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Prologue

When finishing my undergraduate studies, my relationship with anything Byzantine was at best superficial: the miracles of St. Artemios seemed simplistic fables compared to the disputes of the gods, Meremeroes’ ploy mere child’s play before Xerxes’ flogging of the Hellespont, Choniates – albeit his dense but authentic phrasing and complex metaphors – unworthy of his tragic predecessors. In my mind, Byzantium was the ugly cousin twice removed of the illustrious Classics. Curiosity however, oftentimes is stronger than personal preferences. How different could Byzantium be from the Classical tradition? This question was calling for an answer, and led me to pursue further information on the mystery of Byzantium. It was not until I finished with my mandatory coursework however, that I ceased searching for the shadow of the Classics and started to appreciate the individual value of Byzantine texts and literature.

This pleasant surprise surely would not have arisen from the texts themselves. There is a long list of people I would like to thank, first and foremost being my supervisor Eleni Kaltsogianni who offered her undivided attention and precious insights throughout the various phases of the current thesis’ development, but also her trust as to my scholarly ability. My professor Dimitris Georgakopoulos, who was always eager to offer knowledge and support in class and with my research inquiries. The personnel of the Byzantine Greek summer school I attended in Istanbul last summer, especially Prof. Niels Gaul who presented me with a new perspective on Byzantine texts during our collaboration. Prof. Christos Stavrakos, who will bring new light to an otherwise philological survey. My mother Georgia and brother George, who endured many hours of externalized speculation and analysis on subjects which maybe were not of their immediate interest. And lastly, I would like to express the largest amount of thanks towards my father Alexander, who despite his own scholarly background never dictated which path I should choose, but rather encouraged me ever to freely delve into the realms of my own interests and let them be guide to my choices.

But for now, let us turn “to a most splendid narration.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AASS</td>
<td><em>Acta Sanctorum Bollandiana</em> (Brussels, 1643 ff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td><em>Analecta Bollandiana</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHG Auctarium</td>
<td><em>Auctarium Bibliothecae hagiographicae graecae</em>, ed. F. Halkin. [SubsHag 47], (Brussels, 1969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BZ</td>
<td><em>Byzantinische Zeitschrift</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOP</td>
<td><em>Dumbarton Oaks Papers</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEEΣΑΠΘ</td>
<td>Επιστημονικές Επετηρίδες Θεολογικής Σχολής Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCP</td>
<td><em>Orientalia Christiana Periodica</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REB</td>
<td><em>Revue des Études Byzantines</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SubsHag</td>
<td><em>Subsidia Hagiographica</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SynaxCP</td>
<td>H. Delehaye (ed.), <em>Propylaeum ad AASS Novembris, Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae e codice Sirmondiano</em>, (Bruxelles, 1902)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

1.1. Icons and miracle narrations: an overview

When one is called to address matters pertaining to Byzantine Iconoclasm, it becomes quickly apparent that this specific realm remains one of ongoing dispute, both for the enlightened men contemporary to its outbreak\(^1\) as for the modern-day scholar attempting to piece together the evidence and make the phenomena and its outcomes clearer to their readers. It has been long debated whether icons were actually venerated religious objects in the time prior to Iconoclasm,\(^2\) but regardless of where one stands on this matter at present, it seems that icons and miraculous happenings are two closely related concepts, as countless literary sources can testify.\(^3\) Though the exact dating of such texts is another heavily debated issue,\(^4\) examples shall be drawn from sources dated more or less precisely.

Beginning with the Chronicle of Pseudo-Zacharia Rhetor written in 568/9\(^5\), a miraculous narration about how the Sassanian king besieged Amida in 503 goes as such: A vision of Christ appears to the king in his dream the night he contemplates abandoning the siege, and continues to say ‘that he would hand over the inhabitants of the city in three days because they had sinned against him’. The city is captured in the aforementioned time-frame and upon the king’s entering a church, he sees and recognizes the icon of Christ as the one who visited him in his dream.\(^6\) From the collection of miracles of the life of St Demetrius by John of Thessalonika (written ca.

---


\(^2\) See for example the debate on whether or not icons begin to systematically be venerated before the outbreak of Iconoclasm starting from Ernst Kitzinger’s article, ‘The cult of images in the age before iconoclasm’, *DOP* 8 (1954), which led to its heavy criticism from Paul Speck in “Wunderheilige und Bilder. Zur Frage des Beginns der Bilderverehrung”, *Varia III, Ηνωμένα Βυζαντινά* 11, (1991), the subsequent re-evaluation by Leslie Brubaker and John Haldon in *Byzantium in the iconoclast era, c. 680-850*, (Cambridge, 2011) and finally the rendering anew proposed by Richard Price in “Icons before and during Iconoclasm”, Heythrop College, University of London, https://www.academia.edu/20430402/Icons_before_and_during_Iconoclasm.

\(^3\) Kitzinger exhibits a long list in his article, see “The cult of images...”, 95-115.

\(^4\) See Price’s review on the matter, “Icons before...”, 4-6.

\(^5\) Greatrex exhibits a long list in his article, see “The cult of images...”, 95-115.


there are many stories of the saint appearing in visions and being recognized because he embodied the form familiar from his icons. Even though miraculous happenings such as these don’t manifest directly from the icon, they do inform us of the significance icons had already gained in the practice of worshiping holy persons, from as early as the sixth century. One can also argue that the existence of these particular miracles, namely the apparition of a saint or holy figure and their subsequent recognition through their icon’s depiction, is the phase during which saints and holy figures acquire some kind of visual normality throughout the Christian world.

During the late sixth century, stories of acheiropoietai icons – icons “not made by [human] hands” – start becoming prominent in the sources. These icons are believed to have come into being solely by the will of a holy person, most often either of Christ or the Virgin Mary. They also had the ability to reproduce themselves, as the famous story of the Keramion, or Holy Tile, testifies. An early testimony of such an icon is found in Pseudo-Zachariah rhetor, where there is a full narration of the image of Camuliana, one of the most well-known cases of acheiropoieta. The story goes that the pagan Hypatia refuses to believe in Christ, since she hasn’t seen Him. She then finds a linen cloth with the imprint of his face in a fountain. This image had many magical properties, most prominent of which its role as a palladium, an icon accompanying the Byzantine army during sieges and aiding in victory. The legend of the Holy Face of Edessa, another cloth-imprint of Christ’s face said to have miraculously healed King Abgar of an illness, makes its appearance also during this time.

---

8 Price, “Icons before...”, 5.
9 Von Dobschütz traces the tradition of diipeteis (heaven-sent) icons to antiquity, to the tale allegedly of the icon of the goddess Athena which is either sent from Zeus as a gift to Dardanus or gifted by Athena herself in memory of a lost play-mate, see Ernst von Dobschütz, Christusbilder. Untersuchungen zur christlichen Legende, [Texte und Untersuchungen, Neue Folge 3], (Leipzig, 1899), 1-3. On the appearance of acheiropoietos see Kitzinger, “The cult of images...”, 112-115, Price, “Icons before...”, 3-4, and ODB, I 12, though the emergence of the legend of the acheiropoietos of the Theotokos in Lydda is wrongly ascribed there to the 6th century; for more on this matter see 2.1., 16-8.
10 ODB, I, 12.
11 The Keramion was an acheiropoietos depiction of Christ’s face on a ceramic tile, which came to be after it came in contact with the Mandylion, which was hidden underneath it. This story is one of the cases in which an acheiropoieton manifests its ability of reproducing itself, see ODB, II, 1123.
12 Greatrex, The chronicle of Pseudo-Zachariah, xii. 4, 425-7; on more concerning the different traditions of the Camuliana image see von Dobschütz, Christusbilder, 40-60, and ODB, II, 1099.
13 Though in the beginning, what later becomes the “Holy Mandylion” in Christian tradition starts out as a letter written by Christ to Abgar; for a concise overview of the Abgar legend and its variants, see Christopher Walter, “Iconographical Considerations”, in Joseph A. Munitiz, Julian Chrysostomides,
Later narrations show icons playing a more active role in miraculous happenings. In the *Life of Symeon Stylites the Younger*, a text dating to the second quarter of the seventh century, there are two stories of icon-miracles following exorcisms preformed on faithful people who sought out the saint’s aid to their problems. In the first story, the now freed woman sets up an icon of the saint in her home which in turn works miracles, expelling demons and healing the sick. Specifically, another woman suffering from a chronic haemorrhage, upon approaching the icon in adoration and piety, is instantly cured. In the second story, the man rid of his demon sets an icon of the saint in a public place above his workshop. This icon draws hostility from a group of unbelievers, who try to access it with a ladder and dismount it. However, whenever the men would extend their hand against the icon, they would miraculously fall to the ground. In a narration attributed to the patriarch Germanos I regarding the siege of 717, which has been dated somewhere after 726 but remains open to consideration, an icon of the Virgin Mary painted above the city gate casts its holy regard upon the horse Suleiman was riding, which in turn suddenly rears on its hind legs, dropping the emir to the ground.

The stories listed above surely are only a morcel from the grand platter of miracle narrations belonging already to the pre-Iconoclastic era. This small amount however does give us an overview of some of the motifs prominent in such narrations. Many contemporary and later stories follow along the same lines, with the icon either acting as an aid of recognition, or a healing medium; an icon can miraculously come into being or just as miraculously defend itself from unbelievers. Since the description of each and every story could prove to be an endless endeavor, the current list shall suffice, as the question of motifs shall rise again later on in the individual stories recounted below. For now let us turn to the status miracle narrations acquire with the dawn of the late-8th century iconoclastic dispute.

With the outbreak of Iconoclasm, the pressing need to defend icons provides sufficient reason to compile all these stories; John of Damascus makes a first attempt

---


16 *Life of Symeon*, 158, in Lamberz, ibid., 408-10.


18 Ibid., 5-13.
at gathering such stories in his Iconophile orations, De imaginibus orationes tres.\textsuperscript{19} These stories are quoted from church fathers, ecclesiastical histories and saint’s \textit{vitae}, which gives them the authority perscribed to their initial recounters, thus acting as proof of the validity and necessity to worship icons.\textsuperscript{20} The true treasure-trove of such stories however is found in the acts of the 787 Council of Nicaea. Some of the stories mentioned above are found in these Acts and are often quoted from various saints’ \textit{Vitae}, making the body of stories a mix of earlier and contemporary to Iconoclasm traditions. In each case, the miracle narrations would highlight a different quality of the icon and its place in religious worship, thus supplying themselves as concrete arguments in favor of images.\textsuperscript{21}

Of the miracles narrated, the staggering majority are those of icons providing miraculous cures for the sick, in most cases after the sick person venerates the icon.\textsuperscript{22} There is one instance of an icon spewing forth blood – namely the well-known icon of Beirut\textsuperscript{23} – which blood in turn has healing properties.\textsuperscript{24} In another story the icon nods as an answer to supplications, and then offers healing through the oil holding the flame underneath it.\textsuperscript{25} The familiar image of an icon allows a pious prisoner of barbarians to recognize the saint who miraculously appears as an aid in his escape and the rescue of his abandoned father.\textsuperscript{26} In three instances, icons actively deliver some form of punishment to the people harming them.\textsuperscript{27} Elsewhere, an icon bestows forgiveness to the formerly sinful person (namely Mary the Egyptian) who comes to worship the holy cross.\textsuperscript{28} Then, there is a series of miraculous incidents: the faces of Christ and the angels Michael and Gabriel appear on a man-made cross the night it is fabricated (a clear case of \textit{acheiropoietos} imagery),\textsuperscript{29} supplication to an icon helps John the baptist memorize a psalm,\textsuperscript{30} a dry well fills with water when an icon of a saint is thrown in\textsuperscript{31} and an old

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{20} Ibid., chapter “das Florileg”, 24-5.
  \item \textsuperscript{21} Lamberz, \textit{Concilium universale…}, 404-590; the specific functions illuminated by the stories recounted can be best understood when reading the assembly’s comments, which follow after each story.
  \item \textsuperscript{22} Ibid., 312-316, 328, 376, 386, 388, 392, 406-408, 428, 476, 478.
  \item \textsuperscript{23} For an overview of the Beirut image miracle see Walter, “Iconographical…”, lx.
  \item \textsuperscript{24} Lamberz, \textit{Concilium universale…}, 316-328.
  \item \textsuperscript{25} Ibid., 376.
  \item \textsuperscript{26} Ibid., 332.
  \item \textsuperscript{27} Ibid., 410-2. We shall return to this specific category of stories later on.
  \item \textsuperscript{28} Ibid., 424.
  \item \textsuperscript{29} Ibid., 426.
  \item \textsuperscript{30} Ibid., 428.
  \item \textsuperscript{31} Ibid., 586.
\end{itemize}
hermit prays to the icon of the Virgin Mary which he keeps in his cave to keep the candle in front of it alit while he is away on pilgrimages, which is exactly what happens.32

This first mass compilation of miracle stories seems to have paved the road for the genre’s credibility in such theological contexts, but despite the icon-positive outcome of the Council of 787, the dispute over icon worship hadn’t yet fully come to an end. The second outbreak of Iconoclastic controversy starting in 814 provides yet another reason for iconophiles to organize their thesis in favor of icon worship. This era provides us with some of the most important texts containing collections of icon miracle stories. The first is the so-called Letter of the Three Patriarchs, an official letter supposed to have been written by the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem to the Emperor Theophilos in favor of icons during a synod in Jerusalem in April 836.33 The authenticity of the Letter has been questioned, as has the probability of a synod taking place in Jerusalem at the specific date,34 and it has been proposed that it was a political document written in the 9th century after Theophilos’ death.35 In this extant document, there exists a dossier of twelve miracle narrations related to icons. The authenticity of the passage has been disputed by J. Chrysostomides, who considered it to be a later interpolation.36 Regardless though of its initial or not inclusion in the Letter, the dossier of miracles was closely connected to the main text in the popular mind, as it spawned countless similar compilations which cite it as their main source.37

A second text containing a lengthy dossier of icon miracles is the Letter to Theophilos, a dogmatic treatise in favor of the worship of icons, which had been ascribed to St. John of Damascus.38 This paternity has been rejected,39 though the question of by whom the text was written still remains unresolved. For many years the Letter to Theophilos was confused with The Letter of the Three Patriarchs,40 though it

32 Ibid., 588.
33 Von Dobschütz, Christusbilder, 209**, and Munitiz, “Preliminary Remarks”, in Munitiz, et al., The Letter of the Three Patriarchs, xiv
34 Julian Chrysostomides, “An Investigation Concerning the Authenticity of the Letter of the Three Patriarchs”, in Munitiz et al., The Letter of the Three Patriarchs..., xvii ff; Chrysostomides supports partial authenticity of the text.
35 ODB, II, 1220.
36 Ibid., xxiv-xxxvii. I have proposed a dating to the dossier in 2.4., 54, ft.16.
39 CPG, III, #8115.
seems that von Dobschütz had already made a distinction between the two texts.\footnote{Von Dobschütz, \textit{Christusbilder}, 208**-210**.} Hemmerdinger classifies this text as a homily and traces some of its sources to the 9th century, calling it an “habit d’arlequin,” albeit of excellent morcels.\footnote{Hemmerdinger, “Les sources…”, 147.} Scholarly research on the text is scarce and a precise dating hasn’t of yet been proposed, Munitiz however places the \textit{Letter to Theophilos} among “documents of doubtful authenticity … produced in the late 9th century in defence of the iconophile position…”\footnote{Munitiz, “Preliminary Remarks”, xiv.} and considers it immediately related to \textit{The Letter of the Three Patriarchs};\footnote{Ibid., xiv.} the similarities between the two texts are indeed striking.\footnote{Hemmerdinger offers a well-aimed example, “Les sources…”, 146.} Here, the dossier of miracles is presented again as proof of the necessity to worship icons.\footnote{Pseudo-Damascene, \textit{Letter to Emperor Theophilos on the Holy and Venerated Icons}, in Munitiz et. al., \textit{The Letter of the Three Patriarchs}, 4.a-6.d. 149-154.}

Alongside these compilations, texts of various genres dating to the second Iconoclasm are also important testimonies of many of the miraculous stories we shall be examining below.

These miracle stories however don’t seem to lose their popularity with the Triumph of Orthodoxy and the restitution of Icons in 843; on the contrary, this period seems to have given the rise to icon miracle narrations. Some legends spring forth solely during the 9th century,\footnote{See for example the Lydda prodigy, the Germanos prodigy, and Synesios \textit{lithoxoos} below.} and develop their tradition in those following. One such example is the miraculous icon of the Virgin Mary, called the Maria \textit{Rhomaia}, which is a development of not one, but a plethora of different miraculous icon stories which merge into one.\footnote{Von Dobschütz presents a version of the story in his \textit{Christusbilder}, 234**-266**, and published yet another in his article “Maria Romaia”, \textit{BZ}, 12 (1903), 193-206. We shall be examining the case of the \textit{Maria Rhomaia} in relation to stories of the current compilation in 2.1., 2.2., 2.3..} Furthermore, the existence of manuscripts containing compilations of such miraculous stories\footnote{A list of such can be found in Munitiz, “Manuscript Tradition”, xciv. For a more comprehensive list of texts produced for the specific feast see \textit{BHG, Auctarium}, 1386-1394\textsuperscript{i}.}, such as the one the current edition is based on, hints that these narrations possibly were, for some time, an integral part of the Feast of Orthodoxy.\footnote{Von Dobschütz, \textit{Christusbilder}, 204**-206**.}
1.2. The compilation of Vat. gr. 1587 and the Bilder-Predigten in Christusbilder

We have already spoken of icon miracle compilations, and this is exactly the nature of the body of texts following. These Byzantine texts come from the 14th century Vaticanus graecus 1587 manuscript and are, of course, a compilation of miracle stories concerning icons, much like the one E. von Dobschütz published in the Beilage VI of his Christusbilder, under the title of “Zwei byzantinische Bilder-Predigten.” The two sermons of the title are collated in this part of von Dobschütz’s work, thus providing the body of icon miracle narrations listed there. Von Dobschütz notices the importance of this compilation in providing us interesting insights regarding the content of Byzantine sermons. He does find the narrations too long to be read during mass though, and proposes their recounting at the table of the Feast. He also supports that these stories don’t follow any specific order in their narration; they are mere pearls on the necklace of sermon-making and can be strung together solely on the basis of the preacher’s preference. Lastly, he notices a close relation of the stories in his edition with those in the Letter of the Three Patriarchs. Many of these observations seem applicable to the present compilation, and for this reason they deserved reference. Regardless however of their credibility, it seems that von Dobschütz was the first scholar to actually place these sermons on the scholarly map, and his edition is the first source one must refer to when examining such texts.

The codex Vat. gr. 1587 was not taken into account when von Dobschütz wrote his Christusbilder. The BHG listing of the manuscript classifies the specific part containing the miracle narrations under the category of “Orthodoxiae Festum,” from which one can understand that von Dobschütz’s text and the present one are of the same genre. Of the six miracle narrations in Vat. gr. 1587, four are also found in

51 Ibid., 204**-234**.
52 Ibid., 204**.
53 Ibid., 206**.
54 Ibid., 206**.
55 Ibid., 206**. The text of von Dobschütz’s compilation indeed states the Letter as its source for the stories, as can be seen in the introductory paragraph before the miracle narrations, see Ibid., 213**.
56 BHG, Auctarium, 1390f.
Christusbilder. There are many similarities between the texts,\textsuperscript{57} and their comparison was the basis of the current edition.\textsuperscript{58}

In many cases it seems that the text preserved in the Vat. gr. 1587 is of higher quality to those which von Dobschütz had at his disposal when composing his edition. For example, in the prodigy of Anne,\textsuperscript{59} after the heroin’s blinding, Vat. gr. 1587 refers to her eye’s “πήρωσιν” as retribution for her deed, whereas von Dobschütz’s text writes “πείρωσιν.” This word, deriving from the verb πείρω, which means “to pierce/run through”\textsuperscript{60} does seem acceptable, since while Anne was committing the blasphemous act of gouging out the eye of the Virgin’s icon, her own eye was miraculously pierced through. However, the alternative πήρωσιν in Vat. gr. 1587 derives from the verb πηρόω-ώ which initially means “to mutilate,” however from Plutarch onwards, when combined with the genitive τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, means specifically the blinding of the eyes.\textsuperscript{61} The appropriateness of the writing given in Vat. gr. 1587 also shines forth when one attempts to translate the text. For other such cases, one is invited to refer to the critical apparatus.

One major difference between the two compilations is the tenacity with which Vat. gr. 1587 makes use of pejorative epithets to characterize the “villains” of each story on the one hand, and its verbose development of respective vocabulary when referring to icons of Holy persons on the other. For instance, the θαύματος γέμουσαν ἁγία καὶ σεβάσμιον εἰκόνα in Vat. gr. 1587 is a plain θαυμασίαν εἰκόνα in von Dobschütz.\textsuperscript{62} Likewise, ὁ ἄθλιος Ιουδαῖος in von Dobschütz becomes ὁ ἐπάρατος καὶ θεοστυγής Ιουδαῖος in Vat. gr. 1587.\textsuperscript{63} The accumulation of these epithets proved to be a true headache when translating the text; many epithets of similar meaning are often bunched together in the same sentence more than once, requiring thus excess expenditure of resourcefulness to avoid tedious repetition. This clustering of epithets occurs most often when the narration reaches its peak, which more often than not is the moment when the impious protagonists desecrate the “holy and revered” icon.

\textsuperscript{57} And consequently, of the versions of the stories, but this we shall be examining below.
\textsuperscript{58} On the principles of the edition, see \textbf{1.4.}, 15.
\textsuperscript{59} \textbf{2.4.}, §3, 58.
\textsuperscript{60} LSJ, 1355, πείρω
\textsuperscript{61} LSJ, 1401-2, πηρ-όω and Δημήτριος Δημητράκος, \textit{Μίγμα Λεξικών Όλης της Ελληνικής Γλώσσας}, IA′, 5802, πήρωσις-εως. Cf. the exact wording from the prodigy: τὴν πήρωσιν τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ.
\textsuperscript{62} \textbf{2.2.}, §3, 32.
\textsuperscript{63} \textbf{2.5.}, §3, 46.
The last two stories of the present compilation have not been published until now. It seems that this was a common practice in such compilations; a given narration would begin with some of the most well known miracle stories regarding icons and would conclude with less popular traditions, the development of which most probably occurs around the time the text is written. The Letter of the Three Patriarchs for example contains legends unique to the Letter towards the end of the miracle dossier and von Dobschütz’s compilation is also testimony to texts without a widespread tradition.

