

After the Text

Byzantine Enquiries in Honour
of Margaret Mullett

Edited by

**Liz James, Oliver Nicholson
and Roger Scott**

ISBN: 978-0-367-89886-1 (hbk)

First published 2022

Chapter 16

**Same-gender friendships and enmity in
the *Life of Eupraxia***

Stavroula Constantinou

(CC BY-NC-ND 4.0)

DOI: 10.4324/9781003021759-21

16 Same-gender friendships and enmity in the *Life of Eupraxia**

Stavroula Constantinou

In his influential ascetic works, Basil of Caesarea (c. 329–79) disapproves the formation of personal friendships within monastic contexts because they both threaten monastic harmony and violate Christ's commandment according to which love should be equally addressed to all human beings.¹ Basil's authoritative line is largely adopted by later Byzantine monasticism,² as attested by a number of monastic foundation documents in which personal friendships between monks or nuns are condemned.³ Despite such condemnations, however, a considerable number of hagiographical texts celebrate monumental friendships between the holy protagonist and a fellow-ascetic,⁴ which often dominate the texts' narrative plots.⁵ Of course, this is a further indication of Byzantine hagiographical literature's frequent inclusion of profane rather than religious values.⁶ This very fact should be associated with the authors' intentions and their audiences' tastes and interests. Functioning as the 'television of the Middle Ages',⁷ hagiography was unavoidably deeply entertaining, a characteristic that was mainly achieved through its profane elements and narrative techniques.

As for friendship narratives in female hagiography,⁸ a case in point is the *Life of Eupraxia* (hereafter *LE*; *BHG* 631), an anonymous text of a male author relating a story set towards the end of the 4th and at the beginning of the 5th century that was probably written at some point in the 5th century.⁹ According to her *Life*, Eupraxia was born under the reign of Theodosios I (379–95), the last emperor who ruled both the Eastern and Western parts of the Roman Empire. Eupraxia is the only child of a noble woman with the same name and a senator called Antigonos, a kinsman and very close friend of the emperor Theodosios. Before reaching the very young age of five, Eupraxia becomes an orphan after the sudden death of her father.

Full of sorrow for the unexpected loss of his beloved relative and friend, Theodosios takes Antigonos' widow and daughter under his personal protection. His second move is to secure the little girl's future by betrothing her to the son of a rich senator. Some time later, another member of the senate asks the widow, through the intercession of the empress, to marry him. Eupraxia, who has renounced sexual life before her husband's death, rejects the proposal. Upon hearing about these marriage arrangements, the emperor shows his dissatisfaction and reproaches the empress.

In an attempt to extricate the royal couple from any further arguments because of her, the widow Eupraxia moves with her synonymous daughter to Egypt. They settle down in the Thebaid where they engage in philanthropic activities. They also become frequent visitors to a nunnery with an extremely strict monastic *régime* that is located in a nearby town. The girl is so impressed by the convent life that she decides to become a nun. Accepting this decision, the mother leaves her daughter in the hands of

the abbess Theodoule, and returns to her charitable work. Sometime later the widow dies, and she is buried in the nunnery's enclosure.

In the meantime and while in the convent, the young Eupraxia develops a very close friendship with her tutor and fellow nun, Ioulia, who is always with her offering support, especially when Eupraxia is tempted by the Devil. Assisted by both her friend and the abbess, Eupraxia gradually becomes an exemplary nun: she does the nunnery's heaviest work, she serves the sisters with zeal, she defeats temptation, and she acquires virtues, such as obedience, patience, humility, kindness and love. Eupraxia's conduct provokes admiration and envy, love and hatred. The abbess and all the sisters, apart from one nun, love Eupraxia and admire her greatly. Driven by her jealousy, this nun, who has the uncommon name Germana, becomes, along with the Devil, Eupraxia's constant enemy.

First, Germana maintains that the heroine only works hard because she wants to become Theodoule's successor, and then she tries to belittle Eupraxia's piety and ascetic life. Eventually, Eupraxia achieves such high levels of spirituality that she is granted the gift of miracle working which, while arousing admiration from the convent's other members, is questioned by the envious Germana. When Eupraxia's death is approaching, the abbess has a vision in which she is informed that in ten days the heroine will be received in Paradise. This information greatly saddens Theodoule who does not want to lose her favourite nun. The most intense sorrow, nevertheless, is experienced by Eupraxia's closest friend, Ioulia, who cannot accept her sudden loss. She stays on Eupraxia's tomb until she finally meets her own death. Ioulia is buried next to her eternal friend. A month later, the abbess dies too. She follows the two friends to Heaven, and she is buried with them. The three women's grave becomes a locus of signs and miracles.

Eupraxia's *Life* was popular among monks, both in the Byzantine and post-Byzantine periods. For example, the monk John Zonaras wrote in the 12th century a reworking of the ancient *Life* [BHG 631m] discussed here,¹⁰ and Ignatios, a 17th-century monk of the Dionysiou monastery on Mount Athos, translated the 5th-century text into the *koine* of the time in order to make it accessible to wider monastic audiences.¹¹ The *LE*, which, despite its recognition in Byzantium, has not received much scholarly attention,¹² is examined here in its own right from a literary perspective, and not in relation to other monastic texts concerned with female friendship.¹³ The reason for this is threefold.

First, while in other hagiographical works recording female friendships the protagonist's relationship with God is presented as the supreme friendship, Eupraxia's *Life*, as the following analysis will further show, establishes a world of (female) friendship that is prioritized. Eupraxia's friendship with Ioulia lies at its very centre while the heroine's relationship with Christ, her spiritual spouse, as she sees him (*LE*, Ch.II.10), acquires a somewhat less importance.

Second, as will also be demonstrated, the *Life* examined here, in contrast to other Lives celebrating female friendships, includes a male non-monastic relationship – that between Antigonos and Theodosios – which anticipates the one between Eupraxia and Ioulia. Furthermore, Eupraxia's *Life* contains some additional female friendships, which take up less narrative space and thus appear to be less significant. These are, for example, the relationship between the mother Eupraxia and the empress and the relationship between the abbess and the protagonist. Despite their lesser importance in the narrative – as compared to the text's two predominant friendships

(Antigonos-Theodosios and Eupraxia-Ioulia) – these secondary relationships contribute to the establishment of friendship as the *LE*'s principal theme.

