

Theatron



Millennium-Studien

zu Kultur und Geschichte des ersten Jahrtausends n. Chr.

Millennium Studies

in the culture and history of the first millennium C.E.

Herausgegeben von / Edited by
Wolfram Brandes, Alexander Demandt, Helmut Krasser,
Hartmut Leppin, Peter von Möllendorff

Volume 13

Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York

Theatron

Rhetorische Kultur in Spätantike
und Mittelalter / *Rhetorical Culture
in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*

Herausgegeben von / Edited by
Michael Grünbart

Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York

Diese Publikation wurde im Rahmen des Fördervorhabens 16TOA021 – *Reihentransformation für die Altertumswissenschaften („Millennium-Studien“)* mit Mitteln des Bundesministeriums für Bildung und Forschung im Open Access bereitgestellt. Das Fördervorhaben wird in Kooperation mit dem DFG-geförderten *Fachinformationsdienst Altertumswissenschaften – Propylaeum* an der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek durchgeführt.



Dieses Werk ist lizenziert unter der Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International Lizenz. Weitere Informationen finden Sie unter <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

Die Bedingungen der Creative-Commons-Lizenz gelten nur für Originalmaterial. Die Wiederverwendung von Material aus anderen Quellen (gekennzeichnet mit Quellenangabe) wie z.B. Schaubilder, Abbildungen, Fotos und Textauszüge erfordert ggf. weitere Nutzungsgenehmigungen durch den jeweiligen Rechteinhaber.

⊗ Gedruckt auf säurefreiem Papier, das die US-ANSI-Norm über Haltbarkeit erfüllt.

ISBN 978-3-11-019476-0

ISSN 1862-1139

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

© Copyright 2007 by Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, 10785 Berlin
Dieses Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

Printed in Germany

Umshlaggestaltung: Christopher Schneider, Berlin

Γεωργίω Φατούρω
ὀγδοηκονταέτει

Vorwort / Preface

„Heilig ist die Versammlung und den Willen Gottes vollziehend die Feier, der Tag ist freudevoll und die Begegnung ungewöhnlich; aber wer ist es, der diese Versammlung zusammengebracht hat?“ fragt Theodoros Studites am Beginn seiner Lobrede auf den hl. Theophanes.¹ Studites verwendet das Wort *theatron* für Publikum, das aber auch „schauspielerische Aufführung“ oder „Spektakel“ bedeuten kann.² Es kann den Ort des Schauspiels genauso bezeichnen wie bereits in der Antike das Leben im metaphorischen Sinne. Darüber hinaus bildet sich ab der Spätantike eine weitere Bedeutung heraus, die die ersten drei Komponenten vereint: Man versteht darunter auch die Zusammenkunft von Gelehrten, Intellektuellen und Literaturinteressierten an einem bestimmten Ort, wo man sich über Literatur austauscht. Dabei spielen die adäquate Präsentation bzw. der entsprechende Vortrag eine prominente Rolle. Die ursprüngliche Bedeutung des Wortes bleibt jedenfalls deutlich bestehen.

Seit der Spätantike lassen sich in der griechischsprachigen Welt derartige *theatra* oder auch *syllogoi* nachweisen. Bekannte Zeugnisse sind bei Libanios oder Kaiser Julian zu finden, wobei sogar rhetorische Wettkämpfe stattgefunden haben. Auch in den folgenden Jahrhunderten lassen sich weitere Belege dazu finden.³ Dabei war die Abhaltung von literarischen Zusammenkünften nicht nur auf die kaiserliche Familie beschränkt (z.B. um die *sebastokratorissa* Eirene),⁴ sondern Spuren lassen sich auch in aristokratischen Haushalten, besonders im

-
- 1 Ἱερὸν τὸ ἄθροισμα καὶ θεοτελὴς ἡ πανήγυρις, ἡ ἡμέρα χαρμόσυνος καὶ ξενοπρεπὲς τὸ ἀπάντημα· ἀλλὰ τίς ὁ συναγηγεοκῶς τοῦτο τὸ θέατρον, siehe S. Efthymiadis, Le panégyrique de S. Théophane le Confesseur par S. Théodore Stoudite (*BHG* 1792b). Édition critique du texte intégral, in: *AB* 111 (1993) 259–290, 1, 1–2.
 - 2 Z.B. καὶ γὰρ θέατρον ὄντως ἡ παροῦσα ζωὴ καὶ οὐδὲν ἕτερον („Denn ein Schauspiel ist unser gegenwärtiges Leben und nichts anderes“ [vgl. 1 Cor. 4,9]) schreibt Theodoros Prodromos in einem Brief für die Mönche des Paschasiosklosters in Nikomedeia an Konstantinos Bardachlas, s. M. Op de Coul, Deux inédits à l’ombre de Prodrome, in: *JÖB* 56 (2006) 177–192, I 12f. – Heutige Leser und Zuhörer denken bei der Vorstellung von der Welt als Bühne eher an “All the world’s a stage, and all the men and women merely players” aus William Shakespeares “As you like it” (2.7, 139f.).
 - 3 I. Medvedev, The So-called *Theatra* as a Form of Communication of the Byzantine Intellectuals in the 14th and 15th Centuries, in: N. G. Moschonas (Hrsg.), Πρακτικά του β’ διεθνούς συμποσίου. Η ἐπικοινωνία στο Βυζάντιο, Athen 1993, 227–235.
 - 4 M. und E. Jeffreys, Who was the Sebastokratorissa Eirene?, in: *Byz* 64 (1994) 40–68.

zwölften Jahrhundert, nachweisen.⁵ Eine späte Blüte erfuhren *theatra* in der Palaiologenzeit, etwa am Hofe Kaiser Manuels II., wo eine weitere gesellschaftliche Funktion derartiger Treffen zutage tritt: In einem *theatron* konnte man sich profilieren und entsprechende Kontakte knüpfen, die dem persönlichen Fortkommen dienlich waren.⁶

Dass Rhetorik und die rhetorische Darbietung immer etwas mit Theatralik zu tun haben, ist seit der Antike bekannt. Dabei stellt sich nach Jacques Derrida ein Vortragender bzw. Rhetor anders als ein Schauspieler selbst zur Schau. In ihm sind Darsteller und Dargestelltes eins,⁷ während ein Schauspieler seine Stimme und sein Talent für die Darstellung einer Figur hergibt.⁸ Zwar existieren im byzantinischen Reich Theater im antiken Sinn nicht mehr, aber die Theatralität/Inszenierung lebte in anderen Bereichen wie etwa bei der gesprochenen Rede oder beim Zeremoniell am Kaiserhof weiter.⁹

Für die antike griechische und lateinische Redekunst gibt es bereits Untersuchungen, die der Person des Redners, seiner Stimmbildung,¹⁰ seiner Wechselwirkung mit dem Publikum und dem Publikum an sich gewidmet sind.¹¹ In der byzantinistischen Forschung wird in den letzten Jahren zunehmend auf die Theatralik¹² und Performanz in der byzantinischen Kultur Rücksicht genommen,¹³ doch Studien zur Macht und zur Verantwortung des Redners und zur

-
- 5 So etwa im Haus der Kamateroi, s. Ioannis Tzetzae epistulae rec. P. A. M. Leone, Leipzig 1972, ep. 89; dazu M. Grünbart, Byzantinisches Gelehrtenelend – oder wie meistert man seinen Alltag?, in: L. M. Hoffmann/A. Monchizadeh (Hrsg.), Zwischen Polis, Provinz und Peripherie. Beiträge zur byzantinischen Geschichte und Kultur (Mainzer Veröffentlichungen zur Byzantinistik 7), Mainz 2005, 413–426, 419f.
 - 6 N. H. Gaul, Eine dritte Sophistik? Thomas Magistros (um 1280–um 1347/48) im Kontext seiner Zeitgenossen. Untersuchungen zu Funktion und gesellschaftlicher Stellung der Gelehrten in der frühen Palaiologenzeit, Diss. Univ. Bonn 2005.
 - 7 Wobei das voraussetzt, dass ein Redner auch Schreiber seiner Rede ist – was für die byzantinische Rhetorik in den meisten Fällen zutrifft – und nicht den Text eines anderen vorträgt.
 - 8 J. Derrida, Grammatologie. Übersetzt von H.-J. Rheinberger/H. Zischler (suhrkamp taschenbuch wissenschaft 417), Frankfurt am Main 1983, 423–424.
 - 9 W. Puchner, Zum ‘Theater’ in Byzanz. Eine Zwischenbilanz, in: G. Prinzing/D. Simon (Hrsg.), Fest und Alltag in Byzanz, München 1990, 11–16; ders. Zur Geschichte der antiken Theaterterminologie im nachantiken Griechisch, in: WSt 119 (2006) 79–113.
 - 10 A. Krumbacher, Die Stimmbildung der Redner im Altertum bis auf die Zeit Quintilians (Rhetorische Studien 10), Paderborn 1920.
 - 11 Exemplarisch M. Korenjak, Publikum und Redner: ihre Interaktion in der sophistischen Rhetorik der Kaiserzeit (Zetemata 104), München 2000.
 - 12 A. Karpozilos, The Narrative Function of Theatrical Imagery in Michael Psellos, in: S. Kaklamanes/A. Markopoulos/G. Mauromates (Hrsg.), Ἐνθύμησις Νικολάου Μ. Παναγιωτάκη, Herakleio 2000, 303–308.
 - 13 S. z.B. M. Mullett, Rhetoric, Theory and the Imperative of Performance: Byzantium and Now, in: E. Jeffreys (Hrsg.), Rhetoric in Byzantium (Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies 11), Aldershot 2003, 151–170 und programmatisch das von Margaret Mullett organisierte

Wirkung von rhetorischen Darbietungen auf ein Auditorium sind bislang rar.¹⁴ Dabei wird aus den Quellen deutlich, wie bewußt sich byzantinische Rhetoren der manipulativen Kraft ihres Vortrages waren (z.B. Michael Psellos, Georgios Akropolites).

24 Forscherinnen und Forscher sind der Einladung gefolgt, sich zu einer gemeinsamen Publikation zusammenzufinden, die Aspekte der rhetorischen Kultur des Mittelalters und insbesondere der Wirkung und gesellschaftlichen Relevanz der Redekunst gewidmet ist. Der Schwerpunkt der Beiträge liegt dabei auf dem griechischsprachigen Bereich. Die Streuung der Themen zeigt die wichtige Funktion von Rhetorik in verschiedenen Bereichen des Alltags. Der betreffende Redner/Autor mußte daran denken, welches Publikum er vor sich hatte bzw. erreichen wollte (Schulbetrieb, Militär, Kaiserhof, kirchlicher Bereich).

Der Sammelband ist Professor Georgios Fatouros anläßlich seines 80. Geburtstages am 31. März 2007 gewidmet. Georgios Fatouros hat durch sein Wirken die byzantinische Philologie und Literaturgeschichte maßgebend beeinflusst. Seine wissenschaftliche Tätigkeit betrifft das gesamte byzantinische Millennium von Libanios¹⁵ über Theodoros Studites¹⁶ bis Nikephoros Gregoras, Michael Gabras¹⁷ und Bessarion.¹⁸ Nicht nur als exzellenter Editor, auch als Übersetzer byzantinischer Texte hat sich Georgios Fatouros hervorgetan,¹⁹ sein Œuvre wird noch vielen Forschergenerationen wissenschaftlicher Nährboden sein.

XXXIX. Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies (2–4 April 2005) unter dem Titel “Performing Byzantium”. Die Akten erscheinen voraussichtlich 2007.

- 14 R. Webb, Praise and Persuasion: Argumentation and Audience Response in Epideictic Oratory, in: E. Jeffreys (Hrsg.), *Rhetoric in Byzantium* (Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies 11), Aldershot 2003, 127–135. Zur Persönlichkeit des Rhetors s. M. Grünbart, *Byzantinisches Rednerideal? Anmerkungen zu einem kaum beachteten Aspekt mittelgriechischer Beredsamkeit*, in: W. Kofler/K. Töchterle (Hrsg.), *Pontes III. Die antike Rhetorik in der europäischen Geistesgeschichte* (Comparanda. Literaturwissenschaftliche Studien zu Antike und Moderne 6), Innsbruck/Wien/Bozen 2005, 103–114.
- 15 G. Fatouros/T. Krischer/D. Najock, *Concordantiae in Libanium* 1,1–2; 2, 1–3; 3, 1–5; 4,1–2 (Alpha-Omega: Reihe A, Lexika, Indizes, Konkordanzen zur klassischen Philologie 50), Hildesheim/New York 1987–1996.
- 16 *Theodori Studitae epistulae*, ed. G. Fatouros (CFHB XXXI/1–2 – Series Berolinensis), Berlin/New York 1992.
- 17 G. Fatouros, *Die Briefe des Michael Gabras* (ca 1290 – nach 1350) (WBS X 1–2), Wien 1973.
- 18 G. Fatouros, Bessarion und Libanios. Ein typischer Fall byzantinischer Mimesis, in: *JÖB* 49 (1999) 191–204.
- 19 G. Fatouros/T. Krischer, *Johannes Kantakuzenos, Geschichte* (Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur 17, 21), Stuttgart 1982, 1986; G. Fatouros/T. Krischer (Hrsgg.), *Libanios, Antiochikos* (or. XI): zur heidnischen Renaissance in der Spätantike, Wien/Berlin 1992; G. Fatouros/T. Krischer/W. Portmann, *Libanios, Kaiserreden* (Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur 58), Stuttgart 2002.

Zum Schluß möchte ich mich bei allen beteiligten Autorinnen und Autoren bedanken, die einerseits durch ihre Beiträge das Zustandekommen dieses Bandes ermöglichten und die andererseits in ihren Fragestellungen das Thema „Theatron. Rhetorische Kultur in Spätantike und Mittelalter“ im Auge hatten.²⁰ Herrn apl. Prof. Dr. Wolfram Brandes schulde ich für die unkomplizierte Aufnahme des „Theatron“ in die Millennium-Studien Dank, den Mitarbeitern des De Gruyter Verlages, insbesondere Frau Dr. Sabine Vogt, Frau Sabina Dabrowski und Alwin Müller-Anke, danke ich für die vielfältige Unterstützung und reibungslose Abwicklung des Projektes. Herrn Dr. Herbert Wurm bin ich zu Dank verpflichtet, der mich als erster kritischer und akribischer Leser in der Endphase unterstützte. Frau Mag. Galina Fingarova und Herr Stefan Junker, M.A. brachten die graphischen Darstellungen in eine optisch befriedigende Form.

Wien, im März 2007

Michael Grünbart

20 Trotz der unterschiedlichen Sprachen in diesem Band wurde versucht, die Formalia möglichst einheitlich zu gestalten. Beiträge in deutscher Sprache folgen sowohl der alten als auch der neuen Rechtschreibregel.

Inhaltsverzeichnis / Table of Contents

Vorwort / Preface	VII
JOHN DUFFY	
Proclus the Philosopher and A Weapon of Mass Destruction: History or Legend ?	1
STEPHANOS EFTHYMIADIS / J. M. FEATHERSTONE	
Establishing a Holy Lineage: Theodore the Stoudite's Funerary Catechism for His Mother (BHG 2422)	13
FRITZ FELGENTREU	
Aufbau und Erzähltechnik im Epitaphios auf Kaiser Julian. Zur Kompositionskunst des Libanios	53
NIELS GAUL	
The Partridge's Purple Stockings: Observations on the Historical, Literary and Manuscript Context of Pseudo-Kodinos' Handbook on Court Ceremonial	69
LARS HOFFMANN	
Geschichtsschreibung oder Rhetorik? Zum <i>logos parakletikos</i> bei Leon Diakonos	105
GRAMMATIKI KARLA	
Die Klage über die zerstörte Stadt Nikomedeia bei Libanios im Spiegel der Mimesis	141
SOFIA KOTZABASSI	
Bemerkungen zu dem Enkomion des Joseph Studites auf den heiligen Demetrios (BHG 535)	157
STAVROS I. KOUROUSES	
Ἡ ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ῥητορικὴ: Πηγὴ ἐμπνεύσεως τῆς βυζαντινῆς ὑμνογραφίας	169

GERNOT KRAPINGER	
Die Bienen des armen Mannes in Antike und Mittelalter	189
TILMAN KRISCHER	
Die materiellen Voraussetzungen des geistigen Lebens in Byzanz – Handelskontakte mit Ostafrika, ihre Vorgeschichte und ihre Nachwirkungen	203
RALPH-JOHANNES LILIE	
Fiktive Realität: Basileios II. und Konstantinos VIII. in der „Chronographia“ des Michael Psellos	211
ANTONY LITTLEWOOD	
Vegetal and Animal Imagery in the History of Niketas Choniates	223
MARINA LOUKAKI	
Notes sur l'activité d'Aréthas comme rhéteur de la cour de Léon VI	259
PRZEMYSŁAW MARCINIAK	
Byzantine <i>Theatron</i> – A Place of Performance?	277
KARIN METZLER	
Pagane Bildung im christlichen Byzanz: Basileios von Kaisareia, Michael Psellos und Theodoros Metochites	287
DIETMAR NAJOCK	
Unechtes und Zweifelhafte unter den Deklamationen des Libanios – die statistische Evidenz	305
STRATIS PAPAIOANNOU	
On the Stage of <i>Eros</i> : Two Rhetorical Exercises by Nikephoros Basilakes	357
THOMAS PRATSCH	
Rhetorik in der byzantinischen Hagiographie: Die Prooimia der Heiligenviten.....	377
ANDREAS RHOBY	
Aspekte des Fortlebens des Gregor von Nazianz in byzantinischer und postbyzantinischer Zeit	409
ANDREW F. STONE	
Aurality in the Panegyrics of Eustathios of Thessaloniki	419

IDA TOTH	
Rhetorical <i>Theatron</i> in Late Byzantium: The Example of Palaiologan Imperial Orations	429
ERICH TRAPP	
Zum Wortschatz des Theodor Studites	449
RUTH WEBB	
The Model Ekphraseis of Nikolaos the Sophist as Memory Images	463
Siglenverzeichnis / List of Sigla	477
Indices	481
Autorinnen und Autoren / List of Contributors	515

Proclus the Philosopher and A Weapon of Mass Destruction: History or Legend?*

JOHN DUFFY

The chronicler John Malalas, in his coverage of the imperial years of Anastasius I (491–518), provides a long and lively account of the protracted revolt of the Thracian Vitalian against the emperor a few years before the end of the reign (515).¹ Matters came to a head when the rebel and his forces took their positions across the Golden Horn in Pera, intending to attack the heart of the capital from there. At that crucial point the emperor, exasperated and out of ideas, decided to call in outside help, in an episode described by Malalas as follows: “The emperor Anastasios had formerly summoned, through Marinus, the philosopher Proclus of Athens, a famous man. The emperor Anastasios asked him, ‘Philosopher, what am I to do with this dog who is so disturbing me and the state?’ Proclus replied to him, ‘Do not despair, emperor. For he will go away and leave as soon as you send some men against him.’ The emperor Anastasios immediately spoke to the ex-prefect Marinus the Syrian, who was standing close by while the emperor was conversing with the philosopher Proclus, and told him to prepare for battle against Vitalian who was then opposite Constantinople. The philosopher Proclus said to Marinus the Syrian in the presence of the emperor, ‘Take what I give you and go out against Vitalian.’ And the philosopher ordered that a large amount of what is

* I wish to thank Dominic O’Meara, Eustratios Papaioannou, and Mark Schiefsky for useful discussions on the theme of this paper; none of these scholars, however, is responsible for the views expressed herein. Christopher Jones kindly helped me out on a point of historical geography.