1.3. Description of the Manuscript

The codex Vaticanus graecus 1587 provides the dossier of icon miracle narrations edited below. According to the colophon found on the last page of the codex, it was written in November of the year 1389 by father Michael the nomophylax, on a Wednesday of the matyr Eleftherios’ feast. It consists of 372 folia (recto-verso) and is made of paper. The pages measure a compact 20,5x13,5 cm and can contain a total of 23 written lines. The codex is dispersed in two volumes, the first reaching f. 176 and the second beginning from f. 177 and ending at f. 372. The manuscript comprises an array of texts, most of which are homilies from various church fathers written explicitly for the occasion of Holy Days. Folios 140 – 372 contain a homiliary beginning from Sunday τοῦ τελώνου, until All Saints’ Day, thus ascribing a sermon to every major Feast of Lent and Easter. The complete list of texts contained in the manuscript is the following:

- (ff. 02-12) Johannes Maupouos Euchaita, Oratio I in Hierarchas tres
- (ff. 12v-21v) Basilius Caesariensis, Homilia exhortatoria ad sanctum baptism
- (21v-28v) Basilius Caesariensis, In sanctam Christi generationem
- (28v, 77v-78v) Cladas Iohannes Cretensis Lampadarios, Encomium metricum in S. Deiparam

---

64 Walter, “Iconographical Considerations”, Iviii-Ixiii.
65 Von Dobschütz, Christusbilder, 223** - 234**.
66 As the scribe himself writes, however the feast of St. Eleftherios is on the 15th December, and so it has been considered that here fr. Michael nomophylax has made a mistake, see Alexander Turyn, Codices Graeci Vaticani saeculi xii et xiv scripti annorumque notis instructi, (Vatican, 1964), 176.
67 Other than the information provided in the colophon, it seems that nothing more is known about the scribe of our manuscript.
70 Ibid., 199.
71 Ehrhard, Überlieferung, 258.
• (29'-42') Maximus Planudes, In seputuram Christi
• (42'-56') Georgius Nicomediensis mtr., In SS. martyres Cosmam et Damianum
• (58'-73') Pepagomenus Nicolaus, Encomium in S. Isidorum
• (79'-85') Basilius Caesariensis, In quadraginta martyres Sebastenos
• (85'-102') Sophronius Hierosolymitanus, Vita Mariae Aegyptiacae
• (103'-113') Andreas Cretensis, In adnationem ss. Deiparae
• (113'-139') Iohannes Chrysostomus, De beato Philogonio
• (140'-143') Iohannes Chrysostomus, In Publicanum et Pharisaeeum
• (144'-150') Iohannes Chrysostomus, In parabolam de filio prodigo
• (151'-166') Andreas Cretensis, De humana uita et de defunctis
• (166'-170') Epfraem Graecus, In uanam uitam, et de paenitentia,
• (170'-179') Iohannes Chrysostomus, In Genesim, sermo 3
• (180'-193') Anastasius Sinai, In sextum Psalmum
• (193'-201') Nectarius Constantinopolitanus, Sermo de festo S. Theodori
• (201'-204') Athanasius Alexandrinus, Narratio de Cruse seu imagine Berytensi
• (204'-210') Hagiographica Varia
• (211'-213') Synesius quidam
• (214'-215') Iohannes Chrysostomus, Thema: Ieiunium
• (216'-218') Iohannes Chrysostomus, Thema: Ieiunium
• (218'-221') Ioseph Thessalonicensis ep. (Studita), Homilia in Sanctam Crucem 2
• (221'-225') Iohannes Chrysostomus, Opera
• (226'-231') Iohannes Chrysostomus, De ieiunio, De Daude
• (231'-236') Hesychius Hierosolymitanus, Homiliae in resurrectionem Lazari 1-2
• (236-242) Iohannes Chrysostomus, Thema: Palmae
• 242-246v Leontius CP. presbyter, Hom. 2 in Lazarum (in ramos palmarum)
• 247-251v Iohannes Chrysostomus, In parabolam de ficu
• 251v-256 Basilius Seleuciensis, Hom. in beatum Iob
• 256-260v Iohannes Chrysostomus, In decem uirgines
• 260v-265v Iohannes Chrysostomus, In Matthaeum homiliae 1-90
• 260v-265v Iohannes Chrysostomus, In decem uirgines
• 265-269v Iohannes Chrysostomus, In meretricem et pharisaeeum
• 269v-275 Iohannes Chrysostomus, In illud : Pater si possibile est
• 275-278v Basilius Seleuciensis, Homilia in feriam V et in proditionem Iudae
• 278v-281v Iohannes Chrysostomus, In latronem
• 281v-288 Iohannes Chrysostomus, In uiiificam sepulturam et triduanam resurrectionem Christi
• 288-294 Georgius Nicomedienis mtr., De Deipara et Christo rediiuio
• 288-294 Georgius Nicomedienis mtr., In S. Mariam assistentem Cruci
• 294-306 Epiphanius Constantiensis, In diuini corporis seputuram
• 306v-308 Gregorius Nazianzenus, In sanctum Pascha 1-2 (or. 1 et 45)
• 308v-313v Theodorus Studita, In Sanctus Pascha
• 314-319 Proclus Constantinopolitanus, Hom 33 : In S. Thomam ap.
• 319-325 Gregorius Antiocenus, In mulieres unguentiferas
• 325-330 Iohannes Chrysostomus, Thema: Paralyticus
• 330-332 Iohannes Chrysostomus, In Mediam Pentecosten
• 338v-345v Leontius CP. presbyter, Hom. 10 in medium Pentecosten
• 346v-349v Basilius Seleuciensis, Hom In Assumptionem Domini
• 349v-353 Iohannes Chrysostomus, Thema: Assumptio Domini
• 353v-355 Hagiographica, Patres Nicaeni (SS.), Precatio super moenia urbis Nicaenae
• 355-* Hagiographica, Patres Nicaeni (SS.), Nomina episcoporum qui concilio Nicaeno interfuerunt
• (357v-360) Anastasius Sinaita, In defunctos
• (357v-361) Ephraem Graecus, In eos qui in Christo obdormierunt
• (362-364v) Iohannes Chrysostomus, Thema: Pentecostes
• (365-366v) Basilius Seleuciensis, Homiliae In Pentecosten
• (367-372v) Iohannes Chrysostomus, De sanctis martyribus

The two items listed in bold are the texts of the current edition, which as can be seen are found on folios 204v-213v. The Holy Day ascribed to these stories is Κυριακή α΄ τῶν ηστειῶν, the Feast of Orthodoxy, and this is most apparently the reason for Halkin’s categorization in the BHG. Since the scribe is the same throughout the manuscript, there are no occasions of different handwriting between texts. Usually, when one text finishes and the next one continues on the same page, Fr. Michael nomophylax leaves a gap of about five lines between them. If a text finishes on one page and the following one begins on the next page, he leaves a gap of 3-4 lines before the beginning. On rare occasions does he adorn the beginning and end of a text with decorative lines, giving the manuscript a modest appearance. Ehrhard refers to “red Tagesrubriken” (which are the days ascribed to each text) in the upper margins of the folia, but sadly the pictures in the manuscript’s digital archive don’t preserve any colors other than black and white. The initial letter of each text must have also been written in red ink, and was most likely capitalized, but again, this is not apparent on the digital file and, besides, some of these letters have been omitted by the rubricator.

Fr. Michael’s working script is characteristic to the Paleologan era and is a combination of the so-called Fettaugen style and the Metochites style. It has a slight inclination to the right and distinct ascenders and descendors. Capital forms are freely interchanged with miniscule forms and there are many cases of hyphenation. At times the accents are attached to the respective letter, especially in the case of the circumflex above an ου complex, but in many cases are also written separately. Above the iota and
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72 The list follows the names and titles on the Pinakes platform: https://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/cote/68218/ (accessed 24/01/2020)
73 Ehrhard, Überlieferung, 259.
74 Ibid., 258, fn. 2.
75 Ibid., 258, fn. 2.
76 https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.gr.1587.pt.2
ypsilon there is the symbol of diaeresis, regardless of its proper use. The use of nomina sacra does not limit itself to references of Holy Persons, but is dispersed freely throughout the text.

---

1.4. Principles of the current edition

The current edition is based on the text found in the codex *Vaticanus graecus* 1587, the accuracy of which was evaluated through its comparison with the codex found in *Christusbilder*. I preferred to adhere to the writing preserved in the codex and in very few instances did I incorporate the alternatives found in von Dobschütz’s edition in the final text. The manuscripts von Dobschütz based his collation upon were the *Monachensis graecus* 226 (13th cent.), *Parisinus graecus* 635 (14th cent.), *Parisinus graecus* 767 (13th cent.) and the *Coislianus graecus* 296 (12th cent.), and so it may be considered that the comparison is made between the writings of the *Vat. gr.* 1587 and of the aforementioned four manuscripts. Any differences noticed during the comparison between the two texts, either lexicological, in phrasing, omissions etc. have been indicated in the critical apparatus beneath each story; the same applies for spelling and grammatical mistakes preserved in the manuscript. These have been corrected in the text proper but are indicated again in the critical apparatus. I tried to remain as close as possible to the punctuation used in the manuscript, however some modifications proved unavoidable. Proper names and location names have all been capitalized and the *nomina sacra* analyzed without parenthesis. Fr. Michael nomophylax does not always follow the classic rules of accentuation, and wherever he deviates from them they were corrected silently. On occasion he also omits the *iota* subscript, which has been silently added whenever necessary. Finally, other than the critical apparatus, an apparatus fontium follows each text where its sources can be identified.
The Dossier of Miracle Narrations

2.1. The icon of the Virgin in Diospolis

The first story to begin our compilation is that of the icon of the Virgin Mary which miraculously appears engraved on a column of a church built in Her honor by the Apostles Peter and John. According to the story, Peter and John are living eighteen miles outside Jerusalem, in Lydda, otherwise known as Diospolis. They erect a temple in the Virgin’s honor and proceed to visit Her, enquiring on where She was during the building of the temple. She charmingly assures them of Her presence there, and at that very moment Her full-size image appears on one of the columns. More than three centuries later, when Julian the Apostate perceives the icon’s existence and veneration, he commands it be removed. But however hard the stonemasons he hires scrape away at the column, ever so brightly does the image shine forth. Up until the time when the narrative was composed the icon existed and worked miracles, a living proof and aid to the faithful.

The version of the story in the present edition, which also appears earlier in the currently unpublished 11th century Paris. gr. 1478 manuscript,¹ is one of the most developed. In E. von Dobschütz’s Christusbilder we are provided with two versions of the story, one mostly similar to the one in this edition, and an even more developed one which we shall be examining later on. There remain a few published texts in which the story is attested, which we shall be examining below, and an unspecified number of unpublished texts in which the story is to be found. When one starts delving deeper into the story’s literary tradition, one of the first facts that turns up is that the legend wasn’t among those recounted in the Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council (787, though generally no stories regarding icons on columns are presented there). Nor can it be in John of Damascus’ Orationes de Imaginibus tres. This leads one to wonder when this specific story appears on the icon-miracle spectrum.²

Of the texts preserving the story, the “earliest” was until recently attributed to St. Andrew of Crete,³ thus dating the story to the mid-8th century, an opinion in which von Dobschütz also partakes.⁴ The authenticity of the text was first questioned by B.

¹ The story of the icon in Lydda can be found on folios 290-292 of the manuscript, which, just like in the manuscript of the present edition, is part of a compilation of miracle stories regarding icons, see BHG, III, 1390.
² Of course, the city of Lydda has long been connected with miraculous pillars, see below 26-7, ft.5.
³ Jean-François Boissonade, Anecdota Graeca e codicibus regis, IV, (Paris 1832), 471-3.
⁴ Von Dobschütz, Christusbilder, 79-80.
Tomadakis on a linguistic basis in 1993, however up until 1999 scholarly cycles continued to accept this attribution. G. Tsormpantzoglou however refutes this belief with a close inspection of the text; he establishes that the text draws heavily from many sources dating to the 9th century, such as *The Letter of the Three Patriarchs* and the pseudo-Damascene *Letter to Theophilos* among others, and continues to place its writing in the early 10th century.

The remainder of texts preserving the legend aren’t much earlier than this. *The Letter of the Three Patriarchs* and the *Letter to Theophilos* both preserve a similar between them version of the story, and as we have seen earlier, date to the late 9th century. Another two texts of the early to mid-9th century, the *Refutatio ed everio* of Patriarch Nikephoros I and the *Chronicum Breve* of George Hamartolos, also provide versions of the Lydda Legend. Other than these, the story is to be found in compilations such as the likes of the *Christusbilder Predigten*, which the art historian ascribed to the 11th century, though the manuscripts containing the text date from the 12th century onwards. The earliest-dating manuscripts containing compilations of icon-miracles such as the current one are from the 11th century, though further research would need to be conducted so as to specify which of all contain the Lydda Legend. Lastly, the manuscript containing the text of the present edition belongs to the 14th century. Though surely one cannot be overtly certain with such an assumption, the evidence accumulated tempts one to place the story of the Virgin’s icon in Diospolis among the legends which emerged chiefly during the period of the second Iconoclasm, and developed later on. This assumption could also be supported by the fact that all the aforementioned texts dating to the 9th century, along with that of pseudo-Andrew of Crete, give much shorter and less detailed versions, to such an extent that in the very first lines of his introduction to the compilation of miracle narrations found in *Christusbilder*, von Dobschütz
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6 Walter also adheres to this belief, see “Iconographical Considerations”, liv.
8 1.1., 8-9.
9 Von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder*, 204**-205**.
10 Ibid., 211**-212**.
12 For another such example, see the story of *Synesios lithoxoos* further down.
declared his text “…an important source …especially for the legend of the Theotokos-acheiropoiete of Diospolis…”

As stated above, the version found in the present compilation is not the only one to be handed down to us. It is interesting to see how the story developed through time and among authors, and we shall begin from what can be considered the closest version to the one in the present manuscript, namely that of pseudo-John of Damascus. The introduction of the text is the same: Peter and John, while in Lydda, erect a temple in honor of the Virgin. They beg Her to come to its inauguration, to which She answers “Even from here I am with you.” Miraculously, Her image appears on one of the columns. The main difference lies in the fact that apparently the Virgin Herself physically visits the temple after this episode, and stands in awe of the clarity of Her depiction. This icon still exists during Julian the Apostate’s time, when he sends Jewish marblemasons first to confirm its existence and then to destroy it. However, the harder they would scratch at the marble, the brighter the image would shine forth. Up to this point, this version of the story is almost identical to the one found The Letter of the Three Patriarchs. The pseudo-Damascene text however concludes that its indestructability isn’t the only miracle the Virgin’s engraving performed as demonstration of Her divine powers; it drove away demons, and cured illnessess, such as leprosy.

The Patriarch Nikephoros I in his Refutatio et eversio introduces some new elements to the story. The text is supposed to have been written after 820, and refutes the Iconoclastic Definition of the 815 council of St. Sophia. Though this work is not considered one of the Patriarch’s most masterful, he does draw his arguments from a rich pool of sources, most of which have been identified. The excerpt however which refers to the Lydda Legend has not been traced back to its source. “For how do the unpersuaded and mindless regard the miracle which is attested to this day in the sacred temple of the Mother of God in the so-called town of Lydda, which the grand (yet in this text unnamed) Apostles built whilst still She lived?” So begins Nikephoros’
narration of the ἀχειρότευκτος icon, which here is described as πλακεὶ τετυπωμένον λαμπρὰς καὶ διαυγέσι, driving us to understand that the icon in this version isn’t known to be engraved on a *column* of the church, but rather on a marble slab. Some hostile Jews and Hellenes vehemently tried to scrape away, but their attempts proved unfruitful. It is said that the icon appeared of its own accord after the Holy Lady uttered a promise to the Apostles. The Patriarch then turns to his own present, in which his contemporaries have outdone the Jews of then in hatred and impiety, and concludes that just like them, they have turned against all things sacred. But what of Julian the Apostate? One can understand that in this context, the story of Lydda is not recounted as a tale worth the notice of both iconodules and iconoclasts per se, but rather it adopts the role of rhetoric tool used in favor of the Patriarch’s argument against his fellows’ actions. In light of this, it makes sense that Julian here is non-existent, since his presence in the story isn’t necessary for Nikephoros to make his point.

Georgios Monachus’ *Chronicon Breve*, the last text dating to the 9th century we shall be examining, seems to have drawn from the version in the *Refutatio ed eversio*. The exact dating of the text has been a subject of much debate, though from the body of research it seems that it must have been written sometime after 840. Depending however on the edition of the text, which seems to have been yet another complex undertaking, we are presented with two different variations of the legend. The edition of C. de Boor, gives a version identical to the text of Nikephoros, without the concluding comparison of Jews then with Iconoclasts now. In the earlier editions of E. de Muralt in the *Patrologia Graeca* and I. Bekker, the text again follows that of Nikephoros, but concludes on a completely different note. The Apostles erect the temple after the Virgin Mary’s promise which She visits upon their request. She then allegedly leans on one of the columns, leaving in this way the imprint of Her figure there. Heathens try again to get rid of it, but to no avail.

E. von Dobschütz himself noted the major differences these early testimonies provide of the Lydda Legend’s tradition, and continued to separate them into two
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18 Ibid., 82,73-92, 142-3.
20 Ibid. same pages.
22 Here the text is quite problematic, and since the editions date back to the 19th century, scholars would surely benefit from an updated one.
distinct categories. He based this categorization on the nature of the miraculous engraving’s coming into being: either by touch and imprint or by a force coming from within the material and shaping its exterior. Von Dobschütz considered the second tradition younger to the first, which reminded him of the stories of the “Martyrsäule Christi” dating to the 4th century, in which Jesus’ form is imprinted on the column on which he allegedly had his face and chest pressed against while he was being scourged. On this basis, he considers the Lydda Legend yet another variation of the Martyrsäule stories.24 The sources however that the art historian had then at his disposal were much fewer; he doesn’t seem to have knowledge of Nikephoros’ text or of the differences in the editions of Georgios Monachus. He also includes the text from pseudo-Andrew of Crete, which we shall be examining immediately, into these “early” traditions of the story.25 After the examination of the textual sources above, I don’t believe that Monachus’ version recurs often enough to imply its normality in the Legend’s cycle. As we shall see in the later versions below, this is the only case in which the icon’s materialization after the column comes in contact with the Virgin’s body is recounted. Until the manuscript tradition of the text is examined anew, I would be inclined to believe either that Monachus has confused two different traditions, possibly even of two different icons, or that this part of the text belongs to a different source altogether.

The post-9th-century versions of the story are significantly developed, especially the ones dating to the 11th century onwards. In the pseudo-Andrew of Crete Περὶ τῆς τῶν ἁγίων εἰκόνων προσκυνήσεως, three miraculous icon legends are presented as arguments that prove the existence of the practice of icon worship from the earliest days of Christianity. Beginning with a brief reference to the holy cloth of Edessa, the text continues to describe the icon in Lydda-Diospolis. It is an ἀχειρόγραφος εἰκόνα of life-size proportions from the time of the Apostles, which allegedly survives till the time of the narration. Here too, the icon is described as being ἐν πλαξίπανυ καθαραῖς, rather than ἐφ’ ἐνι τῶν κιόνων. Julian the Apostate makes an appearance, though of quite a different nature: upon hearing of the icon, he sends Jewish painters to confirm its existence. They do so, and standing in awe of its splendor, do it no harm. The narration ends with the story of the church’s establishment. The Apostles (who here again are not named) seek the Theotokos on Mt. Zion where She is living and ask Her where She

24 Von Dobschütz, Christusbilder, 81.
25 Though he cannot be blamed for this, since that was the point scholarship had reached at the time.
was, for they built Her a temple. She replies that She was and is with them, and upon their return to Lydda they find the miraculous engraving. Lexicological similarities and the fact that the icon is said to be engraved on marble slabs bring this version closer to the one seen in Nikephoros, which most probably is the source the writer is referring to when he wrote the *Περὶ τῆς τῶν ἁγίων εἰκόνων προσκυνήσεως*. Though not a lengthy account, it offers the most pronounced differences regarding the previous texts, for example Julain the Apostate’s harmlessness and the specific location of the Virgin Mary’s living quarters.

The elements in the version of the current compilation and the mostly identical one in von Dobschütz’s compilation have been referred to above and can be examined in the text and translation following. As I stated earlier though, von Dobschütz provides us with another version of the story in the *Christusbilder*, namely through the text titled *Ὑπόμνημα εἰς τὴν ἐπονομαίαν τῆς ἁγίαν καὶ προσκυνητὴς εἰκόνας τῆς παναγίων δεσποινῆς ἡμῶν θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας τῆς Ῥωμαίας.* As we can see, the title “*Romaia*” has been ascribed to the Virgin’s icon. A few years later, he publishes yet another text referring to the *Maria Rhomaia*, in his article of the same name, namely the *Διήγησις παράδοξος καὶ ψυχοφελὴς περὶ τῶν γεγονότων θαυμάτων παρὰ τῆς ἁγίας καὶ σεβασμίας εἰκόνας τῆς Θεοτόκου τῆς ἐπονομαζομένης Ῥωμαίας.* These two narrations concerning the *Maria Rhomaia* seem to be compilations in themselves, gathering all the stories in which an icon of the Virgin Mary comes into being, and then merging these traditions into one. In this way, three stories which are related individually in the current compilation and apparently each concern three different icons, in these stories have become part of a long narration concerning the specific icon of the Holy Lady. We will be seeing more of these stories later on, so in the current chapter we shall be examining their testimony only as regards the appearance of the icon in Lydda. The *Διήγησις* is fairly close to the version in the current compilation, however here the Apostles aren’t Peter and John, but Peter and Philip. Another difference of greater importance is that here, the icon which appears on the column isn’t
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27 Von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder*, 234**-266**.
28 This title is referred to also in pseudo-Andrew of Crete’s text, though not in the context of the Lydda prodigy, see Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, 4, 473.
29 Von Dobschütz, “*Maria Romaia*”, *BZ* 12 (1903), 173-214. The *Ὑπόμνημα* in *Christusbilder* seems to be a highly developed version of the *Διήγησις* published in the article, though the two texts do differ on occasion. See more remarks concerning the two versions in Τσορμπατζόγλου, “Παρατηρήσεις…”, 140-143.
solely of the Theotokos, but it also portrays the baby Jesus in her arms. In the Υπόμνημα, the version of the Lydda Legend reminds us more of the one in pseudo-Damascenos, since the Holy Lady visits the church after the icon’s miraculous appearance. Here also, the image is only of the Theotokos, with no reference made to the depiction of the child Jesus.

Regardless however of whichever diversions between the traditions seen above, one inherent quality of the miraculous engraving is omnipresent: it remains unharmed despite the impious’ attempts to destroy it.30

One last aspect of the text remains to be scrutinized. In the current edition, the Lydda Legend is preceded by an introductory paragraph, which refers to the body of miracle narrations following. In short, it states that miracles have been performed incessantly by the Lord for the salvation of human beings, many of them through the holy icons. Instances of icons’ benevolence can be found in abundance, as can those of their hostility. After this, the narration of the first story begins.