Third, enmity is central in Eupraxia's *Life* whereas this is not the case with other hagiographical narratives with female friendships. Thus the *LE* is unique in that it is a narrative of both (female) friendship and enmity, in which friendship is to a large extent defined in opposition to enmity and vice-versa. The text teaches, as will be explored below, how to do the work of friendship, and how both to recognize and to deal with the work of enmity in order to achieve a self-fulfilment which might lead to holiness.

For reasons of space, the present chapter will focus only on the three key human relationships depicted in the *LE* (Antigonos-Theodosios, Eupraxia-Ioulia and Germana-Eupraxia) and their interconnections, with the intention of achieving a double aim: first, to bring to light an understudied, yet remarkable, hagiographical narrative and its workings; and second, to show how worldly relationships, such as friendship and enmity, acquire meaning in a religious text that has attracted the interest of Byzantine and post-Byzantine monks. For the chapter's purposes, I will use both Aristotle's theory of the perfect friendship as formulated in his *Nicomachean Ethics* (*NE*, books VIII and IX) and Jacques Derrida's work on the nature of friendship.¹⁴ Aristotle is useful here because the two monumental friendships celebrated in the *LE* share, as I will show, many of the characteristics of the perfect friendship as defined by the famous ancient Greek philosopher.

For Aristotle, ideal friendship exists between two wise (male) individuals who are interested in and love each other on the basis of virtue (*NE*, VIII.2, 3).¹⁵ Being equal in integrity, real friends share the same thoughts and goals. Each friend treats the other as his own self, and he desires and does what is good and pleasant for the sake of his friend. Perfect friends spend a lot of time together in an attempt to act for each other's benefit. One friend motivates the other by sharing in the joint aspiration towards good judgement through which both friends as persons and their relationship are perfected (*NE*, IX.9, 10, 12).

Derrida's theory is to a great extent inspired by that of Aristotle.¹⁶ What applies most here is his definition of friendship as the work of memory and mourning. According to Derrida, to befriend is to have the experience of mourning, since it is inevitable that one of the two friends must die first.¹⁷ Their friendship, therefore, has to be 'structured from the very beginning by the possibility that one of them would see the other die, and so, surviving, would be left to bury, to commemorate, and to mourn'.¹⁸ As Derrida himself phrases it, friendship is another name for

that twilight space of what is called mourning: the mourning that follows death but also the mourning that is prepared and that we expect from the very beginning to follow upon the death of those we love. Love or friendship would be nothing other than the passion, the endurance, and the patience of this work.¹⁹

The mourning for the friend is simultaneously mourning for the self, since, as one of Derrida's models, Aristotle, has stressed, real friends have one mind and one soul in two bodies, and as such they identify with one another (*NE*, VIII.5, 6; IX.8). In Derrida's formulation, the dead friend is now 'at once too absent and too close: in me, inside me'.²⁰ By grieving the beloved's death, a friend inevitably wonders what the lost one has been to him or her. He or she internalizes the deceased to such a high degree that the friend's loss is experienced as a loss to the self.

As the succeeding discussion will further demonstrate, the Derridean axiom that the essence of friendship lies in mourning and memory finds its full application in the *LE*, since in most of the text's friendships there is a friend who dies and a friend who is left behind to mourn and to remember. In fact, Derrida is relevant here for one more reason. As the philosopher *par excellence* of mourning,²¹ Derrida comes extremely close to ancient Christian ascetic thought, in which mourning is an integral part of the ascetic's life. According to the prominent monastic author John Klimakos (7th century),²² for instance, asceticism is a life of mourning (κατάνυξις, πένθος) through which the monk discovers himself and the divine.²³ In Eupraxia's *Life*, as will be shown, the Derridean work of friendship is associated with the work of asceticism. In other words, mourning and the memory of death in the text examined here coincide with both friendship and asceticism. This common element shared between friendship and asceticism, in association with their other parallels discussed below, blurs the boundaries between religious and secular values. As a result, friendship appears less profane, and thus more acceptable in a monastic text.

Interestingly, sorrow is inherent in Germana's envious enmity too. Envy, 'the most difficult form of enmity' (Basil of Caesarea, *On Envy*, PG 31.376), is described by the Church Fathers as grief over a neighbour's or a relative's welfare, a definition that also goes back to Aristotle (*Rhetorica*, 1387.22–4).²⁴ The following examination of Germana's enmity will demonstrate that some of the ideas expressed in the Basilean homily *On Envy* – a text having a great impact on later Byzantine discourses referring to envy²⁵ – are also reflected in the *LE*. But before discussing the work of enmity in relation to that of friendship in Eupraxia's *Life*, the text's two most significant friendships, their meanings, interrelationships and subtexts should first be investigated.

Love and friendship

Lacking the standard prologue of a saint's *Life*,²⁶ the *LE* opens with a laudatory presentation of the friendship shared between Antigonos and the emperor Theodosios. Apart from marking the beginning of the text, the two men's relationship dominates the first part of the narrative (*LE*, Ch.I). The fact that the anonymous hagiographer devotes the first part of the *Life* to an ideal friendship suggests an intention of alerting his audience at the outset to the significance of friendship for the narrative.

An important contemporary subtext of this first friendship seems to be Latinus Drepanius Pacatus' panegyric addressed to Theodosios, which was delivered (probably in a form more suited to oral delivery) before the emperor and the Senate at Rome in the summer of 389. In this remarkable text, Pacatus praises the emperor in a considerable part of his speech (§16–20) for his capacity for friendship, a capacity which is enumerated as one of his unique virtues.²⁷ As Pacatus writes:

Has any Emperor ever thought that the cultivation of friendship should be counted among the *imperial virtues*? [...] By your deeds, and not merely by words, you have affirmed that the feelings of a prince ought to be all the more benevolent toward his subjects the greater his fortune is, for you act with equal *loyalty* and *generosity*, and as Emperor you extend to your friends what you had wished for them when a private citizen. But what prayers could obtain for them what most of them have received from you as Emperor? [...] But with a novel kind of *benevolence* you distributed to your friends honors which were intended to be exclusive to them, so

that no benefit might accrue to you from them unless it be the *pleasure of giving*. [...] You therefore have so treated your friends that you could not do more for your father. O what a singularly *clever scheme*, this *benefaction* of yours!²⁸

(Pacatus, *Panegyric II* [XII] §16; tr. Nixon and Rodgers, emphasis added)

Pacatus admires Theodosios for being the first Roman emperor to elevate friendship to the level of an imperial virtue: after ascending the throne, he remains the same loyal, generous, benevolent, and caring friend for the friends he had acquired as a private citizen. Unlike his predecessors, he finds more pleasure in giving to his friends than in the prestige, power, and wealth associated with his emperorship. In fact, his friends are as dear to him as is his own father to whom he owes life, and his devotion to them is much stronger than his care for his own self (see also Pacatus, *Panegyric II* [XII] §17). Thus Theodosios may be identified with the wise man who is capable of Aristotle's perfect friendship, while at the same time he follows the Christian practice according to which one should give without expecting anything in return (Lk. 6.35). All in all, Theodosios' treatment of his friends is for Pacatus the most powerful sign of his acuteness and vivacity, qualities which also distinguish him from previous emperors.