1 Throughout, the Greek text of Malalas will be cited from the edition of J. Thurn (ed.), *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia* (CFHB XXXV – Series Berolinensis), Berlin/New York, 2000. Unless otherwise stated, all parts of the chronicle quoted in English are taken from the Australian translation, *The Chronicle of John Malalas: A Translation*, by E. Jeffreys/M. Jeffreys/R. Scott (*Byzantina Australiensia* 4), Melbourne, 1986. Both works are cited according to the sections of the Dindorf edition (*Ioannis Malalae chronographia. Ex recensione L. Dindorfii* [CSHB], Bonn 1831), the only form of reference to Malalas that the two modern works have in common; the Dindorf numbers are found at the head of each page in Thurn, and are printed in bold type in the body of the Australian translation.

known as elemental sulphur be brought in and that it be ground into fine powder. He gave it to Marinus with the words, ‘Wherever you throw some of this, be it at a building or a ship, after sunrise, the building or ship will immediately ignite and be destroyed by fire.’”²

To make a long story short, Marinus mustered a fleet of ships, loaded them with armed men and a supply of sulphur. The rebel Vitalian, for his part, set out with his troops and ships to attack the city. The two fleets met at the third hour of the day in the waters opposite Sycae, the sulphur powder was deployed, most of the rebel ships burst into flames and sank to the bottom of the Bosphorus, Vitalian quickly fled the scene and the city was saved.

The chronicler then closes the account with a few short remarks, in one of them returning to the inventor of the marvelous weapon: “The philosopher Proclus the Athenian successfully sought permission from the emperor to leave, and refused to accept anything from the emperor, who had in fact ordered that he should receive four hundred pounds of gold. The philosopher returned to his own city of Athens where he immediately died.”³

The reactions of scholars to this report, as a piece of history, have been brief, fairly consistent, and understandable. Representative views are those of J. B. Bury and the editor of the *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*. The former comments in a footnote to his *Later Roman Empire*, that the Athenian man of science is “not to be confounded with the famous Neoplatonist who had died in A.D. 485”;⁴ and the *Prosopography*, assigning a separate entry to a Proclus, philosopher, says “possibly a native of Athens; . . . in 515 he contributed to the naval defeat of Vitalianus outside of Constantinople.”⁵ Those comments are under-

-
- 2 Section 403: ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς Ἀναστάσιος πρόην μὲν ἦν μεταστειλάμενος διὰ Μαρίνου τὸν φιλόσοφον Πρόκλον τὸν Ἀθηναῖον, ἄνδρα περιβόητον, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀναστάσιος: ‘τί ἔχω ποιῆσω τῷ κυνὶ τούτῳ, ὅτι οὕτως ταράσσει με καὶ τὴν πολιτείαν, φιλόσοφε;’ ὁ δὲ Πρόκλος εἶπεν αὐτῷ: ‘μὴ ἀθυμήσης, βασιλεῦ· φεύγει γὰρ καὶ ἀπέχεται, ἢ μόνον πέμψεις κατ’ αὐτοῦ τινας.’ καὶ εὐθέως ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀναστάσιος εἶπεν Μαρίνῳ τῷ Σύρῳ τῷ ἀπὸ ἐπάρχων ἐστώτι πλησίον, ὅτε διελέγετο ὁ βασιλεὺς τῷ φιλοσόφῳ Πρόκλῳ, ὁπλίσασθαι κατὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Βιταλιανοῦ, ὄντι εἰς τὸ πέραν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. καὶ λέγει Πρόκλος ὁ φιλόσοφος ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βασιλέως Μαρίνῳ τῷ Σύρῳ: ‘ὁ δίδωμί σοι λάβε, καὶ ἔξελθε κατὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Βιταλιανοῦ.’ καὶ ἐκέλευσεν ὁ αὐτὸς φιλόσοφος ἔνεχθῆναι τὸ λεγόμενον θειον ἄπυρον πολὺ, εἰπὼν τριβῆναι αὐτὸ ὡς εἰς μίγμα λεπτόν, καὶ δέδωκεν τῷ αὐτῷ Μαρίνῳ, εἰρηκῶς αὐτῷ, ὅτι: ‘ὅπου ῥίψεις ἐξ αὐτοῦ εἴτε εἰς οἶκον εἴτε ἐν πλοίῳ μετὰ τὸ ἀνατεῖλαι τὸν ἥλιον, εὐθέως ἅπτεται ὁ οἶκος ἢ τὸ πλοῖον καὶ ὑπὸ πυρὸς ἀναλίσκεται.’
- 3 Ibid., at the end of section: ὁ δὲ φιλόσοφος Πρόκλος ὁ Ἀθηναῖος αἰτήσας τὸν βασιλέα ἀπελύθη, μηδὲν ἀνασχόμενος λαβεῖν παρὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ βασιλέως: ἦν γὰρ κελεύσας αὐτὸν λαβεῖν κεντηνάμια τέσσαρα· ὅστις φιλόσοφος ἀπελθὼν ἐν Ἀθηναῖς εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν εὐθέως ἐτελεύτησεν.
- 4 J. B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire*, London 1931, I 452, n. 1.
- 5 PLRE 2, Proclus no. 8.

standable because historians and prosopographers, when they read chronicles and histories, normally expect to be dealing with more or less factual narratives of the past. Obviously, then, an individual, who by general agreement died in 485, could not be still active in the year 515, and therefore must be a different person.

My purpose here is to raise a serious question about the Malalas story and to offer a set of reasons in support of a new interpretation. The fundamental question is this: does the episode of the emperor and the philosopher deserve to be treated as an account of an actual event?

My view is that it does not, and I am also of the opinion that the man at the center of the story, the weapon-inventing philosopher, is (or more strictly speaking, is imagined to be) the Neoplatonist Proclus of the previous generation. It is not going to be possible to provide a series of straightforward positive proofs, but I hope that the considerations offered will be convincing enough to place the main contention on a firm footing.

The central argument to start the process will be based on plausibility and on the name of the individual in question. Simply put, how likely is it that there were two philosophers from Athens, by the name of Proclus, both deserving the description of “famous”, living within 30 years of each other, and yet one of them would be entirely lost to history were it not for the unique testimony of the chronicler Malalas?⁶ Not very likely, one may say with no little confidence.

Let me cite something of a parallel phenomenon. There is a passage in the *History of Attaleiates* (11th cent.) recording the death of a man who is described as “Michael the monk, the *hypertimos*, a leader in political affairs, τὸ γένος ἑλλκων ἐκ Νικομηδείας”.⁷ Now, for many years, there were scholars who refused to accept that this obituary notice was referring to Michael Psellos, partly because the phrase τὸ γένος ἑλλκων ἐκ Νικομηδείας was understood to indicate the man’s birthplace, which would be in conflict with the generally accepted view that Psellos was a native of Constantinople. But Apostolos Karpozilos, in a recent article, shows this to be a groundless objection. He points out that the phrase in question, as used five times by Attaleiates, consistently refers to family background and not to birthplace. And so Karpozilos sums up the situation nicely, as follows: “But if Attaleiates did not imply Psellos at this point whom could he possibly have in mind? From the historical sources of this period there is only one

6 Unique, in the sense that Malalas is the earliest and only independent source for the story of Proclus and the sulphur weapon.

7 Michael Attaleiates, *Historia*. Introducción, edición y comentario de I. Pérez Martín (Nueva Roma 15), Madrid 2002, 212,11–12: Οὐ πολὺ τὸ ἐν μέσῳ, καὶ Μιχαὴλ μοναχὸς ὁ ὑπέρτιμος, ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν πολιτικῶν πραγμάτων προστάς, τὸ γένος ἑλλκων ἐκ Νικομηδείας, τὴν ζωὴν ἐξεμέτησε.

monk named Michael, who had received the dignity of *hypertimos* and was actively involved in politics – Michael Psellos.”⁸

The case of Proclus is, I suggest, equally strong. For it is well nigh undisputable that in Byzantium there is only one “philosopher Proclus” and he is often cited in these terms alone, without the additional marker “Athenian”. In the present instance the first reporter of the story, Malalas, speaks of τὸν φιλόσοφον Πρόκλον τὸν Ἀθηναῖον . . . ἄνδρα περιβόητον, while in later accounts of the Vitalian episode he is simply called “the philosopher Proclus”.⁹ It is exactly the same with regard to the equally famous Iamblichus. The Byzantines know only one philosopher by that name, often referred to without the addition of “philosopher”. Proclus, by contrast, did have a distinguished namesake earlier in the fifth century, the bishop who held the see of Constantinople (died 446/447); hence the need sometimes to avoid possible misunderstanding and to add a marker either of place or profession. And we should return to the other descriptive adjective περιβόητος, since the point is anything but trivial. Malalas, elsewhere in the *Chronicle*, uses it a mere six times for other people and the list (with one possible exception) will show how renowned the bearers are: Orpheus, Zoroaster, Dionysius the Areopagite, the Roman Asclepion, Libanius, and Hypatia of Alexandria.¹⁰ The evidence here would suggest that he applies the word sparingly and almost exclusively to individuals who enjoy the highest recognition. The conclusion, then, on the basis of this approach, would be that the phrase τὸν φιλόσοφον Πρόκλον τὸν Ἀθηναῖον . . . ἄνδρα περιβόητον can only refer to the Neoplatonist Proclus (died 485).¹¹

Assuming that this position is acceptable for the moment, then the following issues must be immediately confronted: if the Malalas text really has in mind the renowned Proclus of Athens, the Neoplatonist, how are we, first of all, to react to the surprising news that the philosopher developed a prototype of “Greek Fire” for which the *Chronicle* is the only independent source? And secondly, how are we to deal with the impossible scenario of his having accomplished such a noteworthy feat all of 30 years after his own death?

My solution to the first difficulty is to claim straight out that we have to do here, not with history, but with imaginative fiction. We are dealing with a legend

8 A. Karpozilos, When did Michael Psellus die?, in: BZ 96 (2003) 671–677 (for here, 673).

9 E. g. in Georgii Monachi Chronicon ed. C. de Boor; corr. cur. P. Wirth, Stuttgart 1978, 619, 19 and Leonis Grammatici chronographia, ex recogn. I. Bekker (CSHB), Bonn 1842, 119, 1.

10 Section 72; 15; 251; 266; 327; and 359 respectively.

11 One might suggest that the matter is on a similar level of clarity (from the Byzantine perspective) to ὁ ἐν θεολογίᾳ περιβόητος Γρηγόριος, used twice by Photius to refer to Gregory of Nazianzus (Photius, Bibliothèque. Texte établi et traduction par R. Henry, Paris 1959, cod. 228, 246b and Photii patriarchae Constantinopolitanae Epistulae et Amphilochia rec. B. Laourdas/L.G. Westerink, Leipzig 1983, ep. 2, 154). (Cf. A. Rho by in this volume, 411).

associated with the somewhat controversial emperor Anastasius, developed possibly by Malalas himself, but much more likely drawn from a story already in circulation in either oral or written form. We will consider later why Proclus might be an appropriate figure in such a setting; for now we will simply note that the idea is in tune with a fairly common motif encountered in Byzantine chronicles, one to which we could give the general label “philosophers, scientists and magicians in the service of rulers and society.”

The second difficulty may be alleviated in a couple of ways. For one thing we can have recourse to a principle that I would like to express in the following terms: “strict chronology is largely irrelevant to the mythopoeitic mind.” In other words, the creator of an imaginative story will not be constrained by cares for historical accuracy or strict chronology. One could cite numerous examples; I will briefly allude to two.

For centuries there circulated throughout Byzantium (and in the West also) a legend about the death of Julian the Apostate.¹² The core of the story relates that Julian, on his way to the Persian campaign, stopped off in Caesarea to visit bishop Basil the Great and that Basil had an ominous vision in which the emperor was slain by St. Mercurius. That account made the rounds for ages, without raising an eyebrow, and it was not until the 12th century that the critical minded Michael Glykas pointed out the chronological impossibility: Basil was not yet the bishop of Caesarea at the time of Julian’s reign; in fact he assumed the see only some seven years later.¹³

Another consideration is the *modus operandi* of those who compose chronicles. The late Jacob Ljubarskij, in an article discussing the narrative techniques of George the Monk in the ninth century, pointed to several episodes in George’s work that were deliberately placed out of historical context.¹⁴ In one case, a story as told by John Moschus and set around the year 400, was transferred nonchalantly by George to the reign of Constantine III in the 640’s. In another instance, blithely ignoring historical background, George took an event connected with the time of pope Gregory I (590–604) and retold it in the context of the reign of Leo the Isaurian (717–741). Ljubarskij calls this phenomenon “chronological displacement” and it can also be applied to what Malalas, or his source, has done in the case of Proclus.

But it is not just “chroniclers” who can be oblivious to chronological niceties. If one were to ask which Byzantine of the medieval period was most attuned to Proclus the Neoplatonist and his thought, the answer would most likely be Mi-

12 One of the best treatments of the story is still that by N. H. Baynes, *The Death of Julian the Apostate in Christian Legend*, in: *JRS* 27 (1937) 22–29.

13 *Michaelis Glycae annales*, recognovit I. Bekker (CSHB 24), Bonn 1836, 471.

14 J. Ljubarskij, *George the Monk as a Short-Story Writer*, in: *JÖB* 44 (1994) 255–264.

chael Psellos. But consider the section on the reign of Anastasius in the *Historia Syntomos* of Psellos: “Under his rule flourished the great Proclus the philosopher whom I consider second after Plato. He was a pupil of the wise Syrianus, but he exceeded his teacher by far and raised Greek wisdom to his own standard. He studied all the works of Archimedes, but invented many things that had remained unknown to Archimedes. Thus he had fire-bearing mirrors of bronze placed upon the walls; from there he fired thunderbolts upon the barbarians who besieged the city.”¹⁵

Psellos’ chapter on Anastasius, of which we have quoted only the middle part, is an intriguing combination of disparate elements. The section on Proclus is actually sandwiched between two mentions of the emperor’s impious religious leanings: from the point of view of the orthodox he belonged to the Severan heresy and had tried to make an infamous addition to the *Trisagion* hymn. For our topic what jumps out immediately is the fact that Psellos without qualification dates the *floruit* of Proclus to the reign of Anastasius, flying in the face of the fact that the philosopher died a full six years before Anastasius came to the throne. One could try to explain this in any number of ways – e.g. that Psellos composed the work as a young man and made a mistake, or that the error was long entrenched in the chronographic tradition, and so on. But the bottom line does not change; that is to say, even Psellos associates the Neoplatonist Proclus with the era of Anastasius. We should therefore be prepared to accept the dislocation, *a fortiori*, when it shows up in Malalas.

There is a second, equally interesting, development in the *Historia Syntomos* passage, if my interpretation of it is correct. Here we have the new information (at least I am not aware of its being reported by anyone before Psellos) that Proclus the philosopher had devised a successful system of burning mirrors, inspired by his studies of Archimedes.¹⁶ My theory, to put it in a nutshell, is this: Psellos, not

15 Michaelis Pselli *Historia Syntomos*, recensuit, Anglice vertit et commentario instruxit W. J. Aerts (CFHB XXX – Series Berolinensis), Berlin/New York 1990, 52, 36–43: ‘Ἐπὶ τούτου Πρόκλος ὁ μέγας ἦνθει φιλόσοφος, ὃν ἐγὼ μετὰ γε Πλάτωνα τίθημι, ἀνὴρ Συριανοῦ μὲν μαθητῆς τοῦ σοφοῦ, ὑπερβαλὼν δὲ μακρῶ τὸν διδάσκαλον καὶ τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν σοφίαν τῷ ἑαυτοῦ τέλει συμπερανάμενος. Οὗτος ἀναγνοὺς πάντα τὰ Ἀρχιμήδεια, πολλὰ δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς προσεφευρῶν, ὧν ἐκεῖνος ἠγνόησε, κάτοπτρα χαλκεύσας πυρφόρα τῶν τειχῶν ἀπηώρησε καὶ πῦρ ἐκείθεν κατὰ τῶν πολιορκούτων τὴν πόλιν βαρβάρων ἐξεκείραυνωσε. The translation is that of Aerts.

16 I will leave it to someone else to work out (if possible) a definitive solution to the problem of the relationship between the text of Psellos and the mix of authors employed by John Zonaras in the twelfth century: did Zonaras draw directly from Psellos or were both using some unknown common source? The scholar who has done most so far to confront the question is Apostolos Karpozilos. He plans to do this in the third volume of his series on Byzantine historians and chroniclers, and has kindly let me have a preview of the relevant section. But even he has to admit in the end that the relationship is not entirely clear. For the issue at hand the corresponding section of Zonaras is this: καὶ ναυμαχίας γενομένης ἕκ τινος μηχανῆς παρὰ Πρόκλου

unlike the questioning Glykas in the following century, was not comfortable with the received version; in other words, the Malalas account of powder and smoke, so to say, was not to his liking and he decided to change it. A feat of engineering in the spirit of Archimedes would have been, to Psellos, a more intellectually respectable accomplishment for his philosopher hero than a chemical experiment couched in somewhat magical terms.

And “magical” is not being used gratuitously, because the text of Malalas itself could be said to contain the seeds of such an interpretation. In his closing comment on the episode the chronicler says, “There were some people in Constantinople who said that it was from the heat of the sun that the elemental sulphur, as it was so fine, caught fire, when it was thrown into the air, and that this was its nature.”¹⁷ As before, this is the Australian translation of the passage. I myself would prefer to render the last phrase (καὶ φυσικόν ἐστι τοῦτο) as “and this is something natural” or “and this is a natural occurrence”. In any event, what the remark as a whole seems to imply is that other people in Constantinople considered the phenomenon to be beyond the natural. And who could blame them? The Greek name for the substance, θεῖον ἄπυρον, already invites such an interpretation. And the general Byzantine understanding is probably well reflected in the explanation recorded by Eustathius of Thessalonike in his commentary on the *Odyssey*. “*Theion*,” he says, “perhaps because of the strange and marvellous way that it works.”¹⁸ Let it also be noted that, as we learn from his student and biographer Marinus, Proclus was steeped in different kinds of ritual and theurgic practices and was the recipient of visions; among the wonders he claimed to have achieved was to produce rainfall in Attica and to have averted earthquakes.¹⁹ Finally, in the account of Malalas, the air of mystery is, if anything, enhanced by

τοῦ πάνυ γεγεννημένης (τότε γὰρ ἦνθει ἐπὶ φιλοσοφία καὶ ἐν τοῖς μηχανήμασι, τὰ τε τοῦ περιβοήτου ἐν τούτοις Ἀρχιμήδους ἅπαντα διελθὼν καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκείνοις προσεξευρών) τὸ ναυτικὸν τῶν ἐναντίων κατεπολεμήθη. κάτοπτρα γὰρ ἄδεται χαλκεῦσαι πυρφόρα ὁ Πρόκλος, καὶ ταῦτα ἐκ τοῦ τείχους τῶν πολεμίων νεῶν ἀπαιρωρῆσαι κατέναντι, τούτοις δὲ τῶν τοῦ ἡλίου ἀκτίνων προσβαλουσῶν πῦρ ἐκείθην ἐκκερανοῦσθαι καταφλέγον τὸν νηϊτήν τῶν ἐναντίων στρατὸν (Epitome Historiarum [ed. Büttner-Wobst], XIV, 138). Pending a full solution, my instinct persuades me to think that Zonaras had access to and used the *Historia Syntomos*.