The existence of this introduction seems reasonable when one considers that this compilation was a sermon intended to be read during the Feast of Orthodoxy, in commemoration of the triumph of icon worship.31 Furthermore, when we compare the present compilation with that of von Dobschütz, it seems that these introductions were part of these sermons’ formula. Before the miraculous stories in the Christusbilder, an introductory paragraph calls the audience’s attention to the wonderful narrations following, which “as you know the Three Patriarchs … after compiling and writing [them] sent a long letter to Theophilos the emperor, containing rich evidence … of the necessity to worship the holy and revered … icons…”32

But for now, let us turn “to a most splendid and awesome miracle”:

Sigla

cod. = Codex Vaticanus gr. 1587 (14th cent. folios 204v – 205v)

vD = E. von Dobschütz, Christusbilder, pp. 219**-221** based on the manuscripts: Par. B. N. gr. 635 (14th cent.) and Par. B. N. gr. 767 (13th cent.) and Par. B. N. Coisl. gr. 296 (12th cent.).

30 Von Dobschütz also noted this similarity, see Christusbilder, 81.
31 BHG, I, 1390f.
32 Von Dobschütz, Christusbilder, 213**.
Α’

1. (fol. 204’<O>1 Κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ Θεός Ἰσσωύς Χριστός, διὰ τὴν πάντων ἡμῶν τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν σωτηρίαν, πολυμερὸς καὶ πολυτρόπως2 θαυματοποιεῖν έξ' ἀρχής καὶ ἰναοθὲν οὐ διέλειπεν, τὰ μὲν δ' ἐαυτοῦ, τὰ δὲ, διὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν θεραπόντων αὐτοῦ, τὰ δὲ, καὶ διὰ θείων καὶ ιερῶν εἰκόνων, χειροποιήτων τε καὶ ἀχειροποιήτων, αὐτοῦ τε καὶ τῆς τούτου μητρός. Καὶ ἔξεστι3 τῷ βουλομένῳ καὶ φιλοσόφων ἀνιγνοῦντες, πολλὰ σημεία καὶ τέρατα διὰ τῶν ἀγίων αὐτοῦ καὶ σεβασμίων εἰκόνων εὑρεῖν, οὐ μόνον γὰρ νοσημάτων δεινῶν ἀπαλλάττουσι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διάμονας διώκουσι καὶ μίρα βρύουσι, ἀλλὰ καὶ προσομιλοῦσι καὶ προσβλέπουσι, τινάς δὲ καὶ ἀποστρέφονται.

Τοιγαροῦν, τῆς ἡμετέρας δεσποινῆς ἡμῶν Θεοτόκου σω||| (fol. 205’)<M>ματικός 
ἐτι ἐν τῇ γῇ ἀναστρεφομένης,3 οἱ μακάριοι καὶ κορυφαίοι τῶν ἀποστόλων Πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης τὰς διατριβὰς ποιοῦντες πρὸ μιλίων ὀκτωκαϊδέκα ἀπὸ Ἰεροσολύμων ἐν Λύδῃ τῇ καλουμένῃ Διοσπόλει, εὐκτήριον οἰκοδόμησαν4 οἶκον ἐπὶ ἄνω αὐτῆς τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου μητρός, χερσὶν οἰκείας τούτον κατασκευάσαντες. Εἶτα ἔκειθεν ἀπάραντες, κατέλαβον ἐν τῷ οἶκῳ ὑπὸ ἡ Θεοτόκος κατέμενε, καὶ πρὸς γῆν κατακλίναντες, ἐλιτάνευσαν αὐτής λέγοντες τα εἰκότα:5 «Θεοτόκε παρθένε καὶ μήτερ τοῦ Κυρίου· τὸν ἐν σοὶ προστρεχόντων προστάτες καὶ ἄντιληψης βεβαία, ποῦ ἰσθα ἡμῶν σχολαζόντων καὶ καταρτιζόντων τὸν οἶκόν σου ἐν Διοσπόλει;»6.
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4 Ηβ. 1.1

---

1 addidi 2 εξ ἔστιν, cod. 3 τοιγαροῦν ... ἀναστρεφομένης; Περὶ τῆς εὐνυμίας τοῦ δικαίωμα τοῦ τοῦ Θεοτόκου ἐν Λύδῃ τῇ Καλουμένῃ Διοσπόλει, εὐλόγησαν, vD, 219** 10-12 4 sic cod., εὐκτήριον οἰκοδόμησαν vD, 219**, 14 οἱ μακάριοι καὶ ... τὰ εἰκότα; ὁ δὲ πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης οἱ ἐκκρίνοντα, τοὺς τοῦ Κυρίου ναὸν κάλλιστον δειμάμενοι τῇ Θεοτόκῳ ἐν Λύδῃ τῇ καλουμένῃ Διοσπόλει καὶ τούτον εὐφυῶς ἀπαρτήσαντες ικτήριους φωνὰς μετὰ δικρίνων καὶ στεναγμῶν καρδίας προσφέροντες ἐλιτάνευσαν λέγοντες, vD, 219**-220**, 1.13-1.4 6 προστάτες καὶ cod., om. vD, 220**, 1.2 7 ποῦ ἱσθα... Διοσπόλει] φανερὴ ἡμῖν τοῖς ταπεινοῖς καὶ ἀναξίωσις δούλως σοι καὶ πληροφόρησαν ἡμῖν τὸν ἐργον, δ' εἰργαζόμεθα ἐν τῷ σῷ τιμίῳ καὶ σεβασμῷ ὀνόματι, vD, 220**, 1.3-6
2. Ὡς δὲ τοιαῦτα ὦς αὐτὴν διελέγοντο, αὕτη¹ πρὸς αὐτοὺς χαριεντὸς ἀπεκρίνατο· «Κἀγὼ αὐτόθι ἦμην, καὶ εἰμὶ καὶ ἔσομαι»· καὶ ἐν ὅσῳ ταῦτα παρὰ τῆς ἁγίας Θεοτόκου ἐλέγετο πρὸς τοὺς πανευφήμιους ἀποστόλους, αὕτη τῇ ὀρα ἐνδοθεν τοῦ τιμίου θείου καὶ νεοκτίστου ναὸς εἰς ἕνα² τῶν κιόνων³, ἁνεδόθη ἡ τῆς πανάγνου Θεομήτορος ἁγιν καὶ σεβασμία εἰκών ἐν τῷ μαρμάρῳ⁴ τρισχισματὸν ἐξούσα τὸ ἀνάστημα, ὡς ἀπὸ χειρὸς κοσμοδέρου κυρίως ἐγγεγραμμένη, ἤ τε πορφύρα καὶ ὁ στολισμὸς ἅπας, αἱ χεῖρες καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ ἡ λουπὴ διαγραφὴ τῶν ὄψεων. Τούτῳ τὸ παράδοξον καὶ ἐξαισιον θαῦμα⁵, ἁπαντὰς ἐξέστησεν καὶ εἰς φόβον καὶ ἀγονίαν ἐνέβαλε λέγοντας· «Τίς εἶδε, τίς ἦκουσε τοιοῦτον παράδοξον θαῦμα⁶ ποτε γεγονός; σώτος ὁ δοίς ὁ δοῖς οὐδὲς οὐδέποτε θαυμαστός; (fol. 205v) εἶ Κύριε⁷, καὶ θαυμαστά τὰ ἔργα σου⁸, καὶ ἀνεξίγνωστοι αἱ ὁδοὶ σου⁹». 

¹ Esth. 5.2a ² Apoc. 15.3 ³ Rom. 11.33

3. Ταύτην οὖν τὴν τιμίαν¹ καὶ σεβάσμιον εἰκόνα τῆς ὑπερεννόδου θεομήτορος² ώς ἤθετο ὁ παραβάτης Ἰουλιανὸς³ τιμωμένην τε⁴ καὶ προσκυνούμενην ὑπὸ πάντων⁵ τῶν πιστῶν, θυμὸ ἄσχετον⁶ ληφθείς ὁ τύραννος καὶ παλαμναίος⁷, ἀποστειλὰς λιθοξόους ἐπειράτο⁸ ὁ ἀληθινὸς⁹ καταζέσαι¹⁰ καὶ ἠφανίσαι τὸ τοιοῦτον ἄγιον ἐκτύπωμα.¹¹ Αλλ’ ὅσον οὖτοι ἔξεσον¹² μανιωδός, τοσοῦτον¹³ ἔτι καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον φαιδρότερον¹⁴ ἀπεδείκνυτο. Οὐ μόνον δὲ οὕτως ὁ παμμίαρος¹⁵, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔτεροι μετ’ αὐτὸν ἀσβεστὶς¹⁶, πολλάκις τὰ αὐτὰ διαπραξάμενοι κατ’ αὐτή τῆς ἠγίας καὶ σεβασμιάς εἰκόνος¹⁷ καὶ εἰς μηδὲν ἐνεργήσαντες, ἀποκαμόντες¹⁸ ἀπῆλθον ἀπρακτοὶ, ἐξιστάμενοι μᾶλλον καὶ τιμωμαιζόντες¹⁹ ἐπὶ τῷ παραδόξῳ τῷ θαῦματος²⁰.

Το στοις οὖν καὶ μέχρι τοῦ νῦν διαμένει τὸ τοιοῦτον ἄγιον ἀπεικόνισμα τῆς ὑπερεγγαγίας δεσποινῆς ἡμῶν Θεοτόκου καὶ άειπαρθένου Μαρίας ἐν Λύδῃ τῇ καλουμένῃ Διοσπόλει, ἐν οὕτῳ καὶ πολλαί ίσες καὶ θαυματουργίας ἐπιτελοῦνται καθεκάστην ἀκενάως ὑπ’ αὐτῆς τῆς πανάγου Θεομήτορος, εἰς τοὺς πίστει καὶ πόθῳ αὐτῆ προστρέχοντας, δοξάζοντας καὶ προσκυνοῦντας τὸν εἰς αὐτῆς τεχνέαν Χριστὸν τὸν ἀληθινὸν Θεόν ἡμῶν, ὦ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων, ἀμήν²¹.
I

1. Our Lord and God Jesus Christ, for the salvation of our sinful selves, ceased not, from the beginning, to work miracles in manifold ways and manners, some through Himself, some through His disciples or other followers, some [of these miracles] came to be through divine and sacred icons, made by hand of man or acheiropoietai,1 of Himself and His mother. And it is possible for those who wish it and studiously investigate to find omens and portents emanating from His holy and venerable icons; for, not only do they relieve us humans from severe diseases, expel demons and gush forth myrrh,2 but they also speak to and watch over us, as they also turn their back on some of us.3

So, when our most holy Lady, the Mother of God, dwelled still upon the earth,4 Peter and John, the blessed and chief apostles, who were living eighteen miles before Jerusalem in Lydda5—otherwise known as Diospolis—erected a church in the name of Our Lord and God Jesus Christ, for the salvation of our sinful selves, and thereupon the church was dedicated in acknowledgment of the word of the Prophet, which says: “This is my chosen place, and My holy dwelling place will be there.”6

---

1 The exact translation of the word is “not made by hands” which is precisely what this category of icons is; images of holy persons which miraculously come into being by the holy person’s will. Acheiropoietai icons are cited chiefly during the period between Justinian I and Iconoclasm, see ODB, I, 12, for more on acheiropoietai, see Ch.1 a., 5.

2 The most typical kind of miracles performed by icons, as abounding so the sources can testify, see Ch.1 a., 5-6.

3 Compare the introduction of the current text with the pseudo-Damascene conclusion to the Lydda Legend: “And the conclusion of the Aeneas prodigy in The Letter of the Three Patriarchs: "And the conclusion of the Aeneas prodigy, see Mutniz et. al, The Letter ..., 7-37.4, 37-8.

4 The New Testament is quite poor in biographical information about the Holy Lady, informing us only of her marriage to Joseph and the birth of Jesus, their flight to Egypt, her presence in various places, such as Bethlehem, Nazareth and Jerusalem, and on various occasions, such as the miracle in Cana and Jesus’ execution. The so-called Protoevangelium of James supplies information about the Virgin’s early life as do Vitae by various church-fathers, see ODB, III, 2173-4.

5 Modern-day Lod in Israel, a town rich in history and turmoil. Archeological finds place the initial settlement of the city around 5600-5250 BC, see Joshua J. Schwartz, Lod (Lydda), Israel: from its origins through the Byzantine period, 5600 B.C.-640 A.D., (Oxford, Tempus Reparatum, 1991), 39, and it is believed that the first written reference to Lod was made around 1450 BC in a list of villages conquered by the pharaoh Thuthmos III. The name Διοσπόλις seems to have been given by Emperor Septimus Severus in 200-1, when the town acquired Roman city rights. With the institution of Christianity, Lod gained importance in Christian thought, as it is believed to be the birth-place of St. George, see C. E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, B. Lewis, and Ch. Pellat (eds.), Encyclopaedia of Islam, V, (Leiden: Brill, 1983), LUDD, 798-9 and ODB, I, 633. The town of Lod and its outskirts have also been associated with various stories of miraculous pillars during the middle ages. The earliest such story is recounted in the Piacenza Pilgrim’s Antonini Placentii Itinerarium, which has been dated to the end of the 6th century, see ODB, III, 1674. According to this story, there is a stone pillar in the middle of a road not far from the city which has no foundation. Supposedly Christ was being led to this pillar to be scourged, but the pillar “fled” from this fate by agent of a cloud which spirited it away and deposited it to the location in the street, see Aubrey Stewart (trs.), Palestine Pilgrims’ Text Society of the Holy Places visited by Antoninus Martyr, (London, 1887), 21-2. In Adomnán’s recounting of the monk Arculf’s journey through the holy
the Mother of God built by their own hands. Leaving this place behind them, they set off for the Mother of God’s abode and, upon reaching it, fell to their knees properly entreating her with these words: “Oh holy Virgin and Mother of God, steadfast aid and protector of those who seek you, where were You as we dutifully established Your temple in Diospolis?”

lands (ca. 670), a marble pillar inside a house in Lydda supposedly carries the imprint of St. George, who had been tied to it to be scourged. This pillar miraculously absorbs the spear-head and hands of an infidel who tries to strike it, and only when the man repents and confesses the true faith is he released, see Paul Geyer, Itinera hierosolymitana saeculi III-VIII [Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum] (Vienna 1898), xxxiii and 288-90. The earliest testimony to the next story is to be found only in The Letter of the Three Patriarchs, and it is a development of the story of Aeneas the paralytic from the Acts of the Apostles, 9:32-35. In the Acts, while Peter was going to Lydda to visit the saints living there, he came across Aeneas who for eight years had been bed-ridden due to paralysis. St. Peter tells him Jesus Christ has cured him, and immediately the man rises. This event leads many to convert to Christianity. The story in the Letter follows Aeneas who, after being cured, builds a church in the name of the Holy Virgin with the aid of the Seventy Apostles. Jews and Hellenes dispute over the ownership of the church and the then governor decides to seal and patrol the church for three full days, after which the doors would be re-opened; whichever sect would receive then a token of their faith would claim it. When the church is opened three days later, the image of the Virgin is seen fully depicted on a column towards the west side with the phrase “Mary mother of the Nazarene King Christ” inscribed beneath. For linguistic similarities with the current text see fn 7 below. The church is then claimed by the Apostles, and the Virgin’s icon continues to work miracles.

6 The only version which provides us with a location is pseudo-Andrew of Crete’s, in which the Holy Lady lives allegedly on Mt. Zion, though in Christian literature the name of the mountain often implies the city of Jerusalem, see ODB, III, 1905.
2. While the apostles spoke such words to Her, gracefully She replied “I, too, was there, am there and will be there.” And at that very moment of Her speech to the all-praiseworthy apostoles, there issued forth the pure and revered icon of the most pure mother of God, engraved on one of the honorable newly-built chruch’s marble columns. Standing a three cubits high, the whole of Her purple robes and ornamentation, Her hands, Her face and the totality of Her figure, all lay faithfully portrayed as if by hand of an artist. This incredible and extraordinary miracle confounded all, as they clamored in their fear-smitten agonizing voices. “Whoever saw, whoever heard of such a marvelous miracle? 'Tis true; not one, not ever. Marvelous be you our Lord, miraculous your deeds, your path inscrutable.”

7 Of the different texts preserving the Lydda Legend, the vast majority use similar or even identical vocabulary when describing the Virgin’s depiction. Compare the text above with pseudo-Damascenes’s ὅλην ἐκτεταμένην τὴν ἡλικίαν, ἢ τε πορφύρα καὶ ὁ στολισμός”; the Three Patriarchs’ ὅλην ἐντεταμένην τὴν ἡλικίαν, ἢ τε πορφύρα καὶ ὁ στολισμός”; pseudo-Andrew of Crete’s τρίπηχυ παραδείλασα, ... οἵτω κυρίως ἐγγραμμένης ὡς ἀπὸ χειρός ζωγράφου, τὴν τιν πορφύραν φημὶ καὶ τὸν στολισμὸν, τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γραφὴν τῆς ὄψεως”; the highly identical to this version in the Διήγησις of the Maria Rhomaia ἀνεδόθη εἰκὼν ἢ τῆς Θεοτόκου ἐν καθαρῷ τῷ μαρμάρῳ τοῦ θείου ἱεροτρόπου τριπτηχαίον ἐσχόον τὸ ἁνάστημα ὡς ἀπὸ χειρός ζωγράφου κυρίως ἐγγραμμένη, ἢ τε πορφύρα καὶ ὁ στολισμὸς ἀπασ, αἱ χεῖρες καὶ ἡ μορφὴ τοῦ προσώπου καὶ ἡ λοιπὴ διαγραφὴ τῶν ὄψεων”; von Dobschütz’s version is identical to the present one. In The Letter of the Three Patriarchs, the phrase “στήλην ἐγγραμμένην ἐν σχήματι γυναικείῳ τρίπηχῳ τῷ μέτρῳ, πορφύραν ἐστολιμένην...” which reminds us heavily of our own story, is used to describe yet again a column-engraving of the Virgin Mary near Lydda, this time however in the context of the story of Aeneas, the cured paralytic, see above 26-7, fn 5.
3. Alas, when the transgressor Julian\(^8\) percieved the honorable and revered icon being honored and worshiped by the faithful, the murderous tyrant was consumed by ungovernable wrath; upon this the sinner dispatched his marblemasons and attempted to scrape and obliterate the sacred relief. But, however hard they scraped, the image shown forth even brighter.\(^9\) However, it was not only he the odious, but many a man of little faith who undertook the same endeavor against that holy and revered icon after him. But as their efforts bore no fruit, wearily they came away unsuccessful, amazed and marveling by the incredible miracle. From then and till today, there remains the holy relief of our most holy Lady, the Mother of God, the ever-pure virgin Mary, in Lydda, the otherwise known as Diospolis. And through this, many cures and miracles are each day and ever more fulfilled by Herself the ever-pure Mother of God, for those who in faith and yearning turn to Her, lauding and worshiping Him who by Her be born, our one and only Lord, [Jesus] Christ; may His glory and sovereignty reign unto the ages of ages, amen:

---

\(^8\) Julian, commonly called the Apostate in the sources, reigned a brief 19 months from December of 361 to the 26\(^{th}\) June 363. He is most famous for rejecting Christianity and attempting to reinstitute paganism as the religion of the Empire. It seems however that his heretic comportment against objects of Christian faith is a feature attributed to him from later writers. In the sources contemporary to his reign, there are no mentions of Julian desecrating or commissioning the desecration of icons; what is mostly recounted are his educational reforms and the exclusion Christians suffered from various offices during his reign, see Καρπόζηλος, Βυζαντινοί Ιστορικοί..., I, 143-152; ODB, II, 1079; Walter E. Roberts, Michael DiMaio, Jr., “Julian the Apostate”, An Online Encyclopedia of Roman Emperors, last updated February 19, 2002: https://www.roman-emperors.org/julian.htm#Note%201

\(^9\) E. von Dobschütz provides an interesting interpretation of this phenomenon; since the image comes into being eigener Kraft, as a force springing forth from within the column, the deeper the marble masons scrape into its layers, the closer they reach the image itself, see Christusbilder, 81-82.
2.2. The Icon-Traveler: From Constantinople to Rome in one night

The second – and longest – story of our miracle compilation begins in Constantinople, at the time of Germanos’ deposition from the office of Patriarch under Leo III Isaurus’ reign. The Patriarch goes to the Amantiou shore, bearing an icon of Christ in his embrace. In a highly dramatic scene, after worshiping the icon, the deposed Patriarch writes a letter stating the day and time of the event, attaches it to the icon, and proceeds to throw the icon upright into the sea, praying to Christ to save Himself and his slave, for they are under grave peril. That same day the icon appears standing on the river Tiber in Rome, illuminated by a pillar of fire. The Pope Gregory II recognizes the sign by divine revelation and sails the river to retrieve the icon, which enters his open embrace upon recognizing the piety of the holy man. After reading Germanos’ letter, the Pope takes the icon and deposits it to the chamber of holy vessels in the Apostle Peter’s church, where it remains until the time of the narrative, working miracles.

Of all the stories in the compilation, the present one employs the largest amount of description in itself and descriptive vocabulary to enrich and pace the narrative. Our main characters’ mental state, Germanos’ despair on the one hand and Pope Gregory’s pious affection on the other, are both depicted with clarity. The suspense of the upcoming miracle before the icon enters Gregory’s embrace is slowly built by the “minute-by-minute” description of the Pope’s movements and reactions. When read closely, it is truly an immersing text and a well-built story.

It has been supported that the earliest version of the prodigy is preserved in The Letter of the Three Patriarchs, though, depending on the edition, reference also seems to be made to the story in Georgios Monachus. The version in the Letter is not as detailed as the current one, but generally follows the same plot-line with our own, with

---

1 For a thorough review of the period of Leo III’s reign and Germanos’ position therein, see Stephen Gero, Byzantine Iconoclasm during the reign of Leo III, (Louvain, 1973), esp. Chap. ix, 94-126.
2 A locality south-west of the Great Palace, on the shores of the Propontis; for more on ta Amantiou see 38, ft. 7.
3 Though a full narratological analysis of the text could be applicable and provide us with interesting insights, it is not the main focus of the current study. This short comment seems permissible for the time being.
4 Walter, “Iconographical…”, lxi.
some minor differences: Germanos attaches the letter to the right hand of the icon\(^5\) before speaking to it and then shooting it into the water; the icon stands on the Tiber three nights in a row; Gregory speaks to it upon finding it and the icon “walks upon the sea just as the Lord Christ once did”\(^6\); and the miraculous cures it delivers are chiefly towards the blind and paralytic.\(^7\) In the edition of Georgios Monachus which preserves the Germanos prodigy, the story is presented in even lesser detail than the previous one, since the emphasis is on the historical backdrop. There, the Patriarch’s words in the other two stories is what he writes in the letter; Pope Gregory is not named, but plainly called “the there Patriarch” (ὁ ἐκεῖ πατριάρχης); the icon is deposited in the “Grand Church” (Μεγάλη ἐκκλησία) of Rome; the signs of humidity on the icon reach a hight of three digits, \(^8\) not the five in the current version.

