

ΠΑΝΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΙΟ ΙΩΑΝΝΙΝΩΝ
ΤΜΗΜΑ ΦΙΛΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ
ΠΡΟΓΡΑΜΜΑ ΜΕΤΑΠΤΥΧΙΑΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ
ΤΟΜΕΑΣ ΜΝΕΦ, ΚΑΤΕΥΘΥΝΣΗ ΜΕΣΑΙΩΝΙΚΗ

*Εικόνες και θαύματα. Διηγήσεις από το χειρόγραφο Vaticanus gr. 1587
(BHG 1390f)*

*Icons and Miracles. Narrations from the Vaticanus gr. 1587 manuscript
(BHG 1390f)*

ΔΙΠΛΩΜΑΤΙΚΗ ΕΡΓΑΣΙΑ ΓΙΑ ΤΟΝ ΠΡΩΤΟ ΚΥΚΛΟ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ
ΤΗΣ ΦΟΙΤΗΤΡΙΑΣ

ΜΑΡΙΑΣ ΕΙΡΗΝΗΣ ΕΜΜΑΝΟΥΕΛΛΑΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΚΗ

ΕΠΙΒΛΕΠΩΝ ΚΑΘΗΓΗΤΗΣ:
ΕΛΕΝΗ ΚΑΛΤΣΟΓΙΑΝΝΗ

ΙΩΑΝΝΙΝΑ 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| Prologue | 2 |
| Abbreviations | 3 |
| Ch. 1: Introduction | 5 |
| 1.1. Icons and miracle narrations: an overview | 5 |
| 1.2. The compilation of <i>Vat. gr.1587</i> and the Bilder-Predigten in <i>Christusbilder</i> | 11 |
| 1.3. Description of the Manuscript | 13 |
| 1.4. Principles of the Current Edition | 17 |
| Ch. 2: The dossier of Miracle Narrations. | 18 |
| 2.1. The Icon of the Virgin in Diospolis | 18 |
| 2.2. The Icon-Traveler: From Constantinople to Rome in one night | 32 |
| 2.3. The Bleeding Icon and the Holy Well | 44 |
| 2.4. The Blinding of Anna | 52 |
| 2.5. Synesios lithoxoos | 64 |
| 2.6. The Trial of Anthimos | 71 |
| Bibliography | 81 |

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.”

ABBREVIATIONS

- AASS = *Acta Sanctorum Bollandiana* (Brussels, 1643 ff)
- AB = *Analecta Bollandiana*
- BHG = *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca*, 3rd ed., ed. F. Halkin, 3 vols., [SubsHag 8a], (Brussels, 1957)
- BHG Auctarium = *Auctarium Bibliothecae hagiographicae graecae*, ed. F. Halkin. [SubsHag 47], (Brussels, 1969)
- BZ = *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*
- CPG = *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, ed. M. Geerard, vol. III (Turnhout, 1976)
- DOP = *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*
- ΕΕΘΣΑΠΘ = Επιστημονικές Επετηρίδες Θεολογικής Σχολής Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης
- Ehrhard, *Überlieferung* = A. Ehrhard, *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts (TU 50-52)*, 3 vols, (Leipzig, 1937-1952).
- LSJ = H. G. Liddell – R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, a new edition revised and augmented throughout by H. S. Jones, (Oxford, 1940⁹), with a revised *Supplement*, (Oxford, 1996).
- OCP = *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*
- ODB = *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. A Kazhdan, et al., 3 vols. (Oxford New York, 1991)
- PG = *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*, ed. J.P. Migne (Paris, 1857 – 66)
- PL = *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina*, ed. J.P. Migne (Paris, 1844 – 55)
- PLRE 2 = Martindale, John R., *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire 2: AD 395-527* (Cambridge, 1980)
- PmbZ2 = R.-J. Lilie, Cl. Ludwig, et al. (eds.), *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit, Erste Abteilung (641-867)*, 8 vols. (Berlin – Boston, W. de Gruyter, 2013)
- REB = *Revue des Études Byzantines*
- SubsHag = *Subsidia Hagiographica*
- SynaxCP = H. Delehaye (ed.), *Propylaeum ad AASS Novembris, Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae e codice Sirmondiano*, (Bruxelles, 1902)

TM = Travaux et Mémoires

TU = Texte und Untersuchungen

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 on-going dispute, both for the enlightened men contemporary to its outbreak¹ 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 568/9⁵, 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.

¹ For an extant review of the ancient texts both for and against icon worship prior to Iconoclasm see Hans Georg Thümmel, *Die Frühgeschichte der ostkirchlichen Bilderlehre. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Zeit vor dem Bilderstreit*, (Berlin, 1992). On Iconophile ideology see Kenneth Perry’s *Depicting the World: Byzantine Iconophile Thought of the Eighth and Ninth Centuries*, (E.J. Brill, Leiden-New York-Köln, 1996).

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, Ποικίλα Byzantina* 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 See Geoffrey Greatrex, *The chronicle of Pseudo-Zachariah: Church and War in Late Antiquity* [Translated Texts for Historians], (Liverpool University Press, 2011), 32.

