Florin Filimon

PILLAR OF THE COMMUNITIES: THE *LIVES* OF ALYPIUS THE STYLITE

MA Thesis in Medieval Studies

Central European University

Budapest

May 2015

PILLAR OF THE COMMUNITIES: THE *LIVES* OF ALYPIUS THE STYLITE

by

Florin Filimon

(Romania)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,
Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the Master of Arts degree in Medieval Studies.

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU.

_____
Chair, Examination Committee

_____
Thesis Supervisor

_____
Examiner

_____
Examiner

Budapest
May 2015

PILLAR OF THE COMMUNITIES: THE *LIVES* OF ALYPIUS THE STYLITE

by

Florin Filimon

(Romania)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,
Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the Master of Arts degree in Medieval Studies.

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU.

_____

External Reader

Budapest
May 2015

PILLAR OF THE COMMUNITIES: THE *LIVES* OF ALYPIUS THE STYLITE

by

Florin Filimon

(Romania)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,
Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the Master of Arts degree in Medieval Studies.

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU.

_____

External Supervisor

Budapest
May 2015

I, the undersigned, **Florin Filimon**, candidate for the MA degree in Medieval Studies, declare herewith that the present thesis is exclusively my own work, based on my research and only such external information as properly credited in notes and bibliography. I declare that no unidentified and illegitimate use was made of the work of others, and no part of the thesis infringes on any person's or institution's copyright. I also declare that no part of the thesis has been submitted in this form to any other institution of higher education for an academic degree.

Budapest, 20 May 2015

_____

Signature

Abstract

The thesis deals with one of the holy men who imitated Symeon the Elder in practicing his peculiar form of asceticism. For Alypius, a stylite from Adrianoupolis, a prominent city in Paphlagonia, who allegedly died in the times of Heraclius, three major versions of his biography survived: one anonymous, one redacted by the Symeon Metaphrastes' team, and one produced by Antonius, a member of the Great Church's clergy. Little attention has been given to the first two versions, and even less to the *Life* by Antonius; hence, the present thesis aims to analyze the narrative as it appears in the first two biographies; the one by Antonius is considered only in some crucial aspects, since it is more distant from the anonymous *Life*, which may be considered the basis of all further reaction. Since besides the titles of the manuscripts used by Hippolyte Delehaye for editing the earliest *Life*, no chronological information emerges from the text, the main goal of the thesis is to reveal those details that may allow one to determine when Alypius' earliest biography was written, and likewise, when Alypius lived. In doing so, I analyze various aspects of the *Life*. Besides the narrative in its entirety, the saintly figures included by the three biographers in the 'rhetoric comparison' (synkrisis), the pillar and abandoned necropolis that became a monastic *milieu*, and, finally, the monastery created around the pillar's base, its structure, and its dwellers, are at the core of the four chapters of my research. Each of them provides elements that, correlated, offer a probable dating of the anonymous *Life* and of Alypius. Finally, the thesis argues that one of the MS consulted by Delehaye (MS C), but constantly disregarded at the expense of a clearer text filled with totally unexpected details, gives the original form of the anonymous *Life.*

Acknowledgements

The present thesis would have remained a desideratum without my main supervisor, István Perczel, from whose unceasing dedication and high academic expertise I benefited. I definitely hope that no student will ever ask him for the same amount of patience that my work needed.

I owe special thanks to Volker Menze, my second supervisor, for his encouragements, patience, and guidance given in those moments in which they were most needed.

I am grateful to Zsuzsanna Reed for improving my language, to György Geréby for his comments and advices, and to Niels Gaul for having made me acquainted with the tenth-century Byzantium.

I am grateful to Andra Jugănaru, who offered me not only her friendship, but also her expertise, and did her time. I would also like to give my warm thanks to Radu Mustaţă and Lucas McMahon, who offered me suggestions whenever I needed. My friends and colleagues, Roxana Maria Arăş, Ioana Haşu, and Danielle Giammanco, offered me their unceasing support and unconditional camaraderie.

I also owe this thesis to my beloved ones, Iulia and Augustin, who allow me to indulge in the academic life at CEU by temporarily exempting me from domestic and paternal duties. It will not happen again!

Contents

List of Abbreviations

LSJ - *Liddle-Scott-Jones Greek-English Lexikon*

ODB - *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*

PG - *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*

Introduction

Throughout the history of Eastern Christianity, the stylites were those ascetics who lived on the top of their pillars, claiming their ascetic practice as legitimately following the ascetic tradition which begun with Symeon the Elder (c.a. 389-459).[1] One such hermit is Alypius, who died in the reign of Heraclius (610-641).[2] In his case, the importance of the pillar is reflected by multiple symbolic meanings that it receives. Far from being only a permanent dwelling place, reducing the living space of its inhabitant – at the extreme limit of necessity – to the narrowness of the platform, the column symbolically indicates Alypius' spiritual ascension. It signifies also the vehicle that offers him the possibility to escape from the tumult: not being successful in his attempt of secluding himself horizontally by inhabiting an abandoned necropolis, Alypius is detaching himself from the world vertically. Also, as a stationary saint,[3] Alypius is objectified by the members of the urban community (through their representative, the bishop) who needs him always accessible for providing spiritual guidance. Thus, the pillar links Alypius both to the earth and to the heavens. It connects him to the earth because he remains in the city's immediate vicinity, and it ties him to the heavenly realm of the angels, from which he is different only because of the thickness of his body. Therefore, Alypius inhabits the dimension of the middle air, between the two worlds. In this way, he is able to live an angelic life, while he remains the pillar of three distinct communities: the monastic one, the urban-based one, and that of the pilgrims. Alypius' responsibilities include intercession and guidance for the believers who seek him.

[1] For the most recent discussions on stylitism, see Volker Menze, "The Transformation of a Saintly Paradigm: Simeon the Elder and the Legacy of Stylitism," in *Religious identities in the Levant from Alexander to Muhammed: continuity and change*, ed. Michael Blömer, Achim Lichtenberger, and Rubina Raja (Turnhout: Brepols, 2015), 213-25 (and the bibliography therein); Lukas Amadeus Schachner, "The archeology of the stylite," *Late Antique Archeology* 6 (No 1, 2010): 329-97.

[2] For the chronology, see the following section "Dating Alypius."

[3] Robert Doran, *The Lives of Simeon Stylites* (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1992), 31-33; Hyppolite Delehaye, *Les Saints Sylites*, Subsidia Hagiograpica 14 (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1923), clxxxi sqq. Hereafter: Delehaye followed by page number and line number.

Although Alypius' biography has survived in five different versions, in this thesis only three of them will be taken into consideration: the earliest one (anonymous), the Metaphrastic redaction, and the version by Antonius, a cleric from Constantinople, regarded as an intermediary witness. The other two, an *encomium* by Neophytos Enkleistos (1134-ca. 1214) and a short notice from the Constantinopolitan *Synaxarion*, are not relevant to the discussion, since they are morphologically abbreviated versions of the narrative; yet, they will be mentioned when they give significant details.[4]

Kazhdan considers Alypius' anonymous *Life* part of the "ahistoric hagiography," thus a mere succession of commonplaces (*topoi*) filled with nothing concrete.[5] According to his view, the same characterization may be extended to the other two major redactions of the *Life* of Alypius. However, this can be taken as a stereotypical way of approaching Christian hagiography.[6] In my opinion the lack of solid indications of contemporaneous events from the *Lives* does not make Alypius less of an individual character but, on the contrary, those details that are fleshing out the *topoi* disposed in the *Life* according to the basically unchanging structure of an encomiastic literary piece[7] are worthy to receive attention, and they are expected to shade light on both the biographers and Alypius.

This thesis aims at finding the means that may allow to date the anonymous biography and to build the chronology of Alypius himself. Emphasis will be given to those aspects that one may consider essential: the narrative, the pillar, and the ascetic settlement. The rather

[4] For references to each of the texts, see "The Dossier of Alypius."

[5] For a recent discussion on *topoi* and the way the biographies of Christian saints may be used, see Thomas Pratsch, "Exploring the Jungle: Hagiographical Literature between Fact and Fiction," in *Fifty Years of Prosopography: The Later Roman Empire Byzantium and Beyond*, ed. Averil Cameron (Oxford: published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, 2003), 59-72; for a discussion which includes the earliest *Life*, see T. Pratsch, *Der hagiographische Topos: griechische Heiligenviten in mittelbyzantinischer Zeit* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2005).

[6] For the different approaches to Christian hagiography, see Evelyne Patlagean, "Ancient Byzantine hagiography and social history," in *Saints and Their Cults: Studies in Religious Sociology, Folklore, and History*, ed. Stephen Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983):101-121; Flor van Ommeslaeghe, "The Acta Sanctorum and Bollandist Methodology," in *The Byzantine Saint*, ed. Sergei Hackel, (Crestwod, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001): 155-63; Felice Lifshitz, "Beyond Positivism and Genre: 'Hagiographical' Texts As Historical Narrative," in *Viator* 25 (no. 1, 2008): 95-114.

[7] See Branislav Vismek, "Miraculous Healing Narratives and their Function in Late Antique Biohagiographic Texts. A Comparative Study," MA thesis (Budapest: Central European University, 2013), 6-13.

scarce secondary literature which discusses the *Lives* is often relying on the hypotheses of Delehaye, editor of all the *Lives* except the one by Antonius. I will challenge several assumptions disseminated in scholarship by casting nuances over several ideas.

In the first section of the first chapter I discuss the chronology of Alypius' life as it emerges from the three biographies, as well as the chronology of the anonymous *Life*, which will be based on the title of the manuscripts, and on the arguments brought in by Delehaye. The second section analyzes the story of Alypius as it is given by the anonymous biographer, the earliest one; numerous references will be made in footnotes to the Metaphrastic redaction, and, when needed, to the other Constantinopolitan version of the *Life*, written by Antonius. Therefore, the consistent footnotes on this first section of the thesis confer to the exposition of the events the appearance of a commentary; at the same time, the narrative is presented in a detailed manner, with the exception of those passages that are the object of a thorough discussion in the other two subsequent chapters: those in which the biographer exalts Alypius by comparing him to other saints, the episodes that refer to the monastery and to the miraculous events occurring to or by means of Alypius. The second chapter treats the rhetoric comparison (*synkrisis*) and the variety of the biblical or non-biblical characters that the three biographers employ in their attempt to display the one whom they praise, Alypius, at the top of the hierarchy of holiness. The earliest biographer's insistence on Job is particularly considered. The third chapter treats the pillar and the way in which Alypius claims a funeral monument and converts it into the holy edifice that will magnetize pilgrims from all around the place. Finally, the fourth chapter analyzes the monastery created around the stylite's pillar, which I attempt to integrate into a possible structure of the monastic complex. I also discuss whether the community may be considered a 'double monastery,' or rather not.

In the Appendices, first I insist on a central miracle described by the anonymous biographer, and also included in the Metaphrastic redaction. In the second appendix I expand

on the statue which was embellishing the grave-marker, because the studies that take into account this detail do not pay enough attention to the sources. In the following Appendix I present the Constantinopolitan monastery dedicated to Alypius, while the last Appendix concerns the Metaphrastic manuscripts that contain depictions of Alypius.

Chapter 1 - Preliminaries

1.1. The pre-Metaphrastic[8] and the Metaphrastic menologia

One of the major types of liturgical year collections, besides the *homiliaria* and the *panegyrica*,[9] were the *menologia*.[10] The *menologion* as a collection of hagiographical texts existed before Symeon Metaphrastes' times, i.e. in the tenth century, when he was in charge of the redaction of a liturgical collection of 148 Greek saints' *Lives*, *martyria*, and *translationes*, now extant in more than 700 manuscripts.[11] In a *menologion*, the texts are inserted in the chronological order of the feast day of the saints they praise, beginning with September 1st, the beginning of the indiction, that is, the Roman year of taxation.[12] According to Høgel, the author of the most recent monograph on Symeon Metaphrastes and the Metaphrastic *Menologion*, the development of the *menologia* should be placed in the late eighth century. Høgel also maintains the identification of Symeon Metaphrastes with Symeon 'the Logothetes,' given the fact that, following the colophons of the *Menologion*'s manuscripts, it was the "logothetes tou dromou" who was responsible for the most famous hagiographical collection in Byzantium.[13] There is no unquestionable evidence that the *Menologion* had been commissioned by the emperor, since there are scarcely any references to him;[14] yet, by adopting a diachronic view, one can clearly see that the *Menologion* can be

[8] Contrary to Høgel's objection (*Symeon Metaphrastes: Rewriting and Canonization* (Copenhagen, Denmark: Museum Tusculanum Press, University of Copenhagen, 2002), 91 (note 13), 112), it seems justifiable to use the term 'pre-Metaphrastic' for describing those non-Metaphrastic *menologia* which contain an earlier version of the *Lives* used by Symeon in his version, I characterize the Douay Abbey *Menologion* through this label, as both Halkin ("Un Manuscript grec inconnu: Le Ménologe de Douai Abbey, Près de Reading, *Scriptorium* 7 (1953): 51) and Schiffer ("Metaphrastic Lives and Earlier *Metaphráseis* of Saint's Lives," in *Metaphrasis: Redaction and Audiences in Middle Byzantine Hagiography*, ed. Christian Høgel, (Oslo: Research Council of Norway, 1996), 24) are doing.

[9] The distinction belongs to Erhardt, although Høgel considers it unnecessary, since both can be more conveniently termed *panegyrica* (Høgel, *Symeon Metaphrastes*, 42).

[10] Ibid., 39.

[11] Ibid., 62.

[12] Ibid., 10-11.

[13] Ibid., 62-63. Cf. ODB, "Symeon Metaphrastes" *s.v.* Høgel enumerates other datable 'Symeons' that may have been the same with Metaphrastes (Høgel, *Symeon Metaphrastes*, 76-80).

[14] Ibid., 137.

ascribed to the ample hagiographical activities which Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (945-959) started. Ephrem Mtsire (d. 1091-1105) the Georgian translator of the *Menologion*, claims that Symeon became known as hagiographer in 982, during the reign of Basil II (976-1025),[15] who allegedly prohibited the reading of Metaphrastes' *Menologion* in all the churches.[16] According to the same Ephrem, after the death of both Basil and Symeon, the *Menologion* received its past privileged place because of a dream that Constantine VIII (1025-1028) had;[17] accordingly, Constantine "Neos," the one responsible for the second edition of the Metaphrastic *Menologion*, mentioned by the *Menologion* itself, should be identified with Constantine VIII.[18] From Psellos' description of the rephrasing process from which the Metaphrastic *Menologion* resulted, Høgel deduces that the text was redacted by three groups, each of them responsible for one of the following tasks: dictating the new text, putting it down, and proofreading it.[19] Finally, in the end, the redaction must have got the approval ("authorisation," as Høgel terms it), and this might have been the task of Symeon Metaphrastes himself.[20] Whenever I refer to 'Metaphrastes' within this thesis, I mean the team which created the *Menologion* known as Metaphrastic.

[15] Ibid., 127.
[16] Ibid., 69.
[17] Ibid.
[18] Ibid., 131-32.
[19] Even though within the *Menologion* are also inserted old texts that have not been altered. (C. Høgel, "The Redaction of Symeon Metaphrastes: Literary aspects of the Metaphrastic Martyria," in *Metaphrasis: Redaction and Audiences in Middle Byzantine Hagiography*, ed. Christian Høgel, (Oslo: Research Council of Norway, 1996), 9-10).
[20] Høgel, "The Redaction of Symeon Metaphrastes:" 9-10.

1.2. The relation between the *Lives*

It is obvious that the anonymous *Life* (BHG 65) is the earliest one, and also the less rhetorical version the *Life*; this version was used as the basic text by Metaphrastes' team, so that the result of their rhetorical improvement is the BHG 64.

Halkin notices that Antonius had used the anonymous *Life*, but also that, in his version, there are several expressions common with the Metaphrastic *Life*.[21] The *Menologion* of the Douai Abbey is pre-Metaphrastic. From the fact that the Douay Abbey *Menologion* is dated to the eleventh century (and likewise the *non-menological* version of the BHG 66d), and that Metaphrastes died in ca. 1000,[22] Halkin deduces the existence of an intermediate version, now lost, from the tenth century, which was used both by Metaphrastes' team and Antonius, who were more or less contemporary.[23] On the other hand, Elisabeth Schiffer claims that Halkin's assumption is erroneous, as based only on chronology (the MSS of the Metaphrastic version and the one of the non-Metaphrastic *Life* are contemporaneous); thus, she suggests that Metaphrastes' team used both the version written by Antonius and the anonymous *Life*;[24] moreover, from her previous synoptic analysis of the three texts, from which she gives samples in the article, she concludes that the close interdependence of these two dated versions would not allow one to assume the existence of an intermediary version,[25] the putative tenth century rephrasing hypothesised by Halkin.

The architecture of the *Lives* corresponds to the exigencies imposed by the fixed structure of an encomiastic literary piece and, for this reason, the three biographies belong to

[21] Halkin, *Inédits Byzantins d'Ochrida, Candie et Moscou*, ed. François Halkin, Subsidia Hagiographica 38 (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1963), 168. Hereafter: Halkin, followed by line number.
[22] See the conclusion Høgel reached on the basis of the sources (*Symeon Metaphrastes*, 74-76).
[23] Høgel, *Symeon Metaphrastes*, 169. Additionally, Halkin is relying on another example of the Greek *passio* of Anastasia the Virgin; (BHG 77) which Metaphrastes is rewriting using a rather recent redaction by Niketas the Paphlagon (BHG 78) (Halkin, 169, note 28).
[24] Elisabeth Schiffer, "Metaphrastic Lives," 28.
[25] Ibid.

a mixed genre, between the *bios* and the *encomium*, within which the proportions of the narrations, dialogues and the direct intervention of the narratorial voice may vary.[26]

More than in the other two versions, in Antonius' redaction, the exterior events are left in the background, while the rhetoric comparisons, the philosophical digressions, and the theological expositions are privileged. Antonius includes in his *Life* only those events, episodes, and details that give him the opportunity to display the high theological and rhetorical knowledge he possessed.

1.3. The dossier of Alypius

1. two *Lives* that survived within non-Metaphrastic *Menologia*.

1.1. an anonymous *Life* (BHG 65).[27]

1.2. a *Life* written by Antonius, a cleric from Constantinople (BHG 66d).[28]

2. the *Life* from the Metaphrastic *Menologion* (BHG 64).[29]

3. In an abridged form:

3.1. an *Encomium* by Neophytos the Recluse (BGH 66).[30]

3.2. a short version from the Constantinopolitan *Synaxarion*.[31]

3.3. Two *akolouthiai*, that is, canons of the saint sung on his feast day:

3.3.1. "*Akolouthia* of our Father Alypius the Stylite and Wonderworker ... printed for piety's sake in Venice, in the press of Nicholas Glykas from Joannina, in the year 1679." (Ἀκολουθία τοῦ πατρός ἡμῶν Ἀλυπίου τοῦ Κιονίτου καὶ θαυματουργοῦ συναχθεῖσα ἐκ τοῦ Μηναίου παρὰ τοῦ εὐλαβεστάτοῦ ἱερέως Ἐμμανουήλου Τζάνε τοῦ εἰκονογράφου λεγομένου Μπουνιαλῆ. ὁ κανόνας δὲ τῆς αὐτῆς ἀκολουθίας ἐπανακαμθὴς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, ἐξ ὀργανικοῦ ἦχου

[26] E.g. the titles of the anonymous *Life* refers to the text as a βίος καὶ πολιτεία ("the life and the deeds"), while in the body of the text the *Life* is called an ἐπιτάφιος λόγος ("funeral sermon", that is, "eulogy").
[27] Delehaye, 148-69.
[28] Halkin, 170-208
[29] Delehaye, 170-87.
[30] Delehaye, *Les Saints stylites*: 188-94.
[31] *Synaxarion: Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum novembris*, ed. Hippolyte Delehaye (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1902): 258-60 (col. 257-258).

τοῦ πλα’ εἰς τὸ μελοδοποιὸν ἦχον τοῦ πλδ’. περιστρέφων τὰς τῶν συλλαβῶν μεθόδους ἑρμηνείας τῶν λόγων καὶ μελοδικὰ μέτρα ἀπὸ ἦχον εἰς ἦχον ἐπανερχόμενα, τυπωθεῖσα δὲ χάριν εὐλαβείας Ἐνετιήσιν, παρὰ Νικολάῳ τῷ Γλυκεῖ τῷ ἐξ’ Ἰωαννίνων. ᾳχοθ’).[32]

3.3.2. 1118* (“pages 280-288: Office en grec de S. Alype le Cionite”).[33]

1.4. The manuscripts[34]

1.1. The text of the anonymous version of Alypius’ *Life* (BHG 65), as it was edited by the Bollandist Hyppolite Delehaye, follows three manuscripts, dating from the tenth to the eleven centuries[35]:

A = Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale *gr.* 1539 (fol. 188v-206); eleventh century; Premetaphrastic *menologion* of the second part of November; title: Βίος τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀλυπίου τοῦ κιονίτου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις Ἡρακλείου τοῦ βασιλέως τελειωθέντος ἐν Ἀδριάνοῦ τῇ πόλει τῆς Παφλαγόνων ἐπαρχίας. Inc. Εἰ πολλοὶ πολλάκις βίους ὁσίων πατέρων ἀναγραψάμενοι – Des. χαίρετε καὶ φυλάττεσθαι τέκνα, καὶ μὴ δελιάτω ... ἀμήν.[36]

B = Vatican, Bibliotheca Apostolica *gr.* 807 (fol. 269v-278v); tenth century; complete premetaphrastic *menologion* of November; title: Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀλυπίου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις Μαυρικίου τοῦ βασιλέως ἀσκήσαντος.[37]

C. = Vatican, Bibliotheca Apostolica *gr.* 808 (fol. 421v-439); eleventh century; complete premetaphrastic *menologion* of November; title: Βίος τοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν

[32] Louis Petit, *Bibliographie des acolouthies grecques* (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1926.), 6.
[33] Emile Legrand, Louis Petit, and Hubert Octave Pernot, *Bibliographie hellénique ou Description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés par des Grecs au dix-huitième siècle* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1928), 415.
[34] These are the manuscripts used by Delehaye and Halkin for editing the three *Lives*. When giving the manuscripts title, I follow the format employed by Nancy Peterson Sevčenko (*Illustrated Manuscripts of the Metaphrastian Menologion* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990)) because of its conciseness.
[35] Delehaye, lxxvi-lxxvii.
[36] *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum graecorum Bibliothecae Nationalis Parisiensis*, ed. by Hagiogaphi Bollandiani, H. Omont (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1896), 239. Delehaye takes this manuscript as the basis for his edition (Delehaye, lxxvi).
[37] *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum graecorum Bibliothecae Vaticanae*, ed. by Hagiographi Bollandiani, P. Franchi de’Cavalieri (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1899), 53.

Ἀλυπίου τοῦ κιονίτου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις Ἡρακλείου τοῦ βασιλέως τελειωθέντος ἐν Ἀδριάνοῦ τῇ πόλει τῆς Παφλαγόνων ἐπαρχίας.[38]

In his edition Delahaye consistently followed the version of A and B, which I would call "the standard version" in the following, as in many respects it is closer to the other versions (the further two redactions), over against the unique version of C, which I would call "the odd version."

1.2. The text of the Metaphrastic version of the *Life* (BHG 64) has been edited by the same Delehaye also from four manuscripts:[39]

M = Berlin, Staatsbibliothek *gr.* 179 (fol. 301v-322); eleventh century; Metaphrastic *Menologion* of the second part of November, title: Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀλυπίου τοῦ κιονίτου.[40]

R = Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale *gr.* 1499 (fol. 301v-322); 1055/6; Metaphrastic *Menologion* of the second part of November; title: Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀλυπίου τοῦ κιονίτου.[41]

N = Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale *gr.* 579(fol. 140v-152); eleven century; Metaphrastic *Menologion* of the second part of November; title: Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀλυπίου. Inc. Καλοὶ μὲν καὶ οἱ τῶν μαρτύρων ἄθλοι καὶ πολλὴν δυνάμενοι τοῖς φιλαρέτοις – Des. καὶ αὐτῆς ἡμέρας τοῦ πονηροῦ πνεύματος ἀπαλλάττεται... ἀμήν.[42]

O = Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek *hist. gr.* 11 (olim 28); (fol. 125v-137); eleventh-twelfth centuries; Metaphrastic *Menologion* of the second part of November; title: Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀλυπίου τοῦ στυλίτου.[43]

[38] *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum graecorum Bibliothecae Vaticanae*, 53.
[39] Delehaye, lxxix-lxxx.
[40] *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum graecorum Germaniae, Belgii, Angliae*, ed. by C. Van de Vorst, H. Delehaye, Subsidia Hagiographica 13 (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1913), 110.
[41] *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum graecorum Bibliothecae Nationalis Parisiensis*, 187.
[42] Ibid., 21 (Delehaye has erroneously indicated the page 20).
[43] *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum graecorum Germaniae*, 47.

2. The other non-Metaphrastic version of the *Life*, made by Antonius of the Great Church in Constantinople (BHG 66d), has been edited by François Halkin on the basis of two witnesses: D = Berkshire, Library of Douai Abbey *gr*. (fol. 259v-279v); eleventh century; Premetaphrastic *menologion* of November[44]; title: Ἀντονίου μοναχοῦ καὶ πρεσβυτέρου εὐκτηρίων τῆς μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐγκώμιον μετὰ βίου συμπεπλεγμένον εἰς τὸν ἐν ἁγίοις πατέρα ἡμῶν καὶ θαυματουργὸν μέγαν Αλύπιον. Inc. Ἄρτι με τοῖς τοῦ βίου κακοῖς δυσχεραίνοντα καὶ ταῖς τοῦ σώματος ἀνίαις – *Des. mutil.* ἐντεῦθεν αἱ προοράσεις καὶ ... προαγορεύσεις τῶν ἐκ δρυὸς μὲν καὶ πηγῆς μαντεύσεων ἀληθέστεραι| .[45]

H = Heraklion, History Museum *gr*. No 2 (fol. 309v-332v); eleventh century; title: Ἀντονίου μοναχοῦ καὶ πρεσβυτέρου ἐγκώμιον μετὰ βίου συμπεπλεγμένον εἰς τὸν ἐν ἁγίοις πατέρα ἡμῶν καὶ θαυματουργὸν μέγαν Αλύπιον – *Des. mutil.* τὸν ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ ἀπηωρημένον ὄροφον ἐξεδίσκευσεν.[46]

1.5. Dating Alypius

First, one needs to bring into discussion that which one may call the 'internal' chronology, given by the different *Lives*. The earliest *Life* refers to Alypius' age five times, in relation to different important events: he remained an orphan at the age of three, he became a recluse at the age of thirty, and he got out and assumed the *stasis* on the pillar after two years of dwelling in an enclosure. Then Alypius spent fifty three years on the top of his pillar, after which he was lying for other fourteen years until the moment of his death. The version included into the Metaphrastic *Menologion* apparently gives the same numbers, although there is a simple passage from which one may infer that, according to this version, Alypius

[44] Although it leaves 9 or 10 days without having any biography of the saints celebrated on those days, Halkin does not term it incomplete (Halkin, "Un Manuscrit Grec Inconnu:" 57), but he revisits this aspect in the introduction of the edited text. (*Inédits Byzantins d'Ochrida*, 168).
[45] Halkin, "Un Manuscrit Grec Inconnu:" 54-55.
[46] *Inédits Byzantins d'Ochrida, Candie et Moscou*, 361.

died when he was 85 years old.[47] The account by Antonius, on the other hand, follows the chronology of the anonymous *Life.* The further rewritings, from the *Synaxarion* and the encomium by Neophytos the Recluse, give other chronologies. According to the latter, Alypius lived 100 years, he was a stylite for over 60 years, from which 13 were spent in semi-paralysis. Alypius' life is prolonged even more by the *Synaxarion* up to 108 (according to some manuscripts), or even 120 years. The period spent without being able to stand is 13 years, as the one given by Neophytos.