It is interesting that this story, even though its protagonist is one of the chief figures of the Iconophile “resistance” of the 8\(^{th}\) century, \(^9\) is non-extant in contemporary sources and has such poor representation in the sources dating to the second Iconoclasm. This fact seems alluring enough to lead one to categorize this prodigy as yet another one appearing during the 9\(^{th}\) century, like the Lydda Legend. The Germanos prodigy however seems to live on long after the second Iconoclasm, and in these later years it develops into something more than an independent miracle concerning an icon of Christ.

We have already spoken of the Maria Rhomaia earlier on, \(^10\) and the specific narration of course couldn’t be left out of the history of the Germanos prodigy. Von Dobschütz believed that the development of the Maria Rhomaia narration was a product of the 11\(^{th}\) century, \(^11\) to which the earliest manuscripts containing the story date. \(^12\) His theory seems plausible, as it coincides with the theory proposed in the present thesis, namely that icon-miracle narrations springing forth during the 9\(^{th}\) century propagated in the centuries following. In both von Dobschütz’s editions of the

---

\(^5\) This difference could possibly indicate the existence of a double tradition of the story, since the text in the unpublished version of codex Paris. gr. 1478 also prefers this alternative to affixing the letter to the icon’s forehead, which is what happens in the current edition and in von Dobschütz.


\(^7\) Ibid. 7.14.a-7.14.c, 48-51.

\(^8\) *PG* 110, col. 921C.


\(^10\) A small note was made on the nature of the narratives preserving the story, see 2.1., 21.

\(^11\) Von Dobschütz, “Maria Romaia”, 175.

\(^12\) Von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder*, 233**-4**.
'Ὑπόμνημα' and the Διήγησις, the Germanos legend is presented as a continuation of the Lydda Legend.

The texts narrate that due to the reputation of the miraculous engraving, it supposedly grasps Germanos’ attention before his enthronement as Patriarch, and he proceeds to visit Lydda to worship it. Astonished by its splendor, he commands it be copied into panel-form, which he then takes with him to Constantinople. When the time of his deposition arrives, the 'Ὑπόμνημα' informs us that Germanos takes this icon and an icon of Christ to the Amanthiou shore, both of which are thrown into the sea and travel to Rome. Pope Gregory II retrieves the icon of the Virgin and reads the letter attached to it, and this is then presented as the reason behind the letters he allegedly wrote to Leo III.\textsuperscript{13} According to the Διήγησις, Germanos throws one icon into the sea; the panel copy of the Diospolis engraving, which in this version however isn’t solely of the Virgin but also of the child Christ.\textsuperscript{14} Regardless, the icon remains in Rome for a few centuries working miracles, and when finally icons are restored in Constantinople and the threat of Iconoclasm has been vanquished, it leaves of its own accord in the middle of mass and returns as miraculously to the Grand Capital as it left.\textsuperscript{15}

This development seems quite far-fetched an attempt to string together all the traditions of miraculous icons; I would be inclined to believe that the present version of the Germanos prodigy is the original one, albeit narratologically enriched for aesthetic reasons.

But for now, let us turn “our discourse to the narration of another miracle:”

**Sigla**

\textit{cod.} = \textit{Codex Vaticanus gr.} 1587 (14\textsuperscript{th} cent. folios 204\textsuperscript{r} – 205\textsuperscript{v})

\textit{vD} = E. von Dobschütz, \textit{Christusbilder}, pp. 213**–216** based on the manuscripts: \textit{Mon. reg. gr.} 226 (13\textsuperscript{th} cent.), \textit{Par. B. N. gr.} 635 (14\textsuperscript{th} cent.), \textit{Par. B. N. gr.} 767 (13\textsuperscript{th} cent.) and \textit{Par. B. N. Coisl. gr.} 296 (12\textsuperscript{th} cent.).

\textsuperscript{13} Von Dobschütz, \textit{Christusbilder}, §11, 247**–249**. The authenticity of Pope Gregory’s letters has been much debated. For a review of the matter see Jean Gouillard, “Aux origins de l'iconoclasme : le témoignage de Grégoire II”, \textit{TM} 3 (1968), 243-308.

\textsuperscript{14} Von Dobschütz, “Maria Romaia”, §5.11-7, 195.

\textsuperscript{15} Von Dobschütz, “Maria Romaia”, §§21-23, 201-2 and \textit{Christusbilder}, §14, 253**–254**.
1. (fol. 206v) <T>οδι ἀγωνισμοῦ καὶ οἰκουμενικοῦ πατριάρχου Γερμανοῦ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ καλὸς καὶ θεοφιλῶς οἰκακίζοντος καὶ πηδαλουχοῦντος, ὁ ἀεὶ φθονόν και βασκαίνων τὴν τῶν ἄνθρωπων ζωὴν καὶ σωτηρίαν διάβολος, ἐξήγειρε καθ’ ἡμῶν βασιλέα ὅλεθριον καὶ δεινόν, Λέοντα φημι, τὸν ἱναι καὶ παμμίαν, τὸν ἐπονομαζόμενον Ἰσαυρον. Τῆς βασιλείας γὰρ δραξάμενος ὁ δειλιάς τυραννικὸς καὶ κατενεκτὴς τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ βασιλέα Θεοδοσίου τὸν καλούμενον Ἀδραμυττόνι καὶ ἀποκείμενος τὰς φρένας τοῦ δειλιάς, τὰς τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ Θεοῦ πυργοβάρεις πολιορκήσας, τούτεστιν τοὺς ἀρχηγοὺς αὐτῆς καὶ ἱερεῖς, κατέβαλε, καὶ τὸν μέγαν ἐν πατριάρχας καὶ φωστήρα Γερμανὸν, ἱδίας χεριοῦ τύπως ὁ ἐμβρονήτης καὶ θεομάχος, τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀτίμως ἐξέσωσε, Αναστάσιον δὲ τὸν μοχον καὶ ιουδαιώφρονα ἄντ’ αὐτόν, εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν θρόνον ἀνάξιου ὁ ἄθλος ἐνίδρυσε.

Τότε ὁ μακάριος Γερμανός, ὁ πολλὰ δεινὰ πεπονθὸς παρὰ τῶν ἁσβεθῶν καὶ ἁθέων εἰκονομάχον, τὸ τελευταῖον, ἐν ἐξορίᾳ παρ’ αὐτὸν στελλόμενος, ἀπάρας ἐκ τοῦ πατριαρχικοῦ ὀἴκου, εἰληφός δὲ μεθ’ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τὴν τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν καὶ Θεοῦ τιμᾶν καὶ σεβασμῖν εἰκόνα ἐν σανίδι ψηφίσεi κεκοσμημένην κατῆθεν ἐν ἄγκαλαις αὐτοῦ κατέχον παρὰ || (fol. 206r) τῷ τῆς θαλάσσης αἰγιαλῷ, τ’ Ἀμαντίου προσαγορευμένον, καὶ γράφας ἐν πιτακίῳ χερσίν ἱδίαις τὴν τε ὅραν καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν, ἐκκλησίαν αὐτὸ ἐν τῷ τῆς σεβασμίας εἰκόνος μετόπῳ καὶ κατασπασμένος αὐτῆς, καὶ ἐμβαλόν ἐξ ὀρθοῦ τῇ θαλάσσῃ προσκλαύσας τε καὶ προσκυνήσας, τὸ τελευταῖον ἐξεβόστη: «Ἡ ἡσυχία ἐπιστάτας οὐδένας σεαυτοῦ καὶ ἡμᾶς, ὅτι ἀπολέξασθα, καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ ἡμῶν παρὰ βραχὺ τῷ Ἀδη προσήγγεισε», καὶ ταῦτα εἰπόν, εἰχετο τῆς ἐξορίας.

---

* Ps. 84.4.

---

1οδι, cod.  
2πηδαλουχοῦντος, cod.  
3χειροτονῇ cod.  
4πάντες, cod.  
5πολιορκήσας, cod.  
6γεραί, cod.  
7<τ>οῦ...μακάριος, om. vD] καὶ πρώτον μὲν ἔσται κεφαλάιον τοῦτο, θαύματος μεγίστου ἀνάπλατον, ὅτι περ Γερμανοῦ ὁ ἀγίωτατος καὶ οἰκουμενικὸς πατριάρχης, vD, 213**, 3.16-18  
6παρὰ...εἰκονομάχον] ὑπὸ τῶν μισοχρίστων καὶ ἁθέων εἰκονοκαιστῶν, vD, 213**, 3.18-3.1  
9τὸ δὲ τελευταῖον, vD, 213**, 3.1  
10παραπεμφθεὶς, vD, 213**, 3.2  
11ὁ οἶκος, om. vD, 213**, 3.2  
12ἀναίσι, cod.  
13εἰληφός δὲ...κατέχον] καὶ μεθ’ ἑαυτοῦ εἰληφός τὴν τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν καὶ Θεοῦ ἁγίαν εἰκόνα ἐν σανίδι ψηφίσει κεκοσμημένην κατῆθεν ἐναγκαλίσαμεν αὐτήν, vD, 214**, 3.2-4  
14προσαγορευμένα, vD, 214**, 3.5  
15καὶ γράφας...τῆς ἐξορίας καὶ γράψεις ἐν πιτακίῳ χερσίν οἰκείας δοδόκεαλε, οὐδόνας σεαυτοῦ καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐκκόλλησιν αὐτὸ ἐν τῷ τῆς εἰκόνος μετώπῳ καὶ κατασπασμένος αὐτὴν καὶ ἐμβαλόν ἐξ ὀρθοῦ τῇ θαλάσσῃ προσκλαύσας τε καὶ προσκυνήσας εἰχετο τῆς ἐξορίας, vD, 214**, 3.5-9
2. Κατ’ αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν ἡμέραν, ἐν ἦ καὶ ἀπεστάλη, ἐφάνη1 ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ Ῥώμῃ, κατὰ τὸν ποταμὸν τὸν λεγόμενον Τιβέριον, στῦλος πυρσοφαίς διήκον2 ἐως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, διὰ πάσης τῆς νυκτὸς· καὶ οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τί ἦν τὸ σημεῖον καὶ τίς ἢ δήλωσις αὐτοῦ, μόνον δὲ ἐγνωρίσθη τῷ πάπᾳ Γρηγορίῳ δι’ ἀποκάλυψεως θείας. Σπεύσας οὖν αὐθίς ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀνθρωπος, Γρηγόριος ὁ πάπας, καὶ τῆς κλίνης ταχὺ ἐξαναστάς καὶ πανδημεῖτι λιτῆς ποιῆσας, τὸν ποταμὸν κατάλαβε· πορθμίοις καὶ ξύλοις τὸν λαὸν καλυπτάντων τὸ ὁδόρ καὶ λαμπάδηςφοροῦντον3 ἀπάντων, μύρος τε καὶ θυμίαμασι, ἀπασὶ ὁ ἀήρ ἐκεῖνος ἐπεπλήρωτο4· ὡς δὲ ἐνέβη5 ὁ πάπας ἐν τῷ πλοιαρίῳ κυβερνώμενος τῇ ἁνωθὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ6 προνοια, εἰδὲν αὐτήν τὴν ἁγίαν τοῦ σωτήρος εἰκόνα7 καὶ πλησιόν ταύτης8 ἐγένετο· ἀκούσατε λοιπὸν τὸ θαυμαστὸν9 καὶ ἐκπλήξεως γέμον10, καὶ φρεῖστε τὸ ὑπέροχον τοῦ πράγματος11.

---

1 ἐφάνη, cod.  2 διήκον, cod.  3 λαμπαδιφοροῦντον, cod.  4 κατ’ αὐτὴν...ἐπεπλήρωτο, om. vD] ἢ δὲ τουαίτη σεβασμία εἰκών, ὡς φησιν ὁ ἀληθῆς λόγος, διὰ νυχτήμου εὑρέθη ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ Ῥώμῃ, καὶ διὰ θείας ἀποκάλυψεως γνωρισθεία τῷ πάπᾳ Γρηγορίῳ τῷ πατριάρχῃ ἡ τοῦτον ἔλεος καὶ παρουσία, σπεύσας ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀνθρωπος ἐξῆλθεν εἰς ἀπάντησιν αὐτῆς, vD, 214**-215**, 4.10-4.1
11 θαυματος, vD, 215**, 5.5
3. Ὡς γὰρ μόνον[| (fol. 207r) ὁρμησεν ὁ ἄρχιερεύς πρὸς τὴν θαύματος1 γέμουσαν ἁγίαν καὶ σεβασμοῦ2 εἰκόνα, ἐνατενίζον3 μὲν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, ἐκτείνας δὲ τὰς χεῖρας καὶ πρὸ πάντων τὴν καρδίαν, δακρύων4 δῖλος ἐπληρωτοῦ· εὐθὺς δὲ καὶ παραρθήματός5 ἁρθείσα ὑπεράνω τῶν ὀδάτων ἡ ἁγία εἰκόν5, ἐναπέστη ἐν ταῖς ἁγκάλιαις τοῦ ταύτης ἁζίου λάτρου ἰσαιμένου κατὰ τὸ μέσον τοῦ πλοίου: ὁ τοῦ παραδόξου θαύματος ὄντος7 καὶ ἐκπλήκτου8 πράγματος, μάλλον δὲ καὶ ἀκούσματος· τίς γὰρ9 ἀκούων ταῦτα ὑπὸ φρίττει καὶ γέγηθεν10 καὶ τὸν φιλάνθρωπον Θεόν μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ ἄνυμνήσειν καὶ δοξάσειν διὰ παντός11; Ἡπεί οὕκ ἔλαττον τοῦτο, ὡς οἶμεν, τὸ παράδοξον τετραποργήματος12 ὑπάρχει Σωμαίας τοῦ13 θεοδόχου, δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἁγακάλιαις αὐτοῦ ὑπεδέξατο τοῦτον πρότερον14 ὡς βρέφος15, τὸν τὰ16 πάντα λόγου17 κελεύει δημιουργήσαντα, ἢ καὶ τὸ πρὸ αὐτοῦ γενομένου Μωσέως, ὃς δακτύλῳ Θεοῦ γραφείσας18 πλάκας ποτε19 οἰκεία χειρι20 ἐδέξατο. Τότε τούτων21 λαβὼν ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἱερεύς22 τὸν ἁγίον καὶ ἐνδοξῶν χαρακτῆρα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν ταῖς ἁγκάλιαις αὐτοῦ μετὰ δέος καὶ εκπλήξεως, καὶ ἀφελόμενος τὴν ἐπιστολὴν καὶ ἀναγνώσει πάσι τὰ ἐν τῷ Βυζαντίῳ διαπαράγαντα· καὶ γέγονε τις βοὴ δακρύων σύμμικτος, κραξάντων καὶ βοῶντων ἀπαύστως τὸ «κύριε ἐλέησον» 23.
4. Ἐδ’ οὕτως¹ δὲ ἀπάρας ἐκ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ὁ πάππας² ἀμα τοῦ πλῆθους τοῦ λαοῦ μετὰ λαμπάδων καὶ ὡμῶν καὶ ἁρωμάτων³ – τὸν (fol. 207v) μὲν προοδοποιοῦντον, τὸν δὲ ἐπακολουθοῦντον⁴ – εἰσήγαγαν τὸν ἁγιὸν χαρακτῆρα ἐκείνον⁵ ἐν τῷ τεμένει τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ κορυφαίον τῶν ἀποστόλων Πέτρου. Καὶ ἐκτενοὺς δεήσεως γενομένης, καὶ τής συνήθους δοξολογίας πέρας λαβοῦσης⁶, κατετέθη⁷ ἐν τῷ ἐνδοτέρῳ οίκῳ τῶν ἱερῶν σκευῶν⁸, ἐν ὀ καὶ μέχρι τῆς σήμερον⁹ ἐκείσε ἐναπόκειται, ὅπως πάντων τῶν πιστῶν σεβόμενός τε¹⁰ καὶ προσκυνοῦμενον τοῦτο τὸν ἁγιὸν¹¹ ἀπεικόνισμα διασώζοντας¹² καὶ περιφέροντας¹³ νεαράν¹⁴ ἐτὶ τήν ἀπὸ τῆς θαλάσσης νυτίδα καὶ ύπότητα διαμετρουμένην μέχρι δακτύλων πέντε δι’ ἑς πολλαὶ ἰάσεις καὶ παντοδαπαὶ ἀεὶ ἐπιτελείσθαι οὐ διαλυτότατος.¹⁵ Αἰσχυνεύθεσαν λοιπὸν¹⁶ καὶ ἐκλείπετοσαν ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς οἱ μὴ σεβόμενοι εἰς ὅλης καρδίας καὶ προσκυνοῦντες ἐκ ψυχῆς τῆς ἁγίαν καὶ σεβάσμιον¹⁹ εἰκόνα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τής πανάγου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας, τῆς τούτων κατὰ σάρκα τεκούσης καὶ πάντων αὐτοῦ τῶν ἁγίων· ἐστωσαν δὲ καὶ ἄλλοτριοι²⁰ τῆς τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείας, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἕρν ἐτέρου θαυματώ τος διήγησιν τὸν λόγον τρέψομεν.
1. When the most saintly and ecumenical patriarch Germanos¹, rightly held the helm of His church in ways pleasing to God, the Devil, ever enviously watchful of the lives and salvation of humanity with his malignant eye, raised against us a dreadful and deadly king, I mean Leo, the accursed and all-abominable, the otherwise called Isaurus.² For he, the wretched one, despotsically seized the kingdom and overthrew the reign of Theodosius the so-called of Atramyttion,³ had [his hair] shorn and appointed him bishop of Ephesus. Having completely lost his treacherous mind, he began besieging the fortresses of our Lord’s holy church⁴, meaning to say that he sought the demise of His church’s leaders and priests. Furthermore, with his own hands the maddened rival of God smote Germanos, the grand among patriarchs and illuminator, ignominiously forcing him out of the Lord’s church. And in his stead, the wretched man established Anastasios the adulterer of Judaic mind undeservingly in Germanos’ throne.⁵ Then, the blessed Germanos, who had suffered many a terrible hardships by the blasphemous and godless iconoclasts—last of all being his banishment to exile—when he was cast away from the patriarchate, he took with himself the honorable and revered wooden icon of our savior and Lord which was adorned with tesserae;⁶ went

---
¹ The Patriarch Germanos I was born around 655, but details of his life before he became metropolitan of Kyzykos in 712 are recounted in later sources, such as Iohannes Zonaras. He was Patriarch of Constantinople from the 11th August 715 to the 17th January 730, when he resigned from his throne due to the pressure, he was receiving from Leo’s Iconoclast movement, see PmBZ, 1.2, #2298, 31-3.
² Leo III was the founder of the Isaurian dynasty, and reigned for 30 years after Theodosios’ deposition. Though during his reign, he had many military successes, the text gives this highly negative image of him, due to his Iconoclastic positions, see ODB, II, 1208.
³ Theodosios III was a tax-gatherer in Attramytion, and reigned a brief period from 715-717. He was deposed by Artabasdos and Leo III and became a monk just as the text informs us, see ODB, III, 2052.
⁴ Cf. the text from the Letter to Thophilos with the wording in the story: τῇ τῶν ἁρμανικῶν φρυνῶν φυσικής ἀρετῆς, τοὺς προφυλάκους καὶ στοίχους τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν καταστράφων κατέρρησε. In this excerpt the man cheated by the Arian mind-game is Constantios, but it seems that the language used both in the Letter and here are of formulaic nature, since they are describing the same phenomena. In fact, this whole section of the Letter proves interesting when compared to the first paragraph of our story, see Ps.-Damascene, Letter to Theophilos, in Munitiz et. al, The Letter…, 7.d, 155.
⁵ This fact is also accredited in George Monachus, see PG 110, col. 921D.
⁶ This detail allows us to safely deduce that the panel icon Germanos is holding here is a micromosaic. Portable mosaic icons were a rare luxury during the Byzantine era, most likely commissioned and owned solely by members of the imperial family or of the upper class. Less than 50 such items have survived up to the modern era and date from the 11th to the 14th centuries. They have been considered a product of the middle-Byzantine era, see Italo Furlan, Le Icone Bizantine a Mosaico, (Milan, 1979), 8-9, so this testimony could possibly be a case of anachronism, especially when combined with the fact that not all accounts of the prodigy testify to the icon being a mosaic. The version in The Letter of the Three Patriarchs for example, does not make such a reference, see Munitiz et. al, The Letter…, 7.14.a, 49. Not much is known about the production of such icons, though it is believed that they were produced not only in Constantinople but also Thessaloniki, see Arne Effenberger, “Images of Personal Devotion: Miniature Mosaic and Steatite Icons” in Helen C. Evans, Byzantium: faith and power (1261-1557), (New York, 2004), 209-10; ODB, II, 980-1; Otto Demus, “Two Palaeologan Mosaic Icons in the Dumbarton

---

39
down to the so-called of Amantios sea-shore, holding it in his folded arms. Writing then on a piece of paper the time and day in his own hand, he affixed it to the icon’s forehead and after embracing it many times, he threw it upright into the sea weeping gravely and falling down in worship, and bore forth this last cry: “Jesus overseer, save Yourself and us, for we are doomed to perish, and our soul all but made its abode near Hades.” And having spoken thus, he made his way to exile.

Oaks Collection,” DOP 14 (1960), 87-8. Of the icons surviving today, many depict Jesus Christ; the lack of detail in the description of the icon in Germanos’ arms does not allow us to ascribe it a specific style. The Amantios quarter was south-west of the hippodrome, westwards from the church of Sergios and Bacchus, and was located right on the shore next to the Julien port. Janin calls it a locality “de peu d’importance” mostly known for the church of St. Thomas built there, see Raymond Janin, Constantinople Byzantine, (Paris, 1950), 45, 289. Why Germanos would seek refuge in this location is a mystery.

This act reminds us of the episode found in the 11th century Universal History of the Armenian historian Stefan Asotik regarding the Arabic siege of Constantinople in 717. According to this story, the emperor Leo leads the relic of the Holy Cross to the sea in a procession in which he is accompanied by Germanos. Upon reaching the shore, the Emperor beats the sea three times with the cross and pleads Christ for His aid. After this, the Arabic fleet is supposedly annihilated miraculously, see PmBZ, 1.2, #2298, 32.
2. And on the very day it was sent, there shown forth in great Rome, upon the so-called Tiber river, a luminous pillar reaching up to the sky, all through the night. And no one knew what this sign was and which its meaning; only did it become known to Pope Gregory⁹ by divine revelation. Rushing forth immediately, this man of God, the Pope Gregory, after hastingly raising himself from his chamber and holding a litany through the whole city, he came unto the river. And whereas the people had covered the water with vessels and boats and were all carrying torches, the whole sky was filled with perfume and incense. When the Pope embarked on the boat, driven by the heavenly Providence of God, he saw this holy icon of the Savior and went close to it. Hear ye then the miraculous and full of wonder, and shudder from the greatness of the matter.