- 17 Section 406: ἔλεγον δὲ τινες ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει, ὅτι ἀπὸ τῆς θέρμης τοῦ ἡλίου, ὡς λεπτότατον ὄντα, τὸ θεῖον ἄπυρον ῥιπτόμενον εἰς τὸν ἀέρα ἀπτεται, καὶ φυσικόν ἐστι τοῦτο.
- 18 Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam, edidit G. Stallbaum, Leipzig 1826, II 291, 39–40: καὶ θεῖον μὲν ἴσως διὰ τὸ καινὸν τῆς αὐτοῦ ἐνεργείας καὶ τεράστιον.
- 19 Marino di Napoli, Vita di Proclo, testo critico, introduzione, traduzione e commentario a cura di R. Masullo, Naples 1985, chapter 28: ὄμβρους τε ἐκίνησεν . . . καὶ αὐχμῶν ἐξαισίων τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἡλευθέρωσεν, φυλακτῆριά τε σεισμῶν κατετίθετο.

the remark that we quoted earlier, “The philosopher returned to his own city of Athens, where he immediately died.”

In her study, “Malalas’ World View”, Elizabeth Jeffreys stresses at the outset the extent to which this sixth-century chronicler, working entirely outside the classical tradition of historiography, was molded by the intellectual environment of his own times.²⁰ Malalas was certainly a Christian, but he seems to have been alive to a much wider spectrum of religious and superstitious thought, some of it outside the pale of orthodox theology. He weaves into the fabric of his narrative such a range of recurring types and phenomena – *magoi*, talismans, oracles, visions, dream interpreters, and theurgic philosophers –, that we cannot doubt the importance that he and his contemporary audience attached to these aspects of their thought world. Let us select a few representative and pertinent examples.

(Sections 151–152): Belshazzar, emperor of the Assyrians, one day had an ominous vision; he saw a man’s finger writing some words on a wall of the palace and then disappear. He summoned all the sorcerers, *magoi*, astrologers and dream interpreters of the land, but none of them was able to unlock the meaning. Then he called in Daniel, one of the Hebrew captives, who, having received assurances of his safety, proceeded to interpret the writing as predicting the end of Belshazzar’s reign. “When he heard this, Belshazzar let him go, to see if he spoke the truth. A few days later Dareios the Mede . . . attacked and killed him and captured his kingdom.” (Section 233, concerning the chronicler’s native city of Antioch): “Tiberius Caesar learnt that the emperor Seleukos had avoided the mountain and built the city on the plain, in fear of the floods of water coming down from the mountain in winter and forming lakes. So he added to his statue a stone box, in which he put a talisman made by Ablakka, a wonder-worker (τελεστής) and priest, to prevent the waters from the winter torrents of the river Parmenios and the streams coming off the mountain from harming that part of the city or from destroying the two great colonnades he had built.” For the third example we cite the account of the reign of Julian the Apostate where Malalas records a series of three apparitions directly connected with the death of that emperor. The earliest (Sect. 327) occurred at Daphne outside of Antioch, where Julian was visiting on the way to the Persian expedition; after offering sacrifice to Apollo he lay down to sleep and saw in a vision a fair-haired youth who informed him that he was fated to die “in Asia”. Later (Sects. 332–333) Malalas makes a point of recording, from a Cappadocian chronicler and participant in the expedition, a follow-up apparition in which Julian, in his sleep, saw himself being attacked by a full-grown man in body-armor. He awoke to find himself mortally wounded and to

20 This is a chapter in E. Jeffreys/B. Croke/R. Scott (eds.), *Studies in John Malalas (Byzantina Australiensia 6)*, Sydney 1990, 55–66 (for here, 55).

hear from his entourage that the town in which they were encamped was called “Asia”. Soon (Sects. 333–334) Malalas completes the picture by presenting his version of the dream (alluded to earlier) of Basil of Caesarea on the fateful night. Basil saw St. Mercurius, in body-armor, receiving an order from Christ to go and kill the emperor; the saint went off, and later reappeared to report that the mission had been accomplished.

It is clear from these and a small host of other episodes of similar nature that Malalas was intrigued by all kinds of strange and supernatural happenings as well as by men and women who were believed to possess expert knowledge or special powers. In two cases the individuals are designated by him as “philosopher” (φιλόσοφος) and “wonder-worker” (τελεστής);²¹ very similar to those is Apollonius of Tyana, described as “the very wise” (ὁ σοφώτατος) and “performing wonders” (ποιῶν τελέσματα).²² Brian Croke, in his chapter on “Malalas’ Life”, speaks of a “nexus of authors and ideas of special interest to Malalas,” and singles out for mention Julian the Chaldaean, Theon of Alexandria, and Iamblichus “the most Gnostic of the Neoplatonists”, as he styles him.²³ It could be added that each of these, in his own way, might be fairly described from the Byzantine point of view as either a “wonder-worker” (Julian) or “mystical philosopher” (Theon and Iamblichus).

Putting all of the foregoing comments together, it is not difficult to see the direction in which the argument is tending. It is my contention that the story of Proclus and the sulphur fits the pattern, so well-represented throughout the *Chronicle*, of the person of special talent called in or available to help at a time of crisis. The contribution of Proclus the Athenian to the defeat of the rebel Vitalian is, on this reading, not the historical good deed of an otherwise unknown philosopher, but rather an imaginative (and anachronistic) legend woven around the figure of Proclus the Neoplatonist who, whether it be as great thinker or arch villain, always loomed large in the mind of Byzantium.

This conclusion goes directly counter to the interpretation of two of the foremost Malalas experts, Elizabeth Jeffreys and Brian Croke, each of whom prefers not only to accept the story at face value, but also chooses to offer an explanation for the detailed nature of the description. They do this, not unreasonably, by having recourse to a theory of “oral informants”, that is, living sources who might have supplied Malalas with information not otherwise available in written re-

21 The two are Asios (Section 109) who originally gave the famous Palladion image to Tros, the founder of Troy, and Debborios (Section 265) who made a talisman to protect the city of Antioch even against earthquakes.

22 Among the wondrous benefactions bestowed by Apollonius on many cities (Sects. 263 ff.) were talismans against the north wind, earthquakes, scorpions and mosquitoes.

23 Jeffreys/Croke/Scott, *Studies* (see n. 20), 1–25 (for here, 14).

CORDS. For the Proclus episode the informant, according to them, could have been Marinus the Syrian himself, a fellow-countryman of the chronicler, whom Malalas “could have met . . . in Constantinople, perhaps in 520.”²⁴

In reaction to this approach I would offer two comments. Firstly, it is hardly necessary to regard the conversations between Anastasius, Marinus and Proclus as having special significance and needing to be explained by the presence of an eyewitness. As a good narrative artist Malalas, like his fellow chronicler George the Monk in a later period, has a penchant for including in his text short stories, anecdotes, and even scenes with elements of drama, e.g. pieces of dialogue and direct speech. Good examples are to be found in episodes such as these: Belerophon and Stheneboia (Sects. 83–84); Orestes and Pylades (Sects. 135 ff.); Belshazzar and the Hebrew Daniel (Sects. 151–152); and for the historical period, the encounter between Simon Magus and the Apostle Peter (Sects. 252 ff.); and the account of Theodosius and Eudokia Athenais – featuring another Athenian philosopher (Sects. 352 ff.)! The vivid exchanges between Anastasius, Marinus and Proclus are not necessarily, then, anything out of the ordinary in Malalas. Secondly, it should be pointed out that the reconstruction of the career of Malalas, worked out by Brian Croke and including, as we have just seen (note 24), the proposition that Malalas met and knew Marinus in the capital sometime between 512 and 520, is not the most sturdy of edifices. While the attempt to squeeze from the *Chronicle* itself (practically our sole source for the biography of Malalas) every possible ounce of evidence about his life and work, deserves praise and admiration, the picture developed in this manner cannot be said (nor do Croke or Jeffreys assume it) to be in any respect beyond doubt.

With regard to the very different scenario presented in this paper there is still one more piece of Malalas narrative that might be seen as possibly strengthening the proposal that Proclus the weapon developer belongs more properly to the realm of fiction than that of fact.

In the *Chronicle*, soon after the detailing the rebellion of Vitalian, Malalas gives a report (out of chronological sequence) of the serious civil unrest that broke out in the capital in 512, when the emperor attempted to add a monophysite formula to the *Trisagion*.²⁵ Rioting and murders came to an end only after a large number of those arrested were executed on the emperor’s order. In the part immediately following this we are told that a short time after the civic uprising Anasta-

24 Jeffreys, in her chapter “Malalas’ Sources” in Jeffreys/Croke/Scott, *Studies* (see n. 20), 209. Croke, *Studies* (see n. 20), 6: “It is arguable that Malalas’ detailed version of the Greek fire used against Vitalian in 515 came from Marinus; likewise Marinus may have been the source for Malalas’ account of the monophysite riot in Constantinople in 512 in which his own house was put to the torch. If so, Malalas may have been in the imperial capital around 515–520.”

25 Sects. 407–408.

sus was troubled in his sleep by an ominous vision: an angelic looking figure, carrying a book and reading out the emperor's name, announced to him "Because of your insatiability, I am erasing fourteen."²⁶ When the panic stricken Anastasius reported the vision to his *cubicularius* Amantius, he learned that this official too had an equally threatening dream that same night. At this point, not surprisingly, the emperor called in a dream-interpreter who explained that they both would die before long. And the dream-interpreter was – *mirabilile dictu* – none other than Proclus the philosopher! This time, however, he is given the geographical designation ὁ Ἀσιανός, and so presumably for Malalas, or his source, not the same person as Proclus the Athenian. Needless to say modern historians have maintained a discreet silence about the identity of this man, but it is hardly taking a big risk to suggest that he is nothing more than a figment of the imagination. And indeed the chances are good that he has come into his imaginary existence under the influence of the real Proclus of Athens; to put it another way, he is likely to be Proclus of Athens in another guise and playing another role.²⁷

The purpose of this exercise was to raise a serious doubt about the historicity of an episode in the rebellion of Vitalian against the emperor Anastasius, as depicted in the *Chronicle* of John Malalas. It has not been possible, as anticipated at the beginning, to provide hard evidence or a set of positive proofs, but we have tried to present a case for the contention that the story of the philosopher and Greek fire is just that, a story or *mythos* like so many others that are to be found embedded in the narrative of Malalas. And if it be accepted that the protagonist Proclus, in spite of being "out of time", is in fact the renowned Neoplatonist, then that will simply add another piece of color to the variegated image which the Byzantines had formed of him.²⁸

26 Sects. 408–409. Aspects of this story have been looked at in a new way by G. Fatouros, Zu Johannes Malalas' Chronographie, in: I. Vassis/G. S. Henrich/D. R. Reinsch (eds.), Lesarten. Festschrift für Athanasios Kambylis zum 70. Geburtstag, dargebracht von Schülern, Kollegen und Freunden, Berlin/New York 1998, 61–66; see also the valuable comments of E. Papaioannou in his review of this Festschrift, in: JÖB 49 (1999) 321–322.

27 Papaioannou too, (see previous n.), would be open to this identification.

28 The interpretation offered here does not rule out the possibility that Marinus the Syrian did use some kind of chemical device in the battle against Vitalian. On the other hand, a look at his *curriculum vitae* as outlined in PLRE 2, Marinus no. 7, reveals that he spent most of his career in various "civil service" positions in finance and taxation, was already out of office in 515, and therefore not an obvious choice to be given (out of the blue?) an important military command at a time of crisis. Should we be a little suspicious here too?

Establishing a Holy Lineage: Theodore the Stoudite's Funerary Catechism for His Mother (BHG 2422)

STEPHANOS EFTHYMIADIS / J. M. FEATHERSTONE

Introduction, edition and annotation (Stephanos Efthymiadis)

Though the same interests, themes and issues run through his prolific work, of all writers of ninth- and tenth-century Byzantium Theodoros Stoudites stands out as the most original and versatile in terms of language, style and literary genre. His diction mostly combined ecclesiastical and sometimes demotic Greek with the new vocabulary of an inspired craftsman of language; his usually straightforward prose style at times betrayed sophistication and a learned background corresponding to the social status and education of his addressee or honoree; finally, whether in poetry or in prose, his selection of literary genre ranged from the iambic twelve-syllable verse to the Catechism and the Funeral Oration, forms with no recent recorded precedent. By and large, this variety was the natural result of a multifaceted personality engaged in an ongoing struggle in defense and promotion of both public and private interests. The modification of language and style and shifting of genres were prompted by a recurrent and renewable involvement of himself and his monastic community in such crises as the Moechian controversy and Second Iconoclasm. Above all, however, in his writings Theodoros was prudent enough both to blur and draw the dividing line between introversion and extroversion, making things private appear public and vice versa.

In the present study we shall deal with one of his earliest texts which enshrines both the public and the private, the Funeral Catechism for his mother Theoktiste (BHG 2422).¹ The appreciable proportion of seventy-six letters addressed to women and included in his copious correspondence, available in the admirable critical edition of Georgios Fatouros, shows self-asserting Theodoros' openness to the other half of human kind, a feature seldom encountered in the writings of a monastic father. Arguably, this concern was prompted by his close

1 For a detailed biographical sketch of Theoktiste see PmbZ 8032; and PBE 1: Theoktiste 3. As one of his well-known works the Catechism was cited in the *vita* of Theodoros Stoudites A (BHG 1754), in: PG 99, col. 117A; *vita* B (BHG 1755), *ibid.*, col. 237A; and *vita* C (BHG 1755d), ed. V. Latyšev, in: VV 21 (1914) 259–260.

links to Constantinopolitan aristocracy and its officialdom as well as his endeavour to reinforce right faith and discipline in an age marked by doctrinal and spiritual temptations.²

It is among the first letters of this correspondence that we find his first extant address to his mother. Ep. 6, Θεοκτίστη τῇ ἑαυτοῦ μητρὶ, is a letter of mourning, penned in a state of poignant sorrow, not long before her death and after the premature loss of his not named sister and his brother Euthymios.³ In this lamentation Theoktiste is repeatedly styled as a saint who rejected mundane glory for the heritage of heaven, who shared the exploits of martyrdom though not shedding blood, who was bereft of her limbs, i.e., her children, for the love of God.⁴

Apart from this letter, Theodoros addressed his mother after her death in a κατήχησις ἐπιτάφιος, which has come down to us in a *codex unicus* of Stoudite provenance, *Parisinus graecus* 1491 (siglum P). This is a parchment, 24 x 37,7 cm, written in two columns at the beginning of the 10th century by two scribes; the first copied ff. 1–198^v (36 lines to page), whereas the second copied ff. 199–245^v (36–39 lines to page).⁵ The Catechism is contained in ff. 94–103 and it is transmitted in good shape with only a few spelling errors; it ends rather abruptly in the second line of f. 103 and is followed by a lengthy fragment of an untitled text given in the form of “Question and Answer.” This text has been identified with the *Oratio de theatris et de Abraham*, a spurious work of St John Chrysostom, oddly copied in this part of the manuscript.⁶

The fact that the Catechism for his mother was included in a hagiographical collection produced in the monastery of Stoudios provides sufficient proof that,

-
- 2 For these letters see J. Gouillard, *La femme de qualité dans les lettres de Théodore Studite*, in: *JÖB* 32/2 (1982) 445–453; and P. Hatlie, *Women of Discipline During the Iconoclast Age*, in: *BZ* 89 (1996) 37–44.
 - 3 *Theodori Studitae epistulae*, ed. G. Fatouros (CFHB XXXI/1–2 – Series Berolinensis), Berlin/NewYork 1992, 21–23; Theodoros is also alluding twice to the loss of his siblings in vv. 9–10 and 24–25. On the same letter see A. P. Dobroklonskij, *Преподовний Феодор исповедник и игумен Студийски*, Odessa 1913, I 295–298; also Fatouros, *ibid.*, 148*–149*; and V. Sarris, *Η βυζαντινή παραμυθητική ἐπιστολή. Από τὸν Θεόδωρο Στουδίτη ἕως τὸν Εὐστάθιο Θεσσαλονίκης* (9ος–12ος αἰ.), Thessaloniki 2005, 401–402.
 - 4 For Theodoros’ idea that people of his era could emulate the deeds of the early Christian martyrs see P. Hatlie, *The Politics of Salvation: Theodore of Stoudios on Martyrdom (Martyrion) and Speaking Out (Parrhesia)*, in: *DOP* 50 (1990) 266–272.
 - 5 Contents of the manuscript are given in H. Omont, *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris 1898, II 64; F. Halkin, *Manuscrits grecs de Paris: Inventaire hagiographique* (SubHag 44), Brussels 1968, 182–183. On other earlier manuscripts of Stoudite origin see N. F. Kavrus, *Студийский скрипторий в IX в. (по материалам рукописей Москвы и Ленинграда)*, in: *VV* 44 (1983) 98–110.
 - 6 See *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca, Novum Auctarium* (SubHag 65), Brussels 1984, nos 2349t and 2355. The fragment corresponds to PG 56, cols 543–554. *Theodori Studitae epistulae*, ed. Fatouros (see n. 3), 28* has taken it as an unpublished work of Theodoros on the Sunday of Forefathers.

together with his letter, this Funeral Catechism aimed at propounding Theoktiste's holy commemoration.⁷ Before being reprinted in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca* with some typing errors, this text was edited by A. Mai in his *Nova patrum bibliotheca*.⁸ Since this edition is not free of transcription errors and omissions, we deemed it worthy to offer a new one followed by an English translation and succinct commentary given in the form of notes.⁹

Judging from the fact that Theoktiste's death is presented as imminent and irreversible, it is plausible to assume that only a short time separated the composition of Theodoros' Catechism from that of his letter. The Catechism has reasonably been dated to the period between 797 and 802, i.e., during Eirene's reign as a sole ruler. This chronology is suggested by the words: *καὶ γὰρ ἐπανήκομεν οἱ ὑπερορισθέντες καὶ διασκορπισθέντες εἰς ταῦτόν, ὡς ἴστε, δεξιᾶς τυχόντες τῆς ἐπανελεύσεως παρὰ τῆς κρατούσης* (§ 10).¹⁰

Whether departing from historical considerations or not, older and recent surveys of the literary output either of the iconoclastic period in general or Theodoros Stoudites in particular, have not done full justice to this text, perhaps on the single grounds that it was not ranked among his most important literary creations. However, it is no exaggeration to say that, by virtue of the date of its composition alone, the Funeral Catechism for Theoktiste represents both a starting point for its author and a turning one in female sainthood and hagiography. As it will be argued, by launching, on the one hand, a new model of female sainthood – that of a pious housewife ending her marriage and entering the monastery, it drastically parted from the Late Antique past and foreshadowed later medieval examples; and by sketching, on the other hand, a sacred portrait of a mother, it paved the son's way towards holiness.

From Charles Diehl to Alexander Kazhdan scholars have outlined this text's idiosyncratic features as regards both the portrayal of the heroine and the highlights of her life upon it called attention: Theoktiste's tonsure and her overcoming

7 Details in F. Halkin, *La Passion de Sainte Théoctiste*, in: *AB* 73 (1955) 55 (= *Martyrs Grecs IIe–VIIIe s.* [Variorum Collected Studies Series 30], London 1974, II).

8 See *Nova patrum bibliotheca*, VI/2, Rome 1854, 364–378; and as *Oratio* 13 in: *PG* 99, cols 884–902.

9 To cite a few such errors: § 2 *εἶπε τὸ* (for *εἶπετο*), § 6 *μεταστάσεως* (for *μεταναστάσεως*), § 7 *ἕτερος* (for *σφέτερος*); and omissions: § 9 *καὶ ταύτας ἀσπαζομένη* (after *τὰς πληγὰς ὀρώσα*); § 10 *ἐν τῇ διαμέψει* (after *ἐν τῇ συζητήσει*); § 14 *πὺς κοιτάζομαι* (after *πὺς ἀνίσταμαι*).

