18.456-460: οἱ μὲν δύο Μελέτιός φημι καὶ Σέλευκος τὴν τῶν Ἀμασέων ποιμάναντες ἀγιωτάτην ἐκκλησίαν ἐν αὐτῇ ὁσίως κεκοίμηνται καὶ τὰς θαυματουργίας τῶν ἰάσεων ἐπιτελοῦσιν ἐκεῖσε μέχρι τῆς σήμερον.

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

⁵⁵ The secondary literature on Philaretus is extensive, cf. Auzépy, M.-F., “De Philarète, de sa famille, et de certains monastères de Constantinople,” in: Jolivet-Lévy, C., M. Kaplan, J.-P. Sordini (eds), *Les saints et leur sanctuaire à Byzance. Textes, images et monuments*, (Byzantina Sorbonensia 11, Paris, 1993), pp. 117-135; Kazhdan, A., L. F. Sherry, “The Tale of a Happy Fool: The Vita of St. Philaretos the Merciful (BHG 1511z-1512b),” *Byzantion* 66 (1996), pp. 351-362; Ludwig, C., *Sonderformen byzantinischer Hagiographie und ihr literarisches Vorbild. Untersu-* 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>

puts strong emphasis on Philaretus' social virtues and which attributes to him a posthumous miracle.⁵⁶ 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.⁵⁷

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.⁵⁸ Thus the biographies of the two men differ considerably from contemporary *lives* of monastic saints whose fame as wonderworkers 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).⁵⁹ 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.⁶⁰ 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 Sirmund and in the *Menologium* of Basil II.⁶¹ The entry in the *Menologium* is of little historical value: Kazhdan has rightly characterised it as a "standardised

chungen zu den Viten des Äsop, des Philaretos, des Symeon Salos und des Andreas Salos (Berliner Byzantinische Studien 3, Frankfurt, Berlin, Berne, New York, Paris, Vienna, 1997), pp. 74-166.

⁵⁶ *Life of Philaretus* (BHG 1511z), in: Rydén, L. (ed.), *The life of St Philaretos the Merciful written by his grandson Niketas, a critical edition with introduction, translation, notes, and indices* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis 8, Uppsala, 2002). For date and setting, cf. Auzépy, "De Philarète, de sa famille," p. 123.

⁵⁷ The crucial importance of almsgiving in establishing Philaretus' saintly status has repeatedly been pointed out, cf. Kazhdan, Sherry, "The Tale of a Happy Fool," p. 361, and Ludwig, *Sonderformen byzantinischer Hagiographie*, p. 77.

⁵⁸ On the absence of miracles from Philaretus' *Life* cf. Kazhdan, Sherry, "The Tale of a Happy Fool," 361, and Ludwig, *Sonderformen byzantinischer Hagiographie*, p. 77.

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

⁶⁰ Cf. Kazhdan, A., S. Franklin, *Studies on Byzantine Literature of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 151-152. Browning, R., "Eustathios of Thessalonike revisited," *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 40 (1995), pp. 83-90, esp. p. 88. In his article on the twelfth-century holy man, Magdalino mentions the *Life* of Philotheus only in a footnote with no reference to the atypical character of this text; cf. Magdalino, P., "The Byzantine Holy Man in the Twelfth Century," in: Hackel, S. (ed.), *The Byzantine Saint* (London, 1981), pp. 51-66, esp. p. 59, note 47.

⁶¹ *Menologium* of Basil II, Sept. 15, PG, 117, col. 49BCD.

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>

portrayal” that is “devoid of any information”.⁶² For this reason I limit the discussion to the *Synaxarium* 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 deemed 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 deemed 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

⁶² Kazhdan, A., “Philotheos of Opsikion,” *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. 3 (1991), p. 1663.