⁹ Pope Gregory II was a contemporary of the Patriarch Germanos I and it seems that their careers developed in tandem. Born in 669, he was pope from 19th May 715 to 11th February 731. He is famous for being in ongoing dispute with the Emperor Leo III, first by rejecting Byzantine economic and religious policy in Italy and also by combating Iconoclasm. Leo made attempts on the pope’s life, but without success, see ODB, II, 876 and PmBZ, I.II, #2522, 107-8. His presence in the story allows to attribute a dating between 730-731 to the events described.
3. For only when the arch-priest hastened towards the fully miraculous, holy and revered icon, transfixt [upon it] with his eyes, stretching forth his arms, but first and foremost his heart – for he became completely full of tears – did at that moment immediately, raising itself above the waters, the holy icon place itself in the arms of its worthy worshiper who stood in the middle of the boat. How bizzare a miracle to be and amazing a thing, even more so when one hears of it! For who, upon hearing such things, does not tremble in awe and rejoice? And [who] would not celebrate and worship at the top of his lungs the benevolent God now and forever? For I would not consider this incredible miracle to be lesser than [that of] Simon the God-receiver\textsuperscript{10} who welcomed Him in the past in his arms as an infant; Him who created everything with the command of the Word. Or than [that of] Moses who existed before Him, who received the slates written by hand of God in his own hands.\textsuperscript{11} So then, the priest of God, taking the holy and glorious icon of our Lord Jesus Christ in his arms with awe and amazement, and removing the letter and reading it, related to all the details of what had been done in Byzantium. And there broke out an outcry, commingled with tears, of those bawling and shouting the \textit{kyrie eleison} incessantly.

\textsuperscript{10} The story of Simon the God-Receiver can be found in the Gospel of Luke. Simon was a just and devout man, enlightened by the Holy Spirit. It had been revealed to him that he would not die before laying eyes on the Lord’s Christ, and indeed the baby Christ is brought to the temple by his earthly parents to fulfill the rules of custom. Simon is also there, and upon seeing Jesus, he takes the baby in his arms, blesses Him and prophesizes the crucifixion, see Luke 2:25-2:35.

\textsuperscript{11} The Ten Commandments are referred to first in Exodus 20:1-17, with the story of Moses’ ascending Mt. Sinai to acquire them preceding in Exodus 19. Supposedly though the Lord spoke these words rather than write them, contrary to what the text recounts here.
4. Afterwards the Pope, leaving the river accompanied by the crowd of people with torches and hymns and aromas – some leading the way and others following behind – introduced [with them all] that holy image to the temple of the holy and chief of the Apostles Peter. And after the completion of the extended prayer and the end of the customary doxology, it was deposited to the inner chamber of holy vessels in which it lays until this day, revered and worshiped by all the faithful. This holy representation, still preserving fresh and displaying the moisture and dampness from the sea, which counted five digits in height, and through which numerous and manifold cures never cease to take place. […] Thus, those who do not respect with all their heart or worship with all their soul the holy and revered icon of our Lord Jesus Christ and the most pure and ever-virgin Mary, who bore Him unto flesh, and of all His saints, let them feel utter shame and disappear from the face of the earth; and let them stand estranged from the Kingdom of Heaven. We, however, shall turn our discourse to the narration of another miracle:

12 The Old St. Peter’s Basilica was built in the 4th century by command of Constantine the Great. It was a five-aisled basilica-plan church with apsed transept at the west end. The church could be entered through an atrium called Paradise that enclosed a garden with fountains. From the atrium there were five doors into the body of the church. The nave was terminated by an arch with a mosaic of Constantine, accompanied by St. Peter, presenting a model of his church to Christ. On the clerestory walls, each pierced by 11 windows, were frescoes of the patriarchs, prophets, and Apostles and scenes from the Old and New Testaments. Old St. Peter’s was torn down in the early 16th century and replaced by New St. Peter’s, which stands to this day in the Vatican, see The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica, “Old Saint Peter's Basilica” in Encyclopædia Britannica, published: 25/01/2018 (accessed 25/01/2020) https://www.britannica.com/topic/Old-Saint-Peters-Basilica

13 Here the text proves a bit problematic. In the beginning of the story, the icon Germanos holds in his arms portrays only Jesus Himself; here however reference is made also to the Virgin Mary and the Saints. If the Saints hadn’t been mentioned, it could have been possible that this icon was the Maria Rhomaia, though this would also raise questions since clearly the icon described in the beginning is not. Another possibility would be that part of the text is missing, most likely a concluding paragraph condemning any kind of disrespect towards icons, and this is the last sentence of that part.
2.3. The Bleeding Icon and the Holy Well

The third story of the compilation takes place in Constantinople, specifically in and around the complex of the Hagia Sophia. A Jewish man, passing frequently by a side road looking into the temple, is enraged by the mass amount of worship towards an icon of Christ hanging above the Holy Well.\(^1\) One day, he enters the temple unnoticed, brandishing a dagger, and stabs the icon through. The icon then starts to miraculously spew forth blood, drenching the Jew’s tunic. The man throws the icon into the well and flees. He is seized however by the passers-by and accused of murder, upon which he admits his attempt against the icon. The crowd then rushes to retrieve the icon, which is found still pouring blood. This miracle attracts the attention of countless pilgrims who flood the area to see it, and whoever suffered from any kind of illness, after getting anointed by the holy blood would regain his health.

The motif of an icon being stabbed and spewing forth blood is quite common in medieval sources. One of the most renowned stories of the kind is that of the Beirut icon, which was recounted in the Acts of the Council of Nicaea.\(^2\) Earlier still, Gregory of Tours\(^3\) provides us with another story of an icon of Christ bleeding after a Jew stabs it. Leontius,\(^4\) bishop of Neapolis in Cyprus, in his *Speech against the Jews*, invokes the flowing of blood from icons as proof of their sanctity.\(^5\) A story of a bleeding icon, though this time not of Christ, can also be found in John of Damascus’ third oration in favor of icons.\(^6\)

Despite the common motif however, this specific story is not to be found in any Iconophile sources other than *The Letter of the Three Patriarchs*, in which it is presented in much less detail.\(^7\) Allusions are made to it in later sources, chiefly in accounts of pilgrims visiting the Hagia Sophia, and in compilations such as the present

---

\(^1\) For more on the Holy Well, see 47, fn. 4.

\(^2\) Lamberz, *Concilium universale…*, 316-330. For more on the Beirut icon see Walter, “Iconographical…”, lx.

\(^3\) Gregory of Tours, born around 540, was bishop of Tours and the most important historian of Merovingian France, see ODB, II, 883. His text *De Gloria martyrum*, which dates to the 6th century, provides the account of the bleeding icon, see §22, PL 71, col. 724.

\(^4\) Leontios was better known for his hagiographical production. The exact time of his life hasn’t been determined, see ODB, II, 1213-14, and neither can the text of his *Speech* be dated precisely, though most probably it was written in the first half of the 7th century, and Vincent Déroche, “L’apologie contre les Juifs de Léontios de Néapolis”, TM 12 (1994), 45-6.

\(^5\) Déroche, “L’apologie contre les Juifs…”, l. 86, 68.

\(^6\) Kotter, *Die Schriften…*, 184.

\(^7\) Walter, “Iconographical Considerations”, lx.
one. Patrick Andrist traces all the different versions (greek and latin) describing the miracle of the Holy Well as a part of his argumentation in favor of the dating of the “Ἀντίθεσις Ἑβραίων πρὸς Χριστιανοῦς, μετὰ Αθανασίων καὶ Κυρίλλου, περὶ σταυροῦ καὶ εἰκόνων”, a christian text refuting the “Judaic” arguments against icon worship, to the first Iconoclasm, rather than to the second as was generally accepted. He discerns a double tradition between the stories regarding the Holy Well: those which draw from The Letter of the Three Patriarchs and focus on the miraculous happening in itself, and those which act as an “origin myth,” presenting the miracle as an explanation for the title of the “ἅγιον φρέαρ” in the Hagia Sophia. He continues to establish that the “origin myths” are traditions pertaining to the pre-iconoclastic era, thus justifying his belief that the Ἀντίθεσις Ἑβραίων is a text of the first Iconoclasm. In the present text the title ἅγιον φρέαρ is explained as being due to the relic of Jacob’s Well present in the temple, and not by the miracle itself of the icon spewing forth blood. Based on Andrist’s categorization it thus belongs to the first group.

The evidence Andrist compiles and the questions he poses in his article leave an open field for further research, at present however we shall turn to another “wonderful miracle and most splendid narration.”

Sigla

cod. = Codex Vaticanus gr. 1587 (14th cent. folios 204v – 205v)
vD = E. von Dobschütz, Christusbilder, pp. 219**-221** based on the manuscripts: Par. B. N. gr. 635 (14th cent.) and Par. B. N. gr. 767 (13th cent.) and Par. B. N. Coisl. gr. 296 (12th cent.).

---

8 Ibid., lx-lxi.
10 Ibid., 99.
11 Among this category Andrist also quotes the present compilation as a source “qui se déclare, elle aussi, tirée de la Synodique des patriarches,” even though nowhere in the text is there any explicit reference to The Letter as being the source for the narrations. Indeed, he commits this fallacy twice in his article, see Andrist, “Les Objections des Hébreux”, 131, 133.
12 Ibid., 132-139.
Γ΄

1. <Δ> εσποτικῶν καὶ παραδόξων θαυμάτων ἀνάμιμην βουλόμενος ὑμῖν διηγήσασθαι ποθεινότατοι ἀδέλφοι, ἁγιωτία καὶ φόβῳ συνέχομαι μὴ δυνάμενος κατ᾿ ἄξιον ἐκφράσαι τὸ παρ᾿ ὑμῖν1 || (fol. 208r) προτεθέν πρόβλημα, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο παρακαλῶ πάντας ὑμᾶς τοῦ συνεξεισθαί μοι, καὶ τὰς ἀκούς ὑμῖν ὑφαπλώσατε πιστῶς καὶ ἀκούσατε2.

Ἐν τῷ τεμένει τῆς ἁγίας καὶ μεγάλης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας κατὰ τὴν πύλην τὴν ἀποβλέπουσαν καὶ φέρουσαν πρὸς τὸ ἀνατολικὸν3 μέρος, ὡς καὶ οἱ τίμιοι καὶ ἀγαθοί4 σταυρόν καὶ κατὰ τὴν πυλὴν ἀποβλέποντες5 Ἀγία ἔκρηκαν κατὰ τὴν πύλην μεγάλην πυλήν εἰς τὸ ἱερὰ ναὸν καὶ τὰς ἀκούσας ὑμῖν ὑφαπλώσατε πιστῶς καὶ ἀκούσατε6. Τοῖς τούτοις ὑπάρχουσι καὶ προσαγορεύεται τὸ ἁγιὸν ἔκδοσαν καὶ ἀγαθοὶ καὶ θαυματόβρυτον φρέαρ, διὰ τὸ τὴν πυλῆν τῆς σοφίας, τὸν κύριον ὑμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, ἐν αὐτῷ καταψύξας καὶ τὸν τῆς ὁσιοπροσομοίωσας κόπον, ὡς καὶ τῇ ἴησοῦ τῆς γνώσεως καὶ σοφίας προσωμίλησε12 ἀπορρήτῳ.

2. Ἐν τούτῳ τοῖνος τῶν σεβασμίων καὶ προσκυνητῶν1 τῶπω καὶ τῆς τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν καὶ Θεοῦ τιμίας καὶ ἁγίας εἰκόνος ἐν σανίδι μετεώρῳ 2 ἀναστηλομένης 3 πρὸς ἀνατολάς. Ἰουδαίος τῆς πολλάκις διερχόμενος διὰ τῶν ἔκεισε παράδοξος γὰρ ἐστί βλέπων τὸ ἄγιον καὶ σεβασμίων ἐκείνον 5 ἀπεικόνισμα σεβασμόν τοιαύτα καὶ προσκυνοῦμεν ὑπὸ πάντων ὑπὸ τῶν πιστῶν, δαχθεὶς 7 τε τὴν καρδίαν ὁ δείλας ταῖς τοῦ πονηροῦ δαίμονος ἀκίς, καὶ μὴ μελλήσας, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον βουλευσάμενος ὁ ἄθλιος βουλήν ἄθεον καὶ ἀλλόκοτον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, ἐν μιᾷ ὁὖν τῶν ἡμερῶν δία τοῦ τοῦτο ἐκείνου διερχομένου 11 τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν 13 ἁγίας, καὶ παραχρῆμα 15, ὁ τοῦ φοβεροῦ καὶ ἐξαισίου θαύματος τε καὶ πράγματος 16, ἐβλύσσεν αἴμα τίμιον ἐκεῖθεν, καὶ κατέρρευσεν 17 τὸν τοῦ παρανόμου Ἰουδαίου χιτῶνα τε ἐπὶ καὶ 18 τῇ λαλήσῳ, ὁ Χριστὲ καὶ Θέε μου, ὡσα καὶ οἷα ὑποφέρεις παρὰ τῶν ἁγιώυμον Ἰουδαίων καθ’ ἐκάστην καὶ οὐ μόνον παρ’ αὐτῶν 20, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρ’ ἡμῶν τῶν σὲ καθ’ ἐκάστην 21 παροργίζοντι διὰ τῶν ἀτόπων πράξεως καὶ ἔργων ἡμῶν 22. ὁ δὲ ἄθεος καὶ παράνομος οὗτος Ἰουδαίου ὑπὸ τοῦ δέους καὶ τοῦ φόβου τοῦ μεγίστου 24 θαύματος ἀληθινός καὶ ἐξαιρετισθεὶς ὑπαξίμενος τε τῆς ἁγίας καὶ σεβασμίας εἰκόνος ἐκείνης καὶ καταστάσας αὐτὴν ἀνωθεν ἐρρύς ταύτην ἐνδὸν τοῦ ἁγίου 28 φρέατος, αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ ἀληθήριος 29 φυγάς ὑἄγει.
3. Οὐ δὲ ἐγνώσθη ὁ ἐπάρατος ἱεροσεβοκρατηθεὶς ἵπποι παρά τῶν παραδευόντων χριστιανῶν εὐφροσύνην ἐν σπουδῇ, καὶ τά τῶν ἀγίων αἰμάτων ἐκείνων λείψανα φέρον ἐν τῷ χιτῶνι, ἐφοράθη, τούτεστι ἑνόμισθη, ὡς φονεύς καὶ κρατηθεὶς παρ’ αὐτῶν, ἀπίλεγχετο διὰ τοῦ αἰμάτος. Ὅθεν, ἀναγκασθεὶς ὁ δείλαιος ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐκείστε συνδραμοῦντος ὁγύλου, ἐφανέρωσε, καὶ μὴ βουλόμενος, ὥσπερ ἔδρασεν ἀτόπημα, καὶ «Εἴ ἀπιστεῖτεν, φησίν ὁ ἱεροσεβοκρατηθεὶς ἵππος, ὁ ἐκεῖνων ἐνδοθεν ὑπάρχει τοῦ φράταν», εὐθέως οὖν ἀνάγαντες λαμπάδας καὶ ἀνελόμενοι αὐτὴν ἐκείθεν εἶδον ἕξον καὶ ἀπόρρητον θαῦμα, τὴν μάχαιραν ἐμπεσαρμημένην, τῇ ἀγίᾳ καὶ σεβασμὶ, ἡ ἐν τῇ σεβασμίᾳ έτη βλεψοῦσαν αἴμα θείον.

Τούτῳ τόίνυν τὸ μέγα καὶ παράδοξον καὶ ὑπερανεστήκον τῶν ἄλλων σημείων καὶ ἑσυχιῶν τοὺς πέντε πιστοὺς εἰς χαράν καὶ εὐφροσύνην μετέβαλεν καὶ τοὺς ἁμφιβόλους ἐβεβαίωσεν, τοὺς δὲ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐχθροὺς καὶ ματαιώφρονας, κατῆσχεν καὶ τῇ ἀπολείπῃ παρέδωκε. Τούτῳ δὲ τοῦ μεγίστου θαύματος παντοῦ διαφανεσθείτο, ἢν ἰδέσθαι ποταμίθδον, τὰ πλήθη τῶν λαῶν ἐπηρεόντα τὸ τόπῳ ἕκεινον, σχεδὸν γὰρ πᾶσα η πόλις, ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ ἡ περίχωρο, ἀπάσα ἐκενοῦθ᾽ τῶν οἰκτηρῶν, θυμαμάζοντες καὶ ἐκπληττόμενοι τὴν μεγαλοπρέπειαν καὶ ὑπερβολὴν τοῦ τοιοῦτο παραδοξίου καὶ ἐξαισίου θαύματος, τίνα γὰρ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τούτῳ οὐκ ἔξεπληξεν καὶ εἰς ἔρωτα καὶ τάμβος ἐνήλασεν, ὄροντας ἐκ τῆς νεκρᾶς καὶ ἀψυχοῦ εἰκόνος αἴμα χεόμενον ἀείζουν; Τοιαροῦν δος διαμονιώντες καὶ πεπηρωμένοι τὰς ὑγίεις καὶ χωλοὶ τάς βάσεις καὶ πυρηνεῖς τὸ σῶματι καὶ λεπροὶ τας σαρξι καὶ ἐτέρους λοιποὺς συνεχόμενοι νοσήμασι, προσήρχοντο τὸ ἅγιον ἕκεινον χαρακτήρι τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, καὶ τὸ θεῖο λύθρο καὶ τὸ ἅγιον ἐκείνων αἰμάτως χριῶμενος τῆς ὑγείας αὐτῶν ἐκατοστὸς παραχρήματος ἀπέλασεν, δοξάζοντες καὶ εὐχαριστοῦντες ἐπὶ πάσι τούτῳ τῶν ἀπειροδύναμων καὶ φιλάνθρωπον Θεὸν ἡμῶν.
III

1. Since, my most beloved brothers, I wish to narrate to you the remembrance of Lordly and incredible miracles, I am overwhelmed by agony and fear, lest I be unable to duly recount the issue previously brought forward by you. And for this reason I implore you all to join with me in prayer and extend your hearing in good faith and listen.¹

In the temple of the holy and great church of God,² along the gate which looks and leads to the Eastern side, outside which (gate) hang on either side the precious and life-giving acheiropoietoi crosses set on slabs of Proeconnesian marble³, presenting an incredible wonder to all who pass by there, and being worshiped and revered by every man of faith; inside these, there exists the allegedly holy and miracle-flowing well;⁴ miracle-gushing, for the reason that the fountain of Wisdom, that is, our Lord Jesus Christ found thence refreshment and repelled the fatigue of the journey; in this very place did He preach to the Samaritan the mysteries of knowledge and wisdom.⁵

¹ The text preserved in von Dobschütz does not include this introduction. From its content however, it seems to be a formulaic address towards the audience of the sermon. Since this story is exactly in the middle of the compilation, a short break between this and the previous ones could have been expected or even necessary to help renew the audience’s attention.
² This “great church of God” is none other than the Hagia Sophia.
³ Proekonnesos was the largest island in the Sea of Marmara, famous for its marble quarries, see ODB, III, 1730-1.
⁴ The Holy Well of the text was an adjunct of the Hagia Sophia, which, according to Mango, owed its name to the holy relic of the well-head Christ sat upon when conversing with the Samaritan woman, recounted in John 4:1-26. It remains unknown exactly when the relic was transferred to Constantinople, with Mango noticing reference being made to it chiefly from the 9th century onwards; Andrist on the other hand speculates whether its translation to the Grand Capital could be attributed to the period of Heraclius’ reign, see Cyril Mango, The Brazen House, (Copenhagen, 1959) 60-1 and Andrist, “Les Objections des Hébreux”, 138-9.
⁵ See John 4:5-15.
2. So, on these revered and worshipped grounds there (existed) also the precious and holy icon of our Savior and God set up on a pendulent panel facing the East. Some Jew, passing many times by that place – for it is a side-way – upon seeing (that) the holy and revered image (was) being revered and worshiped by all the faithful, the treacherous man, feeling the biting in his heart of the malignant demon’s needles, and without hesitating, but rather, wretched him, making a decision in his heart for a godless and unusual plan, one of those days, while passing by that place, that god-hated Jew, finding it empty and escaping everybody’s notice, raising up, the wretched one, a knife, [he] stabbed it through the middle of the holy icon of Christ our God.\(^\text{6}\) And immediately – oh how awful and extraordinary a miracle and happening! – from there spewed forth precious blood which completely drenched the lawless Jew’s tunic. What should I say and how should I speak, oh Christ my Lord, of how many and what kind of torments you suffer by the ungrateful Jews every day. And not only by them, but also by us who infuriate you every day with our wicked actions and deeds. This godless, lawless Jew, overwhelmed and despairing in awe and fear of the great miracle, taking hold of that holy and revered icon and bringing it down from above, he threw it inside the holy well;\(^\text{7}\) and he turned his wicked self and fled.

\(^{6}\) The Letter of the Three Patriarchs explicitly states that the icon was pierced through the heart (τῇ καρδίᾳ πηξάμενος), something which could also be inferred from the phrasing here, see The Letter of the Three Patriarchs, in Munitz et al., 7.13.a, 47.

\(^{7}\) Whether a real well existed inside the premises of the church or not is a subject under debate, however testimonies which describe the throwing of the icon inside the well such as the present one are considered proof in favor of this position, see Mango, Brazen House, 62 and fn. 163.
3. When, however, the accursed and god-hated Jew was perceived by the Christians passing by to be shuffling quickly away while (still) sporting the remains of that holy blood on his tunic, he was denounced, meaning to say, he was thought to be a murderer, and, detained by them, he was considered guilty on account of the blood. Thence, being forced by the crowd that had gathered around, he revealed, despite not wanting to, the offence which he had committed and “Pray you disbelieve me,” said the Jew, “behold the icon inside the well.” So then, immediately lighting torches and pulling it, (the icon), from there, they saw a strange and ineffable miracle: the knife impaled through the holy and revered icon, and the revered icon itself still gushing forth sacred blood. Thus, this great and incredible [miracle], surpassing all other portents and marvels, rendered the faithful joyous and cheerful, and reassured the doubtful; as for the adversaries of truth and the foolish, it humiliated them and delivered them to their perdition. Since the rumor of this most great miracle spread far and wide, it was possible to see the crowds of people surging to that place as [would] a river. For almost the whole city – and all the surrounding countryside even – was emptied of its inhabitants, who were in awe and marveling about the splendor and extravagance of such an incredible and extraordinary miracle. For who among these people was not dumbfounded by this, and driven to love and amazement upon seeing ever-living blood pouring from a dead and inanimate icon? For this reason, whoever under demonic possession, blind of sight, lame of step, feverish of body, and leprous of flesh, or burdened by other such illnesses, would come to that holy image of Christ our God, and after being anointed with that holy blood, would each immediately enjoy their health [anew], praising and thanking for all these things our omnipotent and benevolent God.