10 Conversely, erroneously considering that Theoktiste outlived her brother Plato, A. Sideras dated it to ca. 820; see his *Die byzantinischen Grabreden* (WBS XIX), Vienna 1994, 99–100. Long before him, B. Hermann considered that in 807–808 Theoktiste was still alive: see *Theoktista von Byzanz, die Mutter zweier Heiliger*, Freiburg 1919, 108ff. Theodoros simply hinted at his deceased mother in a letter that he addressed to the nun Anna in ca. 809–811, i.e., later than this period; see *Theodori Studitae epistulae* (see n. 3), 42,2–3, 122.

of maternal sentiments; the relationship of mother and son as well as their separation; the spiritual advancement of a woman full of energy and strength who, both in the world and the monastery, could, at instances, be overbearing to people under her charge. The historian Kazhdan went on to underscore that, unlike the Funeral Laudation to his uncle Plato, this funeral sermon was not “historical” and “eventful”; and, what is more, it lacked allusions to the question and the cult of icons.¹¹ As a matter of fact, composed in the interim period between the two Iconoclasms, just ten years after the Council of Nicaea II (787), this oration is a text poor in ecclesiastical polemic concerning Iconoclasm. Just once in his narrative the author is alluding to the “earlier turbulence” (ἐκ τῆς πρὶν διειλήσεως) that had spoiled monasticism (§ 8).

Though posed as a riddle by Kazhdan, several reasons can be adduced to account for this silence on icon-worship. First and foremost, Theoktiste the woman could not claim any direct (and public) involvement in the anti-iconoclastic struggle, nor her son at that point.¹² Besides that, in the Laudation of his uncle Plato, composed much later, in ca. 814, we hear much about First Iconoclasm but nothing of any family resistance. Moreover, the reign of the “much loathsome” Constantine V saw Plato not only recovering from the shock of the plague of 747–748 which had his parents as victims but also, as a notarios, winning fortune and reputation in the imperial quarters.¹³ The “pressing issue” at the time when Theodoros delivered his Catechism was the Moechian controversy, then in its first phase. This impression is further borne out by his first five letters of the collection which date from the same period 795–797 (epp. 1–5). Much more than Iconoclasm, Theodoros’ sermon had good reasons to concentrate on the hardships that he and his uncle Plato endured on account of their opposition to the “adulterous marriage” of Constantine VI, to which the patriarch Tarasios offered his silent support.¹⁴ Naturally, with her brother and son recently recalled from exile by the

11 See Ch. Diehl, *Une bourgeoise de Byzance au VIIIe siècle*, in: *Figures Byzantines*, Paris 1906, I 111–132; and A. Kazhdan, *A History of Byzantine Literature (650–850)*. In collaboration with L. F. Sherry/Ch. Angelidi, Athens 1999, 244–247. The text was also included in D. L. Zakythenos, *Βυζαντινά κείμενα*, Athens 1957, 75–84. The most recent discussion is by O. Delouis, *Saint Jean-Baptiste de Stoudios à Constantinople. La contribution d’un monastère à l’histoire de l’Empire byzantin (v. 454–1204)*, Thèse présentée pour l’obtention du grade de Docteur en l’Histoire de l’Université Paris I-Panthéon Sorbonne, Paris 2005, 308–309.

12 Naturally enough, Theoktiste was excluded from A. Kazhdan’s and A.-M. Talbot’s survey of the role of women in Iconoclasm, see: *Women and Iconoclasm*, in: *BZ 84/85 (1991–1992)* 391–408.

13 See *Laudatio Platonis*, in: *PG 99*, col. 808A–B.

14 Along with her relatives, Theoktiste is said to have suffered a thirty-day imprisonment (§ 10). For a commentary on these allusions see E. von Dobschütz, *Methodius und die Studiten*, in: *BZ 18 (1909)* 60.

empress Eirene, Theoktiste was crowned with a resistance which was monopolized by her family and her monastic milieu.

Nonetheless, the Funeral Catechism for his mother and the Laudation to his uncle diverge not only on the question of Iconoclasm but on matters of literary form and orientation. Thomas Pratsch singled out the *topoi* of piety, humility, disruption of blood bonds and other things, upon which Theodoros canvassed his mother's sainthood in his Catechism.¹⁵ This, however, should not leave the impression that Theodoros' sermon adheres to the laws of hagiographical praise at the expense of recording real life. On the contrary, Theodoros considerably distances himself from the hagiographical stereotypes: idealized homeland, parenthood and childhood are passed over in silence and so is marital engagement.¹⁶ Details on these matters can be drawn only from the Laudation to Plato, which, as already noted, is much more concerned with historicity than the sermon pronounced in honour of Theoktiste; the latter was based more on situations and scenes taken from the real life, all of which stand for eye-witness reports, rather than being modeled upon the typical patterns of a saint's Life. In other words, although the argument and the purpose of the praise to his mother were ultimately hagiographic, the work itself, set and narrated by her son in a realistic fashion, is not hagiography in its common use and sense.

Following the sad announcement of her death in the preamble, Theodoros avoids clinging to the picture of an "ideal passive heroine" whose holiness must appear prefigured. Instead of attaching to her the stereotypes of a noble origin and a prudent childhood, Theodoros portrays his mother as a forceful personality who imposes her own model of holy life and conduct on her family milieu and beyond. Unlike iconophile male and female saints whose holy portrait was mostly derived from hagiographical re-adaptations of historical reality, Theoktiste is depicted as a woman in flesh and blood, with a temperament pairing philanthropy with behaviours not *se ipso* rational. Though translating her violent outbreaks as ultimately leading to repentance, her son does not refrain from divulging them in two instances, while treating her life in family and in the monastery (§§ 5 and 12).

-
- 15 Th. Pratsch, *Theodoros Studites (759–826) – zwischen Dogma und Pragma. Der Abt des Studiosklosters in Konstantinopel im Spannungsfeld von Patriarch, Kaiser und eigenem Anspruch* (BBS 4), Frankfurt am Main 1998, 29–33; and idem, *Der hagiographische Topos. Griechische Heiligenviten in mittelbyzantinischer Zeit* (Millennium Studien 6), Berlin/New York 2005, 51, 96, 212 (Weitere Tugenden); 329 (Verteilung der Habe); 331 (Letzte Amtshandlungen).
- 16 Among the hagiography of the period similar glossing over the *topoi* of homeland, parents and childhood is observable in the Life of St Euthymios of Sardis, a work penned in 832 by the future patriarch Methodios. Yet, this "omission" is not accounted for on the simple grounds of ignorance but on the awareness that none of this is necessarily conducive to virtue; see J. Gouillard, *La vie d'Euthyme de Sardes († 831). Une œuvre du patriarche Méthode*, in: TM 10 (1987) 21–23 (§2).

Both the letter and the Catechism dedicated to Theoktiste constitute the earliest documented examples of portraying a holy woman in a new era, the Byzantine Middle Ages, and of family involvement in promoting the cult of a holy person. As has been pointed out, models of female sainthood were then inspired by the values of a new social elite and an emerging monastic culture.¹⁷ Family lineage gained large acclaim in society and lay behind the development of what has been termed “family cult”.¹⁸ As can be traced in pieces of hagiography dating from the immediately following decades, this cult found fertile ground in monasteries founded or restored by members of the Constantinopolitan aristocracy within and outside the capital.¹⁹ Cases in point are the mother and the sister of St Stephanos the Younger whose *vita* was written in ca. 809 or the equally famous Philaretos the Merciful, praised by his grandson Niketas in ca. 822.²⁰ On another level and beyond the confines of her age, dividing as she did her life between the marital and the monastic status, Theoktiste anticipated, to a great extent, the examples of holy women who attained sainthood either once they were widowed and entered a convent (Athanasia of Aegina, Theodora of Thessalonike) or without ever embracing monastic life (Thomaïs of Lesbos, Maria the Younger). Nevertheless, though a pious housewife practicing secret asceticism, Theoktiste neither “benefited” from her spouse’s death nor became the wife-martyr suffering from a coarse and brutal husband.²¹ What is more, her piety was not vested with the usual colours of a passive humility and modesty, but with those of a woman tak-

17 See E. Patlagean, *L’histoire de la femme déguisée en moine et l’évolution de la sainteté féminine à Byzance*, in: SM, 3e série, XVII, Spoleto 1976, 617–623 (= *Structure sociale, famille, chrétienté à Byzance. IVe–XIe siècle* [Collected Studies Series 134], London 1981, XI).

18 I. Hausherr was the first to point out that the Stoudite’s family was “une famille de saints”; see *Le moine et l’amitié*, in: *Études de spiritualité orientale* (OCA 183), Rome 1969, 338–340. Other examples from Middle Byzantine hagiography were discussed by A.-M. Talbot, *Family Cults in Byzantium: the Case of St Theodora of Thessalonike*, in: *ΑΕΙΜΩΝ. Studies Presented to Lennart Rydén on his Sixty-fifth Birthday*, ed. J. O. Rosenqvist, Uppsala 1996, 49–69 (= *Women and Religious Life in Byzantium*, Aldershot 2001, VI).

19 For the building activity of the period, especially that of the Stoudites, see V. Ruggieri, *Byzantine Religious Architecture (582–867): Its History and Structural Elements* (OCA 237), Rome 1991, 107–111.

20 See *vita* of St Stephen the Younger (BHG 1666), §§ 47 and 53, ed. M. F. Auzépy, *La vie d’Étienne le Jeune par Étienne le Diacre* (Birmingham Byzantine and Ottoman Monographs 3), Aldershot/Hampshire 1997, 148 and 153. Also *vita* of Philaretos the Merciful (BHG 1511z), ed. L. Rydén, *The Life of St Philaretos the Merciful written by his Grandson Niketas* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia 8), Uppsala 2002, 45–50.

21 For other similar examples of secret asceticism within marriage see D. de F. Abrahamse, *Women’s Monasticism in the Middle Byzantine Period: Problems and Prospects*, in: BF 9 (1985) 53–54 and n. 53–54. For a recent innovative discussion of different types of female hagiography see S. Constantinou, *Female Corporeal Performances. Reading the Body in Byzantine Passions and Lives of Holy Women* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia 9), Uppsala 2005.

ing action and gradually managing to impose her impulse towards monastic isolation on male and female members of her family. Granted, a few allusions in Theodoros' account allow us to suspect that her brother Plato played an influential role in this decision,²² yet, this fact alone does not diminish much of Theoktiste's consequential impact on driving, sooner or later, all members of her family (husband, sons and daughters) out of society. Unlike later examples from ninth- and tenth-century hagiography where at least one member remains in the world to perpetuate the family line, in the case of Theoktiste rejection of the world has a total and overwhelming effect.²³

Nonetheless, this is not the only feature that makes Theodoros' Catechism noteworthy; his text is perhaps unique in portraying a woman without interfering with gender issues. Although Theoktiste is not divested the "particulars" of a woman's life in society, references to inferiority and weakness as "befitting" female nature, yet surmounted by the engagement in a holy cause, or, to put it differently, a "gender-oriented" vocabulary is not what we encounter in her praise. Unlike Gorgonia, the married sister of Gregory of Nazianzos who also appropriated her husband to her pious way of life, Theoktiste's ascetical toils are not equated to those of men. Likewise, no matters of gender feature largely in the presentation of Theodoros' mother as they do in the philosophical biography of Gregory of Nyssa's sister, Macrina (d. 380) or in the Encomium which Michael Psellos wrote for his Mother.²⁴ What is more, compared to them Theoktiste would appear superior in that she vanquished her illiteracy by learning the Psalter, a knowledge that she later passed on to her daughter.²⁵ Notably, her son assigns this

22 Cf. §§ 6, 8, 9. Their attraction to monastic vocation was credited to Plato also in the *vitae* of Theodoros: *vitae* A and B, in: PG 99, cols 121A–B and 240D–241A; *vita* C, ed. Latyšev (see n. 1), 261–262.

23 See the examples analyzed by Patlagean, *L'histoire de la femme déguisée* (see n. 17), 617–619. Theodoros highlights this lack in desire for the succession of the race by the words: οὐ τῷ καταλιπεῖν διάδοχον τοῦ γένους (§ 6).

24 See *De vita Macrinae*, ch. 1, ed. P. Maraval, in: Grégoire de Nysse. *Vie de Sainte Macrine* (SC 178), Paris 1971, 140; cf. V. E. F. Harrison, *Male and female in Cappadocian theology*, in: *JThS* n.s. 41 (1996) 446–447. As for Psellos, he refers to his mother as a weak-natured person in two instances: "she was not a man by nature and was not thus allowed to study literature freely" and "she was one who knew nothing feminine, except what was decreed by nature, but was in all other respects strong and manly in soul and even showed herself to be more resilient than the other portion of our species" (U. Criscuolo, *Autobiografia: Encomio per la sua madre* [Speculum 11], Naples 1989, vv. 136–138 and 420–422, 90 and 99 respectively). Moreover, on another occasion, Psellos extols her mother for her mastery of nature and her reconciliation of feminine and masculine qualities (vv. 1595–1597, *ibid.*, 141).

25 For a discussion see N. Kalogeras, *The Role of Parents and Kin in the Education of Byzantine Children*, in: *Hoping for Continuity. Childhood, Education and Death in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, ed. K. Mustakaelio et al., Rome 2005, 136 and n. 20; and K. Nikolaou, *Η γυναίκα στη μέση βυζαντινή εποχή. Κοινωνικά πρότυπα και καθημερινός βίος στα αγιολογικά*

lack of education to her orphan state, and not to her *infirmitas sexus*. Discrimination, if discrimination it is, can be detected only in the use of the word ἀνδρειόφρων, i.e., in styling Theoktiste as a valiant soul, worthy of Abraham (§ 6). Yet, seen in context, the writer's emphasis is here not on Theoktiste's fulfilling a man's labour, but on her brave decision to sever, like Abraham, the bond of parenthood "by the sword of the spirit."²⁶ In other instances, she is simply compared to the biblical and hagiographical *exempla* of female piety: Ruth, Anna, mother of Samuel, the mother of the Maccabees, the mother of one of the Forty Martyrs, Natalia and Priscilla. Thus, though praised for leading a life of such chastity and restraint that she virtually overcame the taint of the married state, Theoktiste is nowhere presented as having transcended the limits of her gender.

All in all, by the frequent use of scriptural quotations mostly drawn from the Old Testament, usually cited *verbatim* and not as allusions, Theodoros employs the straightforward form of Catechism prevailing over the sophisticated elegance of a Funeral Oration. Pronounced before his monastic community and his uncle Plato at Sakkoudion in Bithynia or, if the text dates later than 799,²⁷ at Stoudios in Constantinople this Funeral Catechism justifies its double title and rhetorical character. As a funeral speech, it was prompted by obvious sentimental reasons, without, however, reaching the dramatic heights of the letter discussed above; the introductory lamentation swiftly gives way to edification and portrayal of an idiosyncratic woman whose life both in the world and the monastery tangentially corresponded to former examples of female holiness. Addressing as he did a monastic audience, the Stoudite Father's basic endeavour was to highlight, on the one hand, disruption of the marriage and family ties, to instill, on the other hand, the idea that violent and authoritative conduct is not exclusive of, but conducive to sanctity and salvation.

As already suggested, not only in language and style, but also by retaining a view closer to mundane and earthly matters, Theodoros' Funeral Catechism had little in common with its illustrious literary precedents, namely the Orations which Gregory of Nazianzos wrote to commemorate family members (his sister Gorgonia, his brother Caesarius and his father the elder Gregory), not to mention the loftiest of all, the one celebrating the life and deeds of his close friend Basil. This text is once quoted in the Catechism but no longer used and imitated. None-

κείμενα, Athens 2005, 47–48. A similar allusion to orphanage is made for Plato in his Laudation, but not with regard to education; see PG 99, col. 808A.

26 The same word is used also in ep. 77, Ειρήνη πατρικία, where the addressee is styled as ἀνδρειόφρων ψυχή for her opposition to Iconoclasm; see Theodori Studitae epistulae (see n. 3), 190. It should be noted that in the *vita* C of Theodoros Stoudites Theoktiste is introduced as having emulated her husband and by means of her ascetical toils having made male her female nature: ed. Latyšev, in: VV 21 (1914) 250.

27 For the whole record of events see Pratsch, Theodoros Studites (see n. 15), 115–134.

theless, like the earlier Cappadocians and the later Michael Psellos, also author of an *Encomium* for his Mother, Theodoros Stoudites allows us a panoramic view of mothers and families engaged in a “lofty” cause. In all aforementioned authors, this engagement becomes the basic axis upon which authors attach their underlying intention to promote the sanctification of their relatives and ultimately of themselves. We are told that Gorgonia brought her husband to her own pious way of life and that Macrina greatly contributed to prompting Basil and other members of her family to higher spiritual pursuits.²⁸ It is this particular aspect that links up Theoktiste to the married sister of Gregory of Nazianzos and the unmarried sister of Gregory of Nyssa. Nonetheless, these women instilled moral and spiritual values in their male and female relatives, but they never operated as a driving force directing the whole family towards a total renunciation of life in the world.

In Theodoros' Catechism the mother prevails over the family and the same holds true with Psellos' mother Theodote, in whose *Encomium*, dated ca. 1054, she also swerves from the straight path of family life to draw herself and her husband all the more to the pursuit of ascetical practices within marriage and family, ending up to the rejection of both. Once again, there is a clear point of differentiation here: although Psellos assigns space and value to the husband and father, the latter is entirely underrated in Theodoros' account.²⁹ We may suspect that, like Psellos' father, the husband of Theoktiste, who held a dignity in the imperial treasury (§ 6), was a “secular” and practical man engaged in public affairs and not “a man of religion.”³⁰ Although his son reserves him some encomiastic words when styling him a “Boaz by the side of Ruth” and saying that he too, deserved

28 See Or. 8, *Oratio funebris ad Gorgoniam*, ch. 8, ed. M. A. Calvet-Sebasti, in: Grégoire de Nazianze, *Discours 6–12* (SC 405), Paris 1995, 260: ὁ δὲ κάλλιστον καὶ σεμνότατον, ὅτι καὶ τὸν ἄνδρα πρὸς ἑαυτῆς ἐποιήσατο, καὶ οὐ δεσπότην ἄτοπον, ἀλλ' ὁμόδουλον ἀγαθὸν προσεκτίησατο...; and *De vita Macrinae*, chs. 6 and 11, ed. Maraval, 160–162 and 174–176. It should be noted that their brothers and authors diverge on the firsthand knowledge they had about their sisters' life; whereas Gregory of Nyssa filled out the Oration to his sister Macrina with stories he had experienced or heard from others, ignorance lay behind the “rhetorical platitudes” of Gregory of Nazianzos in Gorgonia's *Encomium*: see R. Van Dam, *Families and Friends in Late Roman Cappadocia*, Philadelphia 2003, 93–96 and 109–112. For a recent analysis of the funeral oration for Gorgonia see V. Burrus, *Life after Death: The Martyrdom of Gorgonia and the Birth of Female Hagiography*, in: *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections*, ed. J. Björtnes/T. Hägg, Copenhagen 2006, 153–170; and for St Gregory of Nazianzos' rhetorical viewing of his family see S. Elm, *Gregory's women: Creating a philosopher's family*, *ibid.*, 171–191.

29 See J. Walker, *These Things I Have Not Betrayed: Michael Psellos' Encomium of his Mother as a Defense of Rhetoric*, in: *Rhetorica* 22 (2004) 49–101; and *The Byzantine Family of Michael Psellos. Mothers and Sons, Fathers and Daughters*, in: A. Kaldellis (ed.), *Michael Psellos in Translation*, Notre Dame 2006, forthcoming.