The biographies of Alypius give no information that could be linked to historical events, thus to allow us to pinpoint certain dates, including the interval in which Alypius lived, or when the anonymous *Life* was written. The single chronological mention appears in the titles of the *Lives* in manuscripts.

The titles given by A and C to the earlier *Life* situate Alypius' death sometimes during the reign of Heraclius. In contrast, the title of C is rather confusing as it suggests that Alypius practiced his *askesis* during in the times of Maurice (582-602). The chronological information provided by this title is not easily explained because Heraclius got to the imperial throne only 8 years after Phokas (602-610), Maurice's successor, started his reign. Moreover, Alypius may have assumed the ascetic discipline at least from the moment when he decided to enclose himself at the age of 30, as the *Life* suggests. Accepting the chronology of the earliest *Life* would mean that Alypius died almost a centenarian. If indeed his death occurred during Heraclius' reign, so between 610 and 642, then Alypius might have lived through the reigns of five emperors: Justinian I (527-565), Justin II (565-578), Tiberios I (578-582), Maurice (582-602), Phokas (602-610). But there is also the possibility that Alypius was alive in the time of Justin I (518-527), so he may be added to the list. Even the least conservative estimates about Alypius cannot explain the presence of Maurice's name in the title of B.

[47] Delehaye, 186, 32-43.

Delehaye claims that the text given by A (which he takes as the basis for establishing the text of this anonymous *Life*) and B is better than the one kept by C,[48] so it is impossible to associate the quality of the text with a potential inaccuracy of the copyist or of the model that he used for B. However, the *Synaxaria*, like Neophyte's *encomium*, follow the title of A and B, while the Metaphrastic manuscripts used by Delehaye suppress any chronological note. Yet, as I will demonstrate further, it is C that represents the more reliable version and, thus, the odd indication of the reign of Maurice for the time of the ascetic life of Alypius becomes a precious data for dating Alypius and understanding the subtle indications in the Life that confirm this dating.

In favor of this rather loose chronology that links Alypius only to the reign of Heraclius, Delehaye notes the possible identification of one of the two bishops who had the same name, and who are mentioned in the *Life*, with a bishop that signed the Ἀναφορὰ πρὸς Ἰωάννην πατριάρχην from 518.[49] In Delehaye's opinion, this argument supports the hypothesis that Alypius lived in the sixth and the beginning of the seventh century.[50]

In his *A History of Byzantine Literature*, Kazhdan affirms that this anonymous *Life* of Alypius "was produced most probably before the mid-eight century,"[51] even though he does not support or detail this conclusion. He links the *Life*'s origin to the "Dark Century" (650-775)[52] on the basis of the lack of references to any historical event, or "historicity," which is the distinctive particularity characterizing hagiographical works from the sixth and the early

[48] Among some of the examples given by Delehaye, the one in which C ignores the icon (in Delehaye, 154, 18 and 24) cannot be simply considered a better lection (Delehaye, lxxvii).
[49] One Theodor, bishop of the church of Adrianoupolis, of the province of Honorias (Θεόδωρος ἐπίσκοπος τῆς κατὰ Ἀδριανούπολιν <ἐ>κκλησίας τῆς Ὀνωρεατῶν ἐπαρχίας) signs this ἀναφορά, in fact a Synodal Epistle of the Council of Constantinople held in the time of Pope Hormisdas, on July 20th 518. Among the decisions taken was the reintroducing in the diptychs the names of 40 bishops from Calcedon, Pope Leo, Euphemius and Macedonius, bishops of Constantinople, but also the condemning of Severus of Antioch. The letter is addressed to John II the Cappadocian, patriarch of Constantinople (*Epistola synodalis concilii Constantinopolitani sub Hormisda*); Johannes Dominicus Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio. Tomus octavus, ad annum 392 ad annum 536 inclusive* (Florence, 1762 (Anastatic reproduction, Paris: Welter, 1901)), 573-5 and 1047 http://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=njp.32101078252077;view=1up;seq=10 (accessed 20.02.2015)
[50] Delehaye, lxxvii.
[51] Aleksandr Petrovich Kazhdan, *A History of Byzantine Literature* (Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation, Institute for Byzantine Research, 1999), 23.
[52] Ibid., 137 sqq.

seventh centuries [53] In his own words, "since the literature of the Dark century was consistently didactic, the protagonists had to be the images of real people but paradigmatic types who represented the fullest potential of human nature."[54]

Hence, Kazhdan does not challenge the assumption made first by Delehaye, namely that the author is to be placed in the period following Alypius' death. In the spirit of the Bollandist methodology,[55] in his short introduction to the *Lives* of Alypius that he edited, Delehaye follows what the writer says about himself as the narrator: he assumes the identity of one of the brethren who inhabited the very monastery established near the pillar saint.[56] Although tenuous, this is the main argument which Delehaye took into consideration. It must be noted here that Bollandists approached biographical data in hagiography less critically than current scholarship. In contrast, the 'disciples' or 'admirers' are currently considered to be a particular type of authors who had different social standing before entering the monastery, but who could also assume the status of an immediate contemporary to the saint for the rhetorical aim of persuasion.[57]

The depersonalization of the heroes, the process of reducing their individuality to the point where they are simply the incarnation of a series of superhuman capacities, such as working wonders and tolerating sufferance beyond the limit of endurance, is what Kazhdan sees in all the pieces that are dated to this period. He notices as a surprising detail the stress which the biographers of this period place on the youth and the beauty of their heroes. This anonymous *Life* stresses the strength of Alypius, which came from him being in the "flower

[53] Ibid., 22.
[54] Ibid., 154.
[55] Van Ommeslaeghe, "The Acta Sanctorum:" 162
[56] "And I, the most insignificant and late sprout of your plant, father, dare to dedicate to you this epitaph by picking up only some of your many deeds, which I have mostly participated in, learning from your [ascetic] struggles how a soul whose righteousness is put to trial, just as the gold in the smelting furnace, does not lose the reliability of its own beauty." (Delehaye, 167, 23-28). The biographer keeps his 'mask' throughout his narration; immediately after the moment when Alypius dies, the biographer speaks as one of the disciple who did not assume Alypius' way of life: "Thus even if [your] present weakness sadden us who did not sought out the decision of the praiseworthy endurance ..." (Delehaye, 168, 19-20).
[57] Høgel, *Symeon Metaphrastes*, 29.

of his youth."[58] Kazhdan goes further, and connects Alypius' physical vigor with the presence of the three young men thrown into the flames[59] in Babylon, whose story is to be found in the Book of Daniel. Yet, in Alypius' *Life* there is no allusion whatsoever to the youth as a criterion for the connection between the stylite and the three Old Testament figures. The reason for which they are included in the rhetorical comparison is their resilience in enduring the flames.

Another element important for the dating of this anonymous *Life* is the reference to an icon, since it may betray the author's iconophile sympathies. This element was somehow ignored by Kazhdan, who argues that this *Life* was written before the mid-eight century[60]. However, one may think that this may be too late for a *terminus ante quem*, accepting that the icon was an element present in the *Life* from the very moment when it was written. Yet, one of the three manuscripts that Delehaye used for the edition of this earlier *Life*, namely MS C is silent regarding the presence of the icon.[61] Since neither of the two instances where the icon is mentioned is found in MS C, it is justifiable to infer that the icon could be one of the elements included in the *Life* at some point. This is not the only different reading between C and the other two MSS. But it appears that 'the odd version' is closer to the original, as the further analysis confirms.

Thus, according to the titles of the MSS, Alypius lived in the seventh century and his first *Life* might have been written in the same period. The icon would be the single element that would rather indicate that the author of this anonymous *Life* lived during or even after the

[58] Delehaye, 154, 22. Kazhdan, *A History of Byzantine literature*, 154. Indeed, although the physical beauty and the strength were among the qualities which the rules of the *encomium* required to be praised, the hagiographers overlooked the external features, since the Christian heroes were praised for their moral qualities. (Cristian Gaspar, "In Praise of Unlikely Holy Men: Elite Hagiography, Monastic Panegyric, and Cultural Translation in the Philotheos Historia of Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrrhus," Ph.D. thesis (Budapest: Central European University, 2006): 120-121, and note 30).
[59] Delehaye, 158, 18-24.
[60] Kazhdan, *A History of Byzantine Literature*, 24.
[61] Delehaye 154, 18: εἰκόνα δεσποτικὴν καὶ σταυρόν in MSS A&B, while the MS C reads: σταυρόν. Delahaye, 154, 24: τὸ τρόπαιον τοῦ σταῦρου καὶ τὸ τοῦ Κύριου ὁμοίωμα in MSS A&B, while C has: τὸ τρόπαιον τοῦ σταῦρου.

Iconoclast period, i.e. in the second half of the eighth, or in the ninth century. [62] Another introductory element is the place where, according to the biographies, Alypius lived; this detail is the subject of the following subchapter.

1.6. The place

Adrianoupolis,[63] the place where, according to the biographies, Alypius was born, is situated 3 km west of the modern town of Eskipazar, near Karabuk (Turkey). Because of its location in the Roman period, between Galatian, Bithynian and Paphlagonian territories, in south-western Paphlagonia, which was a densely populated region, the city had a great importance. Together with Gangra (modern Cankırı) it was a major city of the inland of Roman Paphlagoni. [64] The earliest archaeological evidence is from the year 5 BC, when Adrianoupolis was part of Galatia Province, under the name Caesareia (Kaisareis Proselemmeneitai).[65] Moreover, all the literary references to this city come from Byzantine times.[66] Before the reign of Hadrian and his reforms (including the change of the city's name), Adrianoupolis was the regional capital.[67] From the administrative point of view, until the fourth century, Adrianoupolis was part of Paphlagonia, while after the fourth century it was integrated in Honorias Province. In Classical Antiquity and the Early Byzantine periods, one of the main economic activities were wine production, which was transported to maritime cities in order to be shipped, and the related manufacture of trade *amphorae*.[68]

[62] The icon will be discussed at length in the section "The cross and the icon" from the third chapter.
[63] Although in the secondary literature the modern version of the city's name is often Hadrianoupolis, because of the possible variations (Hadrianopolis (Delehaye, lxxviii) or Adrianopolis), I preferred to give the name in the form given by the transliteration of the Greek form that appears in the *Lives* (Ἀδριανούπολις).
[64] Ergün Laflı, Gülseren Kan Şahin, "Terra Sigillata and Red-Slipped Ware from Southwestern Paphlagonia," *Anatolia Antiqua* 20 (2012): 45.
[65] E. Laflı, "A Roman-Cut Cult Niche at Paphlagonian Hadrianopolis," in *XXIV. Araştırma Sonuıları Toplantısı*, vol. 2 (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanliği Dösimm Basimevi, 2007), 49.
[66] Christian Marek, *Stadt, Ära und Territorium in Pontus-Bithynia und Nord-Galatia* (Tübingen: Wasmuth, 1993), 116, note 837.
[67] Laflı, Şahin, "Terra Sigillata," 45.
[68] Laflı, "A Roman-Cut Cult Niche," 50.

Besides Christian Marek's study, several excavations in the region, which started in 2003 as a part of the "Paphlagonia Project", revealed more relevant elements related to many cities from Paphlagonia, including Adrianoupolis.[69] Most of the buildings preserved are from the Early Byzantine period, and along with the entire archaeological and epigraphical material discovered, scholars included them in a database focusing on Andrianoupolis and its *chora*. The remains of at least 25 buildings were discovered between 2005 and 2008. The most significant are two baths and two churches from the Early Byzantine period, a *domus*, a fortified structure of the Middle Byzantine period, an alleged *theatron*, a vaulted building, a domed building, and other domestic buildings with mosaic floors.[70] In the eastern part of the site there are the remains of a later Early Byzantine church, Church A.[71]

According to Laflı, the first church, the Early Byzantine Church B was probably built in the first half of the fifth century, and may have still been used in the seventh century.[72] All these edifices create the impression that Late Roman and Early Byzantine Adrianoupolis was a fortified centre, consisting of a "polis" with civic buildings, inhabited by a fairly numerous urban population, and a consistent rural population in the *chora*.[73] From the city's *chora*, the most important site is Kemistene, a hilltop site situated at ca. 4 km northeast of Adrianoupolis.[74]

Perhaps the most important piece of information obtained from these archaeological surveys is that Adrianoupolis seems to have been abandoned in the second quarter of the

[69] The official site of the project is http://web.deu.edu.tr/paphlagonia/ (accessed 27.04.2015).
[70] Laflı, Şahin, "Terra Sigillata," 46.
[71] The existence of both churches of the site proves the importance of the city at the time.
[72] The most intriguing is the church's floor mosaic; that main depictions are those of personifications of the four Biblical rivers. Laflı, "A Roman-Cut Cult Niche," 51
[73] Laflı, Şahin, "Terra Sigillata," 46.
[74] Within this settlement were discovered an acropolis, a cistern, and two cemeteries. In the northern part of the necropolis there is a Roman temple dedicated to Zeus Kimistenos. There is no evidence recorded in Kimistene about this temple being Christianized. (Laflı, "A Roman-Cut Cult Niche," 51-52; http://web.deu.edu.tr/paphlagonia/text_03.html (accessed 28.04.2015).

eighth century, when both Adrianoupolis and Gangra were invaded by the Arabs.[75] Alypius' monastery, situated in the *chora* of Adrianoupolis (there are no reasons to discredit this), probably disappeared at the same time; this would mean that the biographer of the anonymous *Life* – hypothetically accepting his assumed identity as a member of a monastic community, rather than discounting it as a topos – probably wrote his *Life* before the eight century.

1.7. Alypius' story according to the sources

In this section, I will follow the narrative given by the *Vita prior*. All the comments will be made in footnotes in order not to interrupt the sequence of the episodes narrated. At the end of each chapter, I will indicate its number in a footnote. I will also mention in the footnotes the difference from the Metaphrastic *Life,* together with other explanations, where different issues will be presented as well. As for the version by Antonius, given the fact that he suppresses many of the scenes presented by the other two major versions, I will confine myself to point out those elements which I consider relevant for the narrative.

The biographer starts by stating the moral goal of his account:

> If so many times many people who have written the lives of the holy fathers benefited countless [souls] changing [their] disposition to emulate the way of life of the latter, how could we possibly not be considered unjust and ill-willed if we were to pass by the so great virtue of a saintly father in silence? Therefore let us write about it [i.e. about Alypius' virtue], "so that another generation might know about it, the children who are going to be born, and that they might make this known to their children, so that they place their hope in God"[76] and pursue a virtue equal to his. Therefore, as far as this is possible for us, we will show to many those things that the divine grace has so clearly made us know on his example.[77]

[75] Laflı, Şahin, "Terra Sigillata," 47. For further information on Roman and Byzantine Adrianoupolis according to the new archaeological discoveries, see E. Laflı, Eva Christof, and Michael Metcalfe, *Hadrianopolis I: Inschriften aus Paphlagonia* (Oxford: Archaeopress, 2012), 1-25.
[76] Ps 77[78]:6-7.
[77] Chapter 1. The Metaphrastic *Life* emphasises the perfect equality of the martyrs and those ascetics dwelling in deserts, on mountains, and in caves: "For in what the martyrs are superior through the sour sufferings and the violent tortures, these [i.e. the ascetics] fill that gap through the duration of their sorrows and their entire life of fight against the evil spirits who, in their case, hold the place of the butchers. In fact, what the latter are for the martyrs, the same are these [i.e. the spirits] for the ascetics, as far as they were unceasingly striking, tormenting and pelting them, bringing upon them all the painful things." (Delehaye, 170, 7-14). Whenever the translator is not mentioned, the text is translated by me.

Alypius was born in Adrianoupolis, a city as important as Gangra. Alypius' mother had two dreams that have the purpose of convincing her of Alypius' future greatness. Before she gave birth, she saw a lamb having two kindled wax-candles on its horns, lighting up the entire house.[78] After she gave birth, Alypius' mother had a second dream: the entire population of the city came to her, singing hymns, praises, litanies, and venerating Alypius as a saint.[79] Shortly after, his father passed away. Alypius was no more than three years old at the time. His mother did not remarry, but she preferred to dedicate her life to God and to her son.[80]

Once she weaned him from her milk, Alypius mother devoted him to God, as Hannah did with Samuel,[81] and left him under the protection of the city's bishop, Theodore.[82] The bishop of Adrianoupolis died, and his successor had both the same reputation, and the same benevolent attitude towards Alypius. The congregation of the church chose him as the most faithful steward and, accordingly, the church's leader named him administrator and consecrated him as deacon of the church in Adrianoupolis. Alypius was indeed a sheep grown by good pastors.[83]

His promising ecclesiastic career was not enough for the striving for perfection. At the same time, he kept in mind the clear sight of God's commandments. In every moment he was thinking at what to do in order to please God and to hear: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."[84] Alypius had fulfilled the two cardinal commandments: granting unconditional

[78] Before the moment she conceived him, Martha, the mother of Daniel the Stylite, also had a dream of two bright stars from heaven that remained near her. The dreams significance will also be revealed. (*Life of Daniel*, 2 and 46; Delehaye, 3, 3 sqq.; 44, 9 sqq.).
[79] Erroneously placed before Alypius was born by George T. Calofonos, "Dream Narratives in the *Continuation of Theophanes*," in *Dreaming in Byzantium and Beyond*, ed. G. T. Calofonos, and Christine Angelidi (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), 105, note 144. However, it is noteworthy that all the visitations that Alypius received occurred while being asleep, with the exception of those when he receives the light from heaven.
[80] Chapter 2.
[81] 1 Sm 2.
[82] Chapter 3. The Metaphrastic *Life* underlines the continuous spiritual progress of the hero, mentioning how Alypius avoided the arrows of the sexual temptations, when he reached his youth (τὰ τῶν ὑπογαστρίων ἡδονῶν τοξεύματα) by fasting and prayers. But he gains the purity of a dove and the intelligence of a snake (Mt 10:16). (Delehaye, 172, 8-18).
[83] Chapter 4.
[84] Mt 25:21.

love to God, and revering the parents. Unlike the young man mentioned in the Gospel, who had kept all the commandments except for giving away all his possessions, Alypius decided to accomplish this one too in exchange for the eternal life.[85]

Alypius hid his innermost desire from all but his mother. Since he was longing for her blessing, he let her know about his intention to depart "towards East" (ἐπὶ τὴν ἀνατολήν) to embrace the solitary ascetic life. The mother's blessing-prayer follows. She says that he must take the path on which God put him by the "divine Spirit of the grace," receiving from God the guidance of a "good angel."[86] In this very theatrical scene, his mother's attitude is heroic: she does not yield to any womanly weakness by not raising any objection, or lamenting the loss of her son. Alypius departs and his mother returns home.[87]

Soon, everyone noticed the absence of the deacon. Both his fellow ministers and the city's citizens became concerned and terribly discouraged, since they could not endure losing the man of God. Theodore, the bishop himself, went searching for Alypius. While inquiring closely about where he was, where and when he passed by, Theodore was discouraged "as a cow which is bellowing when it searches for its wandering calf."[88] He finally reached him in Euchaïta, while his deacon was taking part in the feast of Theodore the Martyr.[89] The bishop

[85] Chapter 5.
[86] Mal 3:4. The biographer inserts here some anticipatory elements of Alypius' vocation as *miles Christi:* "the cuirass of the righteousness," "the helmet of salvation." (Eph 6:14,16).
[87] Chapter 6. All the scene is given by the Metaphrastic *Life* in the chapter 5.
[88] Delehaye, 152, 9-10.
[89] Euchaïta was a pilgrimage centre in Pontos, west of Amaseia (where Theodore, also called 'the Recruit' was martyred, and also from where the relics of the saint where brought from (ODB, Euchaita *s.v.*)), on the way to Gangra. In the seventh century the city became part of the theme of Armeniakon. The town has been burned down by the Persians in 615, and it has been briefly occupied by the Arabs in 663/64, when the church of Theodore was demolished. (Tuna Antun, "The Miracles of St. Theodore Tērōn: An Eighth-Century Source?," *Jahrbuch Der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 58 (2008): 1-11). The church has been soon rebuilt, and the city survived the seventh-century decline of urban life in Asia Minor. (F. Trombley, "The Decline of the Seventh-Century Town: The Exception of Euchaita," in *Byzantine Studies in Honor of Milton V. Anastos*, ed. Speros Vryonis, and Milton Anastos (Malibu: Undena Publications, 1985), 65-90). The cult of St. Theodor played a crucial role in the city's uninterrupted existence especially by its impact on the city's economy: the annual festival provided significant income. As John Haldon points out in *Byzantium in the Seventh Century, The Transformation of a Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 95: "The city of Euchaïta may have survived through the seventh century, although its population and clergy were often forced to seek refuge from Arab raiders in the citadel or fortified section of the town, which included an acropolis ... the presence of the cult itself seems to provide the main reason for its survival and its relatively populous nature."). Another stylite who visited the St. Theodore church is Lazaros of Mount Galesion (Gregory the Cellarer, *Life of Lazaros,*

persuaded him to return to his motherland, where the holy man would spend the rest of his solitary life in a way worthy of God.[90] However, the holy man accepted his superior's request also because he received a vision: "The one who appeared to him during the night told him that there are the Holy Places [i.e. Palestine], where the one who loves God would choose to conduct his pious life."[91] Although unnamed, the one who comforts Alypius is Christ, since the biographer says that "in his sleep the saint heard a divine advice (θεῖα συμβουλῆ)."[92]

Returning home, Alypius spent his time in search of his 'Holy Land' (which, like Christ told him is one's own heart and every place is equal) not far away from his city, but distant enough from its tumult. He found his 'desert' somewhere on a mountain south of the town. The lack of water was troubling him, since this would have made his living there impossible.[93]

Yet, he did not give up, and returned to the city for some tools [94] with which he dug for water until noon in vain. While he was sleeping, a man showed him a spot and following his advice, Alypius finally found a water source.

29; *The Life of Lazaros of Mt. Galesion: An Eleventh-Century Pillar Saint*, intro., trans., and notes Richard P. H. Greenfield (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2000), 113). For an inventory of the saints who were constrained or by their own will went asking for Theodor's aid, see H. Delehaye, *Mélanges D' hagiographie grecque et latine*, Subsidia hagiographica 42 (Brussels: Société des bollandistes, 1996), 279.

[90] Delahaye, 152, 14-15. When narrating the same episode, the *Life* by Antonius alters the story in some details: Alypius leaves his city seeking for his 'desert' letting no one know about his departure; also Antonius does not give the name of the bishop who is seeking Alypius, like he is not naming the bishop to whom Alypius' mother left her son. Also, Alypius receives the monastic *schema* from the bishop: "Alypius returns and puts away the very joyful clothing; and he cloths himself into the monastic garment [receiving them] from the very hands of the bishop." (Halkin, 185, 34-35).

[91] Delehaye, 152, 19-21. Kaplan rightly observes the one who consoles him let Alypius know that he does not have to go to Palestine to find an appropriate place for his ascetic aspirations (Michel Kaplan, "L'Espace et le sacré dans la vie de Daniel le stylite," in *Le sacré et son inscription dans l'espace à Byzance et en Occident: études comparées*, ed. M. Kaplan (Paris: Publication de la Sorbone, 2001), 204).

[92] Delehaye, 152, 18. The "divine advice" comes from God, that is, Christ. If the one who talked to him had been a saint this would have been told in some other way, according to the rules of the genre.

[93] Chapter 7.

[94] In the *Vita prior*, Delehaye has chosen the variant reading σκαφαῖον δίκελλαν ("a two-pronged fork for digging [a two-pronged hoe?]") of MSS A and B, instead of σκαφεὰν καὶ δίκελλαν ("a digging tool [mattock? spade?] and a two-pronged fork") of MS C, while in the Metaphrastic *Life* one reads σκαφεῖον καὶ δίκελλαν ("a hoe and a two-pronged fork"). It seems that the version of C is to be preferred here, too. Alypius might have used the spade or the mattock to loosen the earth, and the two-pronged fork to remove it as, according to the text, he had to dig quite deep.

Further, he returned to the bishop for getting permission to lay the foundation of an altar. Theodor pretended to rejoice, but he secretly sent some men who blocked the well. His intention was to force Alypius to settle on a plain closer to the city, so that he could be accessible to all the believers who needed him.[95] The holy man left the mountain and began to look for another place in the vicinity of the city.[96] And indeed Alypius found an abandoned cemetery infested with demons, which he could make his own 'desert.' The soldier of Christ (ὁ τοῦ Χριστοῦ στρατιώτης)[97] entered the necropolis, and those who were accompanying him in his quests[98] were astonished by his courage, thinking that he was mad. Alypius ignored their noisy protests,[99] to which he replied with a smile.[100] Instead he elevated himself on one of the graves that had a *tauroleon* (ταυρολέων)[101] statue on its top. As it was animated, Alypius addressed the column in praise using the words of Ps 117:2: "The stone that the builders rejected, the same is become the cornerstone."[102] This in itself is already a clear Christological allusion; Alypius explicitly states that his future dwelling on the column of the funeral monument represents his firm perseverance on the cornerstone that is Christ. Alypius even equates his mounting the column with finding the "eternal rest" (αἰωνία ἀνάπαυσις).[103] In this way his choice of dwelling on the column becomes the symbol of living the life to come already while in this world.[104] The miracles that were going to happen to him while in this state are meant to prove this theological statement.

[95] Here ends the chapter 6 of the Metaphrastic *Life*.
[96] In the beginning of the 7 chapter, the Metaphrastic *Life* says that Alypius already had the intention of becoming a stylite, and for this reason he decides to enclose himself, as a preparatory stage.
[97] For the *militia Christi*, see Cristian Gaspar, "In Praise of Unlikely Holy Men," 116, note 17, and the bibliography indicated.
[98] They are not mentioned before, and Metaphrastic *Life* excludes them.
[99] According to the Metaphrastic *Life*, Alypius was seen by the inhabitants of the city while he was building himself a hut in the cemetery.
[100] Chapter 8.
[101] For the a discussion on the statue, see the Appendix II. From the 'bull-lion' (ταυρολέων) to the 'bull-and-lion' (βουφάγος).
[102] Also Mt 21:42, Mk 12:10, Lk 20:17, 1Pt 2:7.
[103] Delehaye, 154, 16.
[104] Here ends chapter 8 in the Metaphrastic *Life*.

Later, Alypius went into the city, and using an iron lever that he brought from there together with a cross,[105] he made the heavy statue fall from its place and break into pieces. He replaced it with the cross, the sign of Christ's victory over the demons. Falling asleep, Alypius sees two men who urged him to build a church dedicated to the holy martyr[106] to purify the place. When Alypius was about to start building, the men reappeared, blessing the exact perimeter where the church's foundation would be.[107] The relics of these two saints would be found later, to be kept into the narthex of the church of Euphemia until the biographer's present time, exactly like Alypius commanded.[108]

After this, the episode of Alypius reaching Chalcedon follows.[109] The bishop of Adrianoupolis was sent to the imperial city, and he wanted Alypius, who was still the deacon of the church, to accompany him. Alypius obeyed his superior's will, although he wanted to keep his ascetic way of living. When they were about to cross the sea, he was able to elude the delegation, so he remained at Chalcedon; entering into the *martyrium* of St. Bassa,[110] he

[105] Here MSS A and B and the Metaphrastic *Life* introduce the motif of an icon that Alypius brings from the city.