Pacatus' portrayal of Theodosios as an ideal friend in Aristotle's terms, one also equal to the exemplary friends of Greek mythology mentioned by Aristotle (Pirithous-Theseus, Pylades-Orestes and Damon-Phintias; Pacatus §17.1–5), accords with the portrayal of Theodosios by Eupraxia's hagiographer, who praises Theodosios for his memorable friendship with Antigonos. The two men's relationship is based on their spiritual equality and mutuality: they are wise and pious and the one works towards the benefit of the other, seeking the other's benefit and happiness rather than his own.

As a religious author, our hagiographer, however, differs from Pacatus in that he presents as the main source of the two men's friendship their common love for God. For the anonymous hagiographer, the emperor loves Antigonos mainly due to his godly love and piety. Like the emperor, Antigonos bestows generous alms on the destitute. Sometime after the birth of his daughter, Eupraxia, Antigonos becomes even more fervent in his God-pleasing activities: he increases his offers to the needy and renounces sexual life. In this way, he expresses his gratitude to God who has offered him a child. Theodosios and Antigonos thus share a perfect friendship not just because they are spiritually equal and the one desires the companionship and wisdom of the other, but also because they share a love for God which is expressed through piety and ascetic practices. Their relationship constitutes, therefore, an example of a Christianized version of Aristotle's ideal friendship. It does not differ much from the friendships between the saintly protagonists of Byzantine hagiography, such as that of Sergios and Bakchos, or that of Eupraxia and Ioulia which will be presented below.²⁹

The two men's relationship enters a new phase after the unexpected death of Antigonos when the devastated Theodosios is left behind to commemorate his friend. Theodosios' fidelity to and responsibility for Antigonos takes a threefold form. First, it is expressed in enormous mourning, through which the deceased remains alive in the living friend's memory. Before long, however, the emperor has to control his grief in order to be able to console his friend's family. Now the lost friend is commemorated by means of affection and support for his family. Finally, Theodosios remembers Antigonos by taking his place as husband and father: he becomes the protector of his dead friend's wife and the father of his daughter. Pacatus, as demonstrated earlier, eulogizes

Theodosios for not betraying his friends after becoming an emperor. The hagiographer of Eupraxia reveals another aspect of Theodosios' treatment of friendship. For the emperor, friendship does not just remain unchanged during life, but it also survives death through mourning and through various different acts of commemoration.

This genuine and pious friendship with which the *LE* starts, prefigures, as suggested before, the text's central friendship that binds together the protagonist Eupraxia and her fellow nun Ioulia. Like her father, Eupraxia develops a true and everlasting friendship, which also constitutes a lively paradigm of a Christianized version of the Aristotelian perfect friendship. This female friendship dominates not only the largest part of the text, but also the two women's shared monastic life, as well as their common afterlife.

This female friendship starts at the beginning of the protagonist's monastic life when Ioulia becomes Eupraxia's spiritual supervisor. Eupraxia's new life as a nun is thus marked by her relationship with Ioulia. In fact, Eupraxia's two new concurrent identities as nun and friend are inextricably interrelated, as the one is presupposed by the other. While Antigonos' friendship with the emperor is, for instance, instrumental in the latter's good governance (*ἀεὶ ἀρεστὰ συμβουλευόν τῷ βασιλεῖ εὐσεβῶς διοικεῖν τῆς Ρωμαϊκῆς καταστάσεως τὰ πράγματα*, *LE*, 1.1), Eupraxia's relationship with Ioulia proves essential for the latter's initiation in monastic life and her subsequent exemplary asceticism. Of course, it is not only Eupraxia or Theodosios who progress in virtues through friendship, but also the other friend; Ioulia shares eventually Eupraxia's holiness, while Antigonos' goodness is strengthened through his relationship with the pious emperor.

As is the case with Antigonos and Theodosios, the two nuns seek out the company of each other. In contrast to the two men, who have a number of worldly responsibilities that often separate them from each other, Eupraxia and Ioulia are almost always together. This becomes possible through the heroines' common monastic life and Ioulia's initial role as Eupraxia's instructor. The *Life* appears, therefore, to suggest that the locus of an ideal friendship is the monastery, which allows the continuous interaction of friends in Christ. Apart from Germana, the two women's friendship does not disturb the abbess and the other nuns. In fact, the two heroines' companionship appears as natural and self-evident. There is no attempt on the hagiographer's part to explain or justify the fact that two nuns of Theodoule's convent, which is famous for its severe rules, enjoy such a strong friendship that separates them from the rest of the monastic community.

Eupraxia and Ioulia are depicted chatting about various aspects of monastic life, such as fasting, the Devil's attacks and the ascetic life of the abbess when she was a young nun. They also share their anxieties and fears. Despite the fact that it is the convent's rule to confess one's temptations to the abbess, it is to her friend that Eupraxia turns when she has her first temptations. Then Ioulia advises Eupraxia what is better for her: always to confess her temptations to the abbess, as it is she who gives the best instructions concerning one's defence against the assaults of the Devil. As well as listening to, advising and improving each other, the two nuns help one another in performing daily tasks, such as cleaning, baking bread and cooking.

The feeling that dominates both friendships is, as implied earlier, fervent love which is both human and divine. Antigonos and Theodosios, as well as Eupraxia and Ioulia love each other, while at the same time they love and worship God together. Their love for and friendship with one another is the result of their love for God and vice versa.