30 For a biographical sketch of Theodoros' father, Photeinos, see Pratsch, *Theodoros Studites* (see n. 15), 17–25. Photeinos must have held the office of βασιλικὸς σακελλάριος.

praise for leaving his wife untouched (§ 4), his reluctance to go further is straight-away made visible in what comes next: religious education of daughters and sons was her own kingdom! Of him and his three brothers who are also said to have embraced the solitary life (§ 6) we hear no more in the narrative.³¹

By and large, Theodoros makes an implicit distinction between the “militant” ascetical members of the family (Plato, Theoktiste, her daughter and himself) and those who hesitantly followed them.³² Their separation, an astonishing event that made enormous impression in Constantinopolitan society, was a “voluntary separation” (ἐθελοντὶ χωρισμός) imposed by the single will of the mother. As a term and a literary theme, separation occupies a focal position in the Catechism. Separation of death is first evoked by Theoktiste as an argument to convince her husband to live apart within marriage. More significantly, it was the heavy price for a brave and breaking action. Inserted as a personal memory and a tragic scene in the narrative, thereby somehow restraining the force of the author’s rhetorical overtones, it is narrated in sentimental detail (§ 7). Just before embarking on her new life, Theoktiste ought to overcome the tears of her little son and the “tyranny” of motherhood. Later on in her life, while a nun, separation of mother from son was once again felt but in retrospect: a short meeting preceded Theodoros’ and Platon’s departure into exile (§ 9).³³ Finally, once again the separation of death seals a relationship that had developed in a reverse order: it transpired that the mother had become her son’s spiritual daughter. In short, her escape from the world had finally subjected her to the guidance of her son, from ἀποταγή she was led to ὑποταγή (§ 13).

Disruption of marriage and motherhood is a significant break with the earlier “Cappadocian exempla” of female holiness and a point of divergence from Psellos’ maternal praise. All mothers are highly acknowledged as having considerably contributed to the moral progress of their sons; yet, their common desire to embrace monastic life and abandon the conventional demands of marriage and family did not result in adopting similar attitudes. In Psellos, whose mother also

31 Marginalisation of the father against the mother is not an uncommon feature in *vitae* of the late antique and medieval period; see Pratsch, *Topos* (see n. 15), 68 and n. 63. This authority gained much more ground if the mother was widowed: see M. Kaplan, *Hagiographie et histoire de la société*, in: *Les Vies des saints à Byzance. Genre littéraire ou biographie historique?* Actes du colloque international philologique, Paris, 6–7–8 juin 2002, ed. P. Odorico/P. A. Agapitos (*Dossiers byzantins* 4), Paris 2004, 37–45.

32 Apart from the Catechism itself (§ 6), this is suggested by ep. 1, addressed Πλάτωνι πνευματικῷ πατρὶ, where Theodoros is counseling his younger brother Euthymios (vv. 63–74) to remain steady in his monastic call; see Theodori Studitae *epistulae* (see n. 3), 7. On the case of Euthymios see R. Cholij, *Theodore the Stoudite: the Ordering of Holiness* (Oxford Theological Monographs), Oxford 2002, 17–18.

33 For the course of this exile see J.-Cl. Cheynet/B. Flusin, *Du monastère Ta Kathara à Thessalonique; Théodore Stoudite sur la route de l’exil*, in: *REB* 48 (1990) 193–211.

ended up taking monastic vows, renunciation of marital and familial ties is regarded as an “apostasy from God”.³⁴ Exit from marriage and withdrawal to the monastic life could be enacted only following the elder daughter's death and Psellos' (rhetorical and real) coming of age. In “conformity” with Late Antique practice, mortal grief functioned as a catalyst for a departure from the world.³⁵ Nevertheless, if the loss of his parents opened up St Anthony's – and many other holy men's – exodus to the desert, this was not so with Theoktiste's “wonderful innovation” (§ 6: θαυμασίας καινοτομίας) whose breaking of family ties and offering up her properties had no association with death.³⁶ In his later years Theodoros expressed similar views in his letter to the *protospatharia* Albeneka (ep. 395), the wife of a high-ranking official related to the imperial palace. Wishing to leave her spouse for the convent, Albeneka was counseled to make him understand her cause, but, should her inner inclination prove intense enough, she was asked to follow her call in spite of his will. However, in his concluding lines the Stoudite abbot reminded her that it would have been possible to find salvation living together with a man.³⁷

In honouring sisters and mothers, such strong personalities as the Cappadocian Fathers and Michael Psellos largely speak for themselves, emphasizing the close link between a female biography and a male autobiography, not to say “autohagiography”. Though trying to disclaim implicit self-praise, giving instead the credit to his uncle Plato (§ 9), Theodoros follows practically the same line: his selection of events and his account of his mother's spiritual feats is set in tandem with his own hardships and modes of persecution.³⁸

34 See ch. 11, vv. 638–641, ed. Criscuolo (see n. 24), 107; and Walker, *These Things I Have Not Betrayed* (see n. 29), 98.

35 Cf. the case of Eustathios the Banker whose son's death prompted his desire for the monastic life; see S. Efthymiadis, *Living in a City and Living in a Sketis: the Dream of Eustathios the Banker* (BHG Nov. Auct. 1317d), in: *BF 21* (1995) (= *Bosphorus. Essays presented in honour of Cyril Mango*), 20 and 26.

36 For parallels from later Medieval hagiography see A.-M. Talbot, *The Byzantine Family and the Monastery*, in: *DOP 44* (1990) 119–120 (= *Women and Religious Life in Byzantium [Variorum Collected Studies Series CS 733]*, Aldershot 2001, XIII). On Theodoros' self-presentation as a reformer of monasticism see J. Leroy, *La réforme studite*, in: *Il monachesimo orientale. Atti del convegno di studi orientali che sul predetto tema si tiene a Roma, sotto la direzione del pontificio orientale, nei giorni 9, 10, 11 e 12 Aprile 1958* (OCA 153), Rome 1958, 184–188.

37 Cited are the words ἔστι γὰρ ἐν τῷ βίῳ σωθῆναι καὶ μετὰ ἀνδρός; see *Theodori Studitae epistulae* (see n. 3), 550. This letter dates from 815 to the beginning of 819.

38 The autobiographical character of the Catechism was briefly noted by S. Efthymiadis, *The Byzantine Hagiographer and his Audience in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*, in: *Metaphrasis. Redactions and Audiences in Middle Byzantine Hagiography*, ed. Chr. Høgel, Oslo 1996, 70; and M. Hinterberger, *Autobiographische Traditionen in Byzanz* (WBS XXII), Vienna 1999, 152–153. See also M. Angold, *The autobiographical impulse in Byzantium*, in: *DOP 52* (1998) 1–17, who notes that the first signs of autobiography in Byzantium appeared in a monastic setting, but does not treat sources earlier than the end of the 10th-beginning of the 11th century.

First and foremost, his laying emphasis on the violent aspects of renunciation of the worldly order (ἀποταγή) and on “voluntary separation” was by all means also a personal experience and not an attitude privileged by his mother. In ep. 4 addressed to the abbot Nikephoros, dated to between September 795 and autumn 796, he confesses that he shared the same tragic feeling: ... ἀπεσχοίνοισα ἑμαυτὸν καὶ τῆς συνδιατριβῆς τῶν συγγενῶν μου καὶ τοῦ ἐθισμοῦ τῶν κατὰ σάρκα φίλων μου καὶ εἴ τινος δὴ οὖν ἄλλου ... Vigorous in his defence of monastic values, Theodoros developed the same ideas throughout the Catechism composed shortly afterwards. Addressing a monastic audience, he himself needed first to demonstrate that he originated from a family that instilled in him the values which he then aimed to impose on his community. His mother, invested with powers and authority hardly compatible with any woman of his age, was the guarantor of his own devotion to the monastic cause. Though it could be argued that he wrote the first eulogy of a female saint in the Byzantine Middle Ages, his concern was not so much to present a full-fledged biography as to propound a monastic ideal that was connected with and regulated secular life too. Theoktiste’s acts and behaviour as a married woman and as a nun were not actually inseparable, but stood for a remarkable continuum: the way she lived in the world prefigured her days as an abbess. In this sense, the striking fact of conferring violence upon her maidservants as a lay matron anticipated her violent outbreaks in the convent.³⁹

Women in antiquity took a leading role in society once they became mothers. For Theoktiste motherhood was the starting point for setting foot on her own path towards spiritual perfection. Monastic piety and discipline were put into action once the son came into being and common life with his mother made a beginning. It is thus no accident that her encomiast did not begin her biography with her birth, but with his own. Giving birth to Theodoros was precisely the time “when she had gained experience in the judgement of that which was good and that which was not” (§ 2). It was then that Theoktiste became conscious of her “holy identity” and of what marked her off from other women of her social class; that she rejected any sort of sorcery following the birth of a child; that she secretly abstained from meat-eating and watching theatrical performances while attending marriage feasts; that she knew one man only. Remarkably, as he would later do with the Praise of his uncle Plato, Theodoros transfers the topos of puer-senex from a “charismatic childhood” to mature age. Spiritual maturity is achieved by cutting oneself off from a society which, at least in its higher strata, “not yet out of the Dark Age,” is presented as quite permissive. To be sure, this denigration of Theoktiste’s social milieu can plausibly raise suspicion as ultimately resulting

39 This was first noted by Hausherr, *Le moine et l’ amitié* (see n. 18), 339.

from her son's endeavour to emphasize that rejecting the customary practices of her class was what estranged her from the world and directed her to a gradual spiritual advancement, first experienced in hiding (but not in negligence of her household duties) and then in actions affecting the family. Except for an allusion to her early orphaned state as a cause for her illiteracy, the author passes over in silence everything that has to do with what preceded their communal life, their *συμβίωσις*, a term also used in the peroration (§ 14), again to denote the "life" expected to be shared post mortem.

Thus highlighting aspects of family life and personal emotions, Theodoros nonetheless leaves much of his mother's monastic career in the shadows, implying that it was not lacking in obstacles and vicissitudes. His account is rounded off with reference to what constituted a reversing of the mother-and-son relationship. Betraying his propensity for coining new words,⁴⁰ Theodoros styled his mother as ἡ μητρότεκνος, μάλλον δὲ διττοτόκος μου διμήτηρ and himself her lord and father, thereby denoting what he viewed as a reversal of the natural order and his own second birth. As hagiographers did in many Lives of saints, Theodoros assigned to the mother a crucial role in paving her son's path of holiness, a prize that Theoktiste had first won for herself. Pronouncing this particular kind of hagiographic praise was a prolegomenon to establishing a holy lineage that was to be perpetuated by those engaged in the harsh monastic life: a sort of prefiguration of the holy portrait of himself.

40 On Theodoros' art as a wordsmith see G. Fatouros, Zur Sprache des Theodoros Stoudites, in: *Lexicographica Byzantina. Beiträge zum Symposion zur byzantinischen Lexikographie* (Wien, 1.–4. 3. 1989), ed. W. Hörandner/E. Trapp (BV 20), Vienna 1991, 123–128.

Text

E cod. Parisino graeco 1491 (= P), ff. 94–103

Τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ ὁμολογητοῦ Θεοδώρου κατήχησις ἐπιτάφιος εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ μητέρα.

1. Ἦνεγκεν ὁ καιρὸς, ᾧ τέκνα καὶ ἀδελφοί, ἀγγελίαν ὑμῖν ἀναγγεῖλαι ἀπροσδόκητον, ἣτις ἐστὶν ὁ θάνατος τῆς ἀοιδίμου ἀδελφῆς τοῦ κοινοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν· αὕτη γὰρ τῇ ὠρισμένη βουλῇ τοῦ ζωοπλάστου Θεοῦ λειτουργήσασα τῷ παρόντι βίῳ, μετακεχώρηκεν εἰς τὰ ὑπερκόσμια, οὐ λύπην ἡμῖν καταλιποῦσα ἀλόγιστον, ὡς ἂν τις οἰηθείη, ἀλλὰ χαρὰν ἐμποίησασα, διὰ τῆς εὐελπίστου αὐτῆς μεταβάσεως. Θέλετε γὰρ διηγῆσωμαι ὑμῖν ὡσπερ καὶ τοῖς ἐνταῦθα – ἐπειδὴ καιρὸς οὐ τοῦ σιγᾶν, ἀλλὰ τοῦ λαλεῖν, κατὰ τὴν κελεύουσαν ἐντολήν, μὴ ἐπαινέσης ἄνδρα ἕως τῆς ἐξόδου αὐτοῦ – ὅσα ἐποίησεν ἡ μακαρία ἐκείνη ἔτι ἐν σαρκὶ οὖσα καλὰ τε καὶ ὅσια, καὶ τῆς τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείας ἐπάξια; Θέτε δὴ οὖν τὰς ἀκοὰς ὑμῶν, τέκνα μου, καὶ γὰρ ὑφηγήσομαι ὑμῖν, ἔξω τοῦ ψεύδους παντελῶς φερόμενος, καὶ γενήσεται ὑμῖν ἡ περὶ ταύτης ἀπαγγελία, ἀντὶ κατηχήσεως οὐκ ἀνόνητος, ὡς οἶμαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ μάλα ὠφέλιμος.

7–8 cf. Eccles. 3,7 8–9 Sir. 27,7

7 διηγῆσομαι P

2. Ἐκ γονέων μὲν ἦρχθαι αὐτῆς τὴν ἀρετὴν, ὡσπερ καὶ τὸν βίον, οὐκ ἔχω λέγειν ἐπεὶ μηδὲ τὰ πρὸ ἐμοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὰ μετ’ ἐμὲ προηγῆσαι συγγράφειν καὶ ἐξότε πειῖραν εἰληφυῖα ἦν τῆς διαγνώσεως, τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ μὴ οὕτως ἔχοντος. Ἴν’ οὖν τὰ τῆς πρώτης καὶ δευτέρας μεθελικιώσεως παρῶμεν, ἀπὸ τοῦ καιροῦ τῆς συμβιώσεως ἀρξώ // 94^v // μεθὰ τῆς διηγῆσεως. Καὶ εἰ μὴ οἰκείως ἡμῖν ἔχει ὁ κοσμικὸς βίος τῆς καλλιμήτορος, ὅμως ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς τὸ τέλος κατιδῶμεν, ἀναγκαίως τοῦτον προσθήσομαι. Ἐκείνης τοίνυν πρῶτον κατόρθωμα, τὸ τὸν Θεὸν σεβασθῆναι καὶ ἀγαπήσαι ἐξ ὀλοκλήρου· ὥστε εἰ καὶ συνήφθη ἀνδρὶ, ἀλλ’ ὅλην ἑαυτὴν ἐβιάζετο τῆς κρείττονος μοίρας γενέσθαι. Διὰ τοῦτο γεννήσασα ἡμᾶς πρῶτως, οὐκ εἶπετο ταῖς ἄλλαις γυναιξίν, οἷα ἐκείναι ἐπὶ τοῖς νεογόνοις εἰώθασιν κατὰ δαιμονικὴν κίνησιν κεχρησθαι κληδονισμοῖς καὶ περιάμμασιν καὶ ἄλλαις τισὶν ἐπωδαῖς εἰς τε τοὺς δίφρους καὶ τοὺς κοιτωνίσκους, περιτραχήλιά τε βάλλουσαι καὶ περιάπτα, ἀλλ’ ἤρκεῖτο μόνον τῇ σφραγίδι τοῦ ζωοποιοῦ σταυροῦ τετειχίσθαι ἡμᾶς, ἀντὶ ὄπλου τινὸς καὶ θυρεοῦ ἀμαχωτάτου τοῦτο προβαλλομένη· διὰ τοῦτο πασῶν τῶν ἄλλων γυναικῶν

20 προσκυνουσῶν καὶ ἀπανισταμένων ἐξ αὐτῆς ὄψεως τῇ αὐτουργῶ καὶ
 μυσταγωγῶ καὶ διδασκάλῳ τῶν τοιούτων, μόνη οὐκ ἠνείχετο ἡ ἡμετέρα
 μήτηρ, οὔτε κεφαλὴν κλίνει πώποτε, οὔτε προσδραμεῖν, οὐδ' αὖ
 μετασχεῖν τῆς γοητείας, καίπερ ὑπὸ τῶν τελουμένων ἀπειλουμένη
 πολλάκις· ἀλλ' ὄντως ψυχαὶ δικαίων ἐν χειρὶ Θεοῦ καὶ οὐ μὴ ἄψηται αὐτῶν
 βάσανος· καὶ ὁ πεποιθῶς ἐπὶ Κύριον ὡς ὄρος Σιών, ὡς τὰ λόγια φησίν.

8–9 cf. Deut. 6.5 12–14 cf. Io. Chrysostomi, Ad illuminandos catechesis 2, PG 49, 231; In
 epistulam ad Ephesios, PG 62,48; In epistulam ad Thessalonicenses PG 62, 412 15 cf. Ps.
 34.2. 21–22 Sap. 3,1 22 Ps.124 (125),1

2 πρόηγμαi P 10 μοίρας P 12 κλειδονισμοῖς P 15 θυραίου P 17 ἐξαυτῆς P 18
 οὐκηνείχετο P

3. Δεύτερον, τοῦ Θεοῦ πόθου αὔξοντος αὐτῆς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, ἐπειδὴ ἦν
 ἀγράμματος ἐξ ὀρφανίας ἀγομένη, γραμματίζει ἑαυτὴν ἡ σοφὴ καὶ
 συνειτίζει καὶ τὸ ψαλτήριον ἀποστηθίζει // 95 // κάλλιστά τε καὶ
 5 συντομώτατα. Καὶ τοῦτο πῶς; Οὐκ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σχολάζουσα τῇ μελέτῃ, ὡς ἂν
 μὴ τὸν ἄνδρα παραλυτήσῃ ἢ τὸν οἶκον ὑπελαττώσῃ, ἀλλὰ πρὸ ὕπνου τε
 καὶ μεθ' ὕπνου φωταγωγούσης κανδήλης κάμνουσα τόνῳ, τοῦ ἐκ τῶν
 χειρῶν ἔργου, οὐκ ἡμέλει· ἀλλὰ πῆ μὲν τοῦτο προσέχουσα, πῆ δὲ τὸ
 ἔτερον εἶδος μεταχειριζομένη, καὶ τὸν οἶκον ἠῦξει καὶ τῶν μαθημάτων
 10 ἐπελαμβάνετο. Ἐκτοτε τοίνυν οὐκ ἐπαύσατο ὀμιλοῦσα τῷ Θεῷ Δαυὶδ
 ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας καὶ ταῖς θεαῖς ἀναγνώσει προσέχουσα· ἐκεῖθεν τε
 καιομένη τὴν καρδίαν, καὶ πρὸς τὸ μέλλον ἀγαθὸν ἀναλάμπουσα, τί ποιεῖ
 καὶ τί ἐργάζεται ἡ θαυμασία; Ἀποκοσμήσασα ἑαυτὴν τῶν ματαίων καὶ ὡς
 χηρευτικόν τι σχῆμα ἀναλαβοῦσα, οὕτως εἰς ὑπόδειγμα καλὸν προὔκειτο
 15 ταῖς γνωρίμοις, μῆτε ὀμνύουσα τὸ καθόλου, μῆδ' αὖ ψευδομένη, μῆτε τὰ
 πολλὰ κρεοφαγοῦσα, ἐν τῷ μάλιστα τεσσαρακοστίζειν· ἀλλὰ καὶ εἴ ποτε
 εἰς εὐωχίαν προῦκαλεῖτο γαμικὴν, λανθανόντως ὑπεξῆγεν ἑαυτὴν
 μηδὲν ἀπτομένη κρεῶν, μηδὲ τὸ ὄμμα αἴρουσα εἰς τὰ θυμελικά
 παίγνια· καὶ γὰρ ἦν σώφρων, εἴ καὶ τις ἄλλη, ἕνα ἄνδρα γνωρίσασα, καὶ
 20 τὴν ψυχὴν μετὰ τὴν ἀποταγὴν τοσοῦτον εἰς ἄκρον ἀγνεύσασα, ὡς καὶ
 μέχρι λογισμοῦ τυραννήσεως ἀκριβεύεσθαι.