[106] Like the text mentions later, the martyr here is Euphemia of Chalcedon. Her martyrdom is traditionally dated to times of Diocletian's persecution (303). By her inclusion within the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* from the second half of the fourth century it is clear that her cult was already well established at Chalcedon. Her shrine is mentioned by Egeria; Socrates' *History* speaks about a meeting between Arcadius and Gaïnas in the same *martyrium*. But its fame essentially comes from the association with the Council of Calcedon, in 451. (ODB, "Euphemia" *s.v.*)

[107] End of chapter 9 in the Metaphrastic *Life*.

[108] Μέχρι τῆς σήμερον ..., οὕτως τοῦ μακαρίου προστάξαντος. (Delehaye, 155, 10-11.) The Metaphrastic *Life* adds that the church will be replaced by a bigger one. The earlier *Life* will give this detail later.

[109] Chapter 9.

[110] St. Bassa was martyred during Maximianus' reign; her cult started to be celebrated at Chalcedon in the fifth century. In 464 Peter 'the Fuller' was serving in Saint Euphemia's church, while in 536 is attested a monastery near the church. After the episode narrated by Alypius' biography, there is no other mention of the church. According to Janin, the place where Alypius' biographer places the church (παρὰ θάλλασαν; "near the sea") corresponds to the one given by Iulius, the abbot of the monastery in 536 ("in the Himerios [district]"), since Himerios is also a river that flows into the sea. Also, the archaeological evidence suggests the existence of a Christian church on the spot. (Raymond Janin, *Les Églises et les monastères des grands centres byzantins (Bithynie, Hellespont, Latros, Galèsios, Trébizonde, Athènes, Thessalonique)* (Paris: Institut Français des Études Byzantines, 1975), 33-34).

hid under one of the benches[111] inside. St. Euphemia appeared to him, again in his sleep, and offered herself to be his companion on the way back to Adrianoupolis.[112]

This meeting made Alypius revere Euphemia; he showed his gratitude for the guidance that he received from her by building a church consecrated to her. Those who knew his voluntarily-assumed poverty provided all the necessary means, including the ones for erecting his pillar.[113] Alypius was training himself in fasts and vigils.[114]

Following the unwritten commandments left by the elders, before ascending a pillar, Alypius enclosed himself, at the age of 30, in a narrow cell, where he remained for two years, fighting with demons. "Just as a commander (στρατηγός) who is about to be engaged in close fight (συμπλέκεσθαι) with the enemy battle-line (παράταξις πολεμίων)," Alypius was provoking the demons "by singing Psalms gradually, hurling at them the inflamed enchantments of the divine sayings."[115] The spirits were attacking the cell of Alypius violently, since they wished to overthrow it so he would be scared enough to abandon the battle. But "armed with the excellent cuirass of prayers, and with the mighty spear of the Cross,"[116] Alypius was victorious, and he casted them away, so they were forced to enter into the chapel of Euphemia. They had the power to do so because the church was consecrated at that very time. When the deacon officiating the service in the church read the words of the Gospel according to Matthew, at the usual response "Glory to Thee, o Lord," the demons are forced to flee the *martyrium* for good.[117]

[111] LSJ, σκάμνος *s.v.* (cf. G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1961), σκαμνίον *s.v.*).
[112] Chapter 10. Also here ends the chapter 10 in the Metaphrastic *Life.*
[113] Ἡ ἐπὶ τοῦ στύλου δαπάνη (Delehaye, 156, 14).
[114] Chapter 11. The mention of Alypius' ascetical practices from the Metaphrastic *Life* is not restricted to only simply stating them, but he adds that the holy man's sight was affected. (Delehaye, 178, 18-21). Also, after telling about Alypius extraordinary endurance, the Metaphrastic *Life* returns to the point when Alypius enclosed himself in the solitary hut. The travel to Chalcedon was just a detour in the narrative's linearity. Here ends chapter 11 in the Metaphrastic *Life*.
[115] Delehaye, 157, 3-7.
[116] Delehaye, 157, 12-13.
[117] Chapter 12. Also here ends chapter 12 in the Metaphrastic *Life*.

The crowds who were coming incessantly and fearlessly asking for his guidance,[118] made Alypius go up on the pillar, for he was not able to follow his ascetical routine. He stood motionless on the pillar, immovable like a bronze statue, resisting the destructive effects of the weather.[119] Unlike the martyrs, who unjustly suffered for a while, but then they were redeemed from the tortures by death, Alypius, through his sufferings, during all his life was living the life of a confessor.

Again, the succession of both extreme winter cold and summer heat made Alypius "dying every day and then ... coming to life again."[120] He also had to resist the attacks of the demons,[121] who one night struck him with a meteorite falling on the column.[122] Alypius threatened the demons using the rock that struck his shoulder as a proof of their unprovoked adversity against him when Christ will come again. Alypius' courage is shown once again

[118] " [...] if someone – either man, woman, children, or elder – wanted to eat and dwell together, and to continue the blessed intercessions." (Delehaye, 157, 32-34). At this moment the monastery was not yet built, there may have been already a building, besides the church, which could accommodate the pilgrims (a *xenodocheion*). The affluence of pilgrims had its cause in the attraction they felt for Alypius, which is expressed by Metaphrastes through comparing him with a magnet (ἡ Ἡρακλεία λίθος; Delehaye, 179, 19).

[119] End of chapter 13 in the Metaphrastic *Life*.

[120] See, 1 Cor 15:31: "I am dying every day, I swear it on my pride in you…"

[121] The passage continues with a comparison with the forty military martyrs from Sebasteia, so the *miles Christi* image is applied to Alypius also: he is "nobly fighting (γενναίως ἀντιμαχόμενος) in the arenas of combat (τὰ σκάμματα τῆς ἀθλήσεως)." Also, the Metaphrastic *Life* enhances the military analogy: the demons were throwing stones at Alypius as they were using a ballista, but he was replying by shooting with the arrows of prayers (τὰ τῶν εὐχῶν βέλη) which he was throwing (ἀκροβολίζομαι) as if from the sky. One can consider this last detail as a reply to the version from MS C (see below the discussion on the meteorite).The episode narrated by the anonymous *Life*, is described in more detail and with more terms from the agonistic vocabulary: the demons formed a phalanx (φάλαγγα τάξαντα τὰ δαιμονία), and made themselves compact for keeping their shields locked together (εἰς συνασπισμὸν πυκνωθέντα) according the laws of war (πολέμου νόμος). The effect of the assault is more dramatic: the projectiles (βολίδες) destroyed the wood-planks that were enclosing the pillar's platform (κύκλῳ σανίδες). The dimension of the stone that wounded the stylite is emphasized, as the severity of the wound. Also, Metaphrastes brings in the example of Antony, who was attacked with stones as well. (Delehaye, 180, 8-19). As a sample of a fragment where Antonius uses the agonistic vocabulary: "For he is a prepared combatant (πρόθυμος ... ἀγωνιστής), not a crowned deserter (λιποτάκτης στεφανίτης), neither the one softening the labours in grief, nor the one stopping the contests (ἆθλοι) in sorrow, so that even if he claims a larger share of pains in excess, he may still be completely victorious (νικάω πάντως) in this excess, and not faint (ὡρακιάω) in the distress and the long-standing afflictions." (Halkin, 189, 45-50).

[122] Delehaye, 158, 33-159, 1. This is the version of MS C: "who [i.e. the demons] made him stoned by a night star [= meteorite] (ἄστρον νυκτερινόν) as if from a ballista (πετρόβολος), so that, while he was standing on the column, his shoulder was hit and wounded." In MSS A and B this natural cause attributed to the demons was changed to a real pelting by the demons: "who [i.e. the demons] once, in an inappropriate time, in the darkness of the night, made him stoned as if from a ballista…" This secondary version makes meaningless the continuation, in which Alypius raises his hands toward the sky to show "to the stars and to the demons themselves that he had not been hurt." (Delehaye, 159, 1-3). This passage also shows, together with many others, the neat superiority of the version of MS C, over the others.

when he promises the demons that he will demolish his roof, so he can win the victorious crown of Stephen, the first martyr.[123] Alypius' audacity forced the demons to abandon the fight and retreat. And indeed their banishment from that place was witnessed by those who were passing by; they confirmed it by saying that they had heard the demons lamenting.[124]

In the next morning, after the morning prayer (ἑωθινὴ προσεύχη), under the pretext that he needed it for a certain thing, Alypius asked his mother for an adze which he used to demolish the roof of his enclosure and thus to keep the promise he had made to the demons in the night before, that he would destroy his rudimentary shelter. The biographer states that he would remain under the open sky until the moment of his death. His mother was near him, since she heard the noise made by the wooden-planks, and she was first scandalized by his extreme gesture. She expressed her disagreement by showing him the virtually deadly perils of being exposed: "the death-bringing wounds by the hailstone,"[125] "the lightning bolts that bring violent death to many and the invisible direction [by the demons] of all these things."[126]Alypius' reply follows: he considers himself to be blessed to suffer anything for Christ. One should accept to shiver of cold in this life, in order to become capable "to approach the unapproachable light there [i.e. in the afterlife] (ἵνα τῷ ἀπροσίτῳ φωτὶ ἐκεῖ προσεγγίσωμεν);"[127] similarly, it is better to endure the extreme heat here below in order to avoid the eternal fire in the life to come.[128]

He convinced his mother not only to accept that the rudimentary shelter had to be demolished for Christ's sake (διὰ Χριστοῦ), but also that Alypius did not need his tunic anymore. The biographer praises the mother for enduring for Christ's sake; she bore to see her son suffering, and thus she preferred God the Begetter to her own begotten. She built for

[123] End of chapter 14 in the Metaphrastic *Life*.
[124] Chapter 14.
[125] Hailstone is the version of A and B (χαλάζης), while C has erroneously "sea" (θαλάσσης).
[126] Delehaye, 159, 32-34. My translation follows the version of MS C. MSS A and B have a different text.
[127] 1 Tm 6:16.
[128] Chapter 15 in the Metaphrastic *Life*.

herself a tent near the pillar in which she lived an ascetic life of prayer and manual labour for providing her son with what he needed and with resources for alms; she considered that even to possess two small coins (τὰ δύο λεπτά) was pitiable.[129]

Once Alypius saw, from the top of his column, his mother returning from the city; she had gone there in order to change one-third nomisma (τρίτον νομισμάτος) that they had received, into smaller coins (κέρμα) to buy food.[130] Alypius was surprised to see his mother with nothing in her hand, and he asked her about the change. She explained that on her way back, Alypius' mother had pity on some beggars, and she gave away everything. Alypius was impressed by her absolute generosity and approved her gesture by blessing her.[131]

The prestige that the stylite was gaining made both men and women to come near Alypius.[132] Euphemia, a noble woman from Adrianoupolis, abandoned her life and became a recluse near the base of Alypius' pillar.[133] The biographer mentions that many other prominent women joined Alypius' mother in the vicinity of the stylite, including Maria, his sister.[134] They asked him to receive them under his authority, and assured him that they were not to be afraid of, since they would be totally obedient.[135] Alypius wept as he was impressed by their request, and replied in a prayer for them. Accordingly two houses were built, one for the monks, and another one for the nuns, in such a way that the women would be not seen by

[129] Chapter 15. Martha will also join her son Symeon the Younger by being buried in the vicinity of his pillar. (Michael Kaplan, "L'Espace et le sacré," 209).
[130] Usually called *tremissis*, a fraction of a *solidus* (a gold coin). The *tremissis* was also of gold, thus Alypius and his mother cannot use as such the donation they received for buying food. The *tremissis* is struck for regular use in the east under Leo III (714-41), while after mid-eight century was struck only as a ceremonial coin. (Philip Grierson, *Byzantine Coinage* (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1999), 8; idem, *Catalogue of the Byzantine Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection and in the Whittemore Collection, Leo III to Michael III (717-867) Part I: Catalogue of the Byzantine Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection and in the Whittemore Collection* (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks research library and collection, 1993): 15-16.
[131] There is no reason to characterize this episode as Alypius' "warning against excessive alms," as Peter Hatlie does in *The Monks and Monasteries of Constantinople, ca. 350-850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 195, note 45.
[132] End of chapter 16 in the Metaphrastic *Life*.
[133] Chapter 16.
[134] End of the chapter 17 in the Metaphrastic *Life*. Maria's name is given in the next chapter.
[135] Chapter 17. The Metaphrastic *Life* omits the scene of the women addressing Alypius openly.

the men.[136] Despite her initial obstinate refusal, Alypius' mother is finally convinced by a vision to receive the monastic *schema* and join the nuns.[137]

The stylite does not elaborate a set of rules for his community, except for two regulations. One was addressed exclusively to the nuns and required them not to be seen by the men, as every contact might be dangerous, no matter how spiritually advanced a nun would be. The other rule referred to the service: the community had to keep the seven monastic hours, i.e. the ascetics had to chant seven times, during the day and night.[138]

Alypius attended the service: three choirs were singing antiphonally, and Alypius, who kept his hands raised,[139] was singing together with the choir of the recluses. The harmony of their praise was pleasing not only the men around the establishment, but also the angels.[140]

At this point, the biographer reaches the point in the *encomium* where he recounts several miracles. Thus, Alypius is shown when he secretly receives the heavenly light (φῶς οὐρανόθεν).[141] The event happened several times and he would not remain unnoticed, but many had witnessed to this marvellous sight. The arrival of the light was anticipated by the frightening sound made by the Cross that Alypius had above his pillar.[142]

As mentioned before, the empress tried to offer money for the precious relic from Alypius; the cross that he had on the top of his pillar, which was to be given in exchange for a significant amount of money, undoubtedly necessary for the well-being of the monastic community. Alypius refused to send his cross to the palace, because he knew that the empress

[136] Chapter 18 in both *Lives*.
[137] Chapter 19 in both *Lives*.
[138] For the monastic hours, see Juan Mateos, "L'Office monastique à la fin du IVe siècle: Antioche, Palestine, Cappadoce," *Oriens Christianus* 47 (1963), 53-88.
[139] Εἰς ὕψος διατεταμένων αὐτοῦ τῶν χειρῶν (Delehaye, 163, 29). In the whole text of the *Life*, there is only one possible allusion of the cruciform stasis, as it was practiced by Symeon the Elder: the biographer speaks in Alypius' name as a virtual reply to his worse affliction, whichprevented him from standing, and makes the hero speak of himself as "the crucified" (ὁ ἐσταυρωμένος) (Delehaye, 167, 4). Immediately after, among the capacities unaffected by semi-paralysis, is mentioned the ability of "stretching them [i.e. the hands] in supplication" (πρὸς δεήσεως ἔκτασιν). Thus the prayer posture assumed by Symeon (the cruciform *orans* stance) is not clearly defined in this passage either.
[140] Chapter 20 in both *Lives*.
[141] See Appendix I. Receiving the divine light: *Coenae tuae*.
[142] Chapter 21 in both *Lives*.

would die soon; thus, in reply, he advised her to wait some more time.[143] Alypius received this gift from God (ὁ χάρισμα) so as to foretell the future, and to predict "for one the crown of the empire, and for the other the authority of the holy [episcopal] throne."[144] Many were trying to find out from him, like from a prophet, if their loved ones were alive. Those afflicted with untreatable illnesses were searching for cures. Unlike no one from the experienced and erudite physicians, he had one unusual method, and this was to pour tears because of those who were ill in such way that those who were sick would have the remedy from above.[145] Others were complaining about the violence of their rulers or masters, or because of the injustice of agreements that had become more coercive. All these bonds were loosened by him through the words learned from the Holy Spirit,[146] not through earthly wisdom, but through prayer and supplication, writing to some, giving advices to others. He also appeased quarrels, and those who once were fighting with sword became brothers. All these brought him the name of peacemaker who rejoices, and who rejoices in the poverty in spirit and in persecutions.[147]

The biographer calls Alypius the most blessed, who, besides his sympathy, compassion, and love, often pours out streams of tears from his eyes. Alypius had a habit: he loved the Lord and Christ, inasmuch as he was preaching the Passions of Christ every year by shedding tears for the humiliation and the offence He endured, in such way that he was thinking that he sees the Lord during his Passions.

[143] Here again, I am following the version of C: "he encourages her to wait a bit so that she may meet the aim of her desire, because in the purity of the eye of his mind he foresaw that she would die." The alternative version of A and B is inferior, and even corrupt. According to the latter Alypius sent the empress a less ambiguous reply: "he encourages her in his reply to wait until her imminent death, so that she may meet the aim of her desire..." However, this would have been a cruel message. (Delehaye, 164, 30-33).
[144] Delehaye, 165, 1-2.
[145] Delehaye, 165, 6-10. The unusual treatment is not kept by the Metaphrastic *Life*.
[146] 1 Cor 2:13.
[147] Chapter 22 in both *Lives*. Mt 5:3,9,10.

Once a beggar came to Alypius and asked for his garment. The stylite gave it to him in absolute silence, for he showed no interest in being glorified.[148] One of the monks enclosed near his pillar saw him and praised him.[149] There is an episode inserted here, according to which he suffered because of the snow that covered him completely:

> But you are not like this [i.e. like Job who cursed the day of his birth because of the calamities that befell upon him], but you received everything in perseverance (καρτερικῶς) when once an awful winter covered you in heavy snow and did not allow you to raise up for many days, pressing hardly and freezing with the cold all the innermost parts of [your] body (καὶ τῷ κρύει πηγνύων τὰ περὶ τὸ σῶμα ἐνδότατα),[150] when the natural cooling down of the old age (ἡ φυσικὴ τοῦ γήρους ψῦξις) was also contributing, so that it could not receive any more normally the heat provided by the liver (τὴν ἐκ τοῦ ἥπατος χορηγουμένην θερμότητα),[151] when, because the tendons all around the feet had been wrenched,[152] the powers of the muscles became numb and could not allow to the feet to stand in a natural way.[153]

Many of Alypius' disciples who allegedly became the bishops of many cities are mentioned.[154] Alypius has endured the harshness of living as a stylite for fifty-three years, and he spent the last fourteen without being able to stand.[155] He also suffered of a wound at his leg, like Job.[156]

After his death, all the citizens of the city gathered around Alypius' relics, and all were keen to have a last blessing from the man they considered a saint before he was been

[148] Chapter 23.Alypius did not entrust the secret even to his left hand (μὴ πιστευθείσης τῆς ἀριστερᾶς τὸ μυστήριον); Mt 6:3.
[149] In the Metaphrastic *Life*, the chapter 23 shows Alypius being generous. The recluse who sees him does not praise him, but he makes sure that Alypius is covered up with a cloak (περιβόλαιον; Lampe, *s.v.*).
[150] This phrase is made clearer in the Metaphrastic *Life*: τὰ ἐνδότατα τοῦ σώματος.
[151] The phrase ἡ ἐκ τοῦ ἥπατος θερμότης appears in the compilation by Aëtius of Amida (fl. 530-60), *Iatricorum liber*, IV, 90 (A. Olivieri, *Aëtii Amideni libri medicinales i-iv*, *Corpus medicorum Graecorum* 8.1 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1935): 404). No further connection is obvious, since Aëtius' work is a compilation.
[152] In the Metaphrastic *Life*: "were destroyed" (διασπασθέντα).
[153] Delehaye, 166, 26-33. The translation follows the version of C. This passage seems to describe the very happening that prevented Alypius to stand in his last 14 years. Nevertheless the passage shows that the author had a minimum of medical knowledge, even if such explanation may have been part of the common knowledge. Metaphrastes inserts it in chapter 24, and he expands the *locus*: "... until gradually his body wasted away, and it was not able [to generate] strength against the resistance caused by his old age and his abstinence; soon [his] soul was constrained to leave it [i.e. the body], and to depart towards God and towards the upper state [i.e. the angels]." (Delehaye, 186, 21-25). Metaphrastes adds that Alypius was not able to use his legs in his last 14 years, because "the knees were bent" (τῶν γονάτων αὐτῷ παρεθέντων) during the long *stasis*, but also that Alypius had his feet "badly struck with a wound (τραύματι ... πονὴρως ... βληθείς), like Job." (Delehaye, 186, 29-31).
[154] Chapter 24. The Metaphrastic *Life* suppresses this information.
[155] At the age of thirty he became a recluse, for two years, thus he lived for 99 years. From the phrase: πέντε καὶ ὀγδοήκοντα ἔτη τὰ πάντα διαβιοὺς ἀποτίθεται τὸ σῶμα, ἀποδύεται τὴν φθοράν, ἀφίησι τὰ φαινόμενα καὶ πρὸς Θεὸν ἄνεισιν εὔελπις (Delehaye, 186, 32-43), one can infer that according to Metaphrastes Alypius' life was 85 years long, so he counts the 14 years of laying on one side from those 53 years spent on the pillar.
[156] Chapter 24 in the Metaphrastic *Life*. The anonymous *Life* includes this information in chapter 25.

buried.[157] And they surrounded Alypius' body do that he could be buried only after four days. And on the last day, one young man who was possessed by a demon came to the grave of the saint, and was instantly cured.[158] The text ends with a prayer of intercession.

The next chapter discusses the biblical or non-biblical characters with which the three biographers compare Alypius in order to augment his ascetic discipline and the divine gifts that God granted him.

[157] Chapter 25 in both *Lives.*
[158] Chapter 26 in both *Lives.*

Chapter 2 - 'Mightier than Job': variation within the synkrisis in the Lives of Alypius

Stylite saints embraced an arduous and eccentric form of asceticism introduced by Symeon the Elder. Their life was especially appealing for their apprentices gathering around their strange edifices, looking for spiritual guidance from people adopting this peculiar form of mortification and submission of the body. Accordingly and not surprisingly, their endurance, beyond an ordinary human being's capacity, was the reason why these ascetics were glorified by their hagiographers. They describe these saints as reprising models principally from the Old Testament. The analogous biblical character who best embodied these virtues is undoubtedly Job, a wealthy and faithful man whose character is put on trial by Satan with the worst and most agonizing tests.[159]

However, a stylite's 'improbable superiority' rests in his capacity to surpass Job's perseverance and fortitude by enduring even greater ordeals. The anonymous biographer can, and indeed does, describe this biblical hero as inferior to the stylite, who is depicted as a 'supra-Job.' There is no better way to underpin a saint's excellence than the rhetorical device of *synkrisis*,[160] which was extensively used in Greek and Latin classical literature, especially in light of the rhetorical training of those who composed or paraphrased the *Lives* of stylites.[161]

Following the examination of how the authors of the three main texts emphasize the figure of Job, I will analyze the way in which Job is presented as the Old Testament *typos* of

[159] This can be seen in the words of Abba John the Persian (in the *Apophtegmata Patrum* collection), who says that "I have been … patient like Job, humble like David." (Derek Krueger, "The Old Testament and Monasticism," in *The Old Testament in Byzantium*, ed. Paul Magdalino and Robert S. Nelson (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2010): 203).
[160] In Greek: σύγκρισις.
[161] For the way this particular rhetorical device of *synkrisis* was used in the Greek literature, see Friedrich Focke, "Synkrisis," *Hermes* 58 (1923): 327-68. For its use by the Patristic authors, see D. Sheerin, "Rhetoric and Hermeneutic Synkrisis in Patristic Typology," in *Nova et Vetera: Patristic Studies in Honor of Thomas Patrick Halton*, ed. John Petruccione (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1998): 22-39.

the stylite in the three extensive *Lives*, as well as the position Job receives within the biblical characters to which Alypius is compared. Finally, I will give an interpretation of the place that Job occupies in the works of his biographers through the analysis of the Job's occurrences in the *Lives* of other stylites. As a theoretical framework is necessary for this unusual association between the stylite and this biblical figure, I shall examine in short the rhetorical means of 'comparison' (*synkrisis*), and its place within the structure of the epideictic rhetoric composition to which the accounts of Alypius' life may be ascribed.[162]

2.1. *Synkrisis* – the rhetorical comparison

Dealing with the composition of an *epitaphios [logos]*, one of the epideictic orations, Pseudo-Dionysius of Halicarnassus claims in his work written sometime between the third and the fifth century AD, that "it is clear that the funeral speech must be based on the same topic as the *encomia*," (like country, family, nature, uprising and actions).[163] What is implied by Pseudo-Dionysius is clearly stated in Περὶ Ἐπιδεικτικῶν, the second treatise by Menander Rhetor, who suggests that the funeral speech delivered long after the sad event is a pure *encomium*, a eulogy, so it does not need the part called the 'consolation'.[164] Further on, Menander advises the reader that one should base his speech on all the encomiastic topics (τόποι): family (γένος), birth (γένεσις), nature (φύσις), upbringing (ἀνατροφή), education (παιδεῖα), accomplishments (ἐπιτεδεύματα).[165] After doing so, the main part of the speech, in fact the larger, must be dedicated to the actions (πράξεις), and, in the end, Menander says, "a

[162] Like it has been stated before, the *Lives* are part of a mixed genre, between biography and panegyric. The latter is part of the epideictic genre (ἐπιδεικτικόν – "demonstrative"; also called ἐγκωμιαστικόν; πανηγυρικόν), one of the three rhetorical genres; the epideictic rhetorical genre has been defined since Aristotle by both "praise" (ἐγκώμιον) and "invective" (ψόγος). (Laurent Pernot, *Rhetoric in antiquity* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 2005), 175 sqq.). See footnotes 7, 26.
[163] Pseudo-Dionysius of Halicarnassus, "On Epideictic Speeches," 6, in *Dionysii Halicarnasei Opuscula*, ed. Ludovic Radermacher (Leipzig: Teubner, 1985): 278; English translation in *Menander Rhetor*, ed., trans. and comm. D. A. Russell and N. G. Wilson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), 374.
[164] *Menander Rhetor*, 170.
[165] Ibid., 175.

comparison relating to the whole subject" must follow.[166] The example that the author of this third-century treatise gives for the introduction of this last component (the *synkrisis*) includes the phrase "He of whom we are speaking is second to none and indeed has these qualities to a higher degree".[167] In this way, the effect of this kind of parallelism emphasizes the qualities embodied by the one who is being praised.[168]

One question may be raised at this point: what are the criteria for choosing the element used in comparison? Following Menander's recommendations, as demonstrated, it must be "the noble" if the protagonist's nobility (or beauty in a moral sense) is to be highlighted. Obviously, since often the one eulogized is a man, his counterpart should be of the same gender. Another author who gives an insight into the rules of *synkrisis* is Aelius Theon of Alexandria, a first century sophist, who wrote four treatises of rhetoric studied throughout the Byzantine period. He notes that, in order to avoid being ridiculed, the comparison must involve things that do not have much difference between them.[169] The second-century Hermogenes of Tarsus, to whom another collection of *progymnasmata* is attributed,[170] explains the purpose of *synkrisis* in the same way and, in addition, he says that "it must be included … in the *encomium*, where we amplify the good features of the subject by comparison".[171] The equality with whom the good example is associated is similarly emphasized by Nicolaus the Sophist (late fifth century), in his short collection of

[166] Ibid., 176: πρὸς ὅλην τὴν ὑπόθεσιν παραλήψῃ τὴν σύγκρισιν.
[167] Ibid.,176: οὐδενὸς δευτέρῳ τῷδε ταῦτα †ἄμεινον† ὑπῆρξεν.
[168] Ibid., 17: δεῖ γὰρ καλοῦ καλλίονα ἀποδεικνύναι ἢ ὁτῳοῦν ἐνδόξῳ ἐφάμμιλον. ("For one must show him to be nobler than the noble or fit to rival any man of distinction.")
[169] Aelius Theon, *Progymnasmata*, ed. Leonhard von Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci* 2 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1854), 112; English translation in G. A. Kennedy, *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 53.
[170] In these manuals or collections, the *progymnasmata* (προγυμνάσματα, "the preliminary exercises") are given in the order of increasing difficulty; they are termed "preliminary" first because they were practiced immediately after the student learned to read and write; secondly, because the *progymnasmata* were considered a means of preparation for declamation, even if they continued through the rhetorical schools, which (usually) boys began between twelve and fifteen (in Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, x). Besides the authors mentioned here, another work on the same topic is Libanius, *Progymnasmata*, *Opera*, vol. 8 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1915).
[171] Hermogenes, *Progymnasmata*, ed. H. Rabe, Rhetores Graeci 6 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1913): 19; G. A. Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*: 83.

progymnasmata, even though, depending on the desired effect of the discourse, the object or person in the comparison may be "a lesser or greater" as well.[172]

In light of Menander's recommendations for those wishing to use *synkrisis* as well as the three authors of the surviving collections of "preliminary exercises," the part of the hagiographical pieces where Job appears can be identified as the *synkrisis*. For this reason, the next step is to see in more detail how this biblical hero is brought up by the three biographers of Alypius.