Love is in fact a central emotion in the *LE*. The verb ἀγαπᾶν (to love) and its synonym φιλεῖν, for instance, are frequently repeated in the text. Words meaning love are often used by the hagiographer to describe not only the dominant emotion of the text's two key friendships, but also the affection involved in other human and spiritual relationships depicted in the text, affections such as biological and monastic kinship, as well as the relationship that most characters have with God. For example, the feeling that the empress and the emperor share for their relative Eupraxia, Antigonos' widow, is love. Being bound up with spiritual kinship, the nuns of Theodoule's nunnery with the exception of Germana who is overcome by envy and hatred, love both each other and also Christ, their common bridegroom.

Like the friendship of Antigonos and Theodosios, that between Eupraxia and Ioulia is destined to become the work of mourning. Just as the pious father is early summoned by his divine friend, leaving his distressed worldly friend behind, the even holier daughter is taken much earlier by her divine bridegroom, abandoning, yet for a very short while, Ioulia. Whereas Theodosios' mourning takes place upon Antigonos' death, that of Ioulia starts while Eupraxia is still alive. Theodosios' lamentation thus cannot be heard by Antigonos who now dwells within the emperor as an absent alterity, as Derrida would have it. Ioulias' mourning, on the other hand, is enacted before Eupraxia who has the possibility to answer her friend's lamentation with her own. Theodosios' previous weeping at the absence of his friend is transformed here into a shared mourning between the two friends:

Having heard this [Eupraxia's upcoming death], Ioulia starts beating both her breast and face in tears. [...] Seeing her in such a state, Eupraxia says: 'I implore you in the name of the son of God, sister, make known to me what you have heard and for what reason you are crying'. Ioulia says: 'My lady, I am lamenting because *today we are separating from each other*. As I have heard tomorrow you will die'. Upon hearing these words, Eupraxia becomes completely overwhelmed and falls down in a faint. Ioulia stands by her in tears.³⁰

(*LE*, Ch.IV.34; emphasis added)

The extremely sad news concerning Eupraxia's imminent loss makes Ioulia think about death before death and about life without her 'other self' (ἔστι γὰρ ὁ φίλος ἄλλος αὐτός, *NE*, IX.4.31–2). Her subsequent bodily reaction shows that she experiences the loss of the friend as the loss of the self. Ioulias' lamentation and gestures of distress cancel language for a while. As Derrida wrote in the wake of Paul de Man's death, 'speaking is impossible, but so too would be silence or absence or a refusal to share one's sadness'.³¹ Consequently, even if Eupraxia's approaching death seems inconceivable and beyond words, Ioulia is called upon to break her verbal silence and share her sadness with her friend. In so doing, she violates the abbess' strict command that Eupraxia should not be informed about the prophecy of her death. Obviously, the law of friendship necessitating the sharing of the friends' experiences proves much stronger than the command of the abbess.

Ioulia's first words express very graphically the true friend's anxiety: she finds herself in a state of immense sorrow because Eupraxia's death will separate them from each other. Eupraxia's reaction to these words is even stronger, as she loses consciousness and falls to the ground. Ioulia in turn finds herself in such shock that she does not respond to Eupraxia's fainting, but stays immobile next to her. Of course, Ioulia's

lack of reaction is the strongest evidence of her loss of self. Until now, she has always undertaken actions towards assisting, protecting and benefiting her friend, yet now she is incapable of looking after Eupraxia, just as she is unable to exercise self-control.

It is, in fact, at this very moment of both friends' complete loss of themselves prior to the event of death that the act of friendship reaches, according to Derrida, the very extreme of its possibility:

The anguished apprehension of mourning (*without which the act of friendship would not spring forth in its very energy*) insinuates itself *a priori* and anticipates itself; it haunts and plunges the friend, before mourning, into mourning. This apprehension weeps before the lamentation, it weeps death before death, and this is the very *respiration of friendship*, the *extreme of its possibility*. Hence surviving is at once the essence, the origin and the possibility, the condition of possibility of friendship; it is *the grieved act of loving*. *This time of surviving thus gives the time of friendship.*³²

(Emphasis added)

In other words, the above-quoted scene of the two heroines' loss of self brings about the complexities of friendship as understood by Derrida for whom its possibility lies in the mourning of the friend's loss even before this loss takes place. From now on and until Eupraxia's death, the two women will experience their friendship in its very essence: as a mournful, yet short-lived, relationship that is bound to a mournful asceticism. Since the time that the two friends have at their disposal is extremely brief – according to the abbess' prophetic vision Eupraxia will die the next day – , they undertake immediate actions.

Recovering soon her senses, Eupraxia turns again to Ioulia to ask for her assistance. Her rashness is reflected in her paratactic and almost breathless speech: 'Give me your hand, sister, and help me stand up; take me to the storage room with the wood and leave me there; and take the breads from the oven and put them inside the nunnery' (*LE*, Ch.IV.34). Eupraxia needs first Ioulia's help to stand to her feet and be able to move to a more private space, and second, to finish her assigned task of preparing bread for the monastic community. Without saying a word, Ioulia fulfils immediately Eupraxia's wishes. Upon being left alone, Eupraxia falls again to the ground to mourn now for the end of her short, and consequently, insufficient ascetic life. She addresses her spiritual spouse as follows:

Why, my lord, did you despise me, your servant, the foreigner and orphan? For what reason have you forgotten me? It is only now that the time has come for me to fight against the Devil and save my soul. Have mercy on me, my Lord Jesus Christ, and let me live for another year so that I might lament over my sins. I have not been able to repent yet. I am naked of every virtue, and I have not performed any work leading to salvation. [Do grant me this year], because it will not be possible for me to confess my sins in the otherworld. There is no way to repent in the tomb. Mourning has no power after death.

(*LE*, Ch.IV.34)

In the light of death, therefore, it is not only friendship that 'springs forth in its very energy', but also asceticism, which reaches its possibility too. Mourning and the memory

of death are thus as essential to asceticism as they are to friendship. Upon hearing about her forthcoming death, the heroine realizes for the first time the quality of both friendship and ascetic life. For the interruption of the first, she laments together with Ioulia, while for that of the second she mourns alone, voicing early and contemporary ascetic ideas concerning mourning that are later adopted by Klimakos. We read, for instance, in the Alphabetical Collection of the *Apophthegmata Patrum* (*AP*; 5th century):

It was said of him [Arsenius] that he had a hollow in his chest channelled out by the tears which fell from his eyes all his life while he sat at his manual work. When Abba Poemen learned that he was dead, he said weeping, 'Truly you are blessed, Abba Arsenius, for you wept for yourself in this world! He who does not weep for himself here below will weep eternally hereafter; so it is impossible not to weep, either voluntarily or when compelled through suffering'.