⁶³ *Synaxarium* of Philotheus of Opsikion, ed. Delehaye, p. 47.10 – p. 48.11: τῆ αὐτῆ ἡμέρα μνήμη τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ θαυματουργοῦ Φιλοθέου. Ὅς ὄρητο θέματος μὲν Ὀψικίου, κόμης δὲ καλουμένης Μύρμηκος, ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς ἀγιασθεὶς καὶ τοῦ μητρικοῦ ὀνόματος κατάλληλον τὴν κλησὶν δεξάμενος· Θεοφίλα γὰρ ἐλέγετο. οὗτος ἦν ὅλως τῷ θεῷ ἀνάθημα νηστεία σχολάζων, προσευχαῖς προσκαρτερῶν, ἐν ταῖς θείαις συνάξεσιν οὐκ ἀπολιμπανόμενος, ταῖς ἀναγνώσεσι νουνεχῶς προσομιλῶν, τοῖς πτωχοῖς ἐπαρκῶν, τοῖς πᾶσι τὰ πάντα γενόμενος· γάμω δὲ προσομιλήσας καὶ παίδων πατήρ γενόμενος τῆς ἱεροσύνης καταξιούται. ἔκτοτε πάλιν οἱ ψαλμοὶ ἐπὶ στόματος, αἱ χεῖρες τοῦ γειηπονεῖν οὐκ ἠμέλουν. ἡ δὲ ἐλεημοσύνη ἀμέτρητος· ὅθεν καὶ θαυμάτων μεγίστων ἠξιώθη, διὰ μόνης προσευχῆς ἐξ ἀπόρων ταμείων τοῖς πεινῶσιν ἄρτον παρασχῶν· ἀλλὰ καὶ ποτάμιον ὕδωρ εἰς οἶνον μετέβαλλε καὶ λίθον μέγιστον λόγῳ μόνῳ μετατέθηκεν καὶ μετὰ ἐνιαυτὸν τῆς κοιμήσεως αὐτοῦ μετατιθεμένου ἐν ἑτέρῳ τόπῳ αὐτὸς τὰς χεῖρας ὡσεὶ ζῶν ἐκτείνας καὶ τῶν ὄμων δραξάμενος τῶν δύο ἱερέων βουλομένων αὐτὸν μεταθεῖναι ἀνέστη καὶ τρεῖς βάσεις βηματίσας κατετέθη ἐν ᾧ νῦν τόπῳ κείμενος βλύζει πηγὴν ἀενάου μύρου θαυμαστήν τινα καὶ ξένην τῆς αὐτοῦ πολιτείας παρέχων 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 ὄμων δραξάμενος τῶν δύο ἱερέων βουλομένων αὐτὸν μεταθεῖναι ἀνέστη καὶ 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>

related. At first sight it seems likely that the relatively lengthy *Encomium* is based on an original extended *life*.⁶⁶ Although we have no secure evidence one can assume that such a text once existed and that it was the source for the *synaxarium*.⁶⁷ However, closer analysis shows that while Eustathius' version is more verbose it does not contain any data that are not found in the *synaxarium*.⁶⁸ Indeed, Eustathius gives clear indications that he had little information at his disposal.⁶⁹ 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.⁷⁰ 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.⁷¹ His identification as "Opsikiotes" permits the conclusion that he lived after the early eighth century when Opsikion

τρεις βάσεις βηματίσας etc., and Eustathius of Salonica, *Encomium of Philotheus*, ch. 20, *PG*, 136, col. 161A: ἄμφω τῶν χειρῶν διαπετάσας ὡς εἶπερ ἔζη ἔπειτα καμπύλας αὐτὰς σχηματίσας ὥστε περιλαβεῖν καὶ τῶν ὄμων καταπετάσας αὐτὰς ἱερῶν ἐκείνων δύο μετατιθέντων καὶ στερεῶς δραξάμενος καὶ οὕτως ἀπηρεϊσάμενος ἀνέστη τε εἰς ὄρθριον καὶ βήματα τρία διαβάς etc.

⁶⁶ The *synaxarium* contains a number of phrases that have parallels in rhetorically embellished extended *Lives*. Cf. e.g. the phrase ἔκτοτε πάλιν οἱ ψαλμοὶ ἐπὶ στόματος, αἱ χεῖρες τοῦ γεηπονεῖν οὐκ ἡμέλουν and the statement τὸ ψαλτήριον ἀποστηθίζει ... τοῦ ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ἔργου οὐκ ἡμέλει in Theodore of Stoudios' *Epitaphius on his Mother*, ch. 3, *PG*, 99, col. 885B. It may be significant that Theodore's mother was a pious laywoman in charge of a large household.

⁶⁷ The eleventh-century Evergetis *Synaxarium* contains the remark "and his life is also read if it exists," ed. A. Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie liturgiĭeskikh rukopisej I* (Kiev, 1895), p. 278: ἀναγινώσκειται δὲ καὶ ὁ βίος αὐτοῦ εἰ ἔστιν. This comment implies that the compiler of the Evergetis *Synaxarium* did not know whether such a *Life* actually existed.

⁶⁸ Cf. e.g. the sentence λίθον μέγιστον λόγῳ μόνῳ μετατέθηκεν in the *synaxarium* and Eustathius of Salonica, *Encomium of Philotheus*, ch. 18, *PG*, 136, col. 157C: λίθον γὰρ οὔτε χερσὶ ληπτὸν οὔτε ὄμοις φορητὸν οὔτε οἷον κυλίεσθαι ἀλλὰ γῆς ἄχθος εἶναι τε καὶ βλάπτειν ὅποια πολλὰ γίνεται λόγον ἐπιπέμψας ὅσα καὶ μοχλὸν εὐμήχανον οὐ μόνον διώχλισεν ὑποσαλεύσας ἀλλὰ καὶ μετέθηκε. If Eustathius had based his account on a more elaborate model he would without doubt have described the circumstances in which this miracle took place.