2.2. Synkrisis in the Lives

2.2.1. The anonymous Life

Job's name occurs three times in this earliest *Life,* first in chapter 24. Towards the end of the *Life*, a whole chapter is dedicated to the praise of Alypius' virtues, continuing an episode narrated in the previous chapter: to prove that the saint was "merciful beyond the [divine] commandment," the narrator brings up an episode in which a poor man comes under the saint's pillar and asks Alypius for his mantle. The saint does not hesitate and throws it to him, and, in spite of Alypius' attempt to keep his gesture unnoticed, we are told that the scene was observed by one of his disciples.[173] This makes the author eulogize the saint within the frame of a theatrical discourse, for which he deploys four rhetorical questions in a row; in this particular form the disciple enumerates some of Alypius' virtues which, according to him, are to be found only in him and Job. However, what separates the two men is Alypius' total acceptance of suffering', because he does not complain about the ordeals sent upon him as the means to gain salvation.[174]

[172] Nicolaus, *Progymnasmata*, ed. I. Felten, Rhetores Graeci 11 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1913): 59; G. A. Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*: 162.
[173] Delehaye, 166, 11.
[174] Delehaye, 166, 23-167, 10. An imaginative response by Alypius follows, and it is counterpoised against the ones offered by Job.

> But you did not say: '*May the night perish, [the night] in which it was said: Behold, a boy!*',[175] nor did you pray *that the stars would be darkened in that night.*[176] You did not say: '*Why did I not die in [my mother's] belly, or came out from her womb and perish immediately, and to which purpose did meet me the knees,*[177] which have become so mercilessly paralysed[178] frozen by the cold?'

In the next chapter, there are two further occurrences of Job. After recounting what the disciple claims that Alypius would have said (οὕτω ἄν ηὐχαρίστησα), the narratorial voice returns and addresses the saint to whom this ἐπιτάφιος λόγος is offered.[179] The narrator describes through a naturalistic image the saint's state from the moment he receives the last and the most painful stroke, the ulcerous wound:

> As a last affliction you were even hit by an evil wound, almost purging the purulence from your body as Job did with the potsherd. When I was musing in this way about these things, it came into my mind the divine voice addressing Job through a storm and a cloud, that you, o, holy man, endure all these for no other reason but to show yourself righteous like him.[180]

Accordingly, the enormous dimension of the bodily pain that the pillar saint endures for God's sake is highlighted through a comparison with Job's physical state: the "sore wound (ἕλκος πονηρόν[181])", with which he was stricken, corresponds to Alypius' "painful wound (πονηρόν τραῦμα)". In addition, by reminding the readers of the "potsherd" (ὄστρακον) from the biblical account about Job,[182] the biographer hopes to amplify the visual impact. Immediately after this, the narrator recalls what he calls the words about the true sense of suffering that God Himself addressed to Job.[183]

Apart from Job's figure, Alypius is compared with other Old Testament figures, taking more than just endurance as a criterion of selection. Accordingly, the anonymous biographer associates his hero with the three young men taken captive to Babylon, to whom Alypius is

[175] Jb 3:3.
[176] Jb 3:9.
[177] Jb 3:11-12.
[178] MSS C: τὰ γόνατα, ἃ οὕτως ἀνηλεῶς παρελύθη συμπαγέντα; MSS A and B: τὰ γόνατα, ἃ οὕτως ἀνηλεῶς παρελύθησαν παγέντα.
[179] Delehaye, 167, 24.
[180] Delehaye, 168, 3-7.
[181] Jb 2:7.
[182] Jb 2:8.
[183] Jb 38:1 sqq.

superior, since those spent only one day enduring the furnace's heat.[184] Also, Alypius has been devoted to God from his childhood like Samuel.[185] Further on, the verticality of Alypius' stance reflecting his steadfastness is compared to the Mount Sion.[186] The forty martyrs of Sebasteia are brought up as an extra-biblical element,[187] and their story provides two convenient aspects for the *Life*'s rhetoric: the fact that they endured the cold of a winter night complements the extreme heat from the Babylonian furnace, and additionally, they are military saints, so they also fit into the *militia Christi* topos.

2.2.2. The Metaphrastic redaction

During the rephrasing process Job is no longer kept as the main biblical counterpart of Alypius. In fact, from the three mentions of Job in the anonymous *Life,* only one is retained in the Metaphrastic redaction. According to the principles applied by the authors of this Menologion, the parts considered irrelevant are abbreviated, or even omitted.[188] Thus, even though the stylite's ultimate generosity showed in chapter 23 of the anonymous *Life* is retained, the disciple who notices it is not given the chance to speak up. As a result, the extensive eulogy in the form of a monologue in the anonymous *Life* is replaced by the simple statement – in indirect speech – of the physical effects of the saint's lifelong mortification. The redactors mention Job in this context: not only was Alypius unable to use his feet for fourteen years, but he also suffered from the wound in his foot, in the same way Job did.[189] Additionally, stating the pre-eminence of Alypius is extended to the next chapter, and the authors of the Menologion present the three young men taken captive to Babylon and the

[184] Delehaye, 158, 19-24; Dn 3:1-23.
[185] Delehaye, 149, 14-15: ὡς νέον τινὰ Σαμουήλ ("like a new Samuel"); 1 Sm 2.
[186] Delehaye, 157, 12; Ps 125:1.
[187] Delehaye, 158, 24-27. For one of the accounts of their martyrdom, see the homily by Basil of Caesarea, *In XL martyres Sebastenses* (PG 31, 508B-525A). They are considered to be military saints who were martyred at the beginning of the fourth century, during the time of Licinius, in the proximity of Sebasteia, by being forced to spend an entire night naked in a frozen lake (ODB, "Forty Martyrs of Sebasteia" *s.v.*).
[188] Høgel, *Symeon Metaphrastes*, 110, recounts this idea not without criticism of generalizing the principle of selection employed by Metaphrastes and his team.
[189] Delehaye, 186, 30-31.

forty martyrs of Sebasteia, as incapable to match the endurance of the stylite.[190] Alypius is also immovable like Mount Sion.[191]

In addition to these characters that are to be found in the anonymous *Life* as well, the Metaphrastic version introduces the greatest ascetic figure, Antony, into the story. However, Alypius does not stand beside the great Antony, instead his character is used by the narrator to present a well-known saint attacked by the demons with stones.[192]

2.2.3. The version by Antonius

In order to come to a valid conclusion from comparing the older *Life* and the Metaphrastic redaction, an examination is necessary of this redaction contemporaneous to Metaphrastes', which is preserved in a fragmentary menologion edited by Halkin. As far as mentions of Job are concerned, only a relatively elaborate text in the beginning of the chapter 23 refers to Job:

> Job sits on a dung heap and endures that whole disaster: the total destruction of the cattle, the loss of the children, and the burst into flames of the household, but he cuts off his hair and he utters words equally of anger and gratitude; so if these are excessive, he reduces the great amount of sufferings through the fact that [his] distress does not go on for long.[193]

The content of this chapter matches precisely chapter 24 of the earliest *Life*, which is outlined by its final phrase, which shows Alypius at least equal if not superior to the ascetics of martyrs:[194]

> But that one [i.e. Alypius] was stoned by the demons, but they did not capture him. I will let aside the others to whom if this one [i.e. Alypius] is compared, either have they died in martyrdom, or become known through their asceticism, he would prove either equal, or superior, but in no way inferior.[195]

[190] Delehaye, 187, 1-5.
[191] Delehaye, 178, 36.
[192] Delehaye, 180, 17-19.
[193] Halkin, 206, 23-28.
[194] This phrase also reflects the remark made by Menander Rhetor in referring to the outcome of *synkrisis*, quoted above in footnote 168: *Menander Rhetor*: 176.
[195] Halkin, 208, 76-78. Halkin titles the twenty third chapter "Par sa prodigieuse constance, Alypius l'emporte sur tout les héros de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament." (Halkin, 205).

The passage describing Job puts him in an almost unfavourable light: even though he is confined to a very limited space, he does not limit himself to complete motionlessness. Instead, he endures disastrous events, but not with serenity. The limited period of his suffering is a third way to decrease Job's steadfastness, and therefore his merits.

Immediately after this passage, Alypius is compared to the three Israelite children in the furnace.[196] Antonius finds more resources in order to exalt Alypius, and by comparing him with more biblical characters he enhances the stylite's spiritual stature, and also improves the text rhetorically. Thus, Antony hints at the torments of the seven Maccabeans children;[197] further on, Daniel the prophet is presented also as an endurer who survived the lions and prison, but his torturer allowed him to be fed by Habakkuk.[198] Another prophet, Jeremiah, although imprisoned in a "den of mire" because his compatriots did not believe God's threats, he did not suffered like Alypius; still, he resembles to Alypius because he was also chosen from his mother's womb. [199] Antonius maintains the parallel with Stephen the protomartyr from the other two *Lives*, and he places it in this chapter dedicated to the final *synkrisis*: again, if the demons had succeeded in Stephen's case, and killed him, Alypius remained unharmed.[200] Perhaps the most unexpected association made within this chapter is the one between Alypius and Paul: what Alypius does not have is the universal amplitude of his actions (the prayers, the travels, and the imprisonment), but in his ascetic practice Alypius is not inferior neither to Paul, nor the other Apostles:

> This mighty one is worthy to be compared to Paul and to Paul's afflictions. If we put aside the sowing of the word,[201] the care for the world (ἡ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐπιστασία),[202] the much

[196] Halkin, 206, 28 sqq.
[197] From 4 Mc 8-12. Halkin, 206, 38 sqq.
[198] Halkin, 207, 58 sqq.
[199] Halkin, 207, 55 sqq.
[200] Halkin, 208, 74-78.
[201] Apparently an odd reference to Acts 17:18: "What does this babbler (σπερμολόγος) want to say?" Σπερμολόγος means literally "sower of words".
[202] See 2 Cor 11:28: "Apart from the other things, my daily responsibility (ἡ ἐπίστασίς μοι), the care for all the churches".

> preaching, the chains, the law courts, the traveling all around the lands and the sea,[203] and all the other things in which he [i.e. Paul] is superior even to all the Apostles altogether; he [Alypius] is not inferior in the numerous fasts, hunger and neediness, in nakedness and cold,[204] and in other mortifications.[205]

Moreover, Paul was raptured to the third heaven and to Paradise, and he himself did not know whether this was with or without the body. However, Alypius, by mounting the column, detached his body from the earth and became quasi-incorporeal, while he did not even need to be raptured, since his mind was all time immersed in intellectual contemplation. Thus, in this very respect, Alypius was even superior to Paul:

> Paul was caught up to the third heaven, was caught up to Paradise; two raptures for two contemplations, either with the body, or only in his soul – he himself stresses that he does not know[206] –, but that one [i.e. Alypius], in his body, was all time detached from the earth,, while there was no time when his mind was not dwelling in intellectual things. [207]

From the diversity of the biblical figures associated to Alypius, one can conclude that the switch of the criterion according to which they have been chosen from the endurance of the extreme temperature, either cold, or heat, to different others, allows the biographer to diversify the biblical characters to which he can compare his hero. Yet, the whole *encomium* by Antonius is a mere vehicle for comparisons and analogies, and for this reason, more than in the case of the other two *Lives*, they are not limited to this chapter. First, when it refers to Alypius as to the chosen one from his mother's womb, Antonius is giving the examples of Saint Antony, whose spiritual acme is shown by God, and of Jacob whom God loved, while from his brother Esau He turned away.[208] Second, Antonius is putting emphasis on the idea of the 'angelic life' by making Alypius a rival to the angels because of his incessant stance and prayer.[209] Further on, Alypius is "the new Samuel," since he was left in the care of the

[203] See 2 Cor 11:23-26.
[204] See 2 Cor 11:27.
[205] Halkin, 207, 62-79.
[206] See 2 Cor 12:2
[207] Cf. 2 Cor 12: 2-4; Halkin 207, 69-208, 73.
[208] Halkin, 176, 47-50.
[209] Halkin, 173, 8-9.

church, and his mother is praised also as one who is imitating Anna.[210] Her sacrifice is in nothing inferior to the one of Jephtae and Abraham, thus Alypius is indirectly associated with Jephtae's daughter and with Isaac.[211] The image of Alypius caring for his flock according to his pastoral duties brings him close to Jacob, who also took care of the flocks enduring the heat and the frost, for making the two daughters of Laban his wives; in the case of Alypius the two wives are allegorically interpreted as the theory and the practice (θεωρία τε φημι καὶ πρᾶξιν).[212] Alypius also imitates Joseph, because he avoids the "charming sprains of the Egyptian pleasures."[213] When departing in search for solitude, Alypius tells no one, like Abraham who started his journey with his bare hands, having only Isaac, the soon to be sacrificed son, by his side.[214] Alypius' returning into his homeland gives Antonius an opportunity for another comparison, and the stylite is called "the new Abraham," despite the fact that God asked the latter to leave his land, while Alypius is asked to return to his.[215] Another major event from Alypius' biography is when he becomes a recluse. Antonius employs his impressive theological knowledge and shows Alypius in his enclosure as being like Adam before Eve was created: both were in the presence of God, to whom they were dedicating all their efforts.[216] According to his severe ascetic practice, Alypius is watching over his own thoughts, which makes him similar to Habakkuk in his vigils.[217] In the last comparison in this chapter, Antonius presents a further proof of his exegetical understanding: Alypius dwells in the narrow enclosure like Jonah lived for three days in the belly of the marine monster; and it is mentioned that Jonah is the *typos* of Christ who dies and rises up in

[210] Halkin, 176, 1.
[211] Halkin, 178, 3-4.
[212] Halkin, 182, 34 sqq.
[213] Halkin, 182, 52.
[214] Halkin, 183, 15 sqq. In the other *Lives*, Alypius is disclosing his intentions to his mother. One can infer that this change cannot be fortuitous, and Antonius is operating it on purpose, perhaps for having the chance to include other parallels, since by doing so, Alypius follows also the commandment given to the Apostle by Christ (Halkin, 183, 22-23).
[215] Halkin, 185, 20 sqq.
[216] Halkin, 188, 10-15. Immediately after this, Alypius is made as industrious and diligent as a bee.
[217] Halkin, 188, 23 sqq.

the third day.[218] Just like the enclosure, the stomach of the marine monster has paradoxical effects on its dweller:

> Jonah, in old times, was in a bigger and more grievous enclosure (εἱρκτή); for the sea was surrounding him, the whale received the prophet within his inward parts, and the fetid stomach concealed the one alive as if a dead body. O, unbelievable things that were accomplished there! The same beast was both a tomb and a house, a moving tomb and a house carrying a dead dweller; the same stomach consumed those things that reached it but did not decompose the being whom it had inside.[219]

Nevertheless, although the pains undertaken by the prophet were more severe, Alypius endured his for a longer time, thus the stylite is in no way inferior to Jonah.

The only non-biblical figure to which Antonius links Alypius is Diogenes. The cleric of the Great Church displays his philosophical interests more than once. Thus, in a highly rhetorical fashion Antonius literally affirms that the Cynic cannot bring any solid contribution to the 'comparison' (σύγκρισις).[220] Yet, he has to show the difference between the two, the Cynic and the stylite: Diogenes lived in the wine-jar because by restraining his vital space and confining his body to the ridiculous house situated in the very middle of the city, he was aiming to set free his soul, but at the same time to set it forth in search of praises. By contrast, Alypius set himself on the narrow platform in order to escape the vainglory; hence everyone should be amazed by him, rather than the ancient philosopher.[221]

From this short overview of the three narratives, it can be concluded that there is a noteworthy difference between the three redactions regarding the significance attributed to the passages which may have been seen as conveying something impossible. Being superior to Job became possible for Alypius: he surpassed the biblical archetype of the righteous

[218] Halkin, 188, 33 sqq.
[219] Halkin, 188, 33-189, 40.
[220] Halkin, 192, 25-26.
[221] Halkin, 192, 17-30. Even though sometimes, Diogenes is considered an appropriate model for the ascetics, the indissoluble link between Hellenism and paganism brings the ancient philosopher into disrepute. The way Antonius uses Diogenes, first as a proof of his erudition, and second as pale, hence inferior, *typos* of Alypius, is noteworthy. Within hagiography, Diogenes is associated especially with the *saloi*, and consistent references to the biography of Diogenes can be found in the *Life* of Symeon the Holy Fool, as it has been illustrated by Krueger (Derek Krueger, *Symeon the Holy Fool: Leontius's Life and the Late Antique City* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 72-107).

sufferer. The author of the anonymous *Life* gives central role to this prominent figure, using him in contrast to the superiority of Alypius. The exclusivity granted to Job by the biographer is also important. On the other hand, Metaphrastes' team, aiming to re-style the text, prefers to reduce the importance of Job by complementing him with two other examples in the passage describing the absolute superiority of the stylite.[222] Antonius does more or less the same and, although he keeps Job among the biblical heroes to whom he compares Alypius, he also adds numerous other models. Another significant change may be observed in the shift of the criterion that makes Alypius a 'supra Job:' the anonymous biographer quotes passages that show Job grieving because of his afflictions, while Antonius stresses the finite character of his sufferance.

Therefore, at this point, one obvious but important aspect follows: the close paraphrase of a single biblical book, that of Job,[223] and the lengthy passage in direct speech could have been something that, by the time of Symeon Metaphrastes, made the *Vita prior* unacceptable for the audience, which is what Psellos claims regarding all the narratives rewritten by Metaphrastes' team.[224] Hence, it is justifiable to infer that rewriting this passage by adding scriptural allusions to more than one character,[225] as well as abbreviating of the direct speech, was a basic condition of the stylistic upgrade.[226]

[222] Delehaye, 186, 35 sqq: "But to whom should we compare him and not find that he [i.e. Alypius] clearly exceeds him?" (Ἀλλὰ τίσιν ἂν αὐτὸν παραθέντες οὐ τὸ πλέον ἔχειν φανερῶς εὕροιμεν;).
[223] E.g. Delehaye, 166, 25-26 from Job 3:6.
[224] Psellos states this in his *encomium* for the Logothete (Høgel, *Symeon Metaphrastes*, 12).
[225] Being transparent and limited to a few biblical references (especially the Psalms and the New Testament), was one of the characteristics of low and middle-low style Byzantine texts as Ševčenko observed in his classic article, "Levels of Style in Byzantine Prose," *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 31 (1981): 289-312.
[226] In fact, this coincides with one of the means employed by the redactors of the Metaphrastic *Menologion* listed by Elisabeth Schiffer at the end of her study ("Metaphrastic Lives:" 40).

2.3. The *philoponia* of the stylites

Job can be considered to illustrate a good example for *philoponia* which Ashbrook Harvey, in her essay on Symeon the Elder, takes as one of the characteristics of a stylite.[227] She points out that Theodoret of Cyrrhus, the first biographer of Symeon the Elder, expresses his admiration for the stylite stating that he surpassed human nature through φιλοπονία and φιλοσοφία. Both can be taken as key terms, two notions which describe the stylite's true vocation.[228] Regarding the latter, it is necessary to point out that most Christian authors consider the Christian ascetic life true philosophy,[229] more precisely, the theoretical sense of the true *philosophia*. Thus, in the Fathers' thought, φιλοσοφία has in its center the contemplation of the "true" God and the practice of "true" virtues. On the other hand, the precise meaning which Theodoret conferred to φιλοπονία is not entirely clear. Although some of his translators equate it to "penitence," Harvey suggests that for Theodoret the term encompasses the ascetic practice as a whole.[230] Nonetheless, its literal sense is clear: the action of bearing afflictions and distress serenely.

Philoponia is indeed the long praised virtue of Alypius and, simultaneously, the one seen by the general Christian perception as being embodied by Job. Harvey: "we find recurring images of the suffering of Job – suffering which is not redemptive (as the crucifixion) but a test from Satan to 'slander' the holy one."[231] If we follow the version of MS C, something similar can be concluded from what the anonymous biographer says about the meaning of Alypius' sufferings, but in an astonishingly non-standard way:

[227] Susan Ashbrook Harvey, "The Sense of a Stylite: Perspectives on Simeon the Elder," *Vigiliae Christianae* 42, no. 4 (1988): 376-94.
[228] *Historia Religiosa*, 26, 1, 1-9 (Théodoret de Cyr, *Histoire des moines de Syrie, "Histoire Philothée" XIV-XXX* (t. 2), ed. and trans. P. Canivet, and A. Leroy-Molinghen. Sources chrétiennes 257 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1979), 158-59).
[229] See the example of the Cappadocians in Jaroslav Pelikan, *Christianity and Classical Culture: The Metamorphosis of Natural Theology in the Christian Encounter with Hellenism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 181.
[230] Harvey, "The Sense of a Stylite:" 379.
[231] Harvey, "The Sense of a Stylite:" 384.

> He ascends the column, making himself a pillar, surrounding himself with a few wooden planks at the top of the column, which is not sufficient even to allow the holy man to lie down or sit a little; but he was continuously standing on it as if, by his nature, he was a bronze statue, fighting with rain, heat and freezing cold, and also with mist, wind and tempest, by which even stone or iron, which are of inanimate and solid matter, often is eroded, decomposed and entirely annihilated through the course of time. Thus the great man was persevering in all these, he the companion of the saints who was struggling above the measure of the saints, the most violent heir to the Kingdom of heavens, more violent than any robber or thief[232]. Those [i.e. the robbers and thieves], being unjust, were perhaps desiring above this one the punishment that delivered them from the [otherworldly] torments, so that they would be deemed worthy of the better destiny, but the praise of God was always in Alypius' mouth, and from his childhood his entire life was a confession.[233]

Here the author of the anonymous *Life* uses unexpected comparisons. Alypius is stronger than a bronze statue in face of the changes of weather; he is even more violently mortifying his own body by undertaking sufferance superior to any violence either committed by robbers and thieves, or, if they would repent, to their violent desire for punishment in order to avoid the otherworldly torments. But Alypius is more than a repentant sinner. He is a confessor of his own just life in the image of Job.

However, according to Antonius, and his source, namely the author of Alypius' anonymous biography, there is more to this. The saint is permanently practicing *stasis* both physically and spiritually, and his superiority in spiritual immovability as compared to Job cannot be properly explained by simply studying the redactions of Alypius' *Life*. Hence an external, intertextual inquiry is necessary.

2.3.1. Job as a topos in the accounts on other stylites

A simple search into the *Lives* of other stylites may reveal that Job's presence is among the *loci communes* to be found in their biographies. In the Syriac *Life* of Symeon the Elder, the biographer states that the prayers of the saint living in a dead body,[234] although he was

[232] See Mt 11:12: "The kingdom of heaven suffers violence and the violent takes it by force."
[233] Delehaye, 158, 3-17. The translation follows the text given by MS C with one exception: it accepts the reading transmitted by A: ἀπαλλάγησαν, instead of ἀπηλλάγησαν transmitted by C. A and B apparently misunderstand this rather complicated text and correct it so that the comparison becomes one between Alypius and the martyrs, but with little sense.
[234] The death of Symeon is discovered only after two days, because there were no perceptible differences between his *staseis*, i.e. in prayer and post mortem) (Doran, *The Lives of Simeon Stylite*, 97-98). Also, "everyone

attached to his pillar just as Job was to the top of a dung heap, ascended freely to God just as the prayers of Job had before him; Symeon was also slandered by Satan in front of God. As in the case of Job, Satan appears before God's throne and asks him for power over the saint, so that he could afflict him, and this is how Symeon receives the terrible wound on his left foot.[235] Similarly, in the "Letter of Cosmas of Panir," Symeon is praised to be victorious in his trials like Job had been.[236] In another redaction of his *Vita* by Antonius, Symeon is called a "new Job" by his abbot,[237] and Job is mentioned again by name in the passage about the wound on Symeon's thigh.[238]

In addition to his status as the one who triumphed over the countless afflictions directly caused by Satan, the biographer of Luke, a tenth-century stylite, finds another detail related to Job that he can employ in his account. In an ingenious way, he uses a genealogy of Job given by the Septuagint[239] in order to link the praised stylite to the great tradition of pillar saints. Although Luke's biographer later mentions another stylite,[240] he states that Luke was the fifth generation after Symeon the Elder and Symeon the Younger, Daniel, and Alypius, in the same way as Job was the fifth generation from Abraham:

> As from the forefather and the exemplar Symeon, the first accepting to serve as a guide in this exceptional march and [this] chariot race along the heavens, the fifth in counting whom one can list in, comparable with Job the blameless and victorious in myriad contests, the fifth from Abraham in the Scripture's genealogy …[241]

But before speaking about his hero, the biographer refers to Alypius as

---

that bends his neck (for monastic life) and serves in this institution is regarded as dead." (Arthur Vööbus, *Literary, Critical and Historical Studies in Ephrem the Syrian* (Stockholm: ETSE, 1958), 102).

[235] Doran, 131.

[236] Doran, 195; the second mention of Job within this text attached to the Syriac *Life* does not concern Symeon (Doran, 198).

[237] Doran, 89.

[238] Doran, 94. Another important observation is that Job the biblical sufferer does not appear in the *Lives* of Symeon the Younger and of Daniel the Stylite.

[239] Jb 42:18.

[240] Delehaye, 200, 14-15. In the other instances where Job is mentioned, the biographer points to Luke's steadiness (in general: Delehaye, 199, 35; his wound: 204, 35; when he is attacked by wasps and other venomous insects, like lice: 207, 30), or the wealth and his parents' place of birth (Delehaye, 200, 2).

[241] Delehaye: 198, 9-13.

> "the one who is rightly named (φερώνυμος) Alypius, the one who rightly bears the name of the blessedness without sorrow (ἀλύπιος μακαριότης) ... who went up on a pillar, which was the plinth of a pagan statue (κίων ξοάνου ἑλληνικοῦ ἀφίδρυμα τυγχάνων)."[242]

Thus the biographer of Luke is praising Alypius by making reference to the literal meaning of his name, which according to him characterizes Alypius' attitude towards his sufferings perfectly; this seems to be exactly the attribute that Alypius' anonymous biographer tries to highlight through the quotations from the Book of Job: while Alypius was without grief and sorrow, under the immense weight of his torments Job did not surrender, but he grieved. While neither the anonymous biographer, nor the *Life* from the Metaphrastic *Menologion* use the adjective, Neophytos inserts it in the very incipit of his short *encomium*.[243]

Yet, although the stylite is linked to Job in both accounts, the Metaphrastic one and the one by Antonius, nothing similar to the 'supra-Job' idea comes up in any other account about the stylites. Accordingly, the question remains whether the figure of Job was relevant only in the monastic *milieu* from which, most probably, the author of the first *Life* came, especially since the superiority of Alypius, his spiritual guide, served the edifying purpose of the biography better with his *philoponia* as compared to that of Job. Is it plausible that Job's significance did not make sense within the imperial (urban *par excellence)* milieu of Symeon Metaphrastes' team and Antonius, and, consequently, the occurrences of his name were reduced? It is possible that the correspondence between the biblical paragon of endurance and a stylite was perceived as being too common, since the hero's superiority is not accentuated through a rhetorical comparison with Job in other stylite biographies either. The anonymous biographer quotes those biblical *loci* that display the instances when Jobs is grieving by cursing the day when he was born in order to show by contrast the serene attitude that Alypius had during the entire time he benevolently subdued himself to the sufferance.