(*AP*, Arsenius: §41)

A brother asked Abba Poemen, 'What shall I do with my sins?' The old man said to him, 'Weep within yourself. For deliverance from sins and procurement of virtues both derive from mourning'.³³

(*AP*, Poemen; §208)

According to Eupraxia, Arsenius and Poemen, the nun's or monk's work is mourning. Without mourning ascetic life loses its very meaning, as it is through weeping that the ascetic receives deliverance from sins and acquires the virtues defining asceticism. In order for mourning to be effective, however, it has to be continuous and to take place with the awareness of death. That is why Eupraxia asks God to let her live for another year so that she might be able to do what Arsenius has been doing all his life: to weep incessantly.

The heroine's mourning, which starts with the announcement of her death, does not cease until she is overcome by a terminal fever paralyzing her body. During Eupraxia's final illness, Ioulia does not leave her side. Full of sorrow, she stays awake next to her dying friend, forgetting her own tiredness and hunger. At some point, she implores Eupraxia saying:

Sister, my lady, do not *forget* me. *Remember* that we have been inseparable on earth. Beseech the Lord to take me with you. *Remember* that I have been the one who introduced you into the good contests. Pray to the Lord so that I may soon go up to heaven to be with you.

(*LE*, VI.35; emphasis added)

Ioulia's words open up a new possibility for the two women's expiring earthly friendship, which has not been available in the case of Antigonos and Theodosios. The knowledge acquired through the abbess concerning Eupraxia's place in Christ's heavenly palace allows Ioulia to ask her dying friend in a rather imperative manner not to *forget* her in her new superior life. Ioulia evokes here friendship as memory, union, reciprocity, loyalty and responsibility.

She first reminds Eupraxia of their previous common life: they have been always together. She then goes on to remind the heroine of what she has been to her: Ioulia

has initiated Eupraxia into the ascetic feats through which the heroine is now deemed worthy of the crown of holiness. The first memory places Eupraxia under the responsibility of not abandoning her friend now that she will start a new and better life in heaven. Eupraxia's special status as a saint enables her to intercede with Christ in favour of the friendship she shares with Ioulia, which can be transferred to paradise provided that Ioulia dies soon thereafter. The second memory recalls Eupraxia's obligation of reciprocity and loyalty. By sharing her holiness with Ioulia, Eupraxia will pay off her debt to her. In so doing, Eupraxia will remain faithful to her friendship, which has been based on mutual love and understanding, as well as on acting towards the friend's improvement and benefit.

Ioulia's pleas are answered soon after Eupraxia's death, but not before Ioulia performs the designated three days of weeping, which she spends alone over Eupraxia's tomb, showing once more her strong attachment to her friend. On the fourth day after Eupraxia's death, God summons Ioulia to heaven through Eupraxia's intercession, and consequently, the friend's sorrow is transformed into joy. Ioulia dies on the following day and her body is buried next to that of Eupraxia. By inhabiting the same tomb, the two friends become inseparable in death too. In fact, their friendship is more permanent than that, since it extends not only life and death, but it also reaches the afterlife. As the abbess announces to the monastic community a month later, and just before her own death through which she is reunited with the two heroines,

The Lord has summoned me. Lady Eupraxia has pleaded on my behalf [...] so that I might become worthy of the heavenly bridegroom. Similarly, Ioulia has through Eupraxia [...] entered that palace, which has not been made by hands, [and they] dwell together with the unimaginable chorus [of saints]. Thus I too rush to be with them.

(*LE*, Ch.IV.37)

Whereas Ioulia achieves holiness due to her exemplary character as a friend, Eupraxia is deemed worthy of sanctification due to her exemplary character as a nun. Of course, Eupraxia owes her monastic perfection chiefly to her friendship with Ioulia, which among other things provides her with the love and support she needs to defend herself against temptation, adversity and envy. In Eupraxia's case, friendship and enmity appear as the two opposing sides of the same coin. Despite their secular and opposing character, these two relationships appear to nurture the protagonist's holiness. Enmity's contribution to this process is analysed below.

Envy and enmity

While the friend is part of the friend's self, and as such she or he provokes the friend's sorrow before death, the envious enemy, and in this case Germana, who has no friend and no love, suffers from a permanent lack causing grief too. As saint Basil puts it: 'envy is grief [...]. Envy is friendship's disorder' (*On Envy*, PG 31.373 and 380). Germana's envious enmity against Eupraxia constitutes a continuous and progressive sorrow. The greater the protagonist's virtues and spirituality, as well as the admiration they incite, the stronger Germana's misery and hatred become.

Germana's enmity against Eupraxia develops parallel with the protagonist's friendship with Ioulia, and it creates in Basil's terms a 'disorder', as it threatens the union,

harmony and order established by love and friendship. Whereas the two heroines' mutual friendship is directed towards the good, Germana's one-sided envy is led towards evil that divides people. Eventually, what Germana achieves with her wicked behaviour is to segregate herself from the rest of the community. The abbess and the other nuns excluding Eupraxia consider her a 'malicious servant' and an 'enemy of God and the sisterhood' (*LE*, Ch.IV.20). Due to Germana's maliciousness, the sisters avoid her, while Theodoule humiliates and punishes her, yet without managing to affect any change on her envious character.

Germana envies Eupraxia, not only because she is so exemplary and highly esteemed, but also because she is her exact opposite, having everything that she lacks. Through her name, Eupraxia is associated with her synonymous mother, and is revealed as the doer of good deeds and the carrier, seeker and inciter of the good. As such, she is the true daughter of her pious and praiseworthy parents. Eupraxia's goodness, as suggested previously, connects all the nuns who have the same positive feelings for her and are edified by her example.

The name Germana, on the other hand, suggests that its carrier is someone who is displaced and distanced from the good and the noble. Feeling demeaned by Eupraxia's goodness and self-fulfillment, Germana sees Eupraxia as the cause and cure of her own weaknesses and sorrows. In an attempt to heal her wounds and fill up her sheer emptiness, Germana fixes her attention upon Eupraxia. All her time and energy go into attempting through hateful speech and unfounded accusations and criticism to destroy Eupraxia's strict asceticism, spirituality and good fame within the nunnery. Thus, instead of concentrating on her relationship with God, Germana neglects her own ascetic work and ends up becoming an anti-nun.