⁶⁹ In the title Eustathius classifies his speech as ἐπελευστικός, a term that denotes a "cursory" and "general" as opposed to a "detailed" and "specific" treatment of a topic. Cf. the juxtaposition between κατὰ μέρος and ἐπελευστικώτερον καὶ ἀπεριλάλητως κατὰ παντός in his treatise *Ad stylitam quendam*, ch. 57, *PG*, 136, col. 248B. This would not have been the only case where Eustathius created a speech without a fully-fledged model: he managed to write an *Encomium* of a local martyr on the basis of icons and an entry in the diptychs, cf. *Oratio de s. Alphaeo et sociis martyribus*, *PG*, 136, cols 263-284.

⁷⁰ Cf. e.g. the saint's deliberation about the different Christian life-styles in Eustathius of Salonica, *Encomium of Philotheus*, 10, *PG*, 136, coll. 149C-152A, and his third sermon *In S. Quadragesimam*, 4, *PG*, 135, col. 637AB.

⁷¹ The note on Philotheus of Opsikion is only found in late versions of the *Synaxarium* of Constantinople, i.e. the classes S, F, B, G, C and M, but not in H and P.

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>

is first attested as a place-name.⁷² However, the references to a flourishing cult in the *synaxaria* let a later date appear more likely.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.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.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.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

⁷² Cf. Brandes, W., "Philippos στρατηλάτης. Anmerkungen zur Frühgeschichte des Thema Opsikion," in: Sode, C., S. Takács (eds), *Novum Millenium. Studies on Byzantine History and Culture, dedicated to Paul Speck, 19 December 1999*, (Aldershot, 2001), pp. 21-39, esp. p. 36, who argues that while definitely in existence by the beginning of the eighth century as "Verwaltungseinheit im geographischen Sinne" it was not yet a "thema".

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 βρῦει παραδόξως ἐκ τῶν τιμίων ὀστέων αὐτοῦ ἰάσεων ἔλαιον μέχρι τῆς σήμερον.

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 Agauri.

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

⁷⁶ Both the *Synaxarium Sirmondianum* and the *Menologium* of Basil II accord him the title θαυματουργός.

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>

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 deemed 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 “dispassion 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

⁷⁷ Patlagean, E., “Ancienne hagiographie byzantine et histoire sociale,” *Annales. Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 1 (1968), pp. 106-126, esp. pp. 115-116: “On n’a pas assez remarqué cette division en deux des Vies de saints: d’abord l’acquisition de la démonstration inaugurale du pouvoir miraculeux, ensuite l’exercice de ce pouvoir dans la société des hommes, sans qu’il soit jamais remis en question, ou sujet à s’affaiblir.”

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: ἡ δὲ ἐλεημοσύνη ἀμέτρητος ὄθεν καὶ θαυμάτων μεγίστων ἠξιώθη. Eustathius’ *Encomium* has a similar transition, cf. Eustathius of Salonica, *Encomium of Philotheus*, ch. 17, *PG*, 136, col. 156D: δίχα γὰρ τοῦ ἄλλως βοηθεῖν τοῖς χρήζουσι διὰ τε εὐχῶν καὶ ἀλοιφῆς ... καὶ χειρῶν ἐπιθέσεως καὶ τεράστια κατείργαζετο θαύματα. 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.

⁸⁰ *Synaxarium* of Thomas Dephourkinos (*BHG* 2458), ed. Delehaye, p. 297.31-33: ἔκτοτε τῶν πειρασμῶν ἀνεθείς ὁ πατήρ χάριν ἰαμάτων ἐκ θεοῦ καὶ προρρήσεων εἴληφε. Cf. also the *Life* of Nicetas the Patrician (*BHG* 1242b), 8, ed. D. Papachryssanthou, “Un confesseur du second iconoclasme. La vie du Patrice Nicéas (+ 836),” *Travaux et Mémoires* 3 (1968), pp. 309-351, esp. p. 331: τὸν οὖν τοσοῦτοις πόνοις καὶ θλίψεσιν ἀνηκέστοις προσομιλήσαντα οὐ θαυμαστὸν εἶ καὶ τέρασι καὶ σημείοις δοξάζει ὁ θεός.

⁸¹ *Life* of Demetrianus, chs 6-7, ed. Delehaye, p. 303EF: ἡ οὐρανοπολίτις ἐν σαρκὶ ἀπάθεια ... ἐκ δὴ τούτων καὶ τῶν τοιούτων οὐδὲ τῶν τοῦ πνεύματος χαρισμάτων γέγονεν ἄμοιρος.