[242] Delehaye, 198, 3-7.
[243] According to Neophytos, Alypius is "the absolute heir of the eternal life, which causes no grief" (ὁ ἀλήκτου καὶ ἀλύπου ζωῆς ἀτεχνῶς κληρονόμος); Delehaye, 188, 6-7.

Alypius' very name carries symbolical weight since it conveys this virtue: enduring "without grief" (ἄλυπος). The anonymous biographer calls him by the names attributed to those who are blessed by Christ in the *Makarismoi:* [244] Alypius is "the peacemaker who rejoices (εἰρηνοποιὸς χαίρων), and the one who rejoices (χαίρων) in the poverty in spirit (πτωχεία πνεύματος) and in persecutions (διωγμοί), just us the one who will inherit (κληρονομήσει) the Kingdom of God, and he was blessed (μακάριος)." [245] As one can see the idea encapsulated by ἄλυπος ("without grief") is echoed by the anonymous biographer through the participial form χαίρων ("rejoicing").

In the further section, I discuss another central element that emerges in the *Life* of any stylite, namely the pillar.

[244] Mt 5:1-11.
[245] Delehaye, 165, 24-25.

Chapter 3 – A pillar saint needs his pillar

The distinguishing criterion of this type of stationary saint is permanently keeping the *stasis* while being on the top of a pillar, in almost all the cases made from stone.[246] Fortunately the vestiges of such pillars survive and provide some information regarding the dimension of this specific instrument that the stylites used in their attempts to detach themselves from the earthly existence and join the angelic life.[247] The three main biographies of Alypius do not provide us with specific information regarding the height of the edifice that was to become his everyday residence, except for the suggestion concerning the width of the platform. The anonymous *Life* states that the platform was as wide as not to allow him to lie down, in order to constrain Alypius to keep his *orans* stance.[248] Nevertheless, there is a considerable number of details concerning the pillar that lend importance to Alypius' biographies.

3.1 The 'desert' and the narratives

If, according to *Life* of Antony, he and his followers "made from the desert a city,"[249] "a counter world"[250] well-populated with the five thousand monks that were said to be dwelling in Nitria around the year four hundred[251], Alypius, and even more so Daniel the Stylite, were trying to find another type of 'desert' in which to exercise themselves in their excruciating practice: a 'deserted' place in the urban vicinity. Moreover, the phrase applied to Daniel should be granted to Alypius as well: they both are "saints de banlieu,"[252] and both of these

[246] As one exception, Symeon's first pillar was made from wood. Schachner, "The Archeology of the Stylite:" 337.
[247] On this specific issue, Schachner's "The Archeology of the Stylite" is an indispensable study.
[248] For example, Delehaye, 158, 4-5: "the column's capital (κεφαλίς) was not enough for allowing the holy man to bend even a little or to sit down."
[249] Peter Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 215.
[250] Ibid., 217.
[203] Ibid., 214-215.
[252] M. Kaplan, "L'Hinterland religieux de Constantinople: Moines et saints de banlieu d'après l'hagiographie," in *Constantinople and its Hinterland: Papers from the Twenty-Seventh Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Oxford, April 1993*, ed. Cyril Mango, Gilbert Dagron and Geoffrey Greatrex (Aldershot [etc.]: Variorum, 1995), 191-205.

saints of the urban periphery benefit from this status: most importantly, that they could obtain the means for building their pillar. Daniel erected his pillar very close to the imperial capital and Alypius settled in close proximity to his hometown.

Continuously searching for an isolated place, Alypius finally finds his 'desert,' or even better said, his 'Holy Land' (ἠρεμίαν τινα), in a place filled with very old pagan graves,[253] which combines the attributes that make it a 'true desert,' id est "repelling and frightening" (ἀειδής and φρικτή), in such a way that only the demons against which Alypius has to fight can dwell in it. Metaphrastes adds more, namely that it lacks the basic natural conditions which make the place unsuitable for human settlement: there is no source of water, the soil is infertile, and the place is also populated by beasts:

> All that land was not only desert, but also unpleasant, and barren and empty, and there were no trees, cultivated or uncultivated, but also no bird songs and even no water, for even this is very rare there; furthermore it was savage because of the terror and the fear of demons, and because of some appearances of strange visions. For the place was full of pagan graves, full of beasts and venomous snakes; for these reasons the place was not accessible for any man before him.[254]

Alypius enters the abandoned necropolis, which seems outrageous to those who are accompanying him. By stepping on one of the tombs (τύμβοι) he amplifies the impression he made on his companions, and forces them to run away; they could not stand the courage of the holy man. That tomb had a column (κίων), a grave-marker with a mysterious statue on top. This is the chronology of the events according to the anonymous biography. Despite their agreement upon Alypius' settling in the necropolis, the three *Lives* differ with respect to his journey until the moment when he climbs the funerary column.

According to the narrative of the anonymous biographer, Alypius finds the necropolis, chooses a funerary monument, and makes it his own resting place. After this episode, the bishop includes him in an ecclesiastical embassy, and he departs to Constantinople which he does not reach, because the vision of Euphemia the Martyr convinces him to return to

[253] Τάφοι ἀρχαιότατοι (Delehaye, 153, 13); ἑλληνικοὶ τάφοι (Delehaye, 176, 2).
[254] Delehaye, 175, 31-176, 4. The same description of the deserted place is given by Antonius (Halkin, 187, 28-38).

Adrianoupolis. With the help of his friends, he builds a small church dedicated to her. He aims to elevate himself on a pillar, but he decides to enclose himself instead, so he dwells in a cell built in the same necropolis for two years, fighting the demons. Finally, in his efforts to escape the crowd's tumult, he ascends the pillar.

According to the Metaphrastic *Life*, Alypius' intention of becoming a stylite precedes his arrival at the cemetery. He perceives the danger of ignoring the different degrees of the ascetic practice, so he chooses not to skip steps in his spiritual ascension. Accordingly, in order to accommodate himself to the ascetic tranquility (ἡσυχία), he decides to enclose himself in a small hut (οἰκίσκος τὶς χαμαίζηλος). Thus, the first step is to live as a recluse in a humble cell built directly on the ground.[255] After the description of the 'desert,' in the eighth chapter, the residents of the city see him constructing his hut (καλύβη) on the spot. After a while he takes a step further, and he searches for a higher place; therefore he chooses the grave-marker with the statue on top. Then Alypius accepts the trip to Constantinople acknowledging the spiritual authority of his bishop. From Chalcedon he returns to Adrianoupolis. His acquaintances provide him with the means he needs. Metaphrastes states that the events which follow Alypius' entrance in the cemetery are a *retardatio* of the narrative, because the narrator returns to Alypius' cell, erected on that tomb. After he casts out the demons from the deserted cemetery, the multitude of those coming to see him makes him decide to mount the column.

In comparison, Antonius does not follow the same three-stage process. In his *Life*, like in the anonymous *Life*, first, Alypius encloses himself in a deserted place.[256] Incapable to find his 'desert' outside his homeland, he seeks for a place appropriate for the true philosophy (φιλοσοφία) in the city's proximity. Just as in the Metaphrastic version, Alypius is aware that if he does not follow the right way to fulfill his desire of becoming a stylite, he risks harming

[255] Chapter 7.
[256] Chapter 11 (Halkin 186, 1-187, 38).

his soul. The "elders' advices" from the anonymous biography[257] are not mentioned, but Alypius learns the ascetic norms or customs (τὰ ἤθη). In spite of the similarity with the account by Metaphrastes, there is no intermediate stage between the enclosure and the pillar in Antonius's narrative.

In the following, I will discuss this significant episode, first by analysing in detail the way in which Alypius uses the funerary column in the three texts. The third part of this chapter will focus on the significance attributed to the column.

3.2 The funerary column

3.2.1 Praising, using, and abusing the funerary column[258]

The biographer of the earliest *Life* does not provide a detailed description of the grave-marker. The only descriptive element is his mention of Alypius' youth which allows him to overthrow the statue. The silence of this anonymous biographer concerning the effort made by Alypius to climb on top of the column in order to reach the statue may indicate that the column's height was not an obstacle for him; i.e. that the column was short. Metaphrastes had the same view, and describes *verbatim* the dimension of the funerary column as short.[259]

On the other hand, in his version, Antonius offers what may be called an *ekphrasis*;[260] he makes the climbing scene more vivid, by offering more details. Antonius states that the column was delightfully embellished with astonishing details, however, this was not the reason for which the stylite chose it from all the other columns which abounded in the

[257] Συμβουλίαις γερώντων ὁδηγηθείς in Delehaye, 156, 34.
[258] Part of the title originates from Troels Myrup Kristensen, "Using and Abusing Images in Late Antiquity (and Beyond): Column Monuments as Topoi of Idolatry," in *Using Images in Late Antiquity*, ed. Stine Birk, Troels Myrup Kristensen, Birte Poulsen, and Paolo Liverani (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2014), 268-82.
[259] Κίων βραχύς in Delehaye, 176, 23.
[260] The definition of *ekphraseis*, the rhetorical means often contained within the *encomium*, given by the authors of *Progymnasmata* collections, with some variation, is: "a descriptive speech which brings the thing shown vividly before the eyes" (*sub oculos subiectio*). Ruth Webb, *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), 51; 49-56 (for a broader discussion of the definitions given by the manuals of *Progymnasmata*).

cemetery. The statue that the column had on top was no less artfully carved. According to his programmatic approach to rewriting, Antonius brings in a scriptural reference even to the way in which Alypius is capable to ascend the column. Alypius needs strength and agility to claim the peak of the column, not just to remove the superb statue like in the anonymous *Life* and in the one of Metaphrastes; this is immediately provided by God who makes his feet as agile as those of a deer.[261] If Alypius needed divine help in order to make himself stand on the column, it means that, in Antonius view, the column was of significant height. Neophytos the Recluse also amplifies the dimensions of the column: it was very high.[262] The attitude that Alypius has towards the stele is friendly, he embraces it as he would greet an intimate friend. According to the anonymous biographer, Alypius appreciates the monument as a tomb (τάφος) and a grave-marker (τάφου σημεῖον), and he solemnly proclaims it as his new permanent residence: "I have chosen this dwelling-place here for the eternal rest."[263] As it has already been stated, this sentence has high symbolic value: by assuming the elevation on the column as his eternal rest, Alypius makes his choice of dwelling on the column to be equivalent with living the life to come already while in this world.

But in order to use it, Alypius has to alter the pillar by 'abusing' it: he overthrows the massive statue and substitutes it with a Cross and, in the secondary versions (MSS A+B, and subsequently, the Metaphrastic version), also with an icon, an "image of the Lord." This last element will be the in focus of the next section.

2.2.2 The cross and the icon

The "image" (εἰκών) referred to any type of representation of Christ or saints made on or of any kind of material, such as parchment, wooden panel or wood, cloth, metal, fresco or

[261] Ps 18:33; chapter 13.
[262] Κίων μακρότατος in Deleahye, 190, 13-14.
[263] Delehaye, 154, 8-16. Amy Papalexandrou's claim, that "Alypius does not recognize the monument as a *stele* (sic!), but he admires it" seems unjustifiable (Amy Papalexandrou, "Memory Tattered and Torn: Spolia in the Heartland of Byzantine Hellenism," in *Archaeologies of Memory*, ed. Ruth M. Van Dyke, Susan E. Alcock (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2003), 73).

mosaic.[264] Besides the accusation of idolatry formulated by the Jews, the veneration of the Cross was never debated. On the other hand, the controversies around the icons remained alive from 726, when Leo III (717-741) proclaimed the removal of all the representations of Christ and of the saints from public display, until 843, when the Council of Constantinople put an end to the Byzantine iconoclasm.

It would not be surprising if the icon was a later insertion in the *Life*, particularly because it is not present in all three manuscripts of the anonymous *Life*. In their study on Byzantine iconoclasm, Brubaker and Haldon claim that, during the ninth century, after the *iconodouloi* prevailed, they consistently rewrote previous hagiographical writings; [265] therefore, one may assume that the *iconodouloi* inserted evidence of icon worshipping, in order to further legitimate their doctrine.[266] Certainly, in order to have the icon element in a saint's *Life*, one would expect that the biography was rewritten after the iconoclastic controversies, and this might be the case of Alypius' anonymous *Life*.

The icon mentioned only once is in contrast with the importance given to the cult of the saints. If the way in which Alypius' body is treated as a relic immediately after his death is not unexpected, the essential contribution to Alypius' spiritual progress attributed to the holy martyr Euphemia is obvious; she receives recognition for her direct guidance by the church consecrated to her name. Directly linked to Euphemia there are two anonymous saints that

[264] *Byzantine Defenders of Images: Eight Saints' Lives in English Translation*, ed. Alice-Mary Talbot (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1988), viii. One of the narratives translated within this volume includes a stylite living during the iconoclastic period: "Life of Sts. David, Symeon, and George of Lesbos," trans. Dorothy Abrahamse, and Douglas Domingo-Forasté, in *Byzantine Defenders of Images*, 143-241). In this narrative, Symeon (764/5-844/5) is living as a stylite until the iconoclast bishop tries to set his pillar on fire. In *Byzantine Defenders of Images*, 144.

[265] Leslie Brubaker, and John F. Haldon, *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era (c. 680-850): The Sources; An Annotated Survey* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), 201.

[266] There seems to be no hard evidence for the widespread public veneration of icons before iconoclasm. On this issue, see L. Brubaker, "Icons Before Iconoclasm?" In *Morfologie sociali e culturali in Europa fra tarda Antichità e alto Medioevo II*. *Settimane di Studio* 45 (Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1998), 1215–54. Despite the existence of a real theological debate on the issue, the ideological, and not religious, reasons for the crisis have been convincingly emphasized.

show him the perimeter of the soon to be erected church, and whose relic will be found and placed in the narthex of the same church.[267]

Coming back to the locus where the text edited by Delehaye refers to the icon, if this iconophile element is authentic, it would rather indicate that the author lived during or even after the Iconoclast period, i.e. in the second half of the eighth, or in the ninth century. Yet, it is conspicuous that the motif is missing from a crucial passage, as transmitted by the MS C, judged as inferior by Delehaye. A comparison of the two variants reveals this idea:

Anonymous *Life*, version of MSS A and B, Delehaye, 154, 16-26	Idem, version of MS C
[…] he ran back to his city and, having taken an icon of the Lord, a cross and an iron lever, he immediately came back and placed the lever under the lion [that was on the top of the column] – for it was very bulky and heavy. Moaning and laboring with the lever, at great difficulty he managed to throw the statue to the ground – for the blessed man was strong, in the flower of his youth. He replaces it and erects in its place the really existing and most powerful sign of the living, the trophy of the Cross, as well as the likeness of the Lord, so that now the hostile army of the Tyrant may be mocked upon and ridiculed without any fear, due to the working of the divine powers.	[…] he ran back to his city. Having taken a cross and an iron lever and coming back immediately, he placed the lever under the lion [that was on the top of the column] – for it was very bulky and heavy. Moaning and laboring with the lever, at great difficulty he managed to throw the statue to the ground – for the blessed man was strong, in the flower of his youth. He replaces it and erects in its place the trophy of the Cross, which is such powerful a sign that now the army[268] of the Tyrant may be mocked upon and ridiculed without any fear, due to the working of the divine powers.

This comparison of the two versions clearly shows that, in the version of MS C, which is also much simpler and clearer, the icon of Christ is entirely missing. Instead, the whole story is built on the literary motif of the opposition of an original funerary statue representing a kind of an idol-chimaera, a *tauroleon* to the Cross of Christ's Passion, which indicates the saint's future perseverant passion on the column; the column itself represents Christ himself being the cornerstone of the Church. A careful philological comparison of the two texts can easily demonstrate that the version of MS C is not a posterior simplification of the other version, but it is rather the version of MSS A and B, which is a later amplification, leaving some loose

[267] Anonymous *Life*, chapter 9: ἱεροπρεπεῖς ("beseeming a saint", hence having the appearance of saints); Metaphrastic *Life*, chapter 9: ἐν ἱερέων σχήματι ("wearing the garments of saints"). There is another apparition, but the biographer remains silent about the identity of the one who comforts Alypius. However, it seems to be Christ himself.

[268] Literally, the "she-warrior" (πολεμίστρ<ι>α), meaning "army".

ends in the text, such as a confusion between the singular of sign (σημείωσιν) and the plural of the two objects erected by Alypius on the column, the cross and the icon (τὸ τρόπαιον τοῦ σταυροῦ καὶ τὸ τοῦ κυρίου ὁμοίωμα). Apparently, the long insertion of this string has also destroyed the original connection of the two clauses indicated by the corresponding pair of pronominal adverbs οὕτως ... ὅπως ("which is *such* powerful a sign *that* now the army of the Tyrant may be mocked upon"); it also inspired the redactor to change οὕτως to ὄντως and add another long string of supplement, so that the original simple "such powerful a sign" finally became "the really existing and most powerful sign of the living." Thus, an analysis of this crucial passage in the two versions shows beyond much reasonable doubt that the iconophile version of MSS A and B is a later redaction, while the version of MS C is much closer to the original. The artificiality of the inclusion of an icon here is also shown by the fact that, while the cross plays an important role in the narrative and comes back several times, there is no role attributed to the icon, and it is mentioned only at this place (e.g. when the fame of the prestige that Alypius acquired reaches the imperial palace, the empress asks him only for the cross that he had on the very top of his pillar).

This recognition, on the one hand, removes the difficulty that the supposed iconophile tendency of the *Life* would prompt a later dating, incoherent with the other elements that consistently indicate a seventh-century dating and, on the other hand, shows once more that Delahaye was wrong in choosing the standard version of MSS A and B for establishing the text of the *Life*, while relegating the odd version of MS C to his apparatus.

3.3. The pillar: the terminology

In this section I will discuss the terms describing the pillar and its structure. The pillar is first described in chapter 13:

> He ascends the column (ἐπὶ τῷ κίονι), making himself a pillar (στηλώσας), surrounding himself with a few wooden planks (σανίδες) at the top of the column (τῇ κεφαλίδι τοῦ στύλου), which is

> not sufficient even to allow the holy man to lie down or sit a little, but he was continuously standing on it as if, by his nature, he was a bronze statue (ἀνδριὰς ... χαλκοῦς). [269]

It results that κίων and στύλος are interchangeably in the anonymous *Life.* In addition to the two terms, Antonius also uses the term στήλη ("stele") for the column on which Alypius elevated himself in the cemetery. Three times στήλη refers to Alypius' column specifically, and only once funerary monuments in general.[270] Although κίων and στήλη are used in the same passage about the funerary monument, κίων is also used with reference to the monuments outside the necropolis. The active verb used to describe the practice of the *stasis* (στάσις) is στηλόω ("make to stand as a pillar," hence "motionless");[271] in the anonymous *Life*, MS A has the lection στυλώσας (στυλόω – "prop or stand with pillars").[272]

The funerary column is altered, and equipped with a κλουβός, "coop, cell,"[273] which remains permanently on the platform of the pillar. In the passage where Alypius is shown receiving the heavenly light, κλουβός is linked to the cross: the cross formerly brought by Alypius from the city was fitted together with the planks of the coop.[274] In the Metaphrastic the phrase is reformulated: "the cross from the top of the cell."[275] The pillar has also a roof (στέγη)[276] made of planks, whose demolition by Alypius made such a noise that it alarmed Alypius' mother. The same passage also has περίφραγμα, a "round-fenced enclosure," a synonym for κλουβός.

According to the Metaphrastic *Life*, besides the demolition of the planks that formed the roof of the cage, the walls surrounding the same platform (κύκλῳ σανίδες) were destroyed by the stones thrown by demons in the previous night.[277] This means that the roof

[269] Delehaye, 158, 4-6.
[270] Halkin, 190, 14, 38; 191, 43, 44; 192, 9; also in the *encomium* by Nephytos the Recluse.
[271] Lampe. *s.v.*
[272] Delehaye, 158, 4. The Metaphrastic *Life* has only στηλώσας; in Delehaye, 179, 25.
[273] Κλουβός is a later form for κλωβός – "cage" (LSJ, *s.v.*), or "coop", (Lampe, *s.v.*). Metaphrastes uses the antiquated form.
[274] Delehaye, 164, 20: ὁ σταυρός ... ταῖς σανίσι συμπεπηγώς τοῦ κλοῦβου.
[275] Ἐπ' ἄκρου τοῦ κλωβοῦ σταυρός (Delehaye, 184, 31).
[276] LSJ, *s.v.*: "roofed chamber."
[277] Delehaye, 180, 13-14.

and the walls were two independent structures, that is to say the roof could stand without the walls.

In order to accommodate Alypius, the columnar "stele" must have been flat-topped, similarly to a preserved "stele" surmounted by two sphinxes.[278]

3.3.1 The significance of the pillar

The anonymous biographer makes Alypius praise the column, embrace it and treat it like an animate friend, name her a stone ignored until the moment he chose it;[279] this facilitates the analogy with the stone initially rejected, but which finally became the cornerstone from the Ps 118: 22-23. Christ described Himself as the true cornerstone.[280] Alypius claims the monument as the place of his eternal rest (εἰς αἰωνίαν ἀνάπαυσιν). Although not expressed literally, the idea of the daily death is present, since Alypius does not decide to make this ancient pagan tomb his dwelling place after his death, but his permanent house during his spiritual journey to the achievement of the angelic life. In the process of rewriting, Metaphrastes accentuates the idea of the symbolic death: "[…] for the reason that first you were a tomb for the dead one, now you will be fit as a dwelling-place for me, the one who assumes the voluntary mortification/death for it [i.e. the chief-cornerstone]."[281]

Antonius goes beyond Metaphrastes' intervention by finding more links to the biblical narrative and providing new connotations with the pillar. In contrast with the other two *Lives,* Antonius suppresses Alypius' praise of the monument, but he elaborates the eulogy addressed to the pillar. Alypius, the rational statue, replaces the inanimate representations of the

[278] "Funerary Stele (Shaft) Surmounted by Two Sphinxes [Cypriot; Said to be from the Necropolis at Golgoi] (74.51.2499)," in *Heilbrunn Timeline of Art History* (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2000) http://www.metmuseum.org/toah/works-of-art/74.51.2499 (accessed 05.04.2015); "Grave stele of a youth and a little girl [Greek, Attic] (11.185a-c,f,g)," in *Heilbrunn Timeline of Art History* (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2000), http://www.metmuseum.org/toah/works-of-art/11.185a-c,f,g (accessed 05.04.2015). It's as high as 3, 65 m.
[279] Delehaye, 154, 8-14.
[280] Eph 2: 20.
[281] Delehaye, 176, 27-29. The chief-cornerstone, Christ, is designated with the exact term from Ephes. 2:20 (ἀκρογωνιαῖος ... λίθος).

ludicrous and impassionate gods (Apis, Serapis, Dionysos, and Apollo). The motif of the cornerstone is replaced by the reference to the ladder used by the citizen of heaven (ἀνὴρ οὐρανοπολίτης) in his ascension, which joins the earth to the skies; moreover, the pillar is the altar carrying a "spiritual burnt-offering" consumed by both the cold and the heat. The image of the ladder recurs, this time pointing to the Old Testament figure of Jacob. The pillar is associated with the stone which Jacob set up as a pillar, a mark for the place where he received the prophetic dream, and which he also consecrated by pouring oil on it.[282] The most significant correlation is the one made with the ladder used by the angels in their two-way movement. With this association, Antonius gives an interpretation of the biblical passage itself. Thus, the angels' ascent and descent on the ladder is translated into intercession, by connecting the passage in the Genesis to another one in the Epistle to the Hebrews: the angels, "ministering spirits," take people's confessions, bring them to God, and finally return to bring them forgiveness.[283]

In conclusion, Alypius chooses the abandoned necropolis as his resting place, where he will live first as a recluse and then as a stylite for the rest of his life. Beyond the symbolic connotation of a cemetery, the paragon of the abandoned pagan cults, a place now infested with demons, it also provides the material means needed by Alypius: a columnar grave-marker will be transformed into a habitable pillar, and the graves will presumably also supply the materials for building the church consecrated to St. Euphemia. The demolition of the artfully carved statue marks the beginning of a process which will end with purifying the place by Christianizing and transforming it into an ascetic *milieu*.

[282] Gn 28.
[283] Heb 1:14. Halkin, 190, 28-191, 60.

Chapter 4 – Monastic community and ascetic routine

In this chapter I will detail the passages in which the earliest biographer recounts the beginning of the monastic community around Alypius, highlighting at the same time those aspects that deserve more attention. Since the Metaphrastic redaction follows the older narrative, I will consider the latter only when it adds a relevant detail, with the mention that the additions reflect Metaphrastes' view and his efforts to make the account less ambiguous and more pleasant to listen to.

Next, this chapter aims to answer to the question of which three types of cenobitic establishments traditionally referred to in scholarship[284] does the community gathered around Alypius belong to? Taking into consideration the details given by the biographer, I will examine if the monastery can be considered a "double monastery," as it has been suggested in the literature.[285] The last part of the chapter will consist of a brief analysis of a miraculous event which happened to Alypius himself. I will demonstrate that a proper interpretation of a certain phrase provides the key for the interpretation of the entire passage.

[284] In his article, "Double Monasticism in the Greek East Fourth through Eighth Century," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 6, no. 2 (1998): 269-312, Daniel Stramara defines three types of cenobitic establishments that emerged in the fourth-century Near East. In this thesis I will follow this theoretical basis: "Mixed monasteries" were those communities in which monks and nuns cohabitated. This criterion differentiates them and the so-called "double monasteries," which had distinct quarters for monks and nuns, but a common church, where they worshipped together. Stramara generalizes the use of this terminology for the fourth-century establishments, even though, as he himself explains, "duplex monasterium" / διπλοῦν μοναστήριον appears in sources only starting from the sixth century on. Being aware of the shortcomings, but having no better terminology yet, I will also use the phrase "double monastery." The third category, "twin monasteries," denote two independent communities. It has to be mentioned that Stratama, although in his brief notice of Alypius' monastery he does not question the fact that Alypius' death occurred during Heraclius reign, is the only one who takes into consideration that the stylite must have been active while Justinian was on the imperial throne; in Stramara, "Double Monasticism," 312, note 233.

[285] Stramara, "Double Monasticism," 303. In fact, Stramara does not provide examples for a "twin monastery", but he speaks *in extenso* about Macrina's monastery. Michel Kaplan says that there was a monastery for nuns, and one for monks. (Kaplan, "L'Espace et le sacré," 209). Hatlie does not classify the two communities, and limits his discussion to the looseness of the monastic regulations that can be gleaned from the biography. (Hatlie, *Monks and Monasteries of Constantinople*, 194-96).