All in all, Germana's behaviour and attacks against the protagonist recall those of the Devil, the greatest enemy of goodness. Envy, as Basil remarks in his homily on the subject, is the Devil's work and the envious man is the Devil's instrument. In the *LE*, the Devil's attacks interchange with those of Germana, and as a result, Eupraxia is constantly confronted with tribulations testing her obedience and faith. Assisted by Ioulia and Theodoule, Eupraxia manages after years of ascetic struggles to vanquish the Devil completely and her temptations cease to disturb her. Germana, however, whose envy appears greater even than that of the Devil, who after his defeat disappears from the narrative, continues to assault the heroine, giving her further opportunity to show her spiritual power and the importance of holding on to the good as a powerful weapon against human envy.

Like the Devil, Germana confronts Eupraxia strategically. She lurks until Eupraxia remains alone while performing the daily tasks through which she serves both Germana and the other sisters. By intruding into Eupraxia's place of work when Ioulia is absent, the envious nun is facilitated in her attempt to hurt the heroine by degrading, and spoiling her ascetic work and goodness:

She [Germana] comes to the kitchen when she [Eupraxia] is alone and tells her: 'Tell me, Eupraxia, if you eat once a week [...] and we cannot perform such a deed, what are we supposed to do in case the abbess obliges us to do the same?' Eupraxia tells her: 'Have mercy on me, my lady, our abbess told us to struggle according to our ability. She did not force me to undertake this yoke'. Germana tells her: 'You, foe, who are filled with viciousness, who wouldn't believe that you are doing all these in viciousness, in order to succeed the abbess after her death? I believe in

God that you will not be deemed worthy of ascending to this office'. Upon hearing these words, Eupraxia falls on her feet, and tells her: 'Have mercy on me, my lady, I have sinned before God and you'.

(*LE*, Ch.IV.20)

Without warning, Germana enters the nunnery's kitchen to mock Eupraxia and to express her insulting opinion about the protagonist's asceticism. She begins with a fake question assuming an invalid possibility: Theodoule might force all the sisters to adopt Eupraxia's extremely strict régime. Germana's choice to address this question, which is related to food, while Eupraxia is cooking, has a double purpose: first, to tempt Eupraxia, who is without food for days, to break her fast by eating some of the food she has in front of her, and second to make her feel guilty about the negative effects that her personal eating practices might have upon the rest of the monastic community. Germana delights in scorning Eupraxia's fasting, which follows that of Theodoule. In contrast to the abbess and the other sisters, Germana sees the heroine's fasting as 'too good to be true'. For Germana, Eupraxia is a hypocrite who has adopted Theodoule's ascetic practices not for spiritual reasons, but with the intention of becoming abbess herself.

Eupraxia's reaction to Germana's hateful words proves their wrongness, while at the same time it makes the envier's maliciousness seem stronger. In answer to Germana's first question, Eupraxia first asks for forgiveness and then she firmly suggests that her fasting will not create any problems to the other sisters, since the abbess allows each nun to undertake ascetic practices according to her individual ability. Eupraxia's reply makes Germana realize that her first question has not really achieved its purposes, a fact that enrages her. Now she calls Eupraxia an 'enemy of goodness', a characterization that in fact describes Germana herself. Germana then continues with a second and more hateful question, and then, before giving Eupraxia the chance to respond to her new accusations, she goes on to assure Eupraxia that her 'treacherous' plan to succeed Theodoule is doomed to fail.

This time Germana has gone too far, and in so doing she attains her objective: to hurt Eupraxia. Her words shake Eupraxia who spontaneously makes the gesture of penance. After falling on Germana's feet, she asks for forgiveness for having sinned against her fellow sister and God. Eupraxia takes responsibility for Germana's projections, but she is not overcome by the envier's misery, badness and emptiness. She does not identify with the cruelty directed at her, despite feeling wounded. She even actively supports Germana, who is immediately afterwards punished by Theodoule for her wickedness in the kitchen episode. It is after great effort that Eupraxia manages to convince the abbess to release Germana. However, Eupraxia's generosity arouses the ingratitude and hateful resentment of Germana, who continues challenging Eupraxia.

Through her confrontation with Germana, Eupraxia further develops the fullness of her own goodness, which, as shown in the previous part of this chapter, is simultaneously cultivated within the framework of the protagonist's friendship with Ioulia. In other words, in the *LE* both friendship and enmity are essential paths to the protagonist's self-perfection and subsequent holiness. Having reached this conclusion, it is time to answer a question posed in the introduction: why did the *LE* attract the interest of both Byzantine and post-Byzantine monks?

By celebrating a perfect friendship in Christ which, as has been amply demonstrated, is also associated with asceticism through mourning, the *LE* becomes appealing to

monastic audiences which might detect in this relationship an edifying spirituality guiding their daily lives in the monastery. As for enmity, the confrontations of Germana with Eupraxia reveal the proximity of envy and compassion, that is another monastic value.³⁴ The episodes involving Germana and Eupraxia show how the monk or anyone else could recognize, understand and deal with envy. Through Germana, who is the personification of the Devil, the monastic's constant enemy, the energies of envy, its vicious attacks and its determination to destroy the good become strikingly obvious. Envy is a passion leading to suffering and misery. It prevents connection with and love for fellow monastics and God. Eupraxia's goodness, on the other hand, teaches the most appropriate way to deal with envy. The heroine does not attack Germana. She does not treat her as an enemy, but as a friend, addressing to her the affective feelings she has learned to share within the framework of her friendship with Ioulia. In so doing, Eupraxia develops further her virtuousness, which brings her even closer to Christ with whom she is soon united. The *LE* invites its (monastic) audiences to emulate Eupraxia's goodness, which does not only constitute a remedy for the sin of envy, but also is a ticket to paradise.