10 cf. Ps. 60,9 11 cf. Lk. 24,32

14 μὴ δ' P 17 μὴ δὲ P

4. Τίς οὖν ἐκείνην ἔλαθεν μεσονυκτίου καιρός; Ἐπειδὴ ἔργον τὸ λόγιον ἐπλήρου, μεσονύκτιον ἐξεχειρόμην τοῦ ἐξομολογεῖσθαί σοι ἐπὶ τὰ κρίματα τῆς δικαιοσύνης σου, τίς δὲ ὀρθρου ἐξέγερσις, τίς δὲ ἑτέρας // 95 // διωρισμένης εὐχαριστίας ὥρα παρελείπετο; Οὐδαμῶς· ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς

5 οἰκουρίας ἀντεχομένη λίαν, καὶ ὡς οὐκ ἂν τις τῶν φιλοπόνων, πλουσιωτέραν τὴν ἐν τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἔργοις εἰσεποιεῖτο ἐπίδοσιν, ῥυθμίζουσα τῷ καθ' ἑαυτὴν ὑποδείγματι, καὶ τὸν ὁμόζυγον καὶ παῖδας καὶ θεραπαινίδας. Τὸν μὲν, μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων καὶ εἰς ὑπόμνησιν φέρουσα

10 τὴν ἀπ' ἀλλήλων στέρησιν. Καὶ μέντοι πείθει· καὶ πείσασα, ἐπὶ μιᾶς εὐνῆς ὅλοις πέντε ἔτεσιν ἢ καὶ πρὸς οὐκ ἔγνωσαν ἑαυτοὺς, τὸ παραδοξότατόν τε καὶ δυσεύρητον. Πῶς γὰρ ἂν καὶ οὐχ ὁμιλήσειεν τὸ πῦρ τῇ παρακειμένη καλάμῃ εἰ μὴ ὑπερφυῶς ἐστὶ τὸ γινόμενον; Καὶ εἰ ὁ Βοῶζ τὴν Ροῦθ ἔασας ἀνέπαφον συγκαθευδήσασαν ἐν μιᾷ νυκτὶ ἐπαινεῖται, πῶς οὐκ ἀμφότεροι

15 εἰκότως σωφροσύνης ἀπενέγκωνται κλέος; Ἀλλ' ἔστω μὲν τοῦτο τοῖν δυοῖν ἐγκώμιον· παραπολαύσει γὰρ ἐνταῦθα οὐκ ἀκαίρως καὶ ὁ γεννήσας, τοῦ τῆς τεκούσης ἐπαίνου. Τὰ δέ, ἢ πανάρετος παιδεύει ἐν νοθεσίαις καὶ παραινήσεσιν πῆ μὲν ῥάβδῳ λογικῇ πλήσσοι, πῆ δὲ ἐμμελείᾳ ἄγουσα καὶ προσάγουσα καὶ αὐξουσα εἰς τὰ τελεώτερα. Ἐξ οὗ τί γίνεται;

20 Καταρτίζει τὸ θυγάτριον καὶ ὁ τρόπος θαυμαστός· οὔτε εἰς ὄψιν ἀρρήνων φέρουσα, οὔτε τὰ γυναικικὰ ἐμπλόκια καὶ περιδέξια καὶ περιπόρφυρα ὑποδεικνύουσα, πρὸς δὲ θεοσέβειαν ἀνάγουσα καὶ τὰ ἱερά γράμματα ἐκπαιδεύουσα καὶ τοὺς πτωχοὺς ὑποδέχεσθαι ἐκδιδάσκουσα καὶ τῶν λωβῶν τὰ ἔλκη ἐκ // 96 // μάσσεσθαι αὐτοχειρῶς ὑπαναγκάζουσα· καὶ

25 τέλος, εἰς Θεὸν καὶ τὰ ἐπουράνια κάλλη ἀπὸ τῶν ἐνθένδε χαμαιζήλων τὸν νοῦν τοῦ κορίου μετάγουσα, Θεῷ ἀνατίθησιν. Ἀλλὰ πολλά με λέγειν ἢ ὑπόθεσις τῆς καλλίστης αὐτῆς παιδοτροφίας ὑπομνήματα παρεχομένη, διὰ τὸν κόρον ἐνταῦθα στήτω· ὁ δὲ με καταλιπεῖν οὐ καλόν, τοῦτο προσθεῖν· ὅτι ἐκάστοτε μετὰ τὸ καθευδῆσαι τοὺς παῖδας, οὐ πάντως ἦν

30 αὐτὴν κοιτασθῆναι πρὶν ἂν ἀπιοῦσαν σημειοῦσθαι τὰ σφῶν μέλη τῇ τοῦ σταυροῦ σφραγίδι. Εἶτα πάλιν μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ νύσσοι καὶ ἀφυπνοῦσαν ἡμᾶς καὶ πρὸς προσευχὴν προτρεπομένην, ἵνα μὴ μόνον ἐκείνη, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ τέκνα Θεῷ λατρεῦναι παιδεύωνται.

2–3 Ps. 118 (119),62 13–14 cf. Ruth 3,7–14

10 ἀπαλλήλων P 13 Βῶζ P 13–14 ἔασασαν ἔπαφον P 15 ἀπενέγκωνται P

5. Ἄ δὲ περὶ δούλων καὶ δουλίδων, πολὺς ὁ λόγος, βουλομένῳ μοι φράζειν, ὅσα ἐκείνη ὠμείρετο· διέτρεφεν, ἐπότιζεν, ἐνεδίδυσκεν, ὡς οὐδεὶς πολὺ

τῶν ἄλλων, καὶ εἰ λίαν φιλανθρώπων, οὐχ ὡς ἔτυχεν ἄρτω καὶ οἴνῳ καὶ
 5 λάρδῳ δεξιουμένη, τὸ ἐφημερήσιον σιτηρέσιον, ἀλλὰ πολλαχῶς καὶ ἐν
 ἑορταστικαῖς ἡμέραις καὶ προσφάτῳ κρέει διατρέφουσα, ὄψοις τε καὶ
 ὀρνέοις καὶ καρυκευτικοῖς προπόμασιν, οὐ φέρουσα τὴν τῶν τοιούτων
 μετάληψιν ἐφ' ἑαυτῆς μόνης ἰσταμένην. Ἄρ' οὐκ ἐπαινετὰ ταῦτα καὶ
 10 ξενίζοντα καὶ τῆς ἀγίας ψυχῆς ἐκείνης προτερήματα; Συμφήσετε οἶδ' ὅτι
 οἱ ἐνωπιζόμενοι. Ἄλλ' ἐμοὶ γε εὖ ἂν ἔχοι πρὸς τούτοις εἰπεῖν ὅτι καὶ
 ἠπειλεῖ καὶ ἠσφαλίζετο καὶ μάλιστα τοῖς ἐγγύθεν – οὐκ οἶδ' ὅτι ἐν μέρει
 15 φόγου ἢ ἐπαινοῦ θήσομαι – τὸ καὶ ἐρῳάπιζε καὶ ἐφύβριζε καὶ προσέτυπτε
 // 96' // διὰ τὸ ὑπὲρ σωφροσύνης καὶ ἀκλοπίας καὶ ἄλλης ἀρετῆς ταῦτα
 γίνεσθαι κὰν τῷ θυμῷ ἐπλήσσετο ἢ σπουδαιόψυχος, ἐπειδὴ καὶ φύσεως
 ἦν ὀξυτέρως ζήλῳ Θεοῦ τὰ πολλὰ τιτρωσκομένης. Ἐκείνης δέ ἐστιν τὸ
 20 μετὰ τὸ τετυφέναι εἰσερχομένης εἰς τὸν κοιτωνίσκον καὶ ἑαυτῆς
 ἀντιτυπτούσης τὰς παρεῖας, «εἰ πονοίης», ἑαυτῇ ἐπιλεγούσης, κὰκ τούτου
 ἀνακοπτομένης πρὸς μετάμελον καὶ τὴν τυφθεῖσαν προσκαλουμένης καὶ
 γονυπετούσης καὶ ἐξαιτουμένης συγχώρησιν. Καὶ ὦ τῆς εὐαγοῦς
 25 ἐπανακλήσεως! Κὰν γὰρ τὸ πρότερον δοίη τις κατηγορούμενον, ἀλλὰ γε
 τὸ δεύτερον παραδόξως γινόμενον, ὁ αὐτὸς ἐπαινέσειεν· ὅθεν καὶ
 κεράσασα τῷ φόβῳ τὸν ἔλεον καὶ στέργεσθαι παρ' αὐτῶν ἐγνωρίζετο καὶ
 φρουρεῖν αὐτὰς πρὸς σωφρονισμόν ὑπεδείκνυτο καὶ ἐκατέρωθεν τὸ
 30 κράτιστον ἐκέκτητο. Ἀγάπησιν δὲ παρὰ τῶν γειτνιαζουσῶν, ἐλεημοσύνην
 δὲ πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ἐνδεεῖς, τίς ὑπερέβαλεν ἐκείνην, ἔχουσαν τοῦ μὲν ἐκ τοῦ
 συμμετριάζειν, καὶ μάλιστα ταῖς ὑποδεεστέραις, τὸ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ἄγαν
 συμπαθοῦς, κὰν ὅσον τὸ δαψιλὲς τῆς προθέσεως, οὐκ εἶα προφαίνεσθαι ἢ
 μετριότης τῆς ὑπάρξεως; Πλὴν μάρτυρες τῆς ἀληθείας οἱ πολλοὶ καὶ
 35 πολλακίς καὶ ἀποτεταγμένως, ὀρφανοὶ τε καὶ χῆραι, ξένοι τὲ καὶ
 αὐτόχθονες, νοσεροὶ τε καὶ γέροντες καὶ οἱ τῆς ἱεράς νόσου λαχόντες
 παρὰ τῆς πτωχοτρόφου δεξιᾶς θεραπεύομενοι. Καὶ γοῦν καὶ τοῦτο αὐτῆς
 τὸ ἐξαιρετόν, τὸ σύνδειπνον καὶ ὁμοτράπεζον τὸν Χριστὸν ἔχειν, ἠνίκα
 μάλιστα παρῆν καιρὸς τοῦ ἑορτάζειν. Ταῦτα // 97 // οὐ μικρὰ μοι
 καταφαίνεται τοῖς προληφθεῖσι τῷ γάμῳ πρὸς σωτηρίας ἐφόδιον εἰ καὶ ἔτι
 λέγειν [οὐκ] ἔχομεν μείζονα περὶ τῆς εὐφημουμένης.

2 ὠμήρετο P 4 ἐφημερίσιον P 8 συμφήσεται P 16 παρίας P

6. Τοιγαροῦν ἐπειδὴ ἠνεγκεν ὁ καιρὸς τὴν τοῦ μοναδικοῦ σχήματος
 ἀνάκλησιν, τίς πρὸ ἐκείνης ἢ ὑπεδέξατο τοὺς Χριστοῦ θεραπευτὰς ἢ
 ἐξενόδοχησεν ἢ ἐθεράπευσεν, μάλιστα καὶ ἐκ τοῦ οἰκείου ἀδελφοῦ
 συνελκομένη; Ὅθεν ἵνα τὰ πολλὰ συντέμῳ, εἰς πόθον ἐλθοῦσα τῆς

5 ἀσκητικῆς ζωῆς, πείθει τὸν ἄνδρα, συμπείθει τοὺς παῖδας πολλαῖς
 ἐπιμελείαις καὶ νοουθεσίαις καὶ ὑποσχέσεσιν, ἔπειτα τοὺς ἐξ ἀνδρὸς
 ἀδελφούς. Καὶ τὰ πάντα εὖ διαθεμένη, ἐξέρχεται τῆς οἰκίας, δημον ὅλον
 τῷ Θεῷ παραστήσασα, τέτταρα μὲν τὰ τέκνα, τρεῖς τοὺς ἐξ ἀνδρὸς
 10 ἀδελφούς καὶ μεθ' ἑαυτῆς τὴν κεφαλὴν. Ὡ τῆς θαυμασίας καινοτομίας!
 Ὡ τῆς παραδόξου μεταναστάσεως! Τοῦτο ἐξένισε μὲν κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν
 τὴν βασιλίδα, ἐξέπληξε δὲ τὰς συγγενίδας, ἐθάμβησε δὲ τὰς γνωρίμους,
 κατένυξεν δὲ οὐ μόνον τοὺς ὀρώντας, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀκούοντας, ὅτι συζυγία
 ἔτι μεσηλικιοῦσα, αὐταρκουμένη τε κατὰ τὸν βίον, ἀξιώματι βασιλικῷ καὶ
 15 ταμιευτικῷ τιμωμένη, τοὺς παῖδας ἡλικιώτας ἔχουσα, οὐχ εἴλχθη μὲν τῷ
 τούτων φίλτρῳ, οὐ τῷ καταλιπεῖν διάδοχον τοῦ γένους, οὐδὲ τῷ αἵματι τῆς
 ἀγχιστείας, οὔτε τῇ τῆς οἰκίας ἀποστερήσει, οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ τῇ τῆς θεραπείας
 ἀλλοτριώσει· ἀλλ' ἔρριψε μὲν τὰς ἐκ βασιλέων τιμάς, κατεπάτησε δὲ τὰ
 τοῦ βίου τερπνά, διέκοψέ τε τῇ τοῦ πνεύματος μαχαίρᾳ ἑαυτὴν ἐκ τῶν //
 97^v // σαρκικῶν σχέσεων καὶ τὰ δόξαντα Θεῷ πέπραχε μεγαλοβούλως. Ὡ
 20 τῆς ἀβραμιαίας ψυχῆς ὡς ἀληθῶς καὶ ἀνδρειόφρονος! Εἰκότως ἂν τις
 αὐτὴν μετὰ τῆς μακκαβαϊκῆς ἀρίστης μητρὸς συντάξειεν, θύσασαν τῇ
 ἀσκητικῇ ἀθλήσει τὰς ὠδίνας, καὶ μετὰ Ἄννης τῆς σαμουηλίτιδος, οὐχ ἓνα
 τὸν ἐξ ἐπαγγελίας, ἀλλ' ὅλον τὸν καρπὸν αὐτῆς ἀφιερῶσασαν τῷ Κυρίῳ.
 Χαρίσομαι δὲ ὑμῖν τοῖς ἀκροαταῖς τάχα τι ὀσιώτερον καὶ τὸν τῆς ἐκβάσεως
 25 αὐτῆς τρόπον διηγησάμενος. Ἐπὶ γὰρ τῇ ὠρισμένη τὴν οἰκίαν
 ἐξαλλάξασα, ὡς οἶον ἄγουσαν ἐορτάσιμον ἡμέραν, οὕτω προσκαλεῖται
 τοὺς τοῦ γένους ἅπαντας. Καὶ οἱ μὲν ἤλγουν, οἱ δὲ ἐθρήνουν, ξένον τι
 ὀρῶσαι θέαμα τὸν ἐθελοντὶ χωρισμὸν καὶ ἐν ἑαυταῖς δοκιμάζουσαι τοῦ
 30 μυστηρίου τὸ μέγεθος, ἀνύμνουν τὸ γινόμενον. Καὶ γὰρ ἐώρων
 ἀμφότεροι, τὸν μὲν ἐξιόντα τῆς οἰκίας, τὴν δὲ πρὸς μικρὸν ἐπιμένουσαν,
 εἶτα ἀπιούσαν πρὸς τὸ ἀσκητήριον, καὶ αὐτὴν τὴν οἰκίαν
 ἀπεμπωληθεῖσαν καὶ διανεμηθεῖσαν τοῖς ἐνδεέσιν. Ταῦτά εἰσιν τῆς
 ἡμετέρας μητρὸς τῆς κοσμικῆς βιώσεως τὰ ἐπίσημα· καὶ ταῦτα διήλθον,
 35 οὐχ ἵνα μόνον ὑμεῖς, ἀλλ', εἰ καὶ τινες τῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ φθάσωσιν
 ἐπανιέναι, ἔχωσιν ὠφελεῖσθαι τοῖς καλλίστοις διηγήμασιν Θεῷ
 ἀνθομολογούμενοι.

18 cf. Mat. 10, 34sq. et Eph. 6,17 20 cf. Gen 22,10sq. 21–22 cf. II Macc. 7,20–23 22–
23 cf. I Reg. 1,11.

14 οὐκ εἴλχθη P 15 τὸ καταλιπεῖν P 19 ὦ iterav. P

7. Δεῦρο δὴ λοιπὸν τῶν ἐξῆς ἐχώμεθα, πρὸς ἃ μάλιστα καὶ οἰκείως ἡμῖν
 ἔξει ὁ λόγος, ἠγαπημένοι. Ἀλλοιοῦται τὴν καλὴν ἀλλοίωσιν, τὸ ἰσάγγελον
 σχῆμα μεταμφιασμένη ἡ περικόσμος· κινεῖ γοῦν πολλῶν δάκρυα ἐπὶ τῷ
 γεγε // 98 // νημένῳ συνελλυθῶτων κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν, ἔστιν ὧν καὶ
 5 ἀκλήτως, ἵνα καὶ μόνον θεάσωνται τὸ μυστήριον τελούμενον· παρῆμεν δὲ
 καὶ ἡμεῖς σὺν τῷ κοινῷ πατρὶ, τί καὶ φῶ, ἑορτάσοντες ἢ θρηνήσοντες; Τὴν
 τε μητέρα ἀποβεβληκότες, οὐκέτι μετὰ τῆς αὐτῆς παρόρησίας, οὔτε
 προσομιλοῦντες, οὔτε προσιόντες, τὸν τε ἀπ' αὐτῆς χωρισμὸν
 ἐπινοοῦμενοι καὶ καρδιαλοῦμενοι. Καὶ γὰρ μελλόντων ἡμῶν μετὰ τὴν
 10 συμπλήρωσιν τοῦ καιροῦ ἀπαίρειν πρὸς τὸ καὶ ἡμᾶς τελεσθῆναι μετὰ τοῦ
 γεννήτορος, ἔγωγε μὲν ὡς ἄτε ἐξ ἀγενείων εἰς ἄνδρα τελῶν, ἀλγεινῶς μὲν
 καὶ ὀδυνηρῶς (πῶς γὰρ οὐ;) πλὴν ἔφερον μετ' εὐχαριστίας τὸ πάθος, τοῖν
 δυοῖν δὲ ἀδελφοῖν ὁ σφέτερος, κομιδῇ νέος ὧν, ἐπειδὴ παρῆν ἢ τῆς
 ἐκδημίας ἡμέρα, οἳ τε ἐξιτήριοι λόγοι καὶ προπεμπτήριοι, αἳ τε
 15 ἀνακλήσεις, αἳ τε οἰμωγαί, αἳ τε περιπλοκαί, ἐπέτρεχεν, εἰσεκολποῦτο,
 δυσασπαστῶς εἶχε τῆς μητρὸς, ὡσανεὶ μωσχάριον τὴν διάζευξιν
 ἀπαναινόμενον, ἐξῆτει ἔτι ἐπιμένειν πρὸς βραχὺ τῇ μητρὶ, εἶθ' ὕστερον
 πληροῦν αὐτῆς τὸ βούλευμα ἐπήγγελο. Ἄρ' οὖν κατεμαλακίσθη ἡ
 ἀδαμαντίνη καρδιά ἐκείνη ἢ συνέπεσεν ἢ συνώκλασε τοῖς τοῦ παιδὸς
 20 κλαυθμυρίσμασιν; Οὐμενοῦν· ἀλλ' οἷον τὸ ὄσιον αὐτῆς ἐπίφθεγμα; Μετὰ
 τινος ἐμβριθοῦς ἔξεως ὑπερνικήσαντος τῶν μητρῶν σπλάγχων τὸ
 τυραννικώτατον, «εἰ μὴ ἐκῶν», φησὶν, «ὦ τέκνον, ἀπέλθοις, ἐγὼ σε τῇ νηὶ
 αὐτοχειρὶ ἐπιβαλοῦμαι.» Εἶξεν οὖν ὁ παῖς καὶ διέστημεν ἀμφοτέροι-
 κάκεινη, ὡς δοκῶ, ἐφάμιλλόν τι // 98^v // τῆς ἐπὶ τοῦ τῶν Τεσσαράκοντα
 25 μαρτύρων ἀγίας μητρὸς ἀδομένου ἐπὶ τῇ τῆς ἀμάξης τοῦ ἔτι ἐμπνέοντος
 οἰκείου υἱοῦ ἄρσει τε καὶ ἐπιθέσει ἐξετέλεσεν.