4.1 The ascetic community according to the *Life*

According to the anonymous biography, the monastic community starts up around Alypius when his prestige becomes high enough to attract souls in search of repentance. The text does not mention the names of the male ascetics who lived around Alypius but clearly specifies from the beginning that both men and women started to approach Alypius.[286]

Alypius' mother was already living in a tent (σκήνη) near her son's pillar. The first disciple to join her is Euphemia, an illustrious woman of Adrianoupolis who abandons her family and encloses herself (ἐγκατακλείω) near the column. Brought there by the love (φίλτρον) for God, another member of the community is Euboule, who remained a widow[287] and, similarly to Euphemia, seems to have belonged to the higher social strata of the urban society.[288] She is to become the first abbess (πρώτη ... ἡγουμενεύσασα) of the house of the women (γυναικεῖος οἶκος). Her rank corresponds to her virtuous life, which enables her to engage in fighting demons for many hours at the time of her midnight prayers. Thus, this detail suggests that she is comparable to Alypius. The third woman who renounces her old way of life for the sake of monasticism is Maria, Alypius' sister, who is followed by many other women from many places. Invoking the irrelevance of the gender distinction in front of God and guaranteeing him that they will be obedient, the women implore Alypius not to be scared by them and to become their spiritual guide. The biographer inserts the female ascetics' collective address to Alypius. Another argument the women bring in their persuasive effort is their maturity shown by their experience of the pleasures and all other

[286] Chapters 17-18 (Delehaye, 161, 16-163, 18).
[287] Delehaye, 161, 17-25. Both the name Euboule and her widowhood are pieces of information provided by MS C. MSS A+B have Euboula, while the widowhood is there in both MSS B+C.
[288] Delehaye, 161, 23-25: ἥτις καὶ ταύτη ἀπὸ βίου [ἄκρου] καὶ δόξης πολλῆς χηρεύσασα εἰς τὸν κατ΄ ἀρετὴν βίον ἐξέλαμψεν – "who, becoming a widow, also shined forth from an [aristocratic] life and much glory to the virtuous life" (according to the version of MS C with the addition of ἄκρου from A+B).

passions. They already have become brides of the good Lover (ὁ καλὸς ἐραστής), Christ.[289] Alypius is impressed and convinced by their proposal (πρόθεσις; "offering"). Thus, he utters a blessing prayer and accepts their request. Consequently, two pure houses (εὐαγεῖς οἴκοι) are built, and they are separated one from another in such a way that the female ascetics may not be seen by the male monks. The biographer clearly states that Alypius regulated this through "rule and commandment" (κανόνα καὶ ἐντολήν), and the nuns did not break this rule even when Alypius had granted them the permission and blessing to meet their families in some exceptional circumstances, such as the funeral of one of their relatives. In this way, the biographer wants to assure his audience of their unshaken strictness.

Following this, in the nineteenth chapter Alypius must deal with another challenge: his mother does not accept the habit of the nuns (σχῆμα τῶν μοναστριῶν), even though she followed the same ascetic routine and the same rule (κανών) as the nuns. She protests arguing that there is no difference between being a nun (μονάστρια) and serving as a deaconess (ἡ διάκονος). It is difficult to understand what this remark means – most probably she considered the monastic vocation identical to bearing a clerical rank which she wanted to avoid. However, a vision (θεία τις ἀποκάλυψις) that she has during her sleep convinces her to request the monastic garment from his son: in her vision she hears the holy women singing a divine chant in harmony (τῇ συμφωνίᾳ ... θεῖα μέλη), and this makes her desire to join them in praising. Willing to do so, the guardian of the door prevents her from entering the house because of her lack of the ascetic garment (τοῦ ἀσκητικοῦ σχήματος). When she wakes up, she tells Alypius about the vision falling upon her knees before him and asking him to give her the *schema*. He accepts her request, so she joins the choir of the other women in praising God, which means that she enters the house of the nuns.[290]

[289] Τοῦτον ἡμᾶς τὸν καλὸν ἐραστὴν νυμφευθῆναι πίστευσον, with the variant reading τούτῳ ἡμᾶς τῷ καλῷ ἐραστῇ (MS C).
[290] According to the Metaphrastic text, she became in communion in this last issue, the garment (Καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν κοινωνοῦσα ἦν καὶ τοῦ σχήματος; Delehaye, 183, 24-25).

Further, the twentieth chapter speaks again about the monastic rules left by Alypius.[291] The idea that the female and the male ascetics must dwell apart is emphasized once more through the use of two adverbs (ἰδίᾳ and χωρίς).[292] They must not break this commandment but must live as genuine brothers and sisters in Christ keeping their mutual love. Alypius left also a rule concerning the monastic office: the daily routine included chanting in unison seven times during the night and during the day (ὁμοφώνως ... νύκτωρ τε καὶ μεθ' ἡμέραν ἑπτάκις αἰνεῖν).

Following this, Alypius is described as standing on the top his pillar with his arms stretched towards the sky while taking part in the service. Those who participate in the psalmody constitute three groups (διὰ τριῶν ταγμάτων), perhaps intentionally meant to represent the Trinity whom they were praising (δοξολογεῖν). Next to the column are the recluses who are living under and around the pillar (οἱ παρὰ τῇ βάσει τοῦ στύλου τυγχάνοντες ἐγκλειστοί), the choirs of the multitude of the monks (χοροστασίαι τοῦ πλήθους τῶν μοναχῶν) are apparently singing elsewhere and, at another place (αὖθις ἑτέρωθι) the choirs of the women (αἱ τῶν γυναικῶν). Often the harmony of the chants made passers-by forget about their businesses and stay to listen to their psalmody.[293]

4.2. Alypius' 'monastic rules:' double monastery or two monasteries?

Can the texts be used to ascertain that Alypius' community was a double monastery? Daniel Stramara suggested that it was so but did not provide an argument for this position.[294] In the next subchapter I will challenge this assumption, based on the text of the *Life*. If, indeed, Alypius' monastic establishment was not a double monastery, was it a twin monastery instead?

[291] Chapter 20 in Delehaye, 163, 19-164, 4.
[292] Metaphrastes has ἄμικτος in Delehaye, 183, 29.
[293] Compared in the Metaphrastic *Life* with the chant of the sirens. (Delehaye, 184, 12-13).
[294] Stramara, "Double Monasticism," 303.

Before proceeding to an extensive analysis of the *Life*, the definition of the characteristics of a double monastery is in order. This terminology has been used in sources referring to such monasteries only starting with the sixth century but, since the nineteenth century, scholars have projected this concept onto earlier communities, based on a shared characteristic: the seclusion of monks and nuns. Mary Bateson,[295] Jules Pargoire,[296] Constance Stoney,[297] and Stephan Hilpisch,[298] defined double monasteries in this way more than 70 years before Daniel Stramara. Curiously, a long gap occured in scholarship after the publication of Stephan Hilpisch's study. In 1998, Daniel Stramara defined double monasteries by quoting Pargoire in translation:

> The first [i.e. a double monastery] simultaneously houses a community of men and a community of women, both communities placed under the governance of the same person, but separated one from the other. In the case of the second [i.e. a mixed monastery], men and women live together.[299]

Applying this basic characterization, the monastic community of Alypius is a double monastery, since there are two separate dwelling places for men and women, and they both seem to be subjected to Alypius' authority. However, a second distinction is necessary between a mixed monastery and twin monasteries, which refer to two independent monasteries situated in proximity.[300]

The use of terminology may shed light on this problem. A typical example for double monasteries in scholarship is the one led by Macrina at the end of the fourth century in Annisa (Cappadocia). In his *Asketikon*, inspired by the organization of this monastery, where he himself spent several years as a recluse, Basil of Caesarea referred to any cenobitic

[295] Mary Bateson, "Origin and Early History of Double Monasteries," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* (*New Series)* 13 (1899): 137-41.
[296] Jules Pargoire, "Les Monastères doubles chez les byzantins," *Echos d'Orient*, 56 (1906): 21-25.
[297] Constance Stoney, *Early Double Monasteries* (Cambridge: Deighton, 1915), http://archive.org/details/earlydoublemonas24633gut (accessed 26.09.2012).
[298] Stephan Hilpisch, *Die Doppelklöster: Entstehung und Organisation* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1928).
[299] Jules Pargoire, "Les Monastères doubles chez les Byzantins :" 21. Translation in Stramara, "Double Monasticism:" 271.
[300] Jean Leclercq, "Feminine Monasticism in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries," in *The Continuing Quest for God: Monastic Spirituality in Tradition and Transition*, ed. William Skudlarek (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1982), 165. Also Stramara, "Double Monasticism:" 271.

establishment as an ἀδελφότης of the ones seeking God. On the other hand, when describing the Annisa community, in the *Life of Macrina*, Gregory of Nyssa mentions that it was an ἀδελφότης, which included a section for women (ἡ γυναικωνῖτις; ὁ παρθενών), and another one for the male ascetics (ὁ ἀνδρών), with a single church (ἡ ἐκκλησία) where nuns and monks worshipped together, but in different choirs. In addition, monks and nuns took their meals separately.[301]

Now the first question is whether the terminology used in Alypius' *Life* is Basilian? It is definitely so, despite the differences between the hagiography and *Asketica* genres. Although the term ἀδελφότης as such does not occur in the *Life*, the anonymous author seems to think of this concept when Alypius, after carefully separating the monks and the nuns says the following:

> "In this way the blessed one has prepared the men and the women to dwell alone and separated from each other but, *as true brothers and sisters according to Christ* (ὡς γνησίους κατὰ Χριστὸν ἀδελφοὺς) not to differ from each other in anything to their relationship with God, and the rest of the conduct of their life ..."[302]

The two houses are called οἴκοι, and this may be the current term for the living spaces. As Basil's *Rules* were widely known, it seems unreasonable to suggest that the two centuries which separate the *Rules* from the time of Alypius are responsible for the lack of precision regarding the vocabulary used in the *Life*, instead it is more likely due to the non-technical character of the *Life*, as compared to the *Asketika* genre.

In the entire *Life* there is neither any mention of contact, nor any indication that the two communities gathered in the church dedicated to the martyr Euphemia. How did they all celebrate the Eucharist, or other services they were supposed to celebrate together if the women never showed themselves to the male ascetics (not even to their male relatives, even though they received Alypius' consent, as the biographer says)? Even the scene in which

[301] For a thorough discussion about the organization of the monastery in Annisa see Anna Silvas, *The Asketikon of St Basil the Great* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 20-21.
[302] Delehaye, 163, 19-22.

Alypius is singing, first with the recluses from the basis of his pillar, followed by the men, and finally by the women does not indicate any such contact. All that can be gathered from this narrative is that the same prayers were said at the same time by the three communities, namely the recluses, the monks and the nuns.

Another thing is that Euboule, the first abbess (ἡγεμονεύσασα) of the women's house, proves her spiritual magnitude by her ability to fight a demon visibly while she is incensing according to *her* custom,[303] and the demon tries to prevent her from finishing the mid-night prayers, performed according to the custom. According to the narrative, there is a clear difference between the two "customs" (ἤθη): the mid-night prayers are prescribed by the (monastic) custom, as part of the hours of prayers. On the other hand, censing is Euboule's custom. Alypius has also a custom: the same term is used when it is recounted how he was weeping in the period of the year when the Passions of Christ were celebrated in the Holy Week.[304]

What one may find also problematic is that Euboule becomes the first *hegoumenissa* of the women' house. Did Alypius' monastery also have an abbot? Is the title given to her (this participle form – ἡγεμονεύσασα) usually applied to the one who led the community of the nuns under the authority of an abbot? During the time Alypius was guarding them all from above, he was the spiritual guide for both communities. Were the two monastic communities administered by an abbot and an abbess, while the third community, that of the recluses, was under Alypius' direct guidance?

The twentieth chapter makes it clear that this was indeed the structure of the three communities. Here, the monks and nuns are defined as being under obedience according to the traditional doctrine. For being under obedience they needed superiors who were in charge

[303] Delehaye, 161, 19-23. Also in the Metaphrastic *Life*: Delehaye, 182, 23-26.
[304] Delehaye, 165, 28-33.

of supervising their daily life, which Alypius, who according to the *Life* never left his column, would have been unable to do.

There is no special mention in the *Life* of any of the monks or their abbot. The biographer gives all the emphasis to the females: beginning with Alypius' mother who unconditionally supports his ascetic aspiration, to his sister, who abandons her family and comes to live in the monastery. At first, Alypius' mother's prominent place in the narrative is not exceptional: her husband dies when Alypius was a child, and she follows him in his 'desert' taking care of all his needs. However, why the biographer gives only the names of the nuns is unclear. The single male ascetic the biographer mentions is an unnamed recluse whose proximity to the pillar allows him to see Alypius giving away his garment (χιτών) to a beggar and offer a long praise about Alypius' perseverance being superior to even Job's.[305]

One may notice that the two biographers who mention the monastic establishment which Alypius starts (the earliest *Life* and the one by Metaphrastes) do not give too much information, thus the accounts are not very specific on this issue. To begin with, the most strongly emphasized detail is one rule Alypius imposes over the ascetics, namely, that he asks the nuns to avoid any contact with the males whatsoever. Another one is the daily praise given to God in seven distinct moments. Peter Hatlie rightly observes by comparing these few commandments with the ones imposed by a contemporary of Alypius, Theodore of Sykeon, on the ascetics under his authority, that Alypius' ascetics may have had a certain liberty, as Alypius relies on some general principles taken from the oral ascetic tradition. This led Hatlie to the conclusion that one can see "the seriousness with which he [i.e. Theodore] took his role as spiritual father and teacher."[306] The hypothesis maintaining that the rules were received by tradition is valid also for Alypius himself: according to such customs he

[305] Delehaye, 166, 3-12.
[306] Hatlie, *Monks and Monasteries of Constantinople*, 195. Also, Hatlie notes that Alypius' contemporary stylite in Syria, Symeon the Younger, did write a set of rules for his monastic community.

does not ascend on the pillar immediately, but only after a preparation period of two years of living as a recluse.[307]

Another relevant fact is that according to the *Life*, Alypius accepts to become the spiritual authority of the community only after he was asked by the women who came to him. It may be inferred from the narrative that for a while they were recluses in the vicinity of his pillar – although this is explicitly stated only about Euphemia. Thus, in a way, Alypius is dealing with a phenomenon that his reputation started, and he only brings it within the boundaries of the monastic practice and customs. The female renouncers address Alypius as one, insisting to be accepted by him, but after the stylite accepts their request he decrees that two houses are to be built. This suggests that, again according to the biographer, either there were also men who dwelled around his pillar (but they are ignored by the biographer), or the women were the first to become enclosed. Hence Alypius' order shows foresight, anticipating that males will soon desire to join the community too, and consequently two distinct houses would be necessary.

Certainly, the second assumption that there were no male renouncers is improbable; however, they are not included in the narrative because the biographer wanted to emphasize what one may call the 'feminine element.' In the part of the biography speaking about the monastery, besides the fact that Alypius replies to the women's supplication with an intercession triggered by their confession, this prominence is reflected by the episode about his mother turning down the monastic garment.

Those monasteries in which the monks and nuns lived in a cenobitic regime were the object of official legal dispositions. Justinian was concerned by the continuous spread of this kind of monasteries and attempted to regulate this phenomenon. In a law issued in 529 he outlaws the custom of men cohabitating with women in the monastic centers, and stipulates

[307] Indeed Symeon the Elder did the same (Harvey, "The Sense of a stylite:" 376).

that the men and women ascetics should be segregated from each other.[308] The same law is reissued in a similar form as a decree from 539.[309] A *novella* from 543 is stating once more the interdiction of the cenobitic establishments that were accommodating both women and men. This legal disposition is of a particular importance since these monasteries are called "double monasteries," so a phrase is attested here for the first time.[310] At least the first two legal dispositions seem to refer, not to the double monasteries, but rather to the 'mixed monasteries,' in which men and women were cohabitating. The *novella* on the other hand, according to Stramara' opinion, regards the Basilian type of double monasteries as well.[311]

It appears that the material in the *Life* does not allow us to include Alypius's community into the category of double monasteries with a sufficient certainty, neither to say that there were two independent monasteries or twin monasteries, since there remains the third category of ascetics, the recluses.[312]

As further interpretations, the *Life* seems to be written partly to give an account of the strong feminine element around this stylite at a time when double monasteries were not seen positively, which is clear from the legislation concerning this ascetic phenomenon. This is why the strict separation of the monks and the nuns, as well as the nuns' obstinence to resist even the concessions given by Alypius is emphasized so much.

It remains unclear whether the three choirs chanting in unison around the pillar, those of the recluses, the monks and the nuns is in the same space or separate. The way it is described seems to point toward the assumption that the three choirs are chanting separately.

[308] *CI* I.3.43; Stramara, "Double Monasticism:" 308.
[309] Stramara, "Double Monasticism:" 308.
[310] *Novella* 123.36. Stramara, "Double Monasticism:" 308.
[311] Stramara, "Double Monasticism:" 308.
[312] Stramara does not exclude the possibility that the three monasteries constructed around Daniel's pillar after his death might have referred to a 'double' one (Stramara, "Double monasticism:" 310, and note 234). However, in Daniel's *Life* it is said that he accepted that a monastery of monks and strangers would be built (τὸ μοναστήριον τῶν ἀδελφῶν καὶ τῶν ξένων) near his column. (*Life of Daniel*, 57; Delehaye, 56, 2 sqq.). Thus at the time a monastery for the nuns is not mentioned.

If Euboule is *hegoumenissa*, than the monks must have a *hegoumenos*, but the *Life* seems to be unclear on this issue on purpose.

Finally, it is clear that initially there are women and men together among the recluses (see the case of Euphemia), but it remains unclear whether or not this situation persists after the houses are built. The silence of the texts on the issue should be read together with their utterances and that even though the image suggested by the texts is unequivocal, i.e. that they all affirm the complete separation of the male and female element according to the Justinianic legislation, the real situation in Alypius' community must have been more complicated.

Also, the emphasis placed not only on the feminine element, but also the fact that these women are as good ascetics as men, seems to be also related to the Justinianic legislation on double monasteries. Apparently, the biographer had to defend Alypius' practice of accepting female ascetics in his community, hence the overemphasizing of the separation of the two communities. At the same time, the recluses around the pillar most probably included, at least before later regulations, both male and female ascetics, which must have been another problematic issue. It is unclear what happened to Euphemia who started as a recluse: did she become a nun under obedience to Euboule, or did she keep her initial status? In principle recluses had a higher status than monks and nuns, and this makes her entering into the house problematic, although the anonymous biographer shows all the women asking Alypius for his guidance, which means that they received his blessing, the house was built, and all the women became nuns.

4.3 A Possible Structure of the Monastic Complex:

From the information that the *Vita* offers, the following hypotheses may be inferred about the structure of the monastic complex:

1. The establishment was a double monastery, with the two houses arranged so that the monks and the nuns could not see each other. In this case, the houses were probably built

around the cells of the recluses, which were closer to the base of the pillar; the nuns could celebrate the seven Lauds alone, but the question is how they would serve the Eucharist. A potential answer may be that one of the priests in charge with the service of the liturgy was the only monk with whom the nuns had contact. Several services were held outside, since Alypius was singing with the recluses; from this detail, two further hypotheses can be distinguished:

a) The liturgy was also held outside; in this case, both nuns and monks could take part in it simultaneously, without seeing each other, being dispersed around the pillar. The pillar was not thick enough to hide from sight the nuns,[313] but it was surrounded by recluses, and their enclosures were preventing the nuns from seeing the monks.

b) The liturgy was held inside the church. In this case, Alypius did not take part in it, and, most probably, a disciple would bring him the Eucharist (as appears in the *Vita* of Symeon the Elder). But how would the nuns and the monks be situated inside the church, so that the nuns would remain unseen by the monks? Since the architecture of the church would not have allowed for such an arrangement to happen, this scenario is less plausible; however, if this hypothesis stands, Alypius could not sing in the liturgy, except during the other services, which were held outside.

As for the leadership of the community, Alypius was presumably the spiritual authority of both the nuns and the monks through their superiors; the monks most probably had an abbot, since it would have been impossible for Alypius to act as their abbot without descending from his pillar.

2. The establishment included a twin monastery, that is to say one community of nuns and one community of monks, independent from each other, but connected by the spiritual

[313] For the dimensions of some of the pillars see Schachner, "The Archeology of the Stylite:" 341-42.

guidance of Alypius. This hypothesis would fit the detail given by the anonymous account, namely that Euboule was the first abbess of the women.

This hypothesis raises several questions, including what the status of the recluses was and to whom did the church belong. As in the former hypothesis, one might assume that the liturgy was celebrated outside by at least one of the groups. It is, however, more probable that the church belonged to the monks. There are two possible answers regarding the recluses' status:

a) The female recluses may have belonged to the monastery of nuns, while the men recluses belonged to the monastery of monks; in which case, Alypius could have sung with each of the groups and the Eucharist could be given to the recluses by the same monk in charge with its service.

b) The recluses may have had a special status, not belonging to either of the monasteries, but being spiritually connected to Alypius; they might have received food and the Communion from the monk who served the liturgy.

In the conclusion, two questions still remain. First, how would the ascetics sing antiphonally during the same service? Second, did female recluses remain around the pillar even after the rules were given, and if yes, where were their cells situated in relation with those inhabited by the male recluses?

In my opinion, the anonymous biographer does not give enough details for coherent interpretation, and this fact emphasizes the author's apologetic intention. He stresses that Alypius and Euboule had an equal monastic status: they both fought the demons; they also have their own 'customs.' Thus, if Euboule was the abbess of the nuns, it results that Alypius was the abbot of the monks. The only objection that one might have is related to Alypius' status within the monastic hierarchy: had he the right to be an abbot? An answer is provided by the episode in which Alypius' mother asks her son for the *schema*: he would not have had the right to offer it unless he was either a priest, or a bishop. Besides being part of the

monastic practice, this fact may be seen in the *Life* by Antonius, when, at his returning to his motherland, Alypius is shown receiving the monastic garment from the very hands of the bishop, the second Theodore (although not mentioned by his name).[314] This interpretation also fits the previous assumption and the biographer is indeed defending Alypius' monastic community by showing it as a 'genuine' twin monastery, in which the nuns where totally independent by the monks. This would explain why the biographer mentions almost exclusively the 'feminine monastic element:' the presence of the monks was not problematic, but rather the nuns being part of the same community might have been the object of potential accusations, especially in the light of the Justinianic legislation concerning the double monasteries.

[314] Halkin, 185, 34-35.

Conclusions

In this thesis, I aimed to discuss for the first time the biography of Alypius in its entirety, as it is given by the three major redactions of his *Life*: the anonymous version, the Metaphrastic one, and the one by Antonius from Constantinople. By focusing on the major elements present in the narrative, I searched for clues that would allow me to revisit the dating of the anonymous *Life*, as it was suggested by its first editor, Delehaye. This date was taken for granted by those who ventured to include one fragment or another in their discussions. (e.g. Alypius' entering into the necropolis).

The first section of the first chapter demonstrated that, by looking at the manuscripts' titles, the death of Alypius can be dated in the times of Heraclius (610-41). A single manuscript (B) offers a rather confusing detail: Alypius is an ascetic during the reign of Maurice (582-602). The internal chronology provided by the biographies displays Alypius dying as a centenarian. Combining the information, one may infer that Alypius was not only being alive as early as during the reign of Justinian I (527-65), but he might have been already practicing the *stasis* (he ascended the pillar when he was thirty two). Up to this point, 542 would be the *terminus post quem* for his ascension on the column, while the *terminus ante quem* would be 573. The brief inquiry into the history of Alypius' city and its *chora* brought in another chronological detail: it seems that Adrianoupolis has been abandoned because of the Arab raids in the second quarter of the eighth century. This fact would set another *terminus ante quem* for the existence of the monastery surrounding Alypius' pillar, hence for Alypius himself, since the anonymous biographer shows that the monastery was active. In the fourth and the most extensive section of this chapter I discuss an element hinting at dating: the presence of the icon, which is thoroughly analyzed in the third chapter. The following part presents a rather weak element, the one-third *nomisma* that Alypius

received as a donation. The *tremissis* (τριμίσιον) was introduced in late fourth century and it was struck in the East for regular use only until mid-eight century. However, if the *tremissis* cannot be taken as a steady dating element, since one may expect that this precious gold coins still circulated after the reign of Leo III, it has to be mentioned, at least for one reason; if the ancient biographer had wanted to enhance the value of the donation and, consequently, of the alms given by Alypius' mother, he could have simply said a *nomisma* (a gold coin), even though this may have seemed a conspicuous exaggeration, or a *semissis* (half of a *nomisma*). Even so, the biographer prefers to give this particular division. Moreover, in the course of the examination of the narrative, one may observe that the narratorial voice assumes the mask of a member of the monastic community under Alypius' guidance, which had survived the stylite. Taking this into consideration with caution, unlike Delehaye, and connecting it with the *terminus ante quem* for the existence of the monastery, this may indicate mid-eight century as a *terminus ante quem* for the writing of this anonymous *Life*.

The second chapter expanded on the noticeable emphasis given to Job figure by the earlier biographer, in comparison with the other two subsequent redactions. By associating Alypius with Job, the first biographer is augmenting the stylite's enduring ability: the extreme ascetic practice makes Alypius a 'supra-Job.' The most important detail concerning the dating of Alypius revealed by this inquiry was the hierarchy of the stylites in which the biographer of Luke, the tenth century stylite, wanted to integrate the praises. Within the succession of the most important pillar saints to whom biographies had been dedicated, Alypius is mentioned as the fourth, after Symeon the Younger (521-597). Thus, one may consider that, according to the tenth century tradition, Alypius must have survived to Symeon; hence, 598 may be taken as a *terminus post quem* for Alypius death.

In the third chapter I analyzed the pillar and the way in which the biographers build the story, by giving abundant or scarce details about the columnar grave-marker that Alypius

claims and makes his ladder reaching the heavens. The second section of this chapter focused on to the iconophile element emerging from the anonymous *Life*. The presence of the icon would point to the end of the eight or even to the beginning of the first part of the ninth century as the time when this *Life* may have been written; nonetheless, this would disagree with all the previous chronological elements. Yet, the philological analysis showed that one of the three manuscripts that Delehaye used for the edition of the anonymous *Life* (MS C) is silent regarding the presence of the icon. The fact that neither of the two instances where the icon is mentioned is found in MS C confirms that the variant of the text (the 'odd version') offered by MS C is older than the other two MSS. Although it has been emphasized as the main difficulty when studying hagiography,[315] in the case of this *Life*, this *locus* allowed me to distinguish between the 'original' form of a *Life* and the further emendations in the process of rewriting before the work of Metaphrastes, i.e. after the triumph of the iconodules. The icon is undoubtedly one such element included into the *Life*, and this observation validates the dating that have been considered until now: the *Life* has been probably written during the Iconoclastic period, or perhaps more plausible, even before the outburst of the Iconoclastic controversies (before 726).

The last chapter is dedicated to Alypius' monastery. By taking into account all the details given by the anonymous biographer, he seems to be keen on showing that the monastic establishment was by no means a mixed monastery. The manifest apologetic attitude of the biographer explains the overemphasis that he lays on the absolute separation of the nuns from the monks; it also gives a plausible justification to the lack of consistency of his description, as the hypotheses on the possible structure of the monastic complex have shown; but it also sheds light on the reason for which the biographer grants almost exclusiveness to the 'feminine monastic element': the presence of the women in the

[315] Brubaker, Haldon, *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era*, 201.

monastery must be justified, and the anonymous biographer does not spear any effort in doing so. In order to underline the complete independence of the nuns from the monks, the biographer shows Euboule having over the nuns the same monastic authority that Alypius had over the recluses, and perhaps over the (male) recluses. Alypius and Euboule had even similar attributes that distinguish them from the rest of the ascetics that appear in the *Life*. Consequently, since this element of the narrative (the monastery) must be seen in the light of the Justinianic legislation issued against the double monasteries, I would advance the period between 529-543 (that is, between the two laws against man cohabitating with women in monasteries) as a *terminus post quem* for dating the anonymous *Life*.