8 In the version of *The Letter of the Three Patriarchs*, this miracle leads the Jew who stabbed the icon to convert to Christianity and be baptized, a development which here does not exist, see *The Letter of the Three Patriarchs*, in Munitiz et al., 7.13.a, 47.
2.4 The Blinding of Anna

The fourth story of our compilation takes place not much further away from the location of the previous one, eastwards of the Hagia Sophia and close to the Bosphorus, in the so-called Hodegous monastery.¹ There, an icon of the Virgin Mary holding the child Christ in Her arms existed, which the nuns of the monastery unwillingly cover up after hearing of Emperor Leo’s ordinance against icon worship. The icon however miraculously expels its covering, but draws the attention of the iconoclast-minded Anna – first attested, from what it seems, here in Byzantine texts – who happened to be passing by there. Infuriated by the holy object, she hurls insults at the icon and gouges out its left eye with a knife. However, at that very moment her own left eye is pierced through by an invisible force, immediately leaving her one-eyed. This incident leads the once-impious Anna to convert to the Christian (or rather, iconophile) faith, and she spends the rest of her days preaching the divine salvation.

Sources refering to the story seem to be non-existent. Even though the prodigy is attested also in von Dobschütz’s compilation, it failed to grasp the art-historian’s attention since his main focus were the traditions concerning acheiropoietai icons. Janin doesn’t include this miracle among the list of those preformed by the Virgin Mary’s icon in the Hodegous monastery.² The story is not attested in The Letter of the Three Patriarchs or in the Letter to Theophilos. It is not to be found in the Acts of 787 either. Another source that testifies a story following the same motif, but without Anna as the protagonist, is the Διήγησις of the Maria Rhomaia, in von Dobschütz’s article of the same name. This story however is not included in the Υπόμνημα he published in the Christusbilder.³

Supposedly, when the icon of the Virgin and child is still in Rome, a man called Leo (not the Emperor himself, but of like beliefs), sees it and assaults it with a knife, stabbing it on the cheek. The icon starts gushing forth blood and the wretched man falls to the ground, as if smote by divine force, and three days later he passes away.⁴ Some main elements differ from those in Anna’s story, and the protagonist’s death after three days reminds us of the outcome of Synesios lithoxoos (see below) but the wording and

¹ For more on the Hodegon monastery, see 59, fn. 2.
³ About the text of the Υπόμνημα see 2.1., 21 and fn. 29.
⁴ Von Dobschütz, “Maria Romaia”, §§12-14, 198-9.
the progression of the Leo miracle are on many occasions identical to the present one, leaving little doubt of their relation. Which of the two preceeds the other however is a question that can be answered only by approximation. Based on the evidence at hand, the earliest manuscripts containing Anna’s version are the ones von Dobschütz consults in his miracle compilation, which, as we have seen, date no earlier than the 12th century.\(^5\) If the story isn’t to be found in any earlier manuscripts, it could be dated to around this time. Leo’s story on the other hand is contained in two manuscripts dating from the 14th century onwards.\(^6\) Until new evidence is found, it seems that Anna’s version is the oldest of the two, but based on the fact that her story continues to be preserved up to the 14th century,\(^7\) it seems possible that the writer of the Ληληγήσις not only had the outline of the story in mind when drafting his composition, but also the text with its current wording.

Returning however to this story in the context of our current compilation, what proves interesting is that it is the first in a series of three stories initiating us in the motif of the icon as punisher. Until now, the prodigies we have seen revolved around different miraculous qualities of their icon-protagonists; its indestructability in the Lydda Legend and partly in the Germanos prodigy, its ability to deliver itself to safety, and its spewing forth of blood, motifs that are common in the icon-miracle cycle. Though these icons are all under some kind of threat, none actively trigger their offenders’ punishment. Here however there is a change in concepts.

The miracle of Anna’s blinding isn’t the only one in the story; it is preceded by that of the icon freeing itself of its concealment. This detail seems to predispose the existence of a mystical force encompassing the icon, which Anna, blinded metaphorically by her iconoclast (and thus heathen) rage, fails to grasp. When she proceeds to desecrate the icon, the “divine wrath released upon her” could very well be this mystical force, which, when penetrated, delivers unto its transgressor the crime committed upon it. In this way, the insult towards the icon which in the previous stories is left unpunished, in this one is delivered its immediate redemption.

Compared to the shared motifs in icon miracle narrations as described in Ch. 1 a., and to the stories related up to now in the present compilation, this new motif seems

\(^5\) Von Dobschütz, Christusbilder, 211*-212**.
\(^6\) Von Dobschütz, “Maria Romaia”, 176-177.
\(^7\) Which is the dating of the Vat. gr. 1587 and of the earliest of the two manuscripts used for the edition in “Maria Romaia”.
to diverge greatly from the norm. At this point, it seems suitable to trace the roots of this kind of narration further back in the historical timeline so as to pinpoint the exact moment at which it takes the form we find it in the present story (and the two following).

Early narrations combining the maltreatment of icons with the perpetrator’s physical punishment can be found in John of Damascus’ third oration in favor of icons. The first story he recounts is supposedly quoted from Theodoros’ Ecclesiastical History, a text dating to the second half of the sixth century. The long narration begins with the punishment inflicted on a follower of Arius who shows disrespect to the holy Trinity in a public bath. This episode is then made into an icon that is hung on one of the bath’s walls, to act as a deterrent. The disciples however of Arianism, discontented with the icon, ask for its removal from the wall. The bath’s steward, on the pretext of damage done to the icon by vapors, hides the icon somewhere; however, when the emperor arrives to the bath and seeks out the icon, miraculously the steward’s eye melts away, as do the rest of his limbs during the course of the next seven days. The steward ends up dying after dreaming of Jesus Christ. Here there is a slight difference in the elements of the story; the icon itself is not of a holy person and no violence is exhibited against it, but rather it finds itself in the midst of a dogmatic disagreement. The “insult” towards it is its removal from public view, and when its absence is perceived, the person responsible receives punishment.

Immediately after this story, the narration continues with a miraculous happening drawn allegedly from the works of St Anastasios of Sinai. A group of Saracens camp in a church of St Theodorus in the village of Karsatas thus defiling it. One day, one of them shoots an arrow at the saint’s icon which, once struck, spews forth blood. This incident doesn’t seem to affect anyone from the group, as they continue their defilement and disrespect of the holy place. In a few days time however, all twenty four families inside the church face a terrible death, while the Saracens living in the village remained unharmed. Again, though the icon is a central element of the story, it does not directly implement the demise of its transgressors, which seems to occur incidently after the insult. It is also interesting that we find these stories collected specifically by a (if not the) major supporter of icon-worship; though they are drawn from sources of the late sixth-century, which hints towards their prior existence on the

---

8 Καρπόζηλος, Βυζαντινοί Ιστορικοί..., I, 221-224.
9 See Kotter, Die Schriften..., 182-184.
10 Ibid., 184.
motif-spectrum, one could argue that their compilation in this very oration shows that the interest in this aspect of the icon is on the rise during the period of Iconoclasm.

Moving forward a few years, similar narrations are to be found in the Acts of the Council of 787. A significant detail however is that these stories aren’t drawn from previous sources, but are rather incidents, contemporary to the time of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, to which Constantine, bishop of Constansteia in Cyprus, was either eye-witness or was informed of by eye-witnesses. In the first story, a Cypriot man sees an icon of the Virgin Mary in a church. In wondering about its place there, he gouges out its right eye with his whip. When he uses his whip afterwards to drive his cattle away from the church, it backlashes, striking him in the same eye and leaving him blinded. In the second story, a man who was decorating the church of the Theotokos with curtains drives a nail through the forehead of St Peter’s icon. From that moment on and for the two days of the Holy Virgin’s feast he suffers from terrible pain in his head, from which he is relieved only when he removes the nail from the image. In the last story, which takes place in 785, some Cypriot men were staying in a church in Syria and among them were some Agarenes. One of them, upon seeing a mosaic on the wall, wondered what its use was. When a Christian man answers him that it avails its worshipers and harms those who insult it, the Agarene gouges out its eye to see how and if he shall be harmed. Immediately his own eye falls to the ground and he is consumed by a high fever, an incident to which there were thirty-two eye-witnessess.¹¹

Looking at the stories in the Acts of 787 in comparison with those in John of Damascus, it so emerges that the insult towards the icon and the subsequent punishment have acquired a relationship of cause and effect. Another noticeable difference is the fact that in these cases, the icon is not asserting itself solely against a heretic (Arian/Saracen), but even a person of Christian faith can suffer from its misuse.

These examples however – other than being too few to base a concrete argument upon – gain much more importance when they are put into the broader perspective of Iconoclasm. In The Letter of the Three Patriarchs, of the twelve stories narrated, three are of miracles where an icon-insulter receives punishment for his crimes. The first two feature the Virgin Mary in the role of the punisher. A man passing frequently by Her church in Alexandria would mock Her icon, but one day She appears to him in his dream accompanied by two eunuchs. The eunuchs hold his arms and legs while She

¹¹ Lamberz, Concilium universale..., 410,412.
draws Her holy finger around his ligaments, which instantly “fractured and fell to the ground, like leaves breaking off a figtree.” A version of this story, is attested also in John Moschos’ Pratum Spirituale, dating to the early 7th century. Its motif of insult towards an icon and an incident following which leads to the insulter’s punishment seems to echo those of the stories of Theodorus and Anastasios of Sinai, as stated above. The second story, though it follows on the same concept, differs in that the icon adopts a more active role as punisher. A man who frequently mocks the Virgin’s icon in Alexandria at some point returns to it seeking refuge from his persecuters. The icon then, in front of everybody’s eyes, turns its back on the man, allowing him thus to be captured and slaughtered. What is interesting about this story is that it is unique to the Letter of the Three Patriarchs. What is more interesting still is that the third and final story is also only attested in the same Letter. A priest preparing the prosphora gouges out the right eye of St Andrew with his lance. His own right eye then immediately falls out with a plop (κλοξ), and takes the place of the icon’s missing one. The motifs found in these two unique to the text of the Letter narrations remind us more of those narrated by bishop Constantine which were contemporary to the first Iconoclasm, and less of the like stories dating to the pre-Iconoclastic era.

Combining thus all the previous data, my assumption on the matter is that this specific type of narration, the icon as punisher, is a product of the ensemble of Iconoclastic dispute; during this era the icon becomes a real-time victim of manifold offences, and because now the enemy is no longer only a heretic or heathen and it cannot ensure its well-being through miraculous intervention it can only find justice – in the popular mind – through the physical punishment of its offender.

12 The Letter of the Three Patriarchs, in Munitiz et al., 7.9, 44-5.
13 Though quite different regarding the individual details of the story; we shall be inspecting it further in the context of Anthimos’ trail below.
14 See Walter, “Iconographical…”, Iviii and John Moschos, Pratum spirituale 47, PG 87. 3, col. 2901C-D (BHG 1076c).
15 Walter, “Iconographical…”, Iviii, lxiii.
16 As stated earlier, we cannot be sure of the dossier’s dating if we agree with Chrysostimide’s skepticism on its authenticity; however, the reference here to the lance as a means of cutting the prosphora has been attested with certainty to the year 869-70, see Walter, “Iconographical…”, lxii. Combined with the fact that the stories – excluding those attested here for the first time – are either drawn from earlier sources or refer to incidents prior to Iconoclasm, see Walter, ibid., li-lixii, it might seem plausible to propose that the dossier could have been written sometime close to the second Iconoclasm, if not a bit later.
17 The Letter of the Three Patriarchs, in Munitiz et al., 7.15.b, 50-1.
18 As happens in the story from the Life of Symeon Stylites the Younger, see I.1., 6.
In the years following the Triumph of Orthodoxy, these stories acquire a normality in the cycle of miracle narrations as remembrances against the blasphemous acts of the past. Thus, I believe, arise stories such as Anna’s or Synesios’ further down.

But for now, let us turn to “another miracle and most beautiful narration.”

Sigla

cod. = Codex Vaticanus gr. 1587 (14th cent. folios 204v – 205v)

vD = E. von Dobschütz, Christusbilder, pp. 219**-221** based on the manuscripts: Par. B. N. gr. 635 (14th cent.) and Par. B. N. gr. 767 (13th cent.) and Par. B. N. Coisl. gr. 296 (12th cent.).
Δ´
1. (fol. 209v) <N>αὸς τις ὑπάρχει περικαλλής καὶ σεβάσμιος, τῆς ἁγίας ὑπερενδόξου καὶ πανομηνίτου θεομύτορος, μονασταῖς προσανατεθειμένος, καὶ σεμινεῖον μοναξουσῶν εἶναι ἀφορισμένον, διὸ οἱ τῆς βασιλίδος περίοικοι ἁστικοὶ τε καὶ ἀγρόται, Ὄδηγος πατρίως προσαγορεῦειν εἰώθασι. Ἐφ’ ὑπὸ <εἰσπορευσμένω> κατὰ τὸ εὐώνυμον μέρος, ἀφορισμένη ταῖς γυναῖξι στάσις ἀπονενέμηται, καθ’ ἣν συνιῶσαι, τῆς θείας ὑμνοδίας καὶ μεταλήψεως μετέχειν εἰώθασι. Ἐν ταύτῃ τοῖνυν τῇ γυναικείᾳ στάσει, ἱερὸς καὶ θεῖος χαράκτηρ τῆς ἁγίαντος καὶ θεομύτορος εξεικονίζεται, ἀγκάλαις φερούσης τόν δι’ ἡμᾶς ἐξ αὐτῆς σαρκωθέντα. Χριστὸν τὸν ἡλιθίον Θεόν ἠμῶν, οὗ πρὸς τέλειον καὶ ποθῆς σκινός παρατεινόμενον τὸ ἄγιον ἐκεῖνο καὶ ἱερὸν εκτύπωσα, μέχρι δὲ τοῦ στήθους σκιογραφοῦμεν. Τότε οἱ τῶν αὐτῶν ναὸν καθυπατροῦντες τὸ τουράννου Λέοντος δεδιότες ἀνήλεξες καὶ ἀπάνθρωπον πρόσταγμα, ὡς δὴ τί εὐσβέστερον δυσσεβεῖν λογιζόμενοι, ὅθεν περικαλύπταντες καὶ ἠμῶς ἐκατέρωθεν προσπήζαντες, ἁβέβηκεν ἐφύπερθεν καταπλάσαντες, ἐπεκονίασαν, ἀφανὴ δήθεν διὰ τῆς φανομενῆς ἐπαλειψῆς ἀπεργασάμενοι ὡς τέλειον αὐτὸν ἐξαφανισθῆναι πάση δοκῆ.
2. Ὅθεν, τοῦτον γενομένον καὶ ἕφ᾽ ἰκανάς ἡμέρας τοῦ ἁγίου συγκεκαλυμμένον ὁμοιωμάτως τῆς θεομήτορος, ἐξάπινα τῆς κεκονιαμένης ἀσβέστου καταπεσούσης καὶ τῆς || (fol. 210') ύφασμομένης ὁδόνθης ἀφαιρεθείσης, εἰτε θείᾳ δυνάμει, εἰτε καὶ ἀνθρωπείας χειρί, ὁ Θεός οἶδε μόνος, ὅμως, ἐπειδὴ ἀμφίβολον τὸ γεγονός καὶ λέγειν οὐκ ἔχει, εἰ καὶ πολλοὶς θείοις εἶναι έδοξε τὸ πραξθέν, ἡ ἁγίᾳ καὶ συσβασίᾳ τῆς θεομήτορος εἰκών ἀνεκαλύφθη πάσι εἰς τούμφων προκειμένη καὶ θεωμένη. Ταῦτην γυνὴ τις προσπελάσασα δυσσεβής καὶ κατάπτυστος, εἰ καὶ πρὸς εὐσέβειαν μετέπειτα μετενήνεκται, Ἄν να τούνομα – λεγέσθω γὰρ καὶ ἡ κλῆσις, εἰς βεβαίαν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπόδειξιν – ἀνακεκαλυμμένον τὸν θείον καὶ ἁγίον χαρακτήρα θεασαμένη, <θ>υμὸν πολλοῦ πληθείσα ἡ ἀσύνετος καὶ λίαν ἐμμανῆς καταστάσα, ὑβρείς κατεβλασφήμι καὶ ὀνειδεύειν ἐβαλλε «Τῆς ἐλληνικῆς εἰδολολατρείας» βοώς ἡ ἁθλία, «πάλιν ἀνακαλυτρωμένη», εἰτα καὶ ἔτερα πολλὰ ἐπειπούσα, ἡ γυναιξικρατείας καὶ παρανομούσας ληρωδεῖν ἐνεστί, μὴ οία τε οὕσα ἐπίσχεν τὰ λαίνα τὴν τῆς δυσσεβείας ὀρμήν, ἵνα περιέφερε χερσὶν ἐπιλαβομένη μάχαιραν, κατὰ τῆς θείας καὶ σωτηρίος εἰκόνος Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν μανικότερον ἐκέντησεν καθωμημένου καὶ τὸν εὐώνυμον ὀργίλος εξώρυξεν ὀρθολμόν.
3. Καὶ δὴ, ἐπὶ τῆς δεινῆς καὶ ἀσβεστάτης ἐπὶ θλήσεως δόξης εἰ τῷ στόμαιον αὐτῆς, καὶ ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀνέβη ἐπʼ αὐτὴν, ὡς ἀπέκλυσεν, ψαλμικός φάναι. Τό γὰρ περιπατητόμενον χεῖρας τοῦ εὐονόμου αὐτῆς ὀφθαλμοῦ, ὡσπερ διὰ ζίσους αὐτίκα, οὕτως διερρήγη; καὶ ἂν τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ ὅπως ἀπανῴθην, μέχρι ἃ ἄναπτε τὸ στόμα τοῦ εὐονόμου αὐτῆς ὀφθαλμοῦ ἐναπεσβέσθη; οὐκ ἄναπτε τὴν παράνομον χεῖρα τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ ἂν τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τῆς κατατάφλοισσεν, καὶ τῇ παρανόμῳ χεῖρᾳ τ游戏操作
1. There exists a temple, most beautiful and revered, of the holy most glorious and most praised Mother of God, dedicated to nuns, and there is also a monastery¹ dedicated to nuns and which the urban and rural inhabitants of the Queen city would call Hodegous,² (a name) inherited from their fathers. In which, on the left hand side to the one who enters, there is a designated space assigned to the women, in which they would gather and would partake in the holy chanting and communion. So, in these women’s quarters, there stood portrayed the holy and sacred depiction of the Undefiled and Mother of God,³ bearing in her arms Him who through her was born unto flesh, Christ our true Lord, without however this holy and sacred rendering extending its representation to the whole of the body up to the legs, but illustrating no further than the bust.⁴ However, those who tended to this holy place, terrified by the merciless and inhuman ordinance⁵ of the tyrant Leo, impiously considered something as a most pious act, and after covering it with a shroud, affixing nails to both sides, and plastering it over, they whitewashed it;⁶ rendering it truly invisible because of the apparent smearing, so it gave the impression to everyone that it had entirely disappeared.

¹ The patriography attributes the construction of the church to Michael III, though without making explicit reference to the monastery. Supposedly the location formerly housed a chapel which contained a miraculous well, see Janin, Les églises..., 208.
² The monastery ιον Hodegon, otherwise called τες Hodegetrias, was located along the premises of the Palace towards the sea, eastwards from the Hagia Sophia, see Janin, Les églises..., 214-5. The monastery was renowned for its miraculous healing of the blind and visually impaired, and allegedly drew its name from the guides ( odbypoi) who would lead the blind to the miraculous fountain at that location so they could be cured, see Janin, Les églises..., 208.
³ It was believed that this icon of the Virgin was the one painted by the Apostle Luke, Janin, Les églises..., 212.
⁴ This detailed description befits that of the most revered portrayal of the Virgin, called Hodegetria, see Bissera M. Pentcheva “The ‘activated’ icon: the Hodegetria procession and Mary’s Eisodos” in Maria Vassilaki (ed.), Images of the Mother of God: Perceptions of the Theotokos in Byzantium, (Routledge 2016), 196.
⁵ If we are to assume that the Leo of the text is Leo the Armenian and the events described date to the 9th century, an overview of the events leading to and the subsequent development of the second Iconoclastic dispute can be found in Paul J. Alexander’s The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople, (Clarendon Press, Oxford 1957), 125-147; nowhere however in the sources is there explicit reference to a formal edict condemning icons and commanding their destruction or removal. Neither is there any such document regarding Iconoclasm under Leo III, see Price, “Icons before…”, 10-2, thus making it difficult to clearly state which out of the two eras the text is referring to. The word πρόσταγμα has quite a general sense on its own, and doesn’t necessarily infer any sort of formal command. However, the Vita of Theophylactos of Nikomedia, written after the 9th century, does use the same word to refer to Leo V’s iconoclastic policy, see Andrew P. Vogt, S. Theophylakte de Nicomedia, A 50 (1932), 77.
⁶ This description reminds one of the famous illustration in the Chludov Psalter, see Helen C. Evans and William D. Wixom (eds.), The glory of Byzantium: art and culture of the Middle Byzantine era, A.D. 843-1261, (New York, 1997), 185.
2. So, this having been done and for a sufficient number of days the holy resemblance of the Mother of God remaining covered, suddenly the hardened plaster fell to the ground and the shroud stretched underneath it was removed, either by divine force or even human hand, God himself only knew. Because, however, the event lays in ambiguity and I cannot [safely] say, even though by many it is considered to be a divine act, [it so remains that] the holy and revered icon of the Mother of God was uncovered, lain in plain view for all to see. Now some woman, impious and abominable, even though she would convert to piety afterwards, Anna by name – for let it be said of the name as being sure proof of the truth – passed by there and, seeing the divine and holy image uncovered, filled herself with great rage and reaching a state of utter mania, the imprudent, started to splurt out terrible profanities and censures. “Such hellenic idolatry,” her wretched mouth screamed “reveals itself again!” And after having said many such things, which pertain to the frivolous talk of women in state of maddend drunkedness and lawlessness, unable to restrain her sorry self from the impious frenzy which encompassed her, taking a knife in her hands, she hurled it against the divine and salvaging icon of Christ our Lord with excess madness, whilst shouting grave insults, and angrily gouged out the left eye.