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

⁸² Auzépy, M.-F., "L'analyse littéraire et l'historien: l'exemple des vies de saints iconoclasts," *Byzantinoslavica* 53 (1992), pp. 57-67, esp. pp. 60-61. George defends his city against an Arab attack, he calms the Black Sea and the river Sangarios, and he lets the bread for the Eucharist appear; cf. *Life* of George of Amastris (*BHG* 668), ch. 24-25, 28, 36, 32, ed. V. G. Vasil'evskij, *Russko-Vizantijskija Isledovanija* II (St Petersburg, 1893), pp. 38-41, 44-46, 56-58, 50-52.

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".

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>

hallmark of Iconoclast saints.⁸⁴ 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 analysed in this article also be regarded as representative of “Iconoclast hagiography”?⁸⁵ As I have pointed out before, none of the texts contain explicit references to Iconoclasm.⁸⁶ 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.⁸⁷ 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.⁸⁸ 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.⁸⁹ 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*.⁹⁰ John’s own position is thoroughly

⁸⁴ Cf. Auzépy, “L’analyse littéraire,” pp. 60-61. This does not mean that references to asceticism are entirely absent, cf. *Life* of George of Amastris, ch. 9, p. 18: τὴν νηστείαν ποιούμενος σύννοικον, and *Life* of George of Amastris, ch. 14, ed. Vasilievskij, p. 26: τροφή δὲ ἦν ἡ ἐγκράτεια.

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 Koprionymos 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.

⁸⁸ Cf. Stephen Gero, *Byzantine iconoclasm during the reign of Constantine V, with particular attention to the oriental sources* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 384: Subsidia, 52, Leuven, 1977), pp. 125-126, p. 154.

⁸⁹ *Synaxarium* of Athanasia of Aegina, ed. Delehay, p. 611.51-53. In the introduction to his translation of the *Life* Lee Sherry tentatively identifies the emperor with Theophilus, cf. Sherry, L. F., “6. Life of St. Athanasia of Aegina,” in: *Holy Women of Byzantium*, p. 139.

⁹⁰ John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei*, ch. 97, in: Kotter, B., (ed.), *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, 5 vols (Berlin, New York, 1973), II, pp. 227-230.

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.⁹¹ 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.⁹² 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.⁹³ 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.⁹⁴ 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!"⁹⁵ 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.⁹⁶ 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.⁹⁷ 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

⁹¹ John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei*, ch. 97, ed. Kotter, p. 229.57-60.

⁹² John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei*, ch. 97, ed. Kotter, p. 230. 61-67.

⁹³ John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei*, ch. 97, ed. Kotter, p. 229.53-57: ταῦτα λέγομεν οὐ τὸν γάμον κακίζοντες· μὴ γένοιτο, followed by a quotation of Hebrews 13:4.

⁹⁴ John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei*, ch. 97, ed. Kotter, p. 230.68-76.

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· ἐπικατάρματος 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.

⁹⁶ John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei*, ch. 97, ed. Kotter, p. 229. 45-51.

⁹⁷ There is some evidence for opposition to monasticism in eighth-century Palestine where John of Damascus lived as monk of St Sabas, cf. B. Pirone (ed.), *Leonzio di Damasco, Vita di Santo Stefano Sabaita: testo arabo, introduzione, traduzione e note* (Cairo, 1991), pp. 44-46.

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.⁹⁸ 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.⁹⁹ 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.

⁹⁸ Continuing interest in Philaretus of Amnia resulted in later redactions of his *Life*, cf. *Life of Philaretus* (BHG 1512), in: Vasiliev, A. A. (ed.), "Žitie Filareta Milostivago," *Izvestiia Russkago Arkheologičeskago Instituta v Konstantinopole* 5 (1900), pp. 49-86, dated to the mid-tenth century by Lennart Rydén, "The revised version of the 'Life of Philaretus' and the 'Life of St Andreas Salos'," *Analecta Bollandiana* 100 (1982), pp. 485-495. Cf. also the discussion of a further unedited version in Rosenqvist, J. O., "Changing Styles and Changing Mentalities," in: Høgel, Chr. (ed.), *Metaphrasis: redactions and audiences in middle Byzantine hagiography* (KULTs skriftserie, 59, Oslo, 1996), pp. 42-48.

⁹⁹ Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie*, I, p. 278: ζητει την πᾶσαν ἀκολουθίαν τοῦ ἁγίου Φιλοθέου ἐν τῷ τέλει τοῦ μνηαίου. 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.

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>