Perhaps the most significant outcome of this research is the remark on the MS C: it is indeed the one that offers the original version of the *Life*. Yet, Delahaye chose the standard version of MSS A and B for establishing the text of the *Life*, while relegating the 'odd version' of MS C to the *apparatus criticus*.

Bibliography

Sources

Ὡρολόγιον τὸ Μέγα περιέχον ἅπασαν τὴν ἀνήκουσαν αὐτῷ Ἀκολουθίαν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας καὶ τῶν ὑποκειμένων αὐτῇ εὐαγῶν Μοναστηρίων μετά τινων ἀπαραιτήτων προσθηκῶν. Athens: Apostolike Diakonia tes Ekklesias tes Ellados, n. d.

Aelius Theon. *Progymnasmata*. Ed. Leonhard von Spengel. Rhetores Graeci 2. Leipzig: Teubner, 1854.

Basil of Caesarea, Saint *In XL martyres Sebastenses*. Patrologiae Cursus Completus, series graeca 31, 508B-525A. Ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1885.

Byzantine Defenders of Images: Eight Saints' Lives in English Translation. Ed. Alice-Mary Talbot. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1988.

Dawes, Elizabeth A. S., and Norman Hepburn Baynes. *Three Byzantine Saints: Contemporary Biographies*. Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1996.

Delehaye, Hyppolite. *Les Saints Sylites*, Subsidia Hagiograpica 14. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1923.

_____. *Mélanges D' hagiographie grecque et latine*, Subsidia hagiographica 42. Brussels: Société des bollandistes, 1996.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *Dionysii Halicarnassei quae extant. Vol. 6: Opusculorum volumen secundum.* Ed, Hermann Usener and Ludovic Radermacher. Leipzig: Teubner, 1985.

Eutychios of Constantinople, Saint. *Sermon on the Easter and the Holy Eucharist*. Patrologiae Cursus Completus, series graeca 86. Ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1865.

Halkin, François. *Inédits Byzantins d'Ochrida, Candie et Moscou*, Subsidia Hagiographica 38. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1963.

Hermogenes. *Progymnasmata*. Ed. H. Rabe. Rhetores Graeci 6. Leipzig: Teubner, 1913.

John Chrysostom, Saint. *Homily in the Epistles to Romans*. Patrologiae Cursus Completus, series graeca 60. Ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1862.

Hesychios of Jerusalem, Saint. *Collection of Difficulties and Solutions*. Patrologiae Cursus Completus, series graeca 93. Ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1865.

Krueger, Derek. *Symeon the Holy Fool: Leontius's Life and the Late Antique City*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

"La vie de saint Luc le Stylite (879-979)," 149-290. Ed. and trans. Fr. Vanderstuyf. *Patrologia Orientalis* XI. Paris: Firmin-Didot et Cie, 1915.

Legrand, Émil. "Description des oeuvres d'art et de l'église des Saints Apôtres de Constantinople. Poème en vers iambiques par Constantin le Rhodien." *Revue des études grecques* 10, no. 33 (1896): 32-65.

Libanius. *Progymnasmata, Opera* 8. Ed. R. Foerster. Leipzig: Teubner, 1915.

Mansi, Giovanni Domenico, Jean Baptiste Martin, and Louis Petit. *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*. Tomus octavus, Florence: 1762. (Anastatic reproduction, Paris, Leipzig: Welter, 1901; Retrieved from http://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=njp.32101078252077;view=1up;seq=10)

Menander Rhetor. Ed., trans., and comm. D. A. Russell, and N. G. Wilson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.

Nicolaus. *Progymnasmata*. Edited by I. Felten. Rhetores Graeci 11. Leipzig: Teubner, 1913.

Olivieri, Alexander. *Aëtii Amideni libri medicinales i-iv*. *Corpus medicorum Graecorum* 8.1. Leipzig: Teubner, 1935; http://cmg.bbaw.de/epubl/online/cmg_08_01.php (accessed 28.04.2015)

Synaxarium *ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae. Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum novembris*. Ed. Hippolyte Delehaye. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1902.

Théodoret de Cyr. *Histoire des moines de Syrie*. "*Histoire Philothée" XIV-XXX* (t. 2). Ed. and trans. Pierre Canivet and Alice Leroy-Molinghen. Sources chrétiennes 257. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1979.

Ovid. *Fasti*. Trans. James George Frazer and G. P. Goold. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Page, Denys Lionel. *Epigrammata Graeca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Payne Smith, R. *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary, Founded Upon the Thesaurus Syriacus of R. Payne Smith*. Ed. J. P. Smith Margoliouth. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957.

Taft, Robert F. *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom / The Great-Entrance: A History of the Transfer of Gifts and Other Preanaphoral Rites of the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom*, Orientalia Christiana Analecta 200. Rome: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 2004.

The Life of Lazaros of Mt. Galesion: An Eleventh-Century Pillar Saint. Introd., trans., and notes Richard P. H. Greenfield. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2000.

Théodoret de Cyr, *Histoire des moines de Syrie, "Histoire Philothée" XIV-XXX* (vol. 2). Ed. and trans. P. Canivet, and A. Leroy-Molinghen. Sources chrétiennes 257. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1979.

Secondary literature

Antun, Tuna. "The Miracles of St. Theodore Tērōn: An Eighth-Century Source?." *Jahrbuch Der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 58 (2008): 1-11.

Bateson, Mary. "Origin and Early History of Double Monasteries." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* (*New Series)* 13 (1899): 137-41.

Beret, Richard. "Let us Put away All Earthly Care: Mysticism and the *Cherubikon* of the Byzantine Rite." In *Studia patristica 64: Papers Presented at the Sixteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 2011*, ed. Markus Vinzent, Ascetica, Liturgica, Orientalia, Critica et Philologica 23, 111-24. Leuven: Peeters, 2013**.**

Brown, Peter. *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.

Brubaker, Leslie, and John F. Haldon. *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era (C. 680-850): The Sources: an Annotated Survey*. Aldershot, Hants: Ashgate, 2001.

Brubaker, Leslie. "Icons Before Iconoclasm?" In *Morfologie sociali e culturali in Europa fra tarda Antichità e alto Medioevo II. Settimane di Studio* 45, 1215–54. Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1998.

Cames, Gérard. *Byzance et la peinture romane de Germanie*. Paris: Picard, 1966.

Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum graecorum Bibliothecae Nationalis Parisiensis. Edited by Hagiogaphi Bollandiani and H. Omont. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1896.

Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum graecorum Bibliothecae Vaticanae. Edited by Hagiographi Bollandiani, P. Franchi de'Cavalieri. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1899.

Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum graecorum Germaniae, Belgii, Angliae. Edited by C. Van de Vorst, H. Delehaye, Subsidia Hagiographica 13. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1913.

Calofonos, George T. "Dream Narratives in the *Continuation of Theophanes*." In *Dreaming in Byzantium and Beyond*, ed. G. T. Calofonos, and Christine Angelidi, 95-123. Farnham: Ashgate, 2014.

Doran, Robert. *The Lives of Simeon Stylites*. Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1992.

Focke, Friedrich, "Synkrisis." *Hermes* 58 (1923): 327-368.

Gaspar, Cristian. “In Praise of Unlikely Holy Men: Elite Hagiography, Monastic Panegyric, and Cultural Translation in the Philotheos Historia of Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrrhus.” D.Phil. thesis. Budapest: Central European University, 2006.

Grabar, André. *Christian Iconography: A Study of its Origins*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.

Grierson, Philip. *Byzantine Coinage*. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1999.

_____. *Catalogue of the Byzantine Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection and in the Whittemore Collection, Leo III to Michael III (717-867) Part I: Catalogue of the Byzantine Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection and in the Whittemore Collection*. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks research library and collection, 1993.

Grossman, Janet Burnett. *Funerary Sculpture*. Princeton, NJ: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 2013)

Guilland, Rodolphe. *Études de topographie de Constantinople Byzantine*, vol. 1. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1969.

Haldon, John F. *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era (c. 680-850): The Sources; An Annotated Survey*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001.

_____. *Byzantium in the Seventh Century: The Transformation of a Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Halkin, François. “Un Manuscrit grec inconnu: Le Ménologe de Douai Abbey, près de Reading.” *Scriptorium* 7 (1953): 5-21.

Harvey, Susan Ashbrook. “The Sense of a Stylite: Perspectives on Simeon the Elder.” *Vigiliae Christianae* 42, no. 4 (1988): 376-94.

Hatlie, Peter. *The Monks and Monasteries of Constantinople, Ca. 350-850*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Heilbrunn Timeline of Art History. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2000.

Hilpisch, Stephan. *Die Doppelklöster: Entstehung und Organisation*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1928.

Høgel, Christian. *Symeon Metaphrastes: Rewriting and Canonization*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, University of Copenhagen, 2002.

Høgel, Christian. “The Redaction of Symeon Metaphrastes: Literary aspects of the Metaphrastic Martyria.” In *Metaphrasis: Redaction and Audiences in Middle Byzantine Hagiography*, ed. Christian Høgel, 7-21. Oslo: Research Council of Norway, 1996.

Janin, Raymond. *Les Églises et les monastères des grands centres byzantins (Bithynie, Hellespont, Latros, Galèsios, Trébizonde, Athènes, Thessalonique).* Paris: Institut Français des Études Byzantines, 1975.

John of Ephesus. *Johannis Ephesini Historiae ecclesiastica, pars tertia*. Ed. Ernest Walter Brooks, CSCO 105-106. Paris, 1935-36.

Kaegi, Walter Emil. *Heraclius, Emperor of Byzantium*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Kaplan, Michel. "L'Espace et le sacré dans la vie de Daniel le stylite." In *Le sacré et son inscription dans l'espace à Byzance et en Occident: études comparées*, ed. M. Kaplan, 199-219. Paris: Publication de la Sorbone, 2001.

_____. "L'Hinterland religieux de Constantinople: Moines et saints de banlieu d'après l'hagiographie." in *Constantinople and its Hinterland: Papers from the Twenty-Seventh Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Oxford, April 1993*, ed. Cyril Mango, Gilbert Dagron and Geoffrey Greatrex (Aldershot [etc.]: Variorum, 1995), 191-205.

Kazhdan, Aleksandr Petrovich. *A History of Byzantine Literature*. Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation, Institute for Byzantine Research, 1999.

Kennedy, George A. *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

Kristensen, Troels Myrup. "Using and Abusing Images in Late Antiquity (and Beyond): Column Monuments as Topoi of Idolatry." In *Using Images in Late Antiquity*, ed. Stine Birk, Troels Myrup Kristensen, Birte Poulsen, and Paolo Liverani, 268-82. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2014.

_____. "The Old Testament and Monasticism." In *The Old Testament in Byzantium*, edited by Paul Magdalino, and Robert S. Nelson, 199-221. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2010.

Laflı, Ergün. "A Roman-Cut Cult Niche at Paphlagonian Hadrianopolis." In *XXIV. Araştırma Sonuıları Toplantısı*, vol. 2, 43-66. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanliği Dösimm Basimevi, 2007.

Lafli, Ergün, Eva Christof, and Michael Metcalfe. *Hadrianopolis I: Inschriften aus Paphlagonia*. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2012.

Laflı, Ergün, Gülseren Kan Şahin. "Terra Sigillata and Red-Slipped Ware from Southwestern Paphlagonia." *Anatolia Antiqua* 20 (2012): 45-120.

Leclercq, Jean. "Feminine Monasticism in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries." In *The Continuing Quest for God: Monastic Spirituality in Tradition and Transition,* ed. William Skudlarek, 159-69. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1982.

Legrand, Emile, Louis Petit, and Hubert Octave Pernot. *Bibliographie hellénique ou Description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés par des Grecs au dix-huitième siècle*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1928.

Kenneth Levy, "A Hymn for Thursday in Holy Week." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 16, no. 2 (1963): 127-75.

Lifshitz, Felice. "Beyond Positivism and Genre: 'Hagiographical' Texts As Historical Narrative." *Viator* 25 (no. 1, 2008): 95-114.

Maguire, Henry. "The Profane Aesthetic in Byzantine Art and Literature." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 53 (1999): 189-205.

Marek, Christian. *Stadt, Ära und Territorium in Pontus-Bithynia und Nord-Galatia*. Tübingen: Wasmuth, 1993.

Mateos, Juan. "L'Office monastique à la fin du IVe siècle: Antioche, Palestine, Cappadoce." *Oriens Christianus* 47 (1963): 53-88.

Menze, Volker. "The Transformation of a Saintly Paradigm: Simeon the Elder and the Legacy of Stylitism." In *Religious identities in the Levant from Alexander to Muhammed: continuity and change*, ed. Michael Blömer, Achim Lichtenberger, and Rubina Raja, 213-25. Turnhout: Brepols, 2015.

_____. *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Ötüken, Semiha Yıldız. "Konstantin IX. – 'Soliman,' Einzelkmapfer,' 'Siegesbringer' – und die 'Unbesiegbare' Theotokos." In *Byzantine Constantinople: Monuments, Topography, and Everyday Life*, ed. Nevra Necipoğlu, 175-186. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Papalexandrou, Amy. "Memory Tattered and Torn: Spolia in the Heartland of Byzantine Hellenism." In *Archaeologies of Memory*, ed. Ruth M. Van Dyke, Susan E. Alcock, 56-80. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2003.

Pargoire, Jules. "Les Monastères doubles chez les byzantins." *Echos d'Orient*, 56 (1906): 21-25

Patlagean, Evelyne. "Ancient Byzantine hagiography and social history." In *Saints and Their Cults: Studies in Religious Sociology, Folklore, and History*, ed. Stephen Wilson, 101-121. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. *Christianity and Classical Culture: The Metamorphosis of Natural Theology in the Christian Encounter with Hellenism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.

Petit, Louis. *Bibliographie des acolouthies grecques*. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1926.

Pratsch, Thomas. *Der hagiographische Topos: griechische Heiligenviten in mittelbyzantinischer Zeit*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2005.

Pratsch, Thomas. "Exploring the Jungle: Hagiographical Literature between Fact and Fiction." In *Fifty Years of Prosopography: The Later Roman Empire Byzantium and Beyond*, ed. Averil Cameron, 59-72. Oxford: published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, 2003.

Saradi Mendelovici, Helen. "Christian Attitudes toward Pagan Monuments in Late Antiquity and Their Legacy in Later Byzantine Centuries." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, vol. 44 (1999): 47-61.

_____. "The Christianization of Pagan Temples in the Greek Hagiographical Texts." In *From Temple to Church: Destruction and Renewal of Local Cultic Topography in Late Antiquity*, ed. Johannes Hahn, and Stephen Emmel, 113-34. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Schachner, Lukas Amadeus. "The archeology of the stylite." *Late Antique Archeology* 6 (no. 1, 2010): 329-97.

Schiffer, Elisabeth. "Metaphrastic Lives and Earlier *metaphráseis* of Saint's Lives." In *Metaphrasis: Redaction and Audieces in Middle Byzantine Hagiography*, ed. Christian Høgel, 22-41. Oslo: Research Council of Norway, 1996.

Ševčenko, Ihor. "Levels of Style in Byzantine Prose." *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 31 (1981): 289-312.

Sevčenko, Nancy Peterson. *Illustrated Manuscripts of the Metaphrastian Menologion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Sheerin, Daniel. "Rhetoric and Hermeneutic Synkrisis in Patristic Typology." In *Nova et Vetera Patristic Studies in Honor of Thomas Patrick Halton*, ed. John Petruccione, 22-39. Washington: Catholic University of American Press, 1998.

Silvas, Anna. *The Asketikon of St Basil the Great*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Stoney, Constance. *Early Double Monasteries*. Cambridge: Deighton, 1915. http://archive.org/details/ earlydoublemonas24633gut

Stramara, Daniel. "Double Monasticism in the Greek East Fourth through Eighth Century." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 6, no. 2 (1998): 269-312.

Summerer, Lâtife, and Alexander von Kienlin. "Achemenid Impact in Paphlagonia: Rupestral Tombs in the Amnias Valley." In *Achaemenid Impact in the Black Sea: Communications in Power*, Black Sea Studies 11, ed. J. Nieling, and E. Rahms, 195-221. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2010.

http://www.pontos.dk/publications/books/bss-11-files/bss-11-summerer (accessed 30.04.2015)

Trombley, F. “The Decline of the Seventh-Century Town: The Exception of Euchaita.” In *Byzantine Studies in Honor of Milton V. Anastos*, ed. Speros Vryonis, and Milton Anastos, 65-90. Malibu: Undena Publications, 1985).

Van Ommeslaeghe, Flor. “The Acta Sanctorum and Bollandist Methodology.” In *The Byzantine Saint*, ed. Sergei Hackel, 155-63. Crestwod, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2001.

Viezure, Dana Iuliana. “*Verbum Crucis, Virtus Dei*: A Study of the Theopaschism from the Council of Chalcedon (451) to the Age of Justinian.” D.Phil. thesis. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2009.

Vismek, Branislav. “Miraculous Healing Narratives and their Function in Late Antique Biohagiographic Texts. A Comparative Study.” MA thesis. Budapest: Central European University, 2013.

Vööbus, Arthur. *Literary, Critical and Historical Studies in Ephrem the Syrian*. Stockholm: ETSE, 1958.

Webb, Ruth. *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.

[Xyngopoulos, Andreas] Ξυγγόπουλος, Ανδρέας. “Ταυρολέων.” *Δελτίον* ΧΑΕ 5, Περίοδος Δ' (1969): 309-14.

Appendix I. Receiving the divine light: *Coenae tuae*

The twenty first chapter of the earliest *Life* describes "the great miracles, which God wrought with his servant."[316] The biographer narrates about the way a divine light comes upon Alypius. This miraculous episode is also present in the *Life* by Metaphrastes,[317] in a slightly compacted form, and without any additional elements, but it is missing from Antonius' version.

> After all this, I turn now to speak about the great miracles, which God wrought with his servant and let nobody doubt them. For this happened many times in the presence of many people, namely that a light descended from heavens over the saint's head (ὑπὲρ κορυφῆς) upon the pillar and stayed there for some time. This happened when, during the night, there was the constant sound of thunders when one blaze of lightning followed the other, when rain was falling in torrents, in order that everyone might not dare, I think, to fix their eyes on the glory of the ineffable things.[318] To such a measure was the place illuminated with the splendour of the light that those unused to this sight believed that the coop (κλουβός) was on fire. Rejoicing while trembling (ἔντρομος in MS C), he was uttering in a low voice (ἠρέμα) the *secret prayer of the tradition* (τὸ μυστικόν τῆς παραδόσεως):[319] 'Of your mystical supper' (τοῦ δείπνου σου τοῦ μυστικοῦ), and so on – before the descent (ἐπιφοιτήσις) as well as after the descent, himself not willing to make known the miracle, being afraid of the ephemeral nature of the earthly glory. Also, the cross on the top which was fitted together with the timbers of the coop was announcing the coming of that luminary[320] by being shaken violently, and giving a sharp sound (ἦχον τινα ... τρισμοῦ)[321] until, taking the form of a pillar of fire[322] that was reaching the clouds, it [i.e. the luminary] returned to the heights of the heavens. And this was seen not only by one, or two, or ten, or only fifty people, but also by many others, so that the sight of such great miracle reached even the imperial city (τὴν βασιλείαν).[323]

It must to be said that the anonymous biographer puts an emphasis on the light in his *Life*. In the eleventh chapter, when it is said that those who knew Alypius' ascetic efforts offered him the means for erecting a pillar, the stylite is characterized by his power to shine in flesh (ὁ ἐν σαρκὶ λάμψας) and the gift he receives for his patience was the pure illuminations of the Holy

[316] Delehaye, 164, 5-7.
[317] Delehaye, 184, 25.
[318] Cf. Moses' vision on the Mount Sinai, Ex 19:16: "It happened on the third day before dawn that there were sounds [of thunder], lightnings and a dark cloud upon the Mount of Sinai…" In other cases as well, thunder, lightning, cloud, darkness and earthquake are announcing the divine apparition. See for example Mordechai's vision in Est 1:1 (LXX).
[319] Τὸ μυστικόν τῆς παραδόσεως is the version of MS C; MSS A+B and Delahaye are adding μυστήριον making the locus ambiguous: τὸ μυστικόν τῆς παραδόσεως μυστήριον.
[320] The text uses here φωστήρ, "luminary", which, in the biblical language indicates the celestial bodies: sun, moon and the stars (see Gn 1:14-16, Ws 13:2, Si 43:7, Dn 12:3(LXX)). The meaning is that a star (being the symbol of Christ) descended from heaven.
[321] Or whistling sound.
[322] See Ex 13:21 sqq.
[323] Delehaye, 164, 7-26.

Spirit (αἰ ἐκ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεῦματος καθαρὰς ἐλλάμψεις).[324] But these are quite standard expressions; hence they do not anticipate this strange vision.

The phrase τὸ μυστικόν τῆς παραδόσεως μυστήριον given by MSS A+B is rather ambiguous, especially because of the accumulation of the two words with a similar meaning: μυστικόν and μυστήριον, but also because of the noun in the genitive that comes between them. Metaphrastes simplifies the phrase by eliminating the adjective.[325] However, if we accept MS C's text as closer to the original, we get a simpler text, which is easier to interpret.

The adjective μυστικός (mystical) is often in connection with the liturgy: the Lord's Prayer is called ἡ εὐχὴ ἡ μυστική (the mystical prayer)[326] and the Cherubic Hymn is ὁ μυστικὸς ὕμνος (the mystical hymn).[327] Another occurrence of μυστικός which may be important in identifying the possible meaning of the expression appears in Hesychios of Jerusalem (d. after 451): during the Last Supper Christ "entrusted them [i.e. the Apostles] the mystical Passover" (τὸ μυστικὸν αὐτοῖς παρέδωκε πάσχα).[328]

As the examples provided above might suggest, there is a link between the μυστικός and the liturgy and the Eucharistic communion. Thus a tentative translation of the phrase τὸ μυστικόν τῆς παραδόσεως μυστήριον may be "the secret prayer of the tradition." Because of the phrase in Hesychios, one can claim that the 'tradition' (ἡ παράδωσις) must be associated with the establishment of the Eucharist at the very moment when Christ handed it to the Apostles during the Last Supper and also with the tradition that has issued from that moment and has transmitted the Eucharist to the Church.

[324] Delehaye 156, 18-19; Delehaye 156, 27.
[325] Metaphrastes: "τὸ μυστικὸν ἐκεῖνο τῆς παραδόσεως" in Delehaye, 184, 24.
[326] Lampe, *s.v.* "And how extraordinary this is, the initiated know, for they are bidden with good reason to say this first word in the Mystical Prayer (ἐπὶ τῆς εὐχῆς τῆς μυστικῆς)." (John Chrysostom, *Homily in the Epistles to Romans*, 14, 3 (PG 60, 527).
[327] In the liturgy of Saint Chrysostom.
[328] Hesychios of Jerusalem, *Collection of Difficulties and Solutions*, 34 (PG 93, 1421D).

The second element that should be clarified is the presence of the words Τοῦ δείπνου σου τοῦ μυστικοῦ καὶ τὰ λοιπά of the biographer. The phrase is the incipit of a prayer technically entitled after the beginning of its Latin translation, *Coenae tuae.* It became one of the Byzantine Great Entrance *troparia*, and it follows: "At your mystical supper, son of God, receive me today as a partaker, for I will not betray the sacrament to your enemies, nor give you a kiss like Judas, but like the thief I confess you: remember me, o Lord, when you will come in your Kingdom!."[329] Like the *Cheroubikon*,[330] *Coenae tuae* must have started as a Communion chant,[331] and is used as the *Troparion* of the Holy Communion up to the present day in the churches of Byzantine Orthodox tradition.[332]

According to a singular testimony, namely by the compiler of the *Historiarum Compendium*, a historian from the eleventh century (1081-1118) conventionally referred to as George Kedrenos, this *Coenae tuae*, like the *Cheroubikon*, was introduced into the celebration of Holy Thursday liturgy by Justin II (565-578) in the ninth year of his reign (thus 573-574). However, besides being the only source that mentions this, it is also five centuries after this innovation had been imposed. Also, regarding this early inclusion into the Holy Thursday liturgy, Kedrenos does not tell in which part of the liturgy it was sung. Another time this prayer is mentioned is in two *Typika* of the Great Church, from the early and late tenth century. In the latter *Coenae tuae* is indicated as being intoned at three distinctive moments within the liturgy of St. Basil celebrated in the evening of the Holy Thursday: at the

[329] Τοῦ Δείπνου σου τοῦ μυστικοῦ σήμερον, Υἱὲ Θεοῦ, κοινωνόν με παράλαβε ο ὐ μὴ γὰρ τοῖς ἐχθροῖς σου τὸ μυστήριον εἴπω· οὐ φίλημά σοι δώσω, καθάπερ ὁ Ἰούδας· ἀλλ᾽ ὡς ὁ λῃστὴς ὁμολογῶ σοι. It continues with a later addition from Luke 23:42, attested to for the first time in a sixteen century MS: Μνήσθητί μου, Κύριε, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου (Remember me Lord in Your kingdom). The article before Judas is also a later addition. Robert F. Taft, *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom / The Great-Entrance: A History of the Transfer of Gifts and Other Preanaphoral Rites of the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom*, Orientalia Christiana Analecta 200 (Rome: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 2004), 491.

[330] The most frequently used Great-Entrance hymn in the Byzantine liturgy. Its incipit is: Οἱ τὰ χερουβὶμ μυστικῶς. For the text and a translation, see Taft, *A History of the Liturgy*, 54.

[331] Ibid., 55.

[332] See Ὡρολόγιον τὸ Μέγα περιέχον ἅπασαν τὴν ἀνήκουσαν αὐτῷ Ἀκολουθίαν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας καὶ τῶν ὑποκειμένων αὐτῇ εὐαγῶν Μοναστηρίων μετά τινων ἀπαραιτήτων προσθηκῶν (Athens: Apostolike Diakonia tes Ekklesias tes Ellados, n. d.), 599.