7 As stated already, our story in fact is testimony to a double miracle, the first being this one.
8 Cf. the text in the Διήγησις of the Maria Rhomaia: καὶ τις ἀνὴρ δυσσεβής τοῦ εἰκονοκαυστῶν καὶ κατάπτυστος, von Dobschütz, “Maria Romaia”, §12, 198.
9 Cf. the like comment on the protagonist’s name: θηριώνυμος καὶ θηριοτρόπος τὴν τε γνώμην καὶ τὴν προσηγορίαν – τὴν γὰρ τοῦ Λέοντος ἔχειν ἔπονημιαν, Ibid., §12, 198.
10 Cf. the whole passage, Ibid., §12ff., 198-9.
3. And as the grave and most impious blasphemy still lay present in her mouth, so did the wrath of God come upon her, to speak with the psalm. For the thin membrane surrounding her own left eye – the very one against which the wretched woman armed her lawless hand – as if by a sword suddenly, was such cleaved asunder, so that immediately she felt the pain become ever more acute, followed by (her eye) starting to spill forth tears. Barely had she returned to her own household when every ability of sight vanished from her left eye, so that she entered her home anew one-eyed and brandished;¹¹ the wretched and miserable woman thus receiving in exchange a just judgement and decree. For, the miscreant, so having armed her daring hands against the left (eye) of the holy icon in likeness of Christ, immediately did she, the treacherous, also lose her own left eye, prevailing thus as a marked and living monument to her own impiety, the pitiful one. Thus did she spend the rest of her life, bearing herself with the one remaining pupil, and she openly proclaimed to all the daring deed of blasphemy, projecting the blinding of the eye as the teaching she received in exchange for her insolence. So much as the holy and salvific Grace blinded her outer eye, even more so did it uncover the inner eye.¹² Thus, shedding away the treacherous and wicked blasphemy, she started announcing the most grand and divine salvation. And many others does it lead to piety; and to renounce in tears and lamentations every kind of impiety. But since we believe that we have dwelled long enough upon her affairs, we shall turn our discourse to another miracle and most beautiful narration.

¹¹ The loss of an eye after assaulting that of an icon is a common motif from the first phase of the Iconoclastic dispute, with two such stories being recounted in the Acts of 787, Lamberz, Concilium universale..., 410,412. The Letter of the Three Patriarchs also presents one such story, see Munitiz et. al., 7.15.b, 51. In our compilation, the last three stories all conclude with the blinding or partial blinding of the protagonist. This was one of the most typical kinds of punishment applied to the person desecrating an icon, and its tradition persists in Greek religious thought and miracle narrations during the post-Byzantine era, the Ottoman reign and up to modern times, see Manolis G. Varvounis – Nikos Rodosthenous, “Religious Traditions of Mount Athos on Miraculous Icons of Panagia (The Mother of God)”, Balkan Studies 52, Thessaloniki (2017), 139 – 150.

¹² The alternating themes of seeing and blindness are delicately outlaid throughout the story. From the respectable displaying of the icon, to its fear-induced yet disrespectful concealment; its miraculous revelation, which however leaves it vulnerable to the blind wrath of Anna’s iconoclast impiety. Here we reach the climax of the interchanging of themes, where Anna’s physical blinding leads to her inner revelation of Truth and piety.
The fifth story of our compilation is a mere two paragraphs in length and relates the story of Synesios the stonemason – the first attestation of such a persona in Byzantine texts – who is hired to scrape away the depictions of the apostles and Jesus Christ on St Euphemia’s coffin. While executing this undertaking, a small fragment hits him lightly in the eye. He temporarily stops his endeavor, but quickly resumes. This second time, a larger fragment is dislodged and pierces his eye through, immediately blinding him. He abandons the task completely and returns home, only to succumb to his wound three days later.

This is the first testimony of the story in Byzantine sources. However, the episode of Synesios’ punishment takes up only the second half of the story; the greater amount of unique information is to be found in the first half. The narration begins with a topographical description of St Euphemia’s church, in which lay her coffin and relics, at least until the first Iconoclasm. This coffin apparently plays a major role in her church’s liturgy, but is unlucky enough to be engraved with the figures of the apostles and Jesus Christ. When “the leader of impiety and champion between the treacherous iconoclasts,” namely the senator John Spektas, perceives this, he immediately commands the removal of the icons from the coffin.

This reference to Spektas is of great value for two reasons. First of all, it provides us with more information on an otherwise underrepresented, so to say, in Byzantine sources man of power. Secondly, his presence in the story allows us to safely date the events described to the beginning of the second Iconoclasm, when he gains a more prominent role in public affairs. It is true that the “thrice-accursed” John Spektas of the text is a figure for whom not much information exists. The PmbZ states only that he was a senator and that he “must have assisted Emperor Leo V in the year 815 in the preparation of the prohibition anew of icon worship;” it also provides the Vita of Niketas of Medikion as the primary source referring to Spektas and Treadgold and Pratsch as bibliographical resources. In the aforementioned Vita, we are indeed informed that he was a senator, one of the two Leo the Armenian gathers around himself.
to enforce his iconoclast policies. In the *Vita* of Nikephorus I of Constantinople, his name is referred to as one of “the best examples” of the threat of Iconoclasm. In his book, *The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople*, Paul J. Alexander states that Spektas was part of the six-man committee, assembled in 814, responsible for the compilation of an Iconoclastic *florilegium*, which would lay ‘the theological foundations for his [Leo V’s] Iconoclastic program.’ This sums up the facts known about Spektas up to now; our narration, which is in fact only the third literary source referring to him, despite being relatively short in length, offers some interesting insights into his personality as a political persona.

To sum up, the dating of the story’s events to the second Iconoclasm, along with the fact that the miracle following is yet another example of the motif of the icon as punisher, adds even more evidence in favor of the proliferation of this kind of stories during the Iconoclastic era.

But from here on, let us turn to this “most great and awesome miracle”:

**Sigla**

*cod. = Codex Vaticanus gr. 1587 (14th cent. folios 211v – 212r)*

---

2 The latest edition of St. Niketas’ life can be found in the doctoral dissertation of Όλγα Π. Κουσουρή, «Ἐπιτάφιος εἰς τὸν ὁσίον πατέρα ἡμῶν καὶ ὑμολογήτην Νικήταν συγγραφεὺς ἕπο Θεοστηρίκτου, μαθητοῦ αὐτοῦ μακαριωτάτου» (BHG 1341), (Ioannina, 2016); on Spektas see 40, 49, 134.


5 For more, see fn. 6, 22.
Ε

1. (fol. 211') <Π>ρὸς τῇ δημοσίᾳ λεωφόρῳ τῶν Λαύσου ἐχόμενα τῆς συνεγγείζονσις ἰπποδρομίας, ναὸς ἱδρυται τῆς ἅγιας καὶ καλλινίκου μάρτυρος Εὐφημίας, τῆς ἐπονομαζομένης2 πανευφήμιον. Ἐφ᾿ οὖ ἐν τοῖς ἀρκτικοῖς μέρεσι πρὸς ἀνατολήν, οἶκος ἐτερος συγκατεσκεύαστο προσπεπλασμένος, φέρων καὶ κατὰ μέσον λάρνακα ἑστῶσαν μεγίστην, ἐν ᾧ καὶ πρότερον τὸ τῆς ἅγιας καὶ καλλινίκου μάρτυρος Εὐφημίας ἑναπέκειτο τίμιον καὶ ἄγιον σῶμα, εἰ καὶ παρὰ δυσσεβῶν καὶ αἱρετικῶν χερσὶ μετὰ ταῦτα εἰς βυθὸν θαλάσσης ἑναπερρήφη3. Ἡς λάρνακος ἑφύπερθεν, τὴν προπαρασκευὴν τῆς θείας καὶ ἀναμάκτου θυσίας καὶ τῶν λειτουργικῶν σκευῶν τὴν ἀπόθεσιν οἱ ἱερατεύοντες τελεύνει εἰώθασιν. Αὐτὴ τοῖνυν ἡ λάρναξ τιμίος καὶ σεπτοῖς εἰκονίσμασι τὸ πρὶν εὐφυῖος πάνυ διαγεγυμμένη, τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῶν θείων καὶ πανευφήμίων ἀποστόλων ἐντευτυπωμένη καθοραζέτο4. Ἐν ᾧ κατὰ περίοδον ἐπιστάς ὁ τῆς δυσσεβείας ἀρχηγός καὶ προασπιστής τῶν ἀθλίων εἰκονομάχων, τὴν χαλεπῆ5 καὶ δυσσεβεστέραν ἀσέβειαν ἐπιδεικνύομενος ὁ ἀλητήριος6 (εἰώθει γὰρ ὁ πανάθλος πάντα περιερχόμενος, τὰ τίμια καὶ ἱερὰ ἔξαφανίζειν σεβάσματα —Σπαίκτας δὲ οὗτός ἦν ὁ τρισκατάρατος, ὁ τῆς ἀντιθέου καὶ μυσαρᾶς7 θρησκείας8 τῶν εἰκονοκαυστῶν δεξιῶς ἀρχιστράτηγος) καὶ τὴν θείαν καὶ ἱεροφόρου σοφὸν ἐκεῖνην θειοσάμενος θείους κεκοσ|| (fol. 211')μημένην εἰκονίσμασι, ἐπιπληκτικὸς ὁ ἄθλος καὶ μεθ᾿ ὃβρεων πολλῶν καὶ προπηλακισμῶν9 τοὺς αὐτὸθ ἱερεῖς ἐνεκελεύσετο πᾶσας ἐντεύθεν εξάραι καὶ «μύσους», φησιν, έλευθερώσαι τὴν λάρνακα». Οἱ δὲ τῷ ὀξύτῳ τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς συσχεθέντες καὶ τῇ προστάξει τούτου καὶ ἀκοντες εξαντε3 λιθοδὸν ἐκμισθωσάμενοι, ἀπαλέϊσαι τὰς ἱεροτύπους μορφὰς προσέτατον.

---

1 λεωφόρου, cod. addito supra lineam  
2 ἐπονομαζομένη, cod.  
3 χαλαστή, cod.  
4 καθοραζέτο, cod.  
5 στὶς, cod.  
6 ἀλητήριος, cod.  
7 μυσαρᾶς, cod.  
8 θρησκείας, cod.  
9 προπηλακισμῶν, cod.  
10 ἡξαντε
2. Οὔτος τε ὁ ἐναγὴς¹ καὶ παμβεβηλος τὰς ἑκατέρωθεν ἐφεστώσας ἀποστολικάς ἐξαφανίσας μορφάς, ἐπὶ τὴν σεβάσμιον καὶ ἀγίαν καὶ θεανδρικὴν τοῦ κυρίου μορφὴν τὴν χείρα κατεύθυνε: καὶ δὴ, σφυρηλατεῖν τὸ ἁγίαν καὶ θείαν ἐκτύπωμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀθλίου καὶ θεοστυγοῦ Συνεσίου τοῦ λιθοζόου κατάρξαντος, βραχύτατη ἀποσπασθείσα ψηφις, τὸν δεξιὸν αὐτοῦ ὀφθαλμὸν, εἰ καὶ μὴ καριάν, ἐπέπληξεν· ἀλγήσας τε βραχύ, μύσας τε τὸ ὁμία καὶ τὴν ἐργασίαν ἐπισηχών, ὡμος οὐκ ἀπέστη τῆς ἐγχειρήσεως ὁ δείλαιος· τὸ δὲ συμβάν ἡγήσατο τύχης ἐπιρεῖα² γεγενήσθαι (καίπερ πολλοῖς ἔτεις πρώην ἑκατοκράς ὁ τάλας καὶ μῆπω τοιοῦτον τι πεπονθώς) αὐτικα τε κατὰ τῆς σωτηρίου καὶ θεοεδιδὸς μορφῆς πάλιν ὁ δείλαιος τὰς χείρας ἑξόπλισε³. καὶ δὴ ὡς τῇ προτέρᾳ μὴ νουθετήθεντα⁴ πληγῆ καὶ ἀθεμίτου ἐκστηθην μὴ ἐλόμενον ἐγχειρήσεως (ἐδει γὰρ συνιέναι τὸν ἁσύνετον—καὶ γὰρ Συνεσίος ὄνομάζετο—καὶ ἀνέιναι ἐκ τῆς ἐγχειρήσεως τοῦ ἔργου), ὁ δὲ μᾶλλον ὑπὸ τῆς πρὶν πλείον ἐξαφθεῖς πληγῆς, τῆς δεινῆς καὶ παρανόμου ἐργασίας ἀντείχετο· καὶ δὴ μείζον⁵ καὶ τελεωτέρα ἀποσπασθείσα⁶ ψηφις ῥαγδαίως τε κατὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὀρμῆς|| (fol. 212) σασα ὀφθαλμοῦ ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον διατίρασασα διεδό, ὡς αὐτίκα τελείως ἐκτυφιλωθήναι τὸν δείλαιον· ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον τε τῷ δεινῷ καὶ ἀφορήτῳ⁷ τοῦ ἀλγοῦς βεβλήσθαι, ὡς καὶ τῆς τοῦ ὀφθαμοῦ ἀλογηθα τΖημίας.

"Ος οἰκαδε αὖθις ἀπελθὼν ἐν τῷ τοῦ ἀειμάρτυρος Ἀγαθονίκου παμμεγίστῳ τεμένει, ἐνθὰ καὶ καταμένειν τετύχηκεν ὁ ταλαίπωρος, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκείας⁸ εὐνής κατακλιθεῖς μηδὲ τρεῖς ἡμέρας τελείως ἐπιβιοῦς, ἀπέψυχεν ὁ ἄθλος τῇ πληγῇ τὴν ζωὴν συναποβαλλόν καὶ ταύτην εἰληφὼς τῆς εἰς Θεὸν παροινίας τὴν ἀντίδοσιν⁹ παραϊνεῖν τε τὴν οἰκείαν ἀναίρεσιν καὶ διδασκαλεῖν σαφέστατον τοῖς δυσσεβεῖν προθ<υμου>μένοις ἑαυτὸν προθέμενος, ὡς μὴ τὰ ὄμιο δρόντας τῶν ὄμιον πειραθεῖν. Ἐντεῦθεν δὲ ἐρ' ἐτερον μέτειμπαθμα.
V

1. Upon the public highway of the Lausou quarter next to the neighboring hippodrome, a temple of the holy and gloriously triumphant martyr Euphemia, the so-called paneuphemos, was established; adjunct to which, on the north face and facing eastwards, another chapel was built attached to it, that bore in its midst a coffin, standing grand. Inside it lay earlier the precious and holy body of the holy and gloriously triumphant martyr Euphemia, although by hands of the impious and heretics, it was thrown to the bottom of the sea. On top of this coffin, the priests would perform the preparation of the holy and bloodless sacrifice and the apothesis of the liturgical vessels. Moreover, this very coffin, having from the beginning been quite skillfully engraved with precious and venerable reliefs, was beautified by the carvings of our

---

1 In relation to the exact location of St. Euphemia’s temple, sources most often refer to ta Antiochou, the palace of Antiochus, inside which the naos was built. The reference here to ta Lausou, the palace of Lausus, as regards the temple is quite rare, if not unique. Lausus was a eunuch at the court of Thedosios II, who became Grand Chamberlain around 420 CE. See PLRE 2: AD 395-527 (Cambridge, 1980) s.v. Lausus, LAVSVS 2, and Lausus 3. He is better known for the grand collection of pagan statues which he kept in his palace, though it sadly was lost to the flames of the fire in 475; for more regarding the statues and the proposed meanings of their arrangement in the premises of the palace, see Cyril Mango, Michael Vickers, and Eric D. Francis, “The Palace of Lausus at Constantinople and Its Collection of Ancient Statues”, Journal of the History of Collections, 4(1) (1992), 89-98 and Sarah Guberti Bassett, “Excellent Offerings: The Lausos Collection in Constantinople”, The Art Bulletin, 82 (2000), 1, 6-25. The location of the palace has been a subject of much debate, with Mango et al. supporting in their article, see above, 90, that it occupied the round semicircular courtyard and adjoining hall excavated in 1942 and 1967 between the Mese and the Hippodrome, right across the palace of Antiochus. A few years later however, Jonathan Bardill proposed a location further to the west, along the Mese and closer to the Forum of Constantine, see Bardill, “The Palace of Lausus and Nearby Monuments in Constantinople: A Topographical Study”, American Journal of Archaeology, 101(1), (1997), 67-95. If we take a closer look at the graphical presentation in the text and put it into the aforementioned context, we are provided with the following information: the “public highway” (δημοσιό ηδονόμο) should indeed be the Mese hodos, the central street of the city, a fact that does not add much to the attempt of placing the palace on the map. The use however of the word συνεγγίζοντα in the phrase συνεγγίζον τὰ ἐπαύρωμασ infers an immediate approximation of ta Lausou with the hippodrome, a piece of information which tempts one to prefer Mango’s positioning of the palace over Bardill’s.

2 The adjective paneuphemos is often used in reference to St. Euphemia, however the collocation is also a figura etymologica, the first of two found in the text; here the play on words is on the adjective euphemos (meaning auspicious in its broader sense) from which the noun and name Euphemia (auspiciousness) and its derivative paneuphemos (all-praiseworthy). The meaning of the participle prospeplasmomenos can be translated into English as “that which has been molded/formed attached to (something else)” however this seems to be the sole testimony where the term is used as an architectural characterization. It is found chiefly in medical contexts, related to human or general anatomy or symptomatology.

3 Saint Euphemia’s sarcophagus was made of silver, see ODB, II, 747, meaning that the icons described below and desecrated later aren’t typical panel icons but metal engravings.

4 The author is referring to Constantine V, under whose reign the coffin and relics of saint Euphemia were cast into the sea, see ODB, II, 747. Theophanes records this incident in his Chronographia, but proceeds to inform us that her coffin and relics appear miraculously in Lemnos, and are returned to her church anew during Constantine VI and Irene’s reign in 796, see C. de Boor, Theophanes chronographia, I, (Leipzig, 1883 rpr. 1963), 439-40. Perhaps the author doesn’t have this development in mind as the text states that the relics lay inside the coffin “earlier;” since the story takes place during the second Iconoclasm however, if one is the believe Theophanes’ account, the relics should be laying intact inside the coffin/bearer of holy vessels.
Lord Jesus Christ and of the divine and wholly blessed apostles. Towards which, when at some point the leader of impiety and champion between the treacherous iconoclasts observed it, he exhibited the most profane impiety, the wicked; for it was his custom, the all-wretched, wherever he went, to completely destroy the precious and holy objects of worship. This thrice-accursed man was Spektas⁶; the weary commander-in-chief of the god-opposing and abominable religion of the burners of icons. Upon seeing that divine coffin, bearer of the holy relics, also decorated with holy imagery, the wretched man ordered and rebuked the priests there with many curses and abuses so that they would remove them all immediately, and “Release” he said “the coffin from this defilement!” They, overwhelmed by the fear towards this impious man, and unwillingly yielding to his command, hired a stonemason and ordered him to expunge the saint-depicting figures.

⁶ If we add the information provided in this text with what has been stated earlier about John Spektas (see above), it seems safe to say that his devotion to enforcing and pursuing iconoclasm wasn’t confined to the court. From what can be inferred from the text, it seems that he regularly paid visits to churches to ensure and implement their “cleansing” of religious imagery and didn’t hesitate to threaten and/or punish anyone who didn’t abide.
2. This accursed and wholly profane man, having already destroyed the apostolic figures standing on either side, directed his hand against the revered and holy and theandric figure of our Lord. However, when Synesios, the wretched and god-hated stonemason, began to hammer the holy and divine portrait of Christ, a most minute fragment that broke away struck his right eye, though not severly. He felt the pain a small while and closed his eye, and even though he paused in his work, he did not desist from the undertaking, the wretched one. He considered the happening to have been a matter of luck, although the terrible man had already grown old years before, and had never suffered something similar, immediately against the salvaging and God-like figure did the sorry man arm his hands again. Without being admonished by the previous blow and not choosing to abandon the lawless endeavor (for the witless man should have been more perceptive – since even his name was Synesios – and abstain from carrying out the operation) but rather feeling ever more inflamed from the earlier wound, he insisted on the dreadful and unlawful business. Thus, a bigger and more rounded fragment was dislodged, and, being violently launched against his eye, penetrated (it), bearing through (it) so far, that it resulted in blinding the miserable man at once. And being struck by such an acute and unbearable pain, he overlooked the damage to the eye. Returning immediately home to the immense temple of the holy martyr Agathonicus, where the miserable man happened to be living, and laying down on his own bed, and just barely surviving three days fully, the wretched man succumbed to his wound, surrendering his life to it. Receiving this reward for the violent act against God, he presented his own demise as an admonition and his very self as a clear instruction towards those willing to engage in ungodly acts, lest they suffer the same consequences should they attempt similar things. From here on, I turn to another miracle:

---

7 Here in the ancient text we have a clever play on words, specifically a *figura etymologica*, since the name Συνέσιος (Synesios) and the infinitive συνιέναι derive both from the verb συνίημι, which means to perceive/understand.

8 This is the main difference compared to the story of Anna’s blinding; while the wording does not imply that any physical force was applied to Anna, thus causing her impairment, here the material object of the icon is clearly the initiator and deliverer of punishment.

9 St Agathonicus and his companions Zoti, Zeno, Theoprepius, Acindynus and Severianus suffered their martyrdom in Bithynia and Thrace under Maximian. The position of the “immense temple of the holy martyr” of the text is possibly that of the saint’s church near the forum Tauri, in the so called Kainoupolis quarter. The fact that the church has bunks for people to stay in would make it more plausible for it to be the chapel of St Agathonicus built inside the ensemble of the Pege monastery; however this specific location seems too far a distance from the church of St Euphemia to be covered on foot, even more so by a person inflicted with such a wound as Synesios’, see Janin, *Les églises...*, 11-12.
2.6  The Trial of Anthimos

The sixth and final story of our compilation begins in an idyllic setting, sending us to the south side of the city (most likely towards the sea shore again) where a well-reputed man builds a chapel next to his quarters, and adorns it with beautiful religious imagery. However, the dark cloud of Leo’s ordinance casts a frightful shadow over the scene, and the man, fearing to take action against the icons himself, appoints the task to his servant Anthimos. The servant is in no way favorably disposed to the icons, and without second thought, scrapes them all away with a rasp. That night, all the figures he had desecrated visit him in his dream to demand justice. They proceed to whip and torture the man, who screams and pleads for mercy, waking all his neighbors. The final blow is delivered to him by the Virgin Mary, who takes the very rasp he had used and gouges out his eyes. At that moment the man awakes, bruised and blinded. He recounts his crime and punishment to everyone present, and lives the rest of his life as “a living icon” of his impiety.