Notes

* A much earlier version of this chapter was presented in a conference on medieval friendship that was organized by Margaret Mullett at Queen's University Belfast in August 2004. At this point I would like to thank Margaret warmly for making me aware of Byzantine friendships and for including me in her friendship networks. The research for this chapter was financed by the A. G. Leventis Foundation within the framework of a project on Byzantine hagiography. Furthermore, some of the ideas that inform the chapter's arguments were developed within the framework of the project 'Network for Medieval Arts and Rituals' (NetMAR), which received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 951875. The opinions expressed in this document reflect only the author's view and in no way reflect the European Commission's opinions. The European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

1 C. White, *Christian Friendship in the Fourth Century* (Cambridge 1992) 79–84.

2 For the impact of Basilian rules on Byzantine monasticism, see J.P. Thomas, A. Constantinides Hero and G. Constable (eds.), *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents: A Complete Translation of the Surviving Founders' Typica and Testaments*, 5 vols. (Washington, DC 2000) I, 21–32.

3 See, for example, the *Bebaia Elpis Typikon* by Theodora Synadene §46, in H. Delehay (ed.), *Deux typica byzantins de l'époque des Paléologues* (Brussels 1921) 18–105 at 45, and the *Charsianeites Typikon* by Patriarch Matthew I B7, in I.M. Konidares and K.M. Manaphes (eds.), "Ἐπιτελεύτιος βούλησις καὶ διδασκαλία τοῦ οἰκουμενικοῦ πατριάρχου Ματθαίου Α' (1397–1410)", *EEBS* 45 (1981–82) 462–515: 'Preserve with great care the most perfect communal life, in which [...] private friendships will be meaningless', (Eng. trans. A.-M. Talbot, 'Bebaia Elpis: Typikon of Theodora Synadene for the Convent of the Mother of God Bebaia Elpis in Constantinople', in Thomas et al. (eds.), *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents*, 1512–78, 1536):

Nor should you have private companionships or friendships, for this destroys harmony in yet another way. Paradoxically strife arises from friendship, for "slanders" and grumbling and "gossip" and suspicious and countless ills result from this [...]. Thus none of you should fraternize privately with another [monk], but should engage only in that communal companionship which members [of a community] owe each other. Nor will anyone be allowed to go to another's cell, and visit or talk with him, either at nighttime or during the day.

- (Eng. trans. A.-M. Talbot, 'Charsianeites: Testament of Patriarch Matthew I for the Monastery of Charsianeites Dedicated to the Mother of God *Nea Peribleptos*', in *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents* 1625–66, 1643).
- 4 For early Byzantine hagiography, see D. Krueger, 'Between Monks: Tales of Monastic Companionship in Early Byzantium', *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 20.1 (2011) 28–61 and E. Catafygiotou Topping, 'St. Matrona and Her Friends: Sisterhood in Byzantium', in J. Chrysostomides (eds.), *ΚΑΘΗΓΗΤΡΙΑ: Essays Presented to Joan Hussey on Her 80th Birthday* (Camberley 1988) 211–24. For monastic friendship in general, see P. Hatlie, *The Monks and Monasteries of Constantinople ca. 350–850* (Cambridge 2007) 263–311; R. Rader, *Breaking Boundaries: Male/Female Friendship in Early Christian Communities* (New York 1983) and White, *Christian Friendship*, 164–84. See also S. Constantinou, 'The Gift of Friendship: Beneficial and Poisonous Friendships in the Byzantine Greek Passion of Sergius and Bacchus', in A. Classen and M. Sandige (eds.), *Friendship in the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Age: Explorations of a Fundamental Ethical Discourse*, *Fundamentals of Medieval and Early Modern Culture* 6 (Berlin and New York 2011) 201–30; P. Hatlie, 'Friendship and the Byzantine Iconoclast Age', in J. Haseldine (ed.), *Friendship and Friendship Networks in the Middle Ages* (London 1990) 137–52; D. Konstan, 'Problems in the History of Christian Friendship', *JECS* 4.1 (1996) 87–113 and D. Konstan, *Friendship in the Classical World* (Cambridge 1997). For friendship in Byzantine society, see M. Mullett, 'Byzantium: A Friendly Society?', *Past and Present* 118 (1988) 3–24; M. Mullett, 'Friendship in Byzantium: Genre, Topos, and Network', in J. Haseldine (ed.), *Friendship in Medieval Europe* (Stroud 1999) 166–84; C. Rapp, 'Ritual Brotherhood in Byzantium', *Traditio* 52 (1997) 285–326 and C. Rapp, *Brother-Making in Late Antiquity and Byzantium: Monks, Laymen and Christian Ritual* (Oxford 2016).
 - 5 See, for example, the following texts: *Life of Eupraxia*, *Life of Matrona*, *Life of Symeon the Holy Fool* (in the first part of *Symeon's Life*), and *Life of Febronia*. Friendship is central also in other narrative genres, such as the romance. Three cases in point are the *Tale of Livistros and Rodamne*, the *War of Troy* and *Florios and Platziافlore*. For a discussion of friendship in *Florios*, see S. Constantinou, 'Retelling the Tale: The Byzantine Rewriting of *Floire and Blancheflor*', in M. Baisch and J. Eming (eds.), *Hybridität und Spiel: Der europäische Liebes- und Abenteuerroman von der Antike zur Frühen Neuzeit* (Berlin 2013) 227–42.
 - 6 See A.-M. Talbot, 'The Byzantine Family and the Monastery', *DOP* 44 (1990) 119–29; S. Constantinou, 'Virginity in Danger: Holiness and Sexuality in the *Life of Mary of Antioch*', in D. Searby, E. Witakowska and J. Heldt (eds.), *ΔΩΡΟΝ ΡΟΔΟΠΟΙΚΙΛΟΝ: Studies in Honour of Jan Olof Rosenqvist*, *Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia* 12 (Uppsala 2012) 123–32, and S. Constantinou, 'Family in the Byzantine Greek Legend of Saint Alexios, the Man of God', in L. Brubaker and S. Tougher (eds.), *Approaches to the Byzantine Family* (Aldershot 2013) 273–84.
 - 7 C. Rapp, 'Figures of Female Sanctity: Byzantine Edifying Manuscripts and Their Audience', *DOP* 50 (1996) 313–44, here 313.
 - 8 These are the texts that are devoted to holy women. See S. Constantinou, 'Subgenre and Gender in Saints' Lives', in P. Odorico and P.A. Agapitos (eds.), *Les vies des saints à Byzance. Genre littéraire ou biographie historique? Actes du IIe colloque international sur la littérature byzantine. Paris, 6–8 juin 2002*, *Dossiers Byzantins* 4 (Paris 2004) 411–23 and S. Constantinou, *Female Corporeal Performances: Reading the Body in Byzantine Passions and Lives of Holy Women*, *Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia* 5 (Uppsala 2005).
 - 9 In AASS Mart. II. 1668: 727–35.
 - 10 In E. Kaltsogianni (ed.), *Τὸ ἀγιολογικὸ καὶ ὁμιλητικὸ ἔργο τοῦ Ἰωάννη Ζωναρᾶ in Βυζαντινὰ Κείμενα καὶ Μελέται* 60 (Thessaloniki 2013) 508–28.
 - 11 Rapp, 'Figures of Female Sanctity', 321.
 - 12 There is a brief analysis of the text in question in Constantinou, *Female Corporeal Performances*, 132–3, 153–4, 157, 159, 161.
 - 13 Of course, a study of female monastic friendship as depicted in Byzantine literature is a worthwhile project. It could enrich our understanding of the literary uses of friendship, and it could probably provide some information about women's relationships in Byzantine nunneries. Obviously, such a study exceeds the limits of this relatively short article.
 - 14 For further use of Aristotelian and Derridean theory in the approach of Byzantine friendship narratives, see S. Constantinou, 'The Gift of Friendship' and *eadem*, 'Retelling the Tale'.