Great Entrance (instead of the regular *Cheroubikon*),[333] at the Communion (where it is already the proper hymn – *koinonikon*), and after the Communion (*polytikion*).[334] On the basis of these three writings (Kedrenos' *History* and the two *Typica*) it may be inferred that in the tenth century this chant was already a part of the Holy Thursday liturgy. Moreover, the *Coenae tuae* is attested as being also present in the liturgy of Jerusalem by a MS that, although dated to 1122, refers to a ceremony practiced prior to the year 1009.[335]

However, there is another source that may speak about the *Coenae tuae*, a fragment from the *Ecclesiastical History* by John of Ephesus (507-586/588) who gives a different chronology than the one by Kedrenos.[336] While the latter claims that the chant was introduced during the patriarchate of John III Scholastikos (565-577), John of Ephesus, on the other hand, describes Eutychios' unsuccessful attempt to introduce a new chant into the Great Thursday liturgy during his second patriarchate in Constantinople (577-582). He tries to replace the usual *antiphon* (مّحبلا) with the one composed by himself under the reason that it is "more suitable than the old one." Because the entire population of the Imperial City was revolting against the patriarch in such a way that they wanted to kill him, he was called, John says, by the Emperor Justin II and admonished. According to John of Ephesus' account, the emperor is accusing the patriarch of being naive for thinking about replacing the "ancient customs." Justin II vehemently rejects Eutychios' antiphon: "Know that if you had brought your antiphon down from heaven, we would not admit it. Go stay in your church: and follow

[333] For a description of the Great Entrance procession, see Taft, *A History of the Liturgy*, 5-7.
[334] Kenneth Levy, "A Hymn for Thursday in Holy Week," in *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 16, no. 2 (1963): 128. Taft, *A History of the Liturgy*, 69.
[335] Taft, *A History of the Liturgy*, 69.
[336] John of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, 3, 2, 40 in *Johannis Ephesini Historiae ecclesiastica, pars tertia*, ed. E.W. Brooks, CSCO 105-106 (Paris, 1935-36), 78 for Latin trans., 106-107 for the Syriac text; English trans. in Taft, *A History of the Liturgy*, 493. References will be made to the translation by Taft.

in it what has been established by the ancient fathers." At this moment, Eutychios does not go on to pressure the Constantinopolitan clergymen.[337]

Similarly, in one of his homilies, Eutychios advocated once more for the inadequacy with the occasion of the Constantinopolitan chants – without naming them – sung during the Great Entrance.[338]

Although the antiphon (*responsorium*) to which John of Ephesus refers cannot be pinpointed with absolute certainty since John is not giving its text, Taft claims that it should be identified with *Coenae tuae*. According to John's account, the emperor did not approve Eutychios, and one reason might have been the general riot that adopting such a measure would have resulted in, it is more than plausible that *Coenae tuae* has been adopted either after Justin's death in 578, when Eutychios was still alive (until 582), or soon after the emperor's death.[339]

Going back to what Alypius' earliest biographer says, at a first glimpse the association between the phrase τὸ μυστικόν τῆς παραδόσεως (μυστήριον) and the *Coenae tuae* chant has the following possible implication: because the chant was sung during the liturgy of Thursday from the Holy Week, and also because ἡ παράδωσις may mean "offering," this noun may refer to the establishment of the communion by Christ at the Last Supper. As for the τὸ μυστήριον, one has to take into consideration that in the Syriac tradition the fifth day of the Holy Week is called (ܚܡܝܫܝ ܕܣܛܪܐ) (The Thursday of the Mysteries), since ܣܛܪܐ, pl. ܣܛܪ can mean

[337] In the following fragment John adds that the patriarchs tried to erase the addition to the Trisagion hymn introduced by Peter the Fuller of Antioch in 460, "That was crucified for us." John of Ephesus states that this measure also scandalized the believers from Syria, Asia, and Cappadocia. For an analysis of the Theopaschite controversy, see V. Menze, *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 165-75; Dana Iuliana Viezure, "*Verbum Crucis, Virtus Dei*: A Study of the Theopaschism from the Council of Chalcedon (451) to the Age of Justinian," Ph.D. thesis (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2009).

[338] Eutychios of Constantinople, *Sermon on the Easter and the Holy Eucharist*, 8 (PG 86, 2400C-2401A). The older chant sung at the Great-Entrance was, Taft still cautiously claims, from Psalm 23: 7-10 (*A History of the Liturgy*, 84-111). The incongruity with this moment in the liturgy arises from the fact that, in Eutychios' opinion, the offerings were over-venerated as signifying the entrance of the "King of Glory" in the church, while they were still earthly elements. In the last edition of his study, Taft shows that this fragment from the Psalm 23 might have been also the old chant defended by John of Ephesus: Taft, *A History of the Liturgy*, 495.

[339] Taft, *A History of the Liturgy*, 497.

'mystery,' 'mystical signification (*typos*),' but also 'a sacrament,' 'the Eucharist,' or 'the mystical elements.'[340] Accepting this interpretation of the phrase, it is possible to infer that at the very moment of the night when the miracle took place, the biographer might have made Alypius celebrate the Liturgy of the Eucharist for the Thursday of the Holy Week.

Nonetheless, this statement may be problematic. Even if the biographer does not mention Alypius being an ordained priest, as I mentioned in the fourth chapter, he most probably did have the right to minister the liturgy, since he was able to give the monastic garment to his mother. On the other hand, Alypius was not assisting to this liturgy while it was performed near his column, because the author recreates the biblical atmosphere of the divine apparitions described in the Old Testament, so that one might not dare to fix one's eyes on the glory of the ineffable**.** Thus no matter how convenient this solution may be, there is no reasonable explanation why Alypius would have ministered this specific liturgy, especially because the biographer's narrative suggests that not only the visitation happened repeatedly, but the external signs and the prayer uttered by the saint when the miracle was taking place might have been part of a routine.[341] If the miracle occurred every year in the Great Thursday, the biographer would not have disregarded such a detail.

As an attempt to overcome this problem, relying on the fact that the *Coenae tuae* eventually became an ordinary hymn for the Communion during the Middle Ages,[342] the biographer might have asserted that Alypius used it as such in his own time, i.e. the end of the sixth century and the beginning of the seventh. This would imply that the meaning suggested for τὸ μυστικόν phrase ("the mystical liturgy of the delivery") has to be dismissed.

The text seems to refer to the *Coenae tuae* as an ordinary Communion chant: the biographer may have wanted to convey the idea that Alypius was receiving the Eucharist

[340] R. Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary, Founded Upon the Thesaurus Syriacus of R. Payne Smith*, ed. J. P. Smith Margoliouth (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), ܪܙܐ *s.v.*
[341] Metaphrastes introduces the adverb πολλάκις; in Delehaye, 184, 16.
[342] K. Levy, "A Hymn for Thursday:" 127.

directly from heavens, brought by Christ Himself, in the shape of a luminary (φωστήρ). If one accepts the hypothesis that the first biographer was probably writing in the second part of the seventh century, then this might be the first instance in the surviving writings when this chant is attested as having this function. Likewise, the translation of the phrase τὸ μυστικόν τῆς παραδόσεως should be revised, and replaced by another tentative version as "the secret prayer of the tradition." The prayer is "secret" or "mystical" because within the prayer's content μυστικός is also the determinative for the "supper" (δεῖπνον), the name given to the Eucharist. A far less improbable explanation for the presence of μυστικός is that it indicates that the hymn was sung quietly,[343] because this would make it unnecessary close to the adverb ἠρέμα. Alypius was indeed whispering the prayer before and after the communion, because he did not want people know that he was receiving direct communion of Christ's body and blood in the descent of the light.

The argument that *Coenae tuae* is indicated by the anonymous biographer as an ordinary Communion chant is incongruous with what Levy says, namely that *Coenae tuae* reaches this status "only during the Middle Ages,"[344] thus his assertion may have to be revised.

In conclusion, the scene shows Christ as a star descending to Alypius who takes a mystical communion and recites the *Troparion* of the communion both before and after he takes the Eucharist. There is no connection with the Holy Thursday except for the fact that this feast commemorates the transmission (παράδωσις) of the Holy Eucharist. Concerning the text, the analysis of this passage shows once more that the version of MS C is simpler and clearer than that of the MSS A+B.

[343] Beginning from at least the eight century (when the *Berberini Gr. 336* Euchologion, the oldest manuscript of the Byzantine liturgy is dated), μυστικῶς is used in order to inform the celebrant that the praery has to be said "mystically (quietly)." Richard Beret, "Let us Put away All Earthly Care: Mysticism and the *Cherubikon* of the Byzantine Rite," in *Studia patristica 64: Papers Presented at the Sixteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 2011*, ed. Markus Vinzent, Ascetica, Liturgica, Orientalia, Critica et Philologica 23, (Leuven: Peeters, 2013), 113, note 2.
[344] K. Levy, "A Hymn for Thursday," 127.

The importance of the presence of this Holy Thursday's communion chant (*Coenae tuae*) is due to the fact that this particular chant is earlier than those in the two *Typica* of the Great Church (Hagia Sophia), or the time suggested by the twelfth-century manuscript – these two being the earliest sources that explicitly mention this hymn. Metaphrastes does not see it as odd, since he probably had the same opinion with Kedrenos about the origin of the *antiphon*.

Appendix II. From the 'bull-lion' (ταυρολέων) to the 'bull-and-lion' (βουφάγος)

In spite of his ignorance concerning the *Life* by Antonius, Delehaye attributed a very precise meaning to the ταυρολέων present in the anonymous *Life*: in his view, the *tauroleon* was "un animal fantastique, moitié taureau moitié lion."[345] It is easy to see how Delehaye reached this conclusion, since Greek mythology provides multiple examples of such composite theriomorphic creatures (e.g. the Hippocampoi or the Hippalektryon). This so-called *tauroleon* is ambiguous due to its absence in other sources, which, in itself, is far from exceptional. For example, there is another merging of two distinct animals with only one textual attestation, the ὀφιοταύρος, a monster born from Gaia with the foreparts of a black bull and the tail of a serpent, which is mentioned only once by Vergil as taking part in the Gigantomachy.[346] The anonymous *Life* does not give any additional information on the statue, besides that the object on the column's platform chosen by Alypius is a ταυρολέων. The Metaphrastic text adds only that the statue is antiquated (χείρος ἔργον παλαιοτέρας – "made by a hand from older times"); thus, it is possible that he did not see the reason to provide another explanation. On the other hand, Antonius builds up his *ekphrasis* on the description of the statue:

> And on the column was set a lion, which was attached to the stele by his hinder parts, its tail and its feet, while with its foreparts it was overpowering, handling, and feasting on an underlying cow – the ornaments were elaborated and worked beyond the human artfulness with extraordinary beauty. And in an instant, he throws the statues (τὰ ξόανα) to the ground.[347]

From this visually detailed illustration, it is clear that in Antonius' *Life* the *tauroleon* was in fact a statuary group representing a duel between a predator and a grass-eater, to be more precise a lion attacking a cow, as reflected by the plural form that Antonius employs: "the

[345] Delehaye, lxxxiii.
[346] Ovid, *Fasti*, 3, 799-800 in Ovid, *Fasti*, trans. James George Frazer, G. P. Goold (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989), 178.
[347] Halkin, 189, 12-190, 18.

statues." One may clearly see the difference from the anonymous *Life*. When he mentions the statue being destroyed, the biographer speaks about a "lion" (λέων)[348] and "a statue."[349]

However, it appears that the statue from the upper part of Alypius' column received emphasis only in the past twenty-five years, emerging in the discussions on the position of the Christians on the pagan monuments during Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages, either concerning the way in which the pagan cultic sites were Christianized, or the way in which were they aesthetically valued by Christians.[350] All the scholars who chose to include Alypius' story in their studies followed without hesitation Delehaye's assumption concerning the *tauroleon* statue, namely that is was the representation of a composite mythological creature, half-bull, half-lion.[351] Even so, no attempt was made to identify the creature. When the *encomium* by Antonius is taken into consideration, at least theoretically (it is given as a source along with the anonymous *Life* and the Metaphrastic one), the true nature of the statue seems to be missing. For example, Maguire, despite the attention given to the text, includes Alypius' statue in his study of the fantastical zoomorphic statue in Byzantium.[352] On the other hand, Kaplan goes further, and does not limit himself to identify the *tauroleon* with the

[348] Delehaye, 154, 19.
[349] Delehaye, 154, 21; Delehaye, 176, 34.
[350] Saradi Mendelovici, "Christian Attitudes toward Pagan Monuments in Late Antiquity and Their Legacy in Later Byzantine Centuries," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 44 (1999): 47-61. Idem, "The Christianization of Pagan Temples in the Greek Hagiographical Texts," in *From Temple to Church: Destruction and Renewal of Local Cultic Topography in Late Antiquity*, ed. Johannes Hahn , and Stephen Emmel (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 113-34; Henry Maguire, "The Profane Aesthetic in Byzantine Art and Literature," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 53 (1999): 189-205; Amy Papalexandrou, "Memory Tattered and Torn: Spolia in the Heartland of Byzantine Hellenism," *Archaeologies of Memory*, ed. Ruth M Van Dyke, and Susan E. Alcock (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2003), 56-80.
[351] The *tauroleon* is seen in the literature having a direct connection with other examples of *ekphraseis*: the 'Gigantomachia' was carved on the bronze doors of the Senate, and Symeon the Holy Fool's tenth-century *Life* asserts that he is being hit because he was looking at the monstrous giants (*The Life of St. Andrew the Holy Fool*, II, 140, *apud.* Henry Maguire, "The Profane Aesthetic," 191); the gate is described also by Constantine the Rhodian's poem about the Church of the Holy Apostles, Στύχοι Κωνστανίνου Ἀσηκρίτης τοῦ Ῥοδίου, 125-62 in É. Legrand, "Description des oeuvres d'art et de l'église des Saints Apôtres de Constantinople. Poème en vers iambiques par Constantin le Rhodien," *Revue des études grecques* 10 (no. 33, 1896): 40-41: all these creatures were displayed in order to be laughed at: γελῶν τοῖς ἀνδράσιν (152).
[352] It is certain that Maguire has read the passage, because he is paraphrasing it. First, he says that the *tauroleon* was a "complex and beautifully worked sculpture of a lion and an ox" ("The Profane Aesthetic," 191), but on the next page he includes it in an enumeration of the composite mythical creatures under the name of *tauroleones*, although he is referring only to the *Life* by Antonius. Thus he does not notice the cow (βοῦς ὑποκειμένη; Halkin, 190, 14-15), nor does he see the two different animals in a fighting scene.

same mythical creature postulated by Delehaye, but speaks about a "statue d'un taureau à tête de lion," without giving any further detail about his statement. Kaplan does not differentiate the description from the anonymous and the Metaphrastic *Lives* from the one given by Antonius.[353]

Only one scholar connected the *tauroleon* to this statuary group of a lion eating a bull, and his conclusion is even more noteworthy, since he reaches it reading only the anonymous and the Metaphrastic *Lives*.[354] In his article, Andreas Xyngopoulos aims to decipher this ambiguous term. Endeavoring to do so, he argues that an analogous example of the *tauroleon* from Alypius' *Life* might have come from the Boukoleon palace from Constantinople, which supposedly gave the name to one of the city's harbors.[355] In fact, Xyngopoulos observes that there is a term similar to the hapax legomenon ταυρολέων, the βουκολέων. He quotes a description of the edifice by Pietro Zen, a Venetian emissary to the Turkish Court from 1532.[356] According to his account, near the harbour there was a colossal statuary group of marble representing the scene of a lion attacking a bull.[357] What this impressive monument might have looked like is possible to envisage from similar statues.[358] Xyngopoulos

[353] M. Kaplan, "L'Espace et le sacré," 204.
[354] [Andreas Xyngopoulos] Ανδρέας Ξυγγόπουλος, "Ταυρολέων," *Δελτίον* ΧΑΕ 5, Περίοδος Δ' (1969): 309-14.
[355] In spite of the title, in the main part of his article, Xyngopoulos analyzes the miniature from the so-called "Skylitzes Madrid" (fol. 27r) which depicts Nikephoros I (802-811) sitting on a balcony of the Boukoleon Palace, and argues that the manuscript was not produced in Constantinople; what is more, that the illustrator never saw Constantinople. The building represented has *Βουκολέων* as a caption, thus the building that the illuminator intended to represent is beyond doubt the Boukoleon Palace. However, the balcony where the emperor is standing is decorated on both sides with two different zoomorphic statues. The statue on the left is of a sitting animal with the caption *λέ(ων)*. The animal on the right side of the building has the caption βοῦς. Since the two statues to which the manuscript makes reference are preserved in the Archaeological Museum in Istanbul, and they both represent a lion, Xyngopoulos claims that the illustrator probably misinterpreted the name of the palace.
[356] Xyngopoulos, "Ταυρολέων," 309-10.
[357] Rodolphe Guilland, *Études de topographie de Constantinople Byzantine*, vol. 1. (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1969), 249-50.
[358] For example, one antique Greek marble group representing a lion attacking a horse is now found in the *Musei Capitolini* in Rome (*Lion Attacking a Horse*, 325–300 BC); Xyngopoulos, "Ταυρολέων," 310. The other argument of Xyngopoulos is the presence of this image in a Christian *milieu*: a small image of a bull lying down under a lion is engraved on a Christian vessel of lead (allegedly liturgical) discovered in Tunis. André Grabar, *Christian Iconography: A Study of its Origins* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), 18 (for discussion); plate 39. This argument does not hold because of the distance between Tunis and northern Asia Minor, and also because they are clearly different types of representation: funerary monument vs. small engraving as part of a more elaborate composition.

concludes that the statue overthrown by Alypius was part of a luxurious tomb-decoration belonging to the 'lion attacking the bull' statuary type. Nonetheless, Xyngolpoulos' assumption seems to be invalidated by the two details given by the anonymous *Life*, which were mentioned before (the *tauroleon* is referred to through "lion" and "statue").

Leaving aside for a moment the difference between the anonymous *Life* and Antonius' (ξόανον – "statue" vs. ξόανα – "statues"), one may formulate another argument for the equivalence between the ταυρολέων and the 'bull-and-lion' statue. Firstly, the studies on funerary monuments in Paphlagonia emphasize both the Greek and the Achaemenid influences on the local elements.[359] Also, the archaeological inquiries in Adrianoupolis showed that its necropolis comprises rock-cut graves, *sarcophagi*, rock-cut niches and *columellas*, but also "pediment-like" tomb stones.[360] Thus, another term may be used to describe this scene (the lion slaying a bull), and the one possible option seems to be βούφαγος. Its meaning is transparent, although the lion's presence is not directly expressed in it. However, βούφαγος is not only the name of a Greek hero, the son of Iapetus and Thornax, but more significantly, an epithet of other mythical figures with the ability to consume a whole beef all at once. One of these heroes is Herakles. He is addressed with this very epithet in a funerary epigram: "Tell me, lion, what dead man's tomb are you guarding / between your legs? Bull-eater, who was worthy of your power?"[361] Therefore, the lion slaying a bull could not have been called βούφαγος. Another argument in favor of the representation of a 'bull-and-lion' motif is that it seems to have been highly popular for architectural monuments from

[359] Lâtife Summerer, and Alexander von Kienlin, "Achemenid Impact in Paphlagonia: Rupestral Tombs in the Amnias Valley," in *Achaemenid Impact in the Black Sea: Communications in Power*, ed. J. Nieling, and E. Rahms, Black Sea Studies 11 (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2010), 196. http://www.pontos.dk/publications/books/bss-11-files/bss-11-summerer (accessed 30.04.2015)
This allows me to refer to the Greek grave-markers as virtually parallel examples.

[360] E. Laflı, "A Roman-Cut Cult Niche," 55. No columnar graves are mentioned in the study, but the material culture of the city is beyond the scope of this section. All the discussion is about what the biographer had in mind when he characterized the statue through the otherwise unattested term ταυρολέων.

[361] Antipater, *Anthologia Palatina*, 7, 426 (Denys Lionel Page, *Epigrammata Graeca* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 226; no. 31); Janet Burnett Grossman, *Funerary Sculpture* (Princeton, NJ: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 2013), 27, note 127.

the Archaic Greek period: there is one representing a lion holding under one of its paws a head of a bull.[362]

Antonius' prefers to convey the meaning of the term through a description. Yet, another issue that stays between the perfect equality of his description and the ταυρολέων term given by the other two *Lives* is the gender distinction between the two grass-eaters. Antonius' statue includes the representation of a cow (βοῦς ὑποκειμένη),[363] while the compound term integrates a bull, since through ταῦρος the gender of the animal is fixed.[364] This is another detail suggesting that the two-animal statuary group is Antonius' literary contribution, and, accordingly, that the ταυρολέων was in fact a composite creature, half-lion half-bull, hence a 'bull-lion.'

One issue remains: what would this 'bull-lion' look like? First, the absence of a mythological creature with these characteristics in the Greek mythology is worth underlining. However, by looking into the analysis of the rupestral tombs from Amnias Valley, in the north-eastern part of Paphlagonia, there is a carved image of two beasts very similar to the Achamenid lion-griffin on the façade of a tomb of this kind: a horned-lion with wings.[365] The same motif of the lion-griffin was adopted by Greek art with an entire lion's body. Henceforth according to this scenario, ταυρολέων might have designated the theriomorphic mythical creature that permeated the funerary imagery of Paphlagonia as an Achaemenid influence.

Yet, on the same carved façade of the "Donalar tomb," above the lion-griffins, there is a lion (on the right) and a bull in an aggressive stance (on the left) on each side of the

[362] Grossman, *Funerary Sculpture*, 27.
[363] Delehaye, 190, 14.
[364] Although not a strong argument, it is possible that the anonymous author of the *Life* uses ταῦρος instead of βοῦς because the compounding the latter with λέον would not be as convenient as it would be in the case of ταῦρος with λέων. A possible combination would be *βούλεων (the sequence -σλ- does not stand in Greek), but such a term would be close to the genitive plural of βουλεύς (except for the accent), thus perhaps not precise enough. However, this argument cannot be decisive, since homonymy is very frequent in Greek.
[365] Lâtife Summerer, and Alexander von Kienlin, "Achemenid Impact in Paphlagonia," 211 (199, for the drawing of the "Donalar tomb").

entrance.[366] Also, the column capitals of the tomb are carved as crouching bulls.[367] These last two suggest that the representation of the bull, the lion, and the lion-griffin on the tombs was common, possible as a mixture of Greek and Achaemenid elements.

Until this point, it is quite clear that the ταυρολέων statue destroyed by Alypius was a representation of a 'bull-lion,' an interpretation properly offered by Delehaye, and assumed by the subsequent studies that referred to Alypius' story. Moreover, the ταυρολέων may be identified as a lion-griffin with wings. This half-bull half-lion creature was commonly known as the ταυρολέων, and this was the reason for which neither the first biographer, nor Metaphrastes insisted on the term; they both felt no need to give any detail about what the statue represented.

As for the description of the statue given by Antonius within the *ekphrasis* of the scene in which Alypius claims the funerary column for himself, it shows the author's aim to make his account more pleasing for his monastic audience. The listeners most probably enjoyed the vivid description of the elevation of the column and the overview on the pagan cemetery given through the *ekphrasis*, and they were also more familiar with the 'bull-and-lion' representation than with an Achamenid mythical creature, perhaps because of its presence in Constantinople. Nevertheless, the shift made by Antonius seems to leave two things without an explanation. The first would be why is he making so clear the change between the two distinct type of representations by changing the bull (ταῦρος) with the cow (ἡ βοῦς), instead of using the ox (ὁ βοῦς). The second unclear thing would be why Antonius is not keeping the bull-lion statue in his *encomium*, since perhaps it would fit better what immediately follows. In the continuation of the scene, Antonius praises the column for bearing the 'rational statue,' the stylite, instead of the statues of the pagan deities, thus one would expect that the cleric

[366] Ibid, 212. In the bibliography that I had access to, there is no example of the bull-slayer lion image; the aggressive bull facing a lion was the closest representation. The lions confronted with a bull are very common in Greek art, hence they represent the Greek element.
[367] Ibid., 201.

from Constantinople would chose the lion-griffin for its symbolic value: the composite monstrous creature would better embody the demonic power that ruled the cemetery until Alypius' arrival and his purifying action: the construction of the church. The lion-griffin would also fit the attitude that Antonius had towards another composite deity, Pan: "the most ludicrous of those [i.e. gods] mentioned and a subject for laughter – a mixture of different natures and faculties, in order to show his fertility."[368]

In conclusion, without considering the identification of the statue type definitive, I argue that the term ταυρολέων refers to the 'bull-lion' statue, the ideal paragon of the demons from which Alypius will take the abandoned necropolis.

[368] Halkin, 191, 55-58. This effect upon the audience is emphasized by Saradi-Mendelovici, but in relation with ταυρολέων; she counts ridicule among the artificial explanations made up for the appreciation of pagan monuments' artistic value shown by cultivated Christians, and proves it with an example from *Vita Constantini* (III, 54); Saradi Mendelovici, "Christian Attitudes," 50.

Appendix III. Illuminated manuscripts of the Metaphrastic Menologion

In her study about the illuminated manuscripts of the Metaphrastic *Menologion*, Nancy Peterson Sevčenko mentions five miniatures depicting Alypius.[369] In two of them, Alypius is staying on the top of his column,[370] while in the others, Alypius is either "standing *orans,*"[371] or simply standing.[372]

Regarding other details, one manuscript illumination depicts Alypius in bust who not only stands on the pillar, but he is also behind a grid; thus, he is enclosed on the platform of his pillar. The column is drawn with significant details: it has three steps at the base, and its capital is decorated with a "lion's head mask."[373] In another depiction, Alypius holds a cross in his hands,[374] while another illustration presents Alypius wearing a pointed black hood.[375]

[369] Nancy Patterson Ševčenko, *Illustrated Manuscripts of the Metaphrastian Menologion* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990).
[370] Paris, Bibliothèque nationale *gr.* 580 + 1499 (Ševčenko, *Illustrated Manuscripts*, 21); and Athos, Lavra Δ 71 (fol. 181v) (Ševčenko, *Illustrated Manuscripts*, 102).
[371] Athos, Dochiariou 5 (Ševčenko, *Illustrated Manuscripts*, 91).
[372] Genoa, Biblioteca Franzoniana *Miss. Urbana*, 36 (fol. 165v) (Ševčenko, *Illustrated Manuscripts*, 44); Copenhagen, Det kongelige Bibliothek *Gamle kongelige Sammlung, fol. 167* (fol. 166r) (Ševčenko, *Illustrated Manuscripts*, 58). Except for the long beard that is characteristic of Alypius' representation, the description does not provide any special detail regarding the monk, thus it must be depicted as standing.
[373] Ševčenko, *Illustrated Manuscripts*, 21.
[374] Ševčenko, *Illustrated Manuscripts*, 44.
[375] Ševčenko, *Illustrated Manuscripts*, 91. Also on the representation of Alypius, see Semiha Yıldız Ötüken, "Konstantin IX. – 'Soliman,' Einzelkmapfer,' 'Siegesbringer' – und die 'Unbesiegbare' Theotokos," in *Byzantine Constantinople: Monuments, Topography, and Everyday Life*, ed. Nevra Necipoğlu (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 183-85.

Appendix IV. 'Alypius' monastery' in Constantinople

One of the manuscripts of the *Synaxarion* refers to a monastery dedicated to Alypius in Constantinople.[376] There is no other reference to this monastery elsewhere, and the exact location of this monastery is not given except for the rather vague phrase πλησίον τοῦ ἱπποδρόμου (close to the Hippodrome). Janin suggests that it must have been situated in the Hippodrome's north-eastern part.[377]

In the *Life* of Athanasius, patriarch of Constantinople (1289-1293; 1303-1309), his biographer, Theoktistos the Studite associates the patriarch with Alypius.[378] By his own words, Theoktistos says that Athanasius himself would have known Alypius' *Life*. The special devotion of the patriarch to the stylite may be also be explained by the fact that the latter also came from a city called Adrianoupolis. However, although it is generally accepted that the city was another Adrianoupolis in Thrace, Athanasius imitated Alypius by leaving his mother for the love of God.[379] If there was such a monastery in Constantinople, Theoktistos would have mentioned, since he was contemporary with his hero, and this may serve as *argumentum ex silentio* for the non-existence of the monastery at the end of the thirteen century.

[376] Delehaye, lxxxi; *Synaxarion: Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, 257 (46-47); Raymond Janin, *La Géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire Byzantin. 1ère partie: Le siège de Constantinople et le Patriarcat Oecuménique*, vol. 3, *Les Églises et les monastères* (Paris: Institut Français d' Études Byzantines, 1969), 19.
[377] Janin, *La Géographie ecclésiastique*, 19. See also Albrecht Berger, Jonathan Bardill, "The Representations of Constantinople in Hartmann Sehedel's World Chronicle, and Related Pictures," *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 22, no. 1 (1998): 18 (also fig. 9) http://www.maneyonline.com/doi/pdfplus/10.1179/byz.1998.22.1.1 (accessed 29.04.2015).
[378] BHG 194. Delehaye, "La Vie d'Athanase, patriarche de Constantinople (1289-1293, 1304-1310)," *Mélanges D'hagiographie grecque et latine*, Subsidia hagiographica 42 (Bruxelles: Société des bollandistes, 1996).
[379] Delehaye, "La Vie d'Athanase," 130-131.