⁶ *The chronicle of Pseudo-Zachariah* VII. 4, 237 and 240-1, and Price, “Icons before...”, 5.

610-41⁷), there are many stories of the saint appearing in visions and being recognized because he embodied the form familiar from his icons.⁸ 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.⁹ 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.¹⁰ They also had the ability to reproduce themselves, as the famous story of the *Keramion*, or Holy Tile, testifies.¹¹ 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.¹² 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.¹³

⁷ See Paul Lemerle (ed.) *Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de saint Démétrius*, (Paris, 1979), vol. I, 102, line 9; 115, line 17; 162, lines 16-17. For the date see vol. II, 40-44, 79-80 and Price, “Icons before...”, 5.

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 *acheiropoieta* 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 *acheiropoieta* 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 *acheiropoieta* 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 *acheiropoieta* 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,¹⁴ there are two stories of icon-miracles following exorcisms performed 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.¹⁵ 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.¹⁶ 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 consideration¹⁷, 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.¹⁸

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

Eirene Harvalia-Crook and Charalambos Dendrinos, *The Letter of the Three Patriarchs to Emperor Theophilos and Related Texts*, (Porphyrogenitus, Athens, 1997), lii-liii.

¹⁴ Price, "Icons before...", 6-7.

¹⁵ *Life of Symeon Stylites the Younger*, 118, in Erich Lamberz (ed.), *Concilium universale Nicaenum secundum, Concilii Actiones VI–VII in Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum ser. II, vol. III*. Band 3, (De Gruyter, Berlin/Boston, 2016), 404-8.

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

¹⁷ Jean Darrouzès, "Deux textes inédits du patriarche Germain", *REB*, 45 (1987), 7.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 5-13.

at gathering such stories in his Iconophile orations, *De imaginibus orationes tres*.¹⁹ These stories are quoted from church fathers, ecclesiastical histories and saint's *vitae*, which gives them the authority prescribed to their initial recounters, thus acting as proof of the validity and necessity to worship icons.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' *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.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.²² There is one instance of an icon spewing forth blood – namely the well-known icon of Beirut²³ – which blood in turn has healing properties.²⁴ In another story the icon nods as an answer to supplications, and then offers healing through the oil holding the flame underneath it.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.²⁶ In three instances, icons actively deliver some form of punishment to the people harming them.²⁷ Elsewhere, an icon bestows forgiveness to the formerly sinful person (namely Mary the Egyptian) who comes to worship the holy cross.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 *acheiropoietos* imagery),²⁹ supplication to an icon helps John the baptist memorize a psalm,³⁰ a dry well fills with water when an icon of a saint is thrown in³¹ and an old

¹⁹ Bonifatius Kötter, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos, vol. 3*, [Patristische Texte und Studien 17]. (Berlin, De Gruyter, 1975), 144-200.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, chapter “*das Florileg*”, 24-5.

²¹ Lamberz, *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.

²² *Ibid.*, 312-316, 328, 376, 386, 388, 392, 406-408, 428, 476, 478.

²³ For an overview of the Beirut image miracle see Walter, “Iconographical...”, lx.

²⁴ Lamberz, *Concilium universale...*, 316-328.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 376.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 332.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 410-2. We shall return to this specific category of stories later on.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 424.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 426.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 428.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 586.

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 Theophilus 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 Theophilus' 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 Theophilus*, 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 Theophilus* 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.

³⁷ Von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder*, 206**-208**; Munitiz, "Manuscript Tradition", in Munitiz et al., *The Letter of the Three Patriarchs...*, xciv.

³⁸ Bertrand Hemmerdinger, "Les sources de *BHG 1387 (PG 95, 345-385)*", *OCP* 34 (1968), 145.

³⁹ CPG, III, #8115.

⁴⁰ Johannes M. Hoeck, "Stand und Aufgaben der Damaskenos-Forschung", *OCP* 17 (1951), 26 n.42 and Hemmerdinger, "Les sources...", 145.

seems that von Dobschütz had already made a distinction between the two texts.⁴¹ 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.⁴² Scholarly research on the text is scarce and a precise dating hasn’t of yet been proposed, Munitiz however places the *Letter to Theophilos* among “documents of doubtful authenticity ... produced in the late 9th century in defence of the iconophile position...”⁴³ and considers it immediately related to *The Letter of the Three Patriarchs*;⁴⁴ the similarities between the two texts are indeed striking.⁴⁵ Here, the dossier of miracles is presented again as proof of the necessity to worship icons.⁴⁶

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,⁴⁷ and develop their tradition in those following. One such example is the miraculous icon of the Virgin Mary, called the *Maria Rhomaia*, which is a development of not one, but a plethora of different miraculous icon stories which merge into one.⁴⁸ Furthermore, the existence of manuscripts containing compilations of such miraculous stories⁴⁹, 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.⁵⁰

⁴¹ Von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder*, 208**.-210**.

⁴² Hemmerdinger, “Les sources...”, 147.

⁴³ Munitiz, “Preliminary