1 ἐχώμεθα P 11 ἀγενείων P 15 τε ante περιπλοκαί om. P 16 ὡς ἀνεὶ P

8. Ἀλλὰ τί τὰ ἐξῆς; Ἐπόθει τοίνυν ἡ γενναία ἄρχεσθαι μᾶλλον, ὥσπερ καὶ ἦν δίκαιον· ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐκ τῆς πρὶν διειλήσεως, οὔτε μοναστήριον ἦν συνιστάμενον, οὐδ' αὖ ψυχὴ ἐπιστημόνως δυναμένη ἀφηγεῖσθαι τῶν πολλῶν, ἐκ τούτου βιάζεται ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ κελλιωτικῶς βιῶσαι μετὰ

5 τῆς προκαρθείσης θυγατρίδος καὶ ἑτέρας συγγενίδος. Ζῆ μὲν αὐτίκα ὑπομονητικῶς, ζῆ δὲ ὀδυνηρῶς (πῶς γὰρ οὐ;), τὸν χειραγωγοῦντα μὴ κεκτημένη καὶ τὰς ἀντιπραττούσας τῷ εὐσεβεῖν ἐφευραμένη, καὶ τοσοῦτον ὥστε καὶ τοῦ σεμνίου ἐξορίζεσθαι; Αἰδοῦμαι εἰπεῖν ὑπὲρ τίνος καὶ διὰ τίνος, φειδοῖ τῶν ἀκροωμένων· ὁμως φέρει ὑπὲρ τοῦ καλοῦ

10 πάσχουσα καὶ διὰ Κύριον πελαζομένη. Καὶ οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ἀπαγγείλω τὰς ἐπαλλήλους ἐπιφορὰς καὶ μεταγωγὰς τῆς ζωῆς αὐτῆς καὶ τὰς ἐπισυμβάσας ἡμῖν, ἐκ τε συγγενείας, ἐκ τε βασιλείας, θλίψεις καὶ ὀδύνας καὶ περιστάσεις· τὸ δὲ συναγόμενον ἦν, ἡ θρυλλομένη μοιχεία τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος, ὑπὲρ ἧς καὶ τὸ πάσχειν <ἦν> αὐτῆ. Ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῦ

15 οἰκουμηνικοῦ τολμήματος ἐμνήσθην, ἴστε οἷον ὀδυνηρὸν ἔλαβεν, ἠνίκα ἑώρα ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ μοναστηρίου ἀρπαζομένους, συνελθοῦσα κατὰ τὴν ὥραν· ἀλλὰ εἰ καὶ τὸ θρηνεῖν ἦν αὐτῆ μονομένη μάλιστα ἐξ ἡμῶν, οὐκ ἠγανάκτησεν, οὐ προΐετο ῥῆμα ἀγενές, οὐ διεῖρήξε τὸν χι // 99 // τῶνα, οὐκ ἠλάλαξε τοῖς κωκυτοῖς, ἀλλ' «ἄπιτε», φησίν, «ὦ παῖδες, καὶ σφῶοισθε ἐν Κυρίῳ, ὅπουπερ ἂν ἀπάγοισθε καὶ ὅποιά ποτ' ἂν πάθοιτε, διὰ νόμον αὐτοῦ τοῦτο προελόμενοι. Ἀγαθὸν γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅ τι ἂν καὶ ὑποσταίητε δεινὸν

20 μέχρι καὶ αἵματος, ἢ προσήκασθαι τὸν μοιχεύσαντα καὶ διὰ τοῦτο προδοῦναι τὴν ἀλήθειαν.» Ὡ τῆς τολμηρᾶς καὶ γενναίας ψυχῆς! Εὐθύς οὐ κατέπεσεν, ὥσπερ ἦν εἰκὸς χθαμαλώτερης καὶ ἀνάνδρου παθεῖν, ἀλλὰ τί;

25 Συνεξεδήμησε, συνωδοιπόρησε, συνέθραυσε τὸ ἀπαλώτατον σαρκίον, τῆ τοῦ ὄρους ὑπερβάσει, οὐδὲ τὸν πρόθυμον συνοδοιπόρον εὐραμένη. Αἶ, αἶ, πῶς γεγόνασιν πάντες τοῦ καιροῦ ἀπανθρωπότεροι; Καὶ μᾶλλον τινες καὶ προσεπεμβαίνοντες καὶ προσονειδίζοντες τῶν ὑποχειρίων, ὡς πληρωθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγελικόν, ὅτι ἐχθροὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οἱ οἰκειακοὶ αὐτοῦ.

29 Mat. 10,36

7 τὸ P 8 σεμνίου P 14 πάσχειν αὐτῆ P 19 κωκυτοῖς P 25 σαρκίον P

9. Ἐφθασε γοῦν ἡμᾶς καὶ αἰκισθέντας ἡ μακαρία. Καὶ μὴ τις ἐν τῷδε
 λογίσηται ἑαυτοὺς ἡμᾶς ἐγκωμιάζειν, οὐκ ἔχοντάς τι τῶν ἐπαινουμένων·
 ἄλλοι γάρ, οὐχ ἡμεῖς, οἱ ἀνδρυσάμενοι καὶ τῷ κοινῷ πατρὶ ἐπιγραφτέον τὸ
 5 κατόρθωμα. Ἴνα δὲ παραστήσωμεν τὸν τῆς ἐπαινουμένης ἀγῶνα,
 ἐνεπέσαμεν, σύγγνωτε, εἰς τοὺς περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐκείνων λόγους, ὡς οὐ
 βεβουλήμεθα· ἀλλὰ, μέγας ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ μεγάλη ἡ ἰσχὺς αὐτοῦ. Ὡς
 ἐκείνη λανθανόντως ὑπέισθαι ἐν τῷ φρουρίῳ τὰς πληγὰς ὀρώσα καὶ
 10 ταύτας ἀσπαζομένη καὶ ταύτας ὑπαλείφουσα καὶ τῷ Θεῷ δόξαν καὶ αἶνον
 ἐν τῷ δι' ἐντολήν αὐτοῦ ταῦτα ὑφίστασθαι τὰ αὐτῆς ἔγγονα // 99^ν //
 ἀναπέμπουσα. Οὕτως ἡμᾶς εὐκτικῶς καὶ κλαυθμυρικῶς καὶ περιχαρῶς ἐν
 μεταίχμιῳ τῶν δύο παθῶν, ἐκ τῶν ἐκείσε πρὸς τὰ ἐπέκεινα τῆς ἀπαγωγῆς
 παραπέμπουσα ἐθαυμάζετο, Θεῷ τε καὶ τοῖς εὐσεβεστέροις τῶν
 15 ἀνθρώπων μακαριζομένη. Οὕτως προέφθασεν αὐτῆς παλινστροφῆσαντας
 ἐκ τῶν Καθαρὰ καὶ πρὸς Θεσσαλονίκην ὑπεροριζομένους εἰς χειμερινὴν
 καὶ ἐσπεραίαν ὥραν ἐν χωριακῷ καταλύματι, φόβῳ πολλῷ κρυπτοφανῶς
 καὶ ἀδιαγνώστως θεάσασθαι καὶ συντυχεῖν ἡμῖν δι' ὅλης σχεδὸν τῆς
 20 νυκτός. Διαθεμένων ἡμῶν διαθήκας τὰς ἐν Κυρίῳ πρὸς ἀλλήλους καὶ
 εὐθύς ἔωθεν (ὅποιον ἦν ἀλγινὸν καὶ ἐλεεινόν!) διαζεγνυμένων ἡμῶν
 ἀπ' ἀλλήλων, ἀκείνης τὸν συντακτῆριον λόγον ποιούσης καὶ ὡς ἐξόδια
 τοῖς φιλήμασιν προσεπιτιθεμένης ἡμῖν κατὰ πᾶν μέλος τοῦ σώματος μετὰ
 25 κλαυθμῶν. «Ἐγὼ γάρ», φησίν, «ἄρτι, τέκνα», ἵνα καὶ τὸν αὐτόλεκτον
 αὐτῆς λόγον εἶπω, «ἐξοδιάζειν ὑμᾶς δοκῶ· ἔξεστι στοχάσασθαι τοῖς
 ἐχέφροσιν· εἰ γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῖς συγκραθεῖσιν ἀγαπητικῶς πρὸς ἀλλήλους καὶ
 διίσταμένους γίνεται, κατὰ τὸν μέγαν θεολόγον Γρηγόριον, ὥσπερ ἐνὸς
 30 σώματος εἰς δύο τομῆ καὶ ἀμφοτέρων νέκρωσις, ἢ μόσχων συντρόφων καὶ
 ὁμοζύγων διάζευξις γοερὸν μυκωμένων ἐπ' ἀλλήλοις καὶ οὐ φερόντων τὴν
 ἀλλοτριώσιν. Τί καὶ πόσον καὶ ἡλικὸν δοίημεν ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος, κἂν
 κατεκρατοῦμεν ἀμφοτέροι φοβοθεΐα τῆς δριμυπαθείας; » Ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μὲν
 35 δὴ τοιοῦτον καὶ τηλικούτον ὄν, τῆς μεγαλοψυχίας αὐτῆς // 100 // τιμάσθω.

3 cf. 1 Cor. 16,13 6 Ps. 146 (147), 5 24–27 Greg. Nazianzen, Funerbris oratio in laudem Basilii magni, no 43, 24,4.3, ed. J. Bernardi, Grégoire de Nazianze, Discours 42–43 (SC 384), Paris 1992, 180.

23 ἔχεφροσιν P 26 γοερῶν P

10. Τὸ δὲ ὑμέτερον, ἀδελφοί, αὐτοὶ ἐξηγήσασθε, οἱ καὶ τῆς εὐεργεσίας ἀπολαύσαντες, ὡς συμβέβληκεν ὑμᾶς ἐξερχομένη πρὸς ἡμᾶς, καθάπερ νεοττοὺς ἐκρῖφέντας ἐκ καλιᾶς εἰς τὸ οἰκεῖον φροντιστήριον· ἔπειτα

5 ὑποστρέψασα καθάπερ ἕκαστον παρηγορήσατο πρὸς τὰ ἐν ἄστει
 πορευομένη· κάκεισε ποδαπῶς εἰσελθοῦσα περιέτρυζεν, ἠντιβόλει, τὸν
 μὲν προσδεχομένη, τὸν δὲ ὑπαλείφουσα, τὸν δὲ ἐρείδουσα, τὸν δὲ
 ὑπεξάγουσα. Καὶ οὓς μὲν τροφευομένη, οὓς δὲ διοικουμένη, ὡς ἂν τις
 10 ἄριστος οἰκονόμος καὶ κατὰ Θεὸν προστάτης, ἢ ὄντως νέα Ναταλία καὶ
 Πρισκίλλης ὁμόζηλος· καὶ μάρτυρες ὑμεῖς, οἱ εὖ παθόντες, καὶ διὰ
 γλώσσης τὸ εὐσυμπάθητον φερόμενον ἔχοντες καὶ θαυμαζόμενον.
 Ἡξιώθη τοιγαροῦν τηνικαῦτα ἡ θαυμασία καὶ τοῦ τελευταίου μακαρισμοῦ
 ἐπιτυγχάνουσα, ὄνειδιζομένη ὑπὸ τινων, ὧν τὰ ὀνόματα ἐκὼν
 ὑπερβήσομαι, καὶ μέντοι διωκομένη ἔνεκεν δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἀληθείας.
 15 «Ἀπόκρινέ μοι καὶ αὐτός, ὦ πάτερ, ὅ τι καὶ ὑπέστη διὰ σέ, πεφρουρισμένου
 σου ἔνεκα, ἢ πολυάθλος, ἐν τῇ διαμέμψει, ἐν τῇ συζητήσει, ἐν τῇ φροντίδι
 τῶν ἀναγκαίων· λέγε τὴν ἀρπαγὴν τοῦ κρατοῦντος, τὴν ἀπειλήν, τὴν
 ἀνέτασιν· οὐχὶ καυτὴ συμπέπονθέν σοι, τριακονθήμερον μείνασα
 φρουρουμένη ὑπὸ τεττάρων τῶν συνασκουμένων, καὶ ταῦτα διηρημένων
 20 ταῖς εἰρκταῖς;» Κάκει ἔῶ λέγειν ὅσα ὑπὸ τῶν δουλίδων τοῦ φρουρέως
 ὑπέστη, καὶ ὅσα ἐταλαιπωρήθη κατὰ τὴν τῆς ζωῆς ἀφορμὴν καὶ ἄρτον
 ὀδύνης ἐσθίουσα // 100^v // καὶ πόμα θλίψεως πίνουσα. Καὶ οὐ τοῦ
 παρόντος καιροῦ τὰ τηνικάδε τετολμημένα καὶ γεγεννημένα διασημαίνειν,
 ἀλλὰ συγχωρεῖσθω τοῖς δεδρακόσιν, ὅ τι καὶ πεπράχασιν. Οὕτω γὰρ
 εἰπεῖν ἀρμοδιώτερον, εἰ καὶ κρίμασιν οἷς παρεχώρησεν ἢ ὠκονόμησεν, ἵνα
 25 ἐγκόπτηται κακία καὶ μὴ εἰς νόμον ἔρχεται τὸ παρανομούμενον, Θεὸς τὸν
 διωγμὸν ἀνεκαλέσατο· καὶ γὰρ ἐπανήκομεν οἱ ὑπερορισθέντες καὶ
 διασκορπισθέντες εἰς ταυτόν, ὡς ἴστε, δεξιᾶς τυχόντες τῆς ἐπανελεύσεως
 παρὰ τῆς κρατοῦσης.

9 cf. Rom. 16,3 13 cf. Mat. 5,10 20–21 cf. Ps. 126,2 et Ps. 101,10 25 cf. Io. Chrysostomi, In Genesim, PG 53, 186.

22 τονικάδε P 24 οἰκονόμησεν P 26 ἐπανήκωμεν P

11. Ἀλλὰ τί ἔτι τῇ θεοτιμῆτῳ μητρὶ πρὸς τοῖς εἰρημένοις προσθειῆμεν καὶ
 τί προσερεισώμεθα ἀρμοδιώτερον; Ὡ δακρύων ὄχετοί, ὅσοι ἐκ τῶν ἐκείνης
 ὀφθαλμῶν ἀενάως προεχέοντο διὰ τὸν ἄνδρα, διὰ τῶν παιδῶν τὸν
 σφαλερώτερον, διὰ τὸ ποιμνιον, διὰ τοὺς ὀλισθαίνοντας, διὰ τὸν καθ'
 5 ἕκαστον στηριγμὸν. Ἐπειδὴ ὡς μήτηρ πνευματικὴ τὸ ἐλεεῖν εἶχεν καὶ ὡς
 ἀδελφὴ ὑπὲρ ἀδελφῶν κατὰ Κύριον ἀεὶ ἠγωνίζετο, κὰν οὐ συνωκίζετο. Ὡ
 ψυχῆς οἰκτίρμονος καὶ ἐλεήμονος ἐπίδοσις καὶ ὦ σπλάγχων συμπαθῶν
 κένωσις, οὐ φερόντων τὴν τῶν προσιόντων στένωσιν· ὥστε καὶ δέεσθαι
 αὐτὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν δεομένων καὶ δανεῖζεσθαι ὑπὲρ τοῦ δανείων ἀπαλλάξαι

10 καὶ χαίρειν καὶ ἑαυτὴν πριάσθαι ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐτέρων ἀπολυτρώσεως,
 τραπεζοποιουμένην αὐτῆς πλειστάκις χριστομιμήτως καὶ τὰς πενομένας
 συγκαλουμένην καὶ ταῖς ἰδίαις χερσὶν ὑπηρετοῦσαν, διότι ἕρως ἦν αὐτῇ τὸ
 τῆς φιλοπτωχίας δώρημα. Ὡς τιμίου στόματος τῆς ἐκ τῶν θείων λο // 101 //
 γίων ἀενάου ἐκμελετήσεως καὶ ἀπαραλείπτου μέχρι θανάτου
 15 διαλειτουργήσεως! Ὡς τιμίων ποδῶν ἀποσφυρώσεως, ἐκ τῆς ἐντευκτικῆς
 πρὸς Θεὸν ἀνενδότου πήξεως τε καὶ παραστάσεως! Ὡς οὐ μόνον
 ἐσπερινῆς ἀλλὰ καὶ ὀρθρινῆς καὶ μεσονυκτικῆς ὁσίων χειρῶν πρὸς Θεὸν
 ἐπάρεσεως καὶ διανυκτικῆς τῶν αἰτηθέντων ἐπιτεύξεως καὶ ὡς νυκτερινῶν
 ἐνυπνίων διασαφήσεως! Ἐπειδὴ πρὸς τὰ παριστάμενα λυπηρά, πολλάκις
 20 αὐτῇ Θεὸς τὸ μέλλον προμεμήνυκεν, παραμυθούμενος τὴν αὐτοῦ
 θεράπαιναν. Ὡς τῆς τοῦ ὅλου σώματος ἐξ ἀσκήσεως παραλύσεως! Καὶ ὡς
 εὐτελοῦς καὶ ἀθάλπου ἐν καιρῷ κρούους ἐνδύσεως καὶ ὡς στρωμνῆς
 διαξήρου στενῆς τε καὶ κολοβῆς καὶ ψυχούσης ἀνακλίσεως! Ὡς τῆς ἀφίλου
 καὶ ἀσυνδύαστου πρὸς πᾶσαν ὄψιν ἄρρενος διαθέσεως καὶ ὡς τῆς
 25 ἐπιμόνου καὶ τεταμμένης αὐτῆς πρὸς Θεὸν μονώσεως! Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ
 ἀκηδία παλαίουςα καὶ μήτε ἡμᾶς ὁρᾶν ἔχουσα συχνότερον μήτε ἄλλον
 τὸν πνευματικῶς ὑπαλείφοντα, ἠττάτο ποιουμένη τὰς τινὰς προόδους καὶ
 ἀποδημίας· ἀλλὰ κὰν τούτῳ τὸν κανόνα φυλάττουσα ἀπαραλείπτου
 ἀπεδείκνυτο. Ὡς φιλεργίας ἀνυπερβλήτου νύκτωρ τε καὶ μεθ' ἡμέραν
 30 διακοπώσεως! Καὶ ὡς δακτύλων τοῦ ἐργαστικοῦ ἀποσκληρώσεως, καὶ εἰς
 βύρσης σκληρότητα μεταποιηθείσης τῆς φυσικῆς ἀπαλότητος· μὴ ὅτι
 πρὸς τὸ ἑαυτὴν ἐπαρκεῖν ἐργαζομένης – τοῦτο γὰρ μηδενὸς λόγον πρὸς
 αὐτῆς – ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς τὸ // 101^v // ὅλον κοινόβιον σχεδὸν ἐνδιδύσκειν, ὡς
 ἐπίστασθε οἱ ἀκούοντες.