- 15 Aristotle, *Ethica Nicomachea*, ed. I. Bywater (Oxford 1894, repr. 1962).
- 16 S. Haddad, 'Friendship', in C. Colebrook (ed.), *Jacques Derrida: Key Concepts* (London and New York 2015) 68–76.
- 17 J. Derrida, 'Jean-Marie Benoist (1942–90): The Taste of Tears', trans. in P.-A. Brault and M. Naas, *The Work of Mourning: Jacques Derrida* (London and Chicago 2001) 107–10, here 107.
- 18 P.-A. Brault and M. Naas, 'Editors' Introduction: To Reckon with the Dead: Jacques Derrida's Politics of Mourning', in Brault and Naas *The Work of Mourning*, 1–30, here 1.
- 19 J. Derrida, 'Louis Marin (1931–92): By Force of Mourning', trans. in Brault and Naas, *The Work of Mourning*, 144–64, here 146.
- 20 J. Derrida, 'Louis Althusser (1918–90): Text Read at Louis Althusser's Funeral', trans. in Brault and Naas, *The Work of Mourning*, 111–18, here 114.
- 21 D. Farrell Krell, *The Purest of Bastards: Works of Mourning, Art, and Affirmation in the Thought of Jacques Derrida* (University Park, PA 2000).
- 22 For the great impact of John Klimakos' work, see C. Luibheid and N. Russell, *John Climacus, The Ladder of Divine Ascent*, with notes by N. Russell, introduction by K. Ware (New York 1982) 67–8.
- 23 *Ladder of Divine Ascent*, in PG 88: 631–1161 (see in particular Step 7, 801–17), Eng. trans. in Luibheid and Russell, *John Climacus*. For mourning in Klimakos, see J.L. Zecher, *The Role of Death in the Ladder of Divine Ascent and the Greek Ascetic Tradition* (Oxford 2015). As for other ascetic texts, such as the *Apophthegmata Patrum*, see B. Müller, *Der Weg des Weinens: Die Tradition des 'Penthos' in den Apophthegmata Patrum* (Göttingen 2000).
- 24 M. Hinterberger, *Phthonos*, Serta Graeca 29 (Wiesbaden 2013) 61–100.
- 25 Hinterberger, *Phthonos*, 68–9. For an analysis of *On Envy*, see V. Limberis, 'The Eyes Infected by Evil: Basil of Caesarea's Homily, *On Envy*', *Harvard Theological Review* 84.2 (1991) 163–84 and Hinterberger, *Phthonos*, 62–9.
- 26 On the prologue as an essential part of Byzantine Greek saints' Lives, see T. Pratsch, *Der hagiographische Topos: Griechische Heiligenviten in mittelbyzantinischer Zeit*, Millennium-Studien zu Kultur und Geschichte des ersten Jahrtausends n. Chr. 6 (Berlin and New York 2005) 19–55.
- 27 In *XII Panegyrici Latini*, ed. R.A.B. Mynors (Oxford 1964) 82–120. For a discussion of the panegyric, see A. Lippold, 'The Ideal of the Ruler and Attachment to Tradition in Pacatus' Panegyric', in R. Rees (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Latin Panegyric* (Oxford 2012) 360–86; S. Lunn-Rockcliffe, 'Commemorating the Usurper Magnus Maximus: *Ekphrasis*, Poetry, and History in Pacatus' Panegyric of Theodosius', *Journal of Late Antiquity* 3.2 (2010) 316–36; C.E.V. Nixon and B. Saylor Rodgers, *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: The Panegyrici Latini. Introduction, Translation, and Historical Commentary*, The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 21 (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1994) 437–47.
- 28 Trans. in Nixon and Saylor Rodgers, *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors*, 466–7.
- 29 See Constantinou, 'The Gift of Friendship'.
- 30 The translation of all passages from Eupraxia's *Life* are my own.
- 31 J. Derrida, *Memoires for Paul de Man*, rev. ed., trans. C. Lindsay et al. (New York 1989) xvi.
- 32 J. Derrida, *The Politics of Friendship*, trans. G. Collins (New York 1997) 14.
- 33 PG 65, 72–440 (here 105) and additions from J.C. Guy, *Recherches sur la tradition Grecque des Apophthegmata Patrum*, Subsidia Hagiographica 36 (Brussels 1962) 31, trans. in B. Ward, *The Sayings of the Desert Fathers: The Alphabetical Collection*, Cistercian Publications 59 (Kalamazoo, MI 1984) 18 and 195.
- 34 Cf., for example, the desert fathers' sayings on charity, and in particular the entry 11 of the systematic collection of the *Apophthegmata Patrum*, which concerns the envy of a hermit in Scetis against Abba Poemen for being more famous than the first. Poemen's reaction to the hermit's envy and criticism is compassion. He seeks for ways to heal the hermit's passion. Eventually, the two men become friends (ed. J.C. Guy. *Les apophthèmes des pères: collection systématique*, 3 vols. SC 498 (Paris 2005) III, 16, 18). For compassion in early Christianity, see S. Wessel, *Passion and Compassion in Early Christianity* (Cambridge 2016).