Just like the story of Synesios, this one also is attested here for the first time, and is the last of the three stories where the icons adopt the role as punisher. Its motif of divine revelation within the dream realm is one we have spoken of earlier on, here however we shall have the chance to give it a closer inspection. It seems that the component of a dream apparition was a vital part of the earliest miraculous traditions concerning icons. As in the examples of the siege of Amida and the miracles of St. Demetrius, the holy person appears in a dream and is either later recognized through their icon or immediately recognized because of their familiar from the icon form. Another such example is found in the Letter of Pope Hadrian excerpted in the Acts of 787, which however draws from the Acta Silvestrii, a text dated to the early fifth century. There, supposedly prior to Constantine the Great’s conversion to Christianity, the Apostles Peter and Paul appear to him in a dream, beseeching him to recall St. Silvester from his exile on Mt. Soracte. The emperor acts as he is told and when he asks the saint to explain his vision to him, Silvester brings the icon of the Apostles and Constantine recognizes them.

1 See Ch.1 a., 4-5.
2 Ibid., 4-5.
4 Lamberz, Concilium universale..., 122-4.
The Acts of 787 provide more such stories, but the benevolent presences described above differ highly from the nature of the dream apparition in the current story. Thus, despite the seemingly common motifs of icons and dreams, it seems that there is not an immediate relation of the previous stories to the current one.

Looking towards texts contemporary to the second iconoclastic dispute, Anthimos’ story reminds us of the first out of the two narrations in The Letter of the Three Patriarchs featuring the Virgin’s icon in Alexandria, which visits its scorners in his sleep. Walter traces the story back to John Moschos’ Pratum Spirituale. This narration does not contain an icon-protagonist, but unfolds as such. A Phoenician mime would ridicule the Virgin Mary in the theater. She appears to the man (it is not specified if in a dream or in a vision), inquiring upon the reason behind Her scoffing and advising him to stop. The mime takes no heed, and continues his blasphemy even more arduously. After a second, again unsuccessful, warning towards the man, the Holy Lady appears to him during his midday slumber. She says nothing and merely traces her finger around his limbs, which immediately are amputated from his torso. The man awakes to the dreadful scene, κορμὸς κείμενος, and confesses the punishment he received for his impiety.

Moschos’ dark story seems to share more elements with the episode of Anthimos’ trial; the inquisition of the holy persons as to the reasons behind their defilement, the dream apparition and the punishment implemented by the holy persons themselves, the confession of the impious protagonist’s wrongdoing in the end. It is also interesting that such an early text portrays the Virgin with the qualities of punisher alongside her advisory and intercessory nature, which again acts as testimony to what I have stated earlier, that the holy person as punisher is not a motif exclusive to Iconoclasm. A scarcity of sources however does not allow us to further investigate the prominence this aspect of the Virgin’s character had in literature. It shall suffice to say

---

5 Lamberz, Concilium universale..., 386, 388.
6 see Ch. 2 b., 53-4.
7 Walter, “Iconographical…”, lviii.
8 Moschos, Pratum spirituale, PG 87. 3, col. 2901C-D
9 Stories utilizing similar or even identical motifs can be found in the two 10th century saint’s Vitae of St. Nikon Ho Metanoeite and St. Athanasios of Athos, however in these texts it is the saints who visit the impious in their dreams and deliver physical punishments for their crimes, not the Virgin Mary, see Dennis Sullivan, The Life of Saint Nikon: Text, translation, and commentary [The Archbishop Iakovos Library of ecclesiastical and historical sources] (Brookline, MA: Hellenic College Press, 1987), 118-124, 190-4, 201-12, 226-31, and Jacques Noret, Vitae duae antiquae sancti Athanasii Athonitae, (Turnhout, 1982), 208.
that the example in Anthimos’ narration, in combination with the two stories in *The Letter of the Three Patriarchs* and that of John Moschos, are four examples displaying the Virgin Mary’s actively vengeful side, something which would be of great interest to examine further.

Since Anthimos’ story is the last of our collection of icon-punisher stories, a general remark regarding the totality of these narrations seems proper at this point. It does strike one as odd, that stories of Christian context have such a pronounced theme of vengeance. This is the very reason why Chrysostomides doubted the authenticity of the dossier in *The Letter of the Three Patriarchs*, since “sheer violence and revenge go counter to the Christian message, and therefore …[the stories] could not be part of an *official* letter issued by three Patriarchs.”\(^\text{10}\) Even more, the “justice” delivered isn’t against the people instituting the blasphemous acts, but on mere instruments executing orders or brainwashed by the dogmatic dispute. Though to explain the development of such a theme would require its own research, what can be inferred from it is that in times of great despair, deliverance of justice in itself is more important to the popular mind than the receiver of this justice.

Sigla

*cod.* = *Codex Vaticanus gr.* 1587 (14\(^{\text{th}}\) cent. folios 211\(’\) – 212\(”\))

\(^{10}\) Chrysostomides, “An Investigation…”, xxxvii.
ΣΤ’

1. Ἔν τῇ τοῦ Χαλκῆς τετραπύλων στάσει, ήτις ἱδρυται πρὸς τὸ μεσότατον τῆς βασιλίδος πόλεως, τοῖς τεσσαράκοντα προσεγγίζουσα μάρτυσι, ὁδὸς ἐστὶ κατωφερής.1 Πρὸς τῇ νοτίᾳ2 ταύτης πλευρῆς3 ἢρ’ ἦς ἐπὶ τὸ πρανέστερον4 κατάντικρυς καὶ βαθυνομένης, οἶκός τις δεδομένος καθέστηκεν τὸν Ῥωμάνης προσαγορευόμενος. Εν τούτῳ τοῖνοι τῷ οἴκῳ ἄνηρ τις τῶν περιφανῶν τὰς οἰκήσεις ποιούμενος, εὐκτήριον ἐκέκτητο τιμίας καὶ σεβασμίας εἰκόσι διαμεμορφωμένον. Τῆς οὖν τοῦ τυράννου || (fol. 212’) καὶ θεομάχου καὶ δυσσεβεστάτου Λέοντος ἁσβείας καὶ τυραννίδος πανταχόσε διαφημισθείσης, ώς πάσαν εἰκονικὴν ἀνατύπωσιν ἐκ πάσης οἰκίας5 καὶ ἐκκλησίας ἐξορύττεσθαι7, φόβῳ τοῦ τυράννου ὁ εὐσεβῆς καὶ φιλόθεος ἄνηρ συνεχόμενος, καὶ τοῦ θείου πόθου ἀντεχόμενος, ἐδεδίε8 αὐτόχερ τὴν τῶν θείων καὶ ἄγιων εἰκόνων ποιήσασθαι κατένεξιν, οὐδὲ γε πάλιν ἐπαλεῖφεν καὶ συγκαλύπτει καὶ ἐναποκλεῖεν τετόλμηκε, τὸ τοῦ τυράννου βασιλέως δεδώς9 ἀνηλέες10 καὶ ἀπάνθρωπον. Κατάμφω οὖν πρὸς τὴν ἐγχείρησιν εὐλαβούμενος ὁ ἄνηρ, οἰκέτη ἰδίως. Ανθίμω11 τοῦνομα, τὴν περὶ τούτων φροντίδα ἀνετίθετο, ἐλπίζων ως συμπαθέστερον τι οὕτως ἀπαθεῖς, ράκκει12 συγκαλύψει καὶ ἐπαλεῖγε, καὶ τὸ τοῦ κινδύνου δέος ἢρ’ ἐαυτὸν ὑποστήσεται, εἰ ἄρα καὶ διάγνωσθῇ, προκάλυμμα τοῦτον τῆς τε παρανόμου ἐγχείρησεος καὶ τῆς συγκεκαλυμμένης δυσσεβείας εἰς ὦστερν διαγνωσκομένης, τοῦτο ἐξάγει πειρώμενος.

1 κατωφερής cod. 2 νοτία cod. 3 πλευρᾶς cod. 4 πρανέστερον cod. 5 πανταχόσα διαφημισθείσης cod. 6 οἰκίας cod. 7 ἐξορύττεσθαι cod. 8 ἐδεδίε cod. 9 δεδώς cod. 10 ἀνηλέες cod. 11 ἀνθίμω cod. 12 ράκκει cod.
2. ὁ δὲ πονηρὸς καὶ ἰθλιος καὶ ἀγνώμων ἐκείνος οἰκέτης, ὡς ἐπὶ τινὶ πράγματε εὐτελεῖ καὶ καταπεφρονημένων ἀσυμπαθῶς εἰςιν ἐν τῷ εὐκτηρίῳ, μηδὲν φοβηθεῖς, μὴδ' αὐτό πάλιν αἰδοὺς ἠξία διαπράξασθαι διανοθεῖς. ξυστήρα σεσιδηρωμένον μετά χειρᾶς ἔλων, κατά τῆς δύσεως τῶν ἀγίων καὶ σεπτῶν εἰκονισμάτων ἤκοντίζειν ὁ ταλαίπωρος, τῆς τε πανάγουν θεομίτορος καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀγέλων καὶ ἀποστόλων. Οὕτως οὖν πάσας οὐκ ἔπον ὁ πανάθλος ἐξαλλοιώσασας τὰς τῶν ἁγίων τιμίας καὶ ἱεροτύπους [((fol. 213')] θέας, ἀλλὰ γε καὶ ἀπεπαίνος ἐξωρύζας ὁ κάκιστος καὶ ἄχρειώδας, τῇ ἐπιστήθει νυκτί, μεθ' ἣν τῷ τοιάδε τὁ θεοστυγῆς καὶ ἀγνώμων οἰκέτης ἐξαιρήσατο, ἐώρα καθ' ὑπὸν τοὺς ἐξορυγημένους ἐκείνους ἀνδρὰς, ὅν καὶ τὰς τιμίας καὶ ἀγίας μορφὰς ὁ δύστηνος καὶ παλαμαινὸς ἐξηράσισθαι, ἐκ τῆς αὐτῶν στάσεως ἀποβεβηκότας καὶ πρὸς αὐτῶν ἐπιστάντας, δίκας εἰσπράττεσθαι τῶν εἰς αὐτοὺς εἰργασμένων, καὶ τῇ παρ' αὐτῶν ἡδικήμενος, ταύτα τετολίμηκεν εἰς αὐτοὺς διαπράξασθαι πυνθανομένους, ποινάς τε ἀπειλεῖν ἀντεπάγειν αὐτῷ καὶ χαλεπάς βασάνους, ἀντὶ τῶν εἰς αὐτοὺς γεγενημένους, καὶ οὐ δὴ ἐν ὀνείροις φαντασώδεις ταῦτα τελείαται ὑπόνοειν, ἀλλ' ὀδ' τῷ ὑπὸν <οὐ> παντεκτείναι καὶ συναπολήγουσιν τὰ μὲν γάρ βλεπόμενα, ὡς ἐν ἐκκάσεαι ἑωράτο τὰ δὲ τελούμενα ἐν στάσει ἐξπληρόντο. Ἡδὴ γὰρ καὶ τὸν ἔργου εἰχόντο· ὑφ' ἦν τὲ τοῦτον συσχόντες τοῖς ἁμασίν ἔφ' ἀπαν τὸ σώμα ἐπὶ ικανάς τὰς ὀρας ἐμάστιζων, ὡς αὐτῶν μὲν τὸν ἰθλιόν βιαῖος ἀλαλάξειν καὶ γοερὸς ἐκβοῦν, πάντας δὲ τοὺς περιοικοῦντας ἀρουπνισθέντας καὶ τὴν δεινὴν καὶ βιαίαν φωνὴν αἰσθομένους, τὸν τὸν οἰκέτου δεσπότην ἐπαράσθην καὶ κατατίθηκεν ἀνηλέος ἐτάξειν ἀνεχόμενον καὶ μὴ δὲ τῷ μήκει τῆς ὀρας παύσασθαι ἐλόμενον· αὐτῶν γὰρ τὰς μάστιγας ἐπάγειν τὸν πονηρὸν οἰκέτη ὑπελάμβανον, ὡς ταῖς γοεραῖς τοῦ οἰκέτου δέσσεις μὴ ταχεώς ἐπικαμπτόμενον. Εἴτε τε καὶ ἡ ὑπεραγία καὶ θεόπας μήτηρ τοῦ κυρίου μέσον τοὺτον ἐπιφανείᾳ συναγηγεμένη, καὶ τὸ ἑκείνου οὕτως ὁργῶς [((fol. 213')] ἐξηράσθησεν πρόσωπον· καὶ ὡς δὴθὲν τὸν αὐτῶν ἀνελομένη σεσιδηρωμένον ξυστήρα, κατὰ τὸν ὄρας τοῦ ἰθλίου οἰκέτου ἱθὺνασα, ἐπέπληξε.
3. Αύτίκα τε, ὁ τοῦ θαύματος, τά τε ὅμματα καὶ ἀπαν τὸ σῶμα ἐν τῇ ἐκκατάσει ὡς ἐν στάσει πληγείς, τῇ ἐνεθεὶ ἀναστάς, καθ’ ὅλου τοῦ σῶματος τραυματίας καὶ μελανωμένος ἐωράτο, καὶ μὴ βλέπων τὸ σύνολον. Τότε ὁ ἄθλος πάσι τὰ συμβεβηκότα αὐτῷ διήγειλεν, αὐτὸν τε ἐκείνον, ὃν καὶ τάς μορφὰς ἐξώρυξε τήν τε θέαν καὶ στάσιν, καὶ τήν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔλευσιν καὶ οίας πληγαῖς ἐπιστάντες κατέτρωσαν, ἀντὶ τῶν εἰς αὐτοὺς γεγενημένων τροsséων, καὶ τί παρ’ αὐτόν ἡδικημένος, ἀνεφευνότες τὸ αἴτιον· ἐτὶ τε καὶ ὅπως τάς ὅψεις ὑπὸ τῆς θεομήτορος τῇ σιδηραῖῳ ξυστήρι πληγείς, τὰς ὀράσεις εὐθέως ἀπέβαλε, τραχωθέντων δὲ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον, ὡστε πάσας ἀπογλαυκηθῆναι τὰς τῶν ὅμματος κόρας καὶ χειραγωγοῦμεν τὸν ἀπαντά τῆς ἴωθες αὐτοῦ χρόνον καὶ τῆς οἰκείας κακίας καὶ δυσσεβείας εἰκόνα γεγενήσθαι περιοῦσαν καὶ στηλιτεύουσαν τῆς πρωτοτύπου ἁσβείας, ὡς ἐν σκιογραφίᾳ, τὴν ἀντίδοσιν. Οὕτως καὶ ἐνεθεὶς ὁ ἄθλος καὶ ταλαίπωρος, ἄγαπητοί, οὕτω πεποιηκός καὶ ἐξαμαρτήσας, πέπονθεν δικαία κρίσει Θεοῦ πρὸς σωφρονισμὸν καὶ νοοθεσίαν πολλῶν· ἱμεῖς δὲ ἐνταῦθα τὸν λόγον καταπαύσαντες, δόξαν τῷ μόνῳ θεῷ ἀναπέμψωμεν, νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀνελευθητοὺς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν.

---

1 γεγενεῖσθαι cod. 2 σκιογραφεία cod. 3 ἀντίδοσιν cod.
VI

1. Inside the structure of the Chalkes Tetrapsylon,\(^1\) which had been established in the very middle of the Queen city, approaching the fourty martyrs,\(^2\) there is a road leading downwards. Towards its southern side, facing the slopiest part and on a hollow, a certain house was built, which was called “\textit{ton Romanes}”.\(^3\) So in this house, some notable man,\(^4\) taking up there his abode, constructed a chapel adorned with precious and revered icons. When the impiety and tyranny of the god-fighting and most sacrilegious tyrant Leo was spread about, namely that every iconic representation be removed from every house and church, the pious and god-loving man, burdened by the fear of the tyrant, but also constrained by his divine love, dreaded to take down the divine and holy icons with his own hands. But neither did he dare to plaster or cover or hide them away, fearing again the merciless and inhuman nature of the tyrant emperor.

\(^1\) Usually the term \textit{Χαλκῆς τετραπύλου} is most commonly used to refer to what has been rendered in English as the “Brazen House”, namely the main entrance vestibule of the Grand Palace of Constantinople, for which Cyril Mango has composed a thorough report, see Mango, \textit{Brazen House}. Here, the fact that this one is \textit{πρὸς τὸ μεσότατον τῆς βασιλείας πόλεως} implies that it is a different \textit{tetrapsylon}, a bit higher than the Grand Palace and along the \textit{Mese}, in between the Forum of Constantine and the Forum Tauri, near the so-called \textit{Artopoleia} quarter. The present \textit{chalkoun tetrapsylon} was indeed situated next to a church of the 40 Martyrs and marked a crossroads of the \textit{Mese} with the \textit{embolos} of Domninos, which adored a cross street that reached from the Golden Horn in the north to the Julian port in the south, see C. Mango, \textit{Le développement urbain de Constantinople (IV\textsuperscript{e} - VII\textsuperscript{e} siècles)}, (Travaux et Mémoires du Centre de recherche d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance, Collège de France, Monographies 2, Paris 1985), 30-1. One of the earliest references to the monument is in the \textit{Chronicon Paschale}, from which we are informed that during the same year of Cyrus Panopolites’ exile to Phrygia (wrongly called Smyrna in the text), ca. 443, see PLRE s.v. CYRUS 7, an earthquake hit the city, destroying the \textit{embolos ton Troadesion} and reaching up to the \textit{tetrapsylon}, see Ludwig A Dindorf, \textit{Chronicon paschale, ad exemplar vaticanum}. vol. 1, [Corpus scriptorium historiae Byzantinae] (Bonn: Weber, 1832), 589.8, covering thus a distance of approximately 2km. This event is also remembered on the 29\textsuperscript{th} of June in the \textit{Synaxarium Constantinopolitanum}, which adds that the earthquake persisted for three months, see SynaxCP col. 425.2. Johannes Malalas refers to this \textit{tetrapsylon} in an episode of a dispute between Greens and Blues, which accumulates in the burning of the house of Varsyminos and the fire reaching the \textit{tetrapsylon} and the road across it, see Ioannes Thurn, \textit{Ioannis Malalae chronographia}, Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantiae, (New York, 2000), 135. Other references to the \textit{tetrapsylon} are made again in the \textit{Chronicon paschale} and the \textit{Synaxarium Constantinopolitanum}, which simply confirm its vicinity to the monastery of the 40 martyrs, see Dindorf, \textit{Chronicon paschale}, 699.1 and SynaxCP, cols. 356, 524. The remaining references in the \textit{Synaxarium} are also the sole testimonies to the existence of a church of St. Theodore close to the \textit{tetrapsylon}, which however has not been verified due to the lack of sources, see SynaxCP cols. 94, 188 and Janin, \textit{Les églises...}, 160-1.

\(^2\) Most probably the monastery referred to here is the \textit{Τοσσαράκοντα μάρτυρων πόλος}, \textit{to ū Χαλκοῦ Τετραπύλου} as Janin presents it. It was supposedly the most famous and frequented church in honor of the 40 martyrs, built by the emperor Anastasios and his wife Ariadne. During Janin’s time, its exact location must have still been obscure since he places it further down the \textit{Mese}, see Janin, \textit{Les églises...}, 501, but according to Mango it must have been right next to the \textit{chalkoun tetrapsylon} described above, see Mango, \textit{Le développement urbain}, 31.

\(^3\) There is no reference to the specific location in Janin, though based on the information provided in the description of the text and the previous two footnotes, most likely this “\textit{ton Romanes}” is a locality neighboring \textit{ta Amanitou}, for which see 2.2, 38, ft.7.

\(^4\) Unfortunately, since the locality of “\textit{ton Romanes}” cannot be identified at present, neither can any speculations be made about the identity of the “notable man” of the text.
Being thus weary towards both endeavors, the man assigned to one of his own house-slaves, Anthimos by name, the arrangement of this matter, hoping that the latter would dispose himself in a more sympathetic manner, and cover them with rags and then plaster them over. In this way, (the servant) would draw upon himself the fear of danger, in the case that the whole matter would be revealed, while the master, in doing so, would have (Anthimos) act as a scapegoat for the lawless deed and the hidden impiety which might later be uncovered.
2. That wicked and wretched and senseless\textsuperscript{5} slave, disdainfully entering the chapel in fear of nothing, as if (he were approaching) something worthless and despisable, without even imagining to commit any acts of respect, raising an iron-coated rasp in his hands, the miserable man jabbed it against the surface of the holy and venerable images, that of the Mother of God and the Holy Angels and Apostles. The all-wretched man, having thus not only spoiled the honorable images representing divinity, but also having cruelly dug them out, the most horrid, and rendered them beyond any repair, the night after which the god-hated and senseless slave perpetrated these things, he saw in his sleep those extracted men whose honorable and holy figures the miserable and abominable man had obliterated. Having been dismounted from their abode and standing over him, so as to exact punishment for the deeds done against them, they asked, in what had they wronged him, for him to dare and commit such acts against them. And threatening to inflict punishments on him and painful tortures, in return for what had been done to them, they insinuated that these would not only be executed in imaginary dreams but rather that they shall not disappear or end together with his slumber’s completion; for the things that were seen, he perceived as if in a trance, whereas the deeds materialized in reality. For they already had set themselves to work; binding him completely with belts, for a long while they whipped his whole body, so that the miserable man screamed violently and moaned distressfully. Having woken all the neighbors, they, hearing the terrible and violent cry, stared cursing the slave’s master and severely accusing him of mercilessly tormenting him, without choosing to cease after such a stretch of time; for they thought that it was he who whipped the wicked slave, without so much as flinching before the slave’s woeful pleads. Then, the most holy and God-bearing mother of the Lord revealed herself also standing amidst them and commenced in utter wrath to mutilate his face; and as if raising that very iron-coated rasp and directing it straight towards his eyes, she struck.

\textsuperscript{5} The accumulation of epithets here leaves no doubt as to Anthimos’ course of action.
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3. Immediately – oh miraculous happening! – his eyes and his whole body, being smote in its trance as if in reality, upon his rising at dawn, was visibly wounded and bruised all over and completely unable to see. Then, the miserable man announced to each and every one the happenings brought unto him, and the vision and stance of those very men whose figures he dug out, and their arrival unto him and the kind of blows they delivered standing around him, in return for the injuries inflicted upon them while they were investigating the reason, and in what way he had been wronged by them. Furthermore, (he described,) the moment when his eyes were struck by the mother of God with the iron rasp, he immediately lost his sight. His eyes had so much been razed, that his pupils were coated white, and for the entirety of his remaining life having to be guided by hand, he became a surviving icon of his own wickedness and impiety, an icon exposing, as if in a shadow, the retribution of the archetypal impiety. And so my friends, this pitiful and miserable man, having acted such and sinned, suffered a fair judgement from God for the moral teaching and admonition of many. Here however we shall cease our narration, and offer glory to the only God, now and for the endless aeons to come, amen.
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