4–5 cf. 2 Petr. 3,17 17–18 cf. Ps. 140,2

2 προσερεισόμεθα P 10 χαίρειν P πριάσθαι P 30 ἀποσκληρώσεως P 33 σχέδον P

12. Καὶ γὰρ ξένη τις τῶν γυναικῶν ἐν τούτῳ ὠφθη μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων· ὥστε
 καὶ εἴ τι ὡς ἄνθρωπον αὐτὴν ἔστι μωμεῖσθαι, ἐντεῦθεν τὰς ἀφορμὰς
 προσεῖναι καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἄλλης αὐτῆς περὶ τὰ καλὰ θερμότητος, ἐπιτατικὴν
 ὡς τὰ πολλὰ οὖσαν καὶ ἀκριβολογουμένην πρὸς τὰς συνασκουμένας
 5 ὑποχειρίους καὶ θυμουμένην ἔστιν ὅτε ἐν ταῖς ἐλλείψεσιν εἴτε τῶν ἔργων
 εἴτε τῶν ψαλμωδιῶν εἴτε τῶν παραστάσεων, ὡς καὶ νικηθῆναι αὐτὴν οὐ
 πολλάκις, ὠθῆσαι τε νυσταζούσας ἢ καὶ ῥαπίσαι ἀνηκουσάσας· ἀλλὰ καὶ
 εἴθ' οὕτως εἶχε τὸ ἀγαπᾶσθαι μᾶλλον ὑπὲρ τοὺς λίαν ὀμαλωτάτους διὰ τὸ
 ἐξ ἀγαθοῦ αὐτὴν κινεῖσθαι πρὸς ταῦτα καὶ πάντοτε ἀπογινώσκουσα καὶ
 10 ζητοῦσα ὑποτάσσεσθαι. Καὶ μέντοι διὰ τοῦτο τὸν Θεὸν ἰλεουμένην, ὡς

ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ τὰς συγχωρήσεις εἰκότως ἐποιούμεθα· καὶ γὰρ μετὰ τὴν κάθειρξιν τοῦ πατρὸς, τοσοῦτον ὑπετάγη μου τῇ ταπεινώσει καὶ ἐπιδέδωκεν εἰς ὑπακοήν, ὥστε καὶ δούλην ἑαυτὴν ὀνομάζειν καὶ τῶν ἀναξίων μου ποδῶν ἐφάπτεσθαι, ἐξαγορεύειν τε τὰ κρυπτά τῆς καρδίας καὶ εἰς πᾶν ὀτιοῦν μὴ ἀντιτείνειν τῶν ἐπιταγμάτων. Αἰδοῦς τοίνυν πληροῦμαι ἔγωγε ὁ τάλας, ὅσάκις ἂν καὶ ἀναλογίσωμαι, ὅπως τέ με ὠνόμαζε κύριον καὶ πατέρα καὶ ὅπως ἐσέβητο συμμαίξασα τῷ φόβῳ τὸν πόθον, καὶ οὐχ ὡς μήτηρ, ἀλλ' ὡς τέκνον πειθαρχοῦσα.

14 cf. Ps. 43,22

16 ἀναλογήσωμαι P

13. Πρὸς ταῦτα ἐγκρατείας μὲν ὄρον, τὸ μὴ εἰς κόρον φαγεῖν εἶχεν· τὴν δὲ ποιότητα τῶν βρωμῶν // 102 // των συστειλαὶ ἢ ὑποταγῇ οὐκ εἶα, καίπερ προσκειμένην ἐπὶ τοῦτο σφοδρῶς καὶ μὴ εἰσακουομένην. Ἦν τοίνυν μονοσιτοῦσα καὶ πρὸς δύσιν τοῦ ἡλίου ὡς τὰ πολλὰ μεταλαμβάνουσα
5 λιτὴν τινα καὶ σχέδιον, ἀνέλαιόν τε καὶ ἄϊνον τὴν τροφήν· κὰν ὀπότε δὲ κατέλυεν ἐν ταῖς ὠρισμέναις ἡμέραις, οὐ κατὰ πλησμονήν, ἐξ ὀλίγου δὲ καὶ κατὰ μικρὸν λαμβάνουσα ἤρκειτο. Ἀκτημοσύνης δὲ δείγμα τὸ μηδὲν ἔχειν αὐτὴν μήτε θεραπαινίδα, μήτε χρυσίον, μήτε ἀργύριον, μήτε τι τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἢ μόνον τὰ τρίχινα ῥακκία ἃ περιεβέβλητο καὶ τὰ δύο
10 πενιχρὰ σκεπάσματα. Ἀμέλει τοίνυν ὅτε ἀπετελεύτα, ἐμοί τε καὶ τῷ ἀδελφῷ διανείμασα ταῦτα καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν εἰς ἐνταφιασμὸν ἔχουσα, οὕτως γυμνή καὶ ταῖς ὕλαις καὶ ταῖς τοῦ κόσμου προσπαθείαις, χαίρουσα. Καὶ ὡς πρὸς τὰ ἴδια χωροῦσα, ἀπεδήμησεν ἐκ τῶν ἐνθένδε, ἐπιφθεγξαμένη ἡμῖν
15 εὐκτήρια καὶ σωτήρια, καὶ κατασφραγίσασα ἕκαστον τῶν παρισταμένων, ἐπειδὴ καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν εὐρέθησαν θεώμενοι τὴν κοίμησιν.

8 μήτέ τι P 9 τρύχηνα P 15 θεόμενοι P

14. Ἀλλ' ὦ μήτηρ σεβασμία καὶ πολυπόθητε – πρὸς σε γὰρ εἶμι ἐπιστρεφόμενος, τὸ γλυκύ μοι καὶ πρᾶγμα καὶ ὄνομα, τὸ ποθητόν μοι καὶ ἐράσιμον θεώρημα, ἢ μητρότεκνος, μᾶλλον δὲ διττοτόκος μου διμήτηρ –
5 ποῦ ποτε ἡμᾶς ἀπολέλοιπας; Ποῦ ποτε μετακεχώρηκας, πῆ δὲ μεθωρίσθης; Πῆ δὲ καὶ ἐν ποίοις τόποις ἐναυλίζει; Ἐν ποίαις ἐπαύλεσι συγχωριάσεις; Ὀπηλίκας κατοπτεύεις; Τὸν γὰρ ἄρχοντα τοῦ ἀέρος τούτου εὖ οἶδα ἐκ τῶν ἀγαθῶν σου πρᾶ // 102^v // ξεων ὑπερνικήσασαν, ἐκεῖσε εἶναι ἔνθα ἀπέδρα ὀδύνη, λύπη καὶ στεναγμός· ἔνθα τῶν ἀγίων πάντων ἐστὶν εὐφραينوμένων ἢ κατοικία· ἔνθα ἤχος καὶ χορὸς ἐορταζόντων καὶ

- 10 ἀγαλλιωμένων· ἔνθα καὶ οἱ κοινοὶ ἡμῶν ἀδελφοὶ οὓς καὶ ἐπόθησας καὶ
 συγκοινωνεῖν ἤρω· ἄρτι γὰρ τὰ ἰδιώματα τῆς σαρκὸς παρόντα διαφορὰν
 ποιοῦνται τῆς συμβιώσεως. Μὴ δὴ ἐπιλάθῃ ἡμῶν τῶν σῶν ἐλαχίστων
 τέκνων· μὴ, παρακαλῶ, μὴ, ἀντιβολῶ, μὴ ἐπιλήσῃ τοῦ ποιμνίου σου τοῦ
 15 μικροῦ τε καὶ τοῦ μεγάλου, ἀλλὰ παρῴρησας τυχοῦσα, – πιστεύω δ' ὅτι καὶ
 ἐπιτετύχησας – στήθι καὶ ἰλεοῦ καὶ ἐξιλάσκου, προσεύχου καὶ ὑπερεύχου
 καὶ μᾶλλον ἄρτι ἐκτενεστέρωσ, παιδαγωγοῦσα καὶ στηρίζουσα καὶ
 φρουροῦσά με τὸν δειλαιὸν ἀπὸ φόβου ἀμαρτητικοῦ, ἀπὸ βέλους
 20 πετομένου ἀνομίας, ἀπὸ πάσης ἄλλης ἐπηρείας δαιμονικῆς, ποιμαίνουσα
 καὶ συμποιμαίνουσα, νύσσουσα καὶ προσυπομιμνήσκουσα διὰ ψυχικῆς
 ἐντεύξεως, ἐπισκεπτομένη τε καὶ ἐπανορθομένη ἐκάστοτε καὶ θεωμένη
 πῶς ἀνίσταμαι, πῶς κοιτάζομαι, πῶς κεκίνημαι ψυχῇ τε καὶ σώματι, ἵνα
 παντοίῳ λόγῳ ῥυθμούμενος καὶ καταρτιζόμενος, κατὰ σκοπὸν τε βαίνων
 τῆς ἀληθείας, φθάσω εὐαρεστεῖν Θεῷ διὰ τῆς ἀγαθῆς ἀφηγήσεως καὶ
 25 τύχῳ μετὰ τὸν τῆδε βίον σὺν τοῖς ἐπομένοις μοι ὑπὸ τὴν σκέπην σου εἶναι
 καὶ συμμετασχεῖν σου ὡς τέκνον ἐλάχιστον τῶν ἐκ δεξιῶν Χριστοῦ τοῦ
 Θεοῦ ἡμῶν παραστάσεως· ταῦτά μοι, τέκνα, ἠνάγκασεν ἡ ἀλήθεια
 διηγῆσασθαι καὶ ὑμῖν παρὰ // 103 // ῥεῦσιν τὰ τοιαῦτα κελεύουσιν.

6 cf. Eph. 2,2 8 Is. 51,11; cf. kontakion officii funebris 8–9 Ps. 86,7 9–10 cf. Ps. 41,5 17–
 18 cf. Ps. 90,5

4 πού ποτε ... πούποτε P 19 προσυπομιμνήσκουσα P 20 θεωμένη P 27 παραρεῦσιν P

Index verborum

Ἄννα	6,22	ἀπανίσταμαι	2,17
Βοόζ	4,13	ἀπαράλειπτος	11,14,28
Γρηγόριος (Naz.)	9,24	ἀπεμπαλέομαι	6,32
Θεσσαλονίκη	9,14	ἀπογινώσκω	12,9
Καθαρά	9,14	ἀποδημία	11,28
Ναταλία	10,8	ἀποκοσμέω	3,12
Πρισκίλλα	10,9	ἀπολύτρωσις	11,10
Ρούθ	4,13	ἀποσκήρωσις	11,30
Σιών	2,22	ἀποστέρησις	6,16
Τεσσαράκοντα μάρτυρες	7,24	ἀποστηθίζω	3,3
		ἀποσφύρωσις	11,15
ἄβραμιαῖος	6,20	ἀποταγή	3,19
ἀγαλλιάομαι	14,10	ἀποτελευτάω	13,10
ἀγάπησις	5,23	ἀποτεταγμένως	5,28
ἀγένειος	7,11	ἀποφέρομαι	4,15
ἀγνεύω	3,19	ἄρσις	7,26
ἀγράμματος	3,2	ἄστυ	10,4
ἀγχιστεία	6,16	ἄσυνδύαστος	11,24
ἄδαμάντινος	7,19	αὐταρκέομαι	6,13
ἀδιαγνώστως	9,16	αὐτοκράτωρ	8,14
ἄθαλπος	11,22	αὐτόλεκτος	9,21
αικίζομαι	9,1	αὐτουργός	2,17
ἄκηδία	11,26	αὐτοχειρί	7,23
ἄκλήτως	7,4	αὐτοχειρίας	4,24
ἄκλοπία	5,12	αὐτόχθων	5,29
ἀκριβεύω	3,20	ἀφήγησις	14,23
ἀκριβολογέομαι	12,4	ἄφιλος	11,23
ἄλλοτρίως	6,17; 9,27	ἄφυπνώ	4,32
ἄλόγιστος	1,5		
ἄκτημοσύνη	13,7	βασιλῆς	6,11
ἄμαρτητικός	14,17	βύρση	11,31
ἀνάκλησις	6,2; 7,15		
ἀνάκλισις	11,23	γαμικός	3,16
ἀνακόπτομαι	5,17	γεννήτωρ	7,10
ἀναπέμπω	9,10	γοητεία	2,20
ἀνδρειόφρων	6,20	γονυπετέω	5,18
ἀνδρίζομαι	9,3	γραμματίζω	3,2
ἀνέλαιος	13,5	γυναικικός	4,21
ἀνένδοτος	11,16		
ἀνέτασις	10,17	δεξιόομαι	5,4
ἀνηκοέω	12,7	διαζεύγνυμαι	9,18
ἀνθομολογέομαι	6,36	διάζευξις	9,26
ἀνόνητος	1,13	διακόπωσις	11,30
ἀντιβολέω	10,5; 14,13	διαλειτούρησις	11,15
ἀντιπράττω	8,7	διάμεψις	10,15
ἀντιτύπτω	5,16	διανυτικός	11,18
ἀνυπέρβλητος	11,29	διάξηρος	11,23
ἄοινος	13,5	διασάφισις	11,19
ἀπαναίνομαι	7,17	διασημαίνω	10,22

διδάσκαλος	2,18	ἐπιτάφιος	Tit.
διείλησις	8,2	ἐπίτευξις	11,18
διήγησις	2,5	ἐπιφθέγγομαι	13,13
διμήτηρ	14,3	ἐπιφθεγμα	7,20
διοικέομαι	10,7	ἐπιφορά	8,11
διττοτόκος	14,3	ἐπωδή	2,13
δίφρος	2,13	ἐράσμιος	14,3
δοιμυπάθεια	9,28	ἐργαστικός	11,30
δυσαιποσπάστωσ	7,16	ἐσπεραία	9,15
δυσεύρητος	4,12	ἐσπερινός (adj.)	11,17
ἔγγονον	9,9	εὐαρεστέω	14,23
ἐγκωμιάζω	9,2	εὐέλπιστος	1,6
ἐθελοντί	6,28	εὐκτήριος	13,14
εἰσακούομαι	13,3	εὐσυμπάθητον	10,10
εἰσκολπόομαι	7,15	εὐφήμιομαι	5,34
ἐκδημία	7,14	εὐφραίνομαι	14,9
ἐκδιδάσκω	4,23	εὐχία	3,16
ἐκμάσσομαι	4,24	ἐφάμιλλος	7,24
ἐκμελέτησις	11,14	ἐφημερήσιος	5,4
ἐκρίπτομαι	10,3	ἐφυβρίζω	5,11
ἐμμέλεια	4,18	ἐχέφρων	9,23
ἐμπίπτω	9,5	ἔωθεν	9,18
ἐμπλόκιον	4,21	ζωοπλάστης	1,3
ἐναυλίζω	14,5	ἡλικιώτης	6,14
ἐνδιδύσκω	5,2; 11,33	θεραπεινίς	4,8
ἐνταφιασμός	13,11	θεώρημα	14,3
ἐντευκτικός	11,15	θουλλέομαι	8,13
ἐντευξις	14,20	θυγατρίς	8,5
ἐξαιτέω	7,17	θυμελικός	3,17
ἐξαλλάσσω	6,26	ιδίωμα	14,11
ἐξιλάσκομαι	14,15	ισάγγελος	7,2
ἐξέγερσις	4,3	καινοτομία	6,9
ἐξιτήριος	7,14	καλλιμήτωρ	2,6
ἐξοδιάζω	9,22	καρδιαλγέομαι	7,9
ἐξόδιος	9,19	καρκευτικός	5,6
ἐορτάσιμος	6,26	κατάλυμα	9,10
ἐορταστικός	5,5	καταμαλακίζομαι	7,18
ἐπαινέομαι	9,2,4	καταπατέω	6,17
ἐπάλληλος	8,11	καταρτίζομαι	14,22
ἐπανάκλησις	5,19	καταρτίζω	4,20
ἐπανέλευσις	10,27	κατασφραγίζω	13,14
ἐπαρσις	11,18	κατήχησις	Tit.; 1,13
ἐπαυλις	14,5	κατοπτεύω	14,6
ἐπήρεια	14,18	κελλιωτικῶσ	8,4
ἐπιγράφομαι	9,3	κλαυθμός	9,21
ἐπίθεισις	7,26	κλαυθμυρικῶσ	9,10
ἐπινόομαι	7,8	κλαυθμύρισμα	7,20
ἐπιστημόνωσ	8,3		
ἐπισυμβάινω	8,12		
ἐπίταγμα	12,15		
ἐπιτατικός	12,3		

κλέος	4,15	όμοτράπεζος	5,31
κληδονισμός	2,12	όρθρινός	11,17
κοιτάζομαι	4,30; 14,21	όρνειον	5,6
κοιτωνίσκος	2,13; 5,15	όψον	5,5
κόριον	4,26		
κρατούσα	10,28	παιδαγωγέω	14,16
κρατῶν	10,16	παιδοτροφία	4,27
κρεοφαγέω	3,15	παλιντροφέω	9,13
κρυπτοφανῶς	9,15	πανάρετος	4,17
κωκυτός	8,19	παραίνεις	4,18
		παραλυπέω	3,5
λανθανόντως	9,7	παραπολαύω	4,16
λάρδον	5,4	παράστασις	11,16; 12,6; 14,26
μακκαβαϊκός	6,21	παῤῥησία	7,7; 14,14
μεγαλοβούλω	6,19	πελάζομαι	8,10
μεγαλοψυχία	9,29	περίαμμα	2,12
μεθελικίως	2,4	περίαπτον	2,14
μεθορίζομαι	14,5	περιδέξιος	4,21
μεσηλικιός	6,13	περίκοσμος	7,3
μεσονυκτικός	11,17	περιπλοκή	7,15
μεταγωγή	8,11	περιπόρφυρος	4,21
μεταίχιμιον	9,11	περίστασις	8,13
μετάληψις	5,7	περιτραχήλιον	2,13
μεταμφιάζομαι	7,3	περιτρύζω	10,5
μετανάστασις	6,10	περιχαρῶς	9,10
μεταχωρέω	1,4; 14,4	πηξίς	11,16
μητρότεκνος	14,3	πλησμονή	13,6
μοιχεία	8,13	πολυπόθητος	14,1
μοιχεύω	8,22	προάγομαι	2,2
μονέομαι	8,17	προαιρέομαι	8,21
μονοσιτέω	13,4	προϊέμαι	8,18
μόνωσις	11,25	προκείρομαι	8,5
μυσταγωγός	2,18	πρόδος	11,27
μωμέομαι	12,2	προπεμπτήριος	7,14
		πρόπομα	5,6
νεόγονος	2,11	προσδέχομαι	10,6
νέκρωσις	9,25	προσεπεμβαίνω	8,28
νοσερός	5,29	προσεπιτίθεμαι	9,20
νύκτωρ	11,29	προσερείδομαι	11,2
νύσσω	4,32	προσίεμαι	8,22
νυστάζω	12,7	προσίημι	11,8
		προσομιλέω	7,7
ξενοδοχέω	6,3	προσονειδίζω	8,28
		προστάτης	10,8
οικονομέω	10,24	προστύπτω	5,11
οικονόμος	10,8	προστυπομμνήσκω	14,19
οίκουμενικός	8,15	πρόσφατος	5,5
οικουρία	4,5	προτέρημα	5,8
όμείρομαι	5,2	προχέομαι	11,3
όμόζηλος	10,9	πτωχοτρόφος (adj.)	5,30
όμόζυγος	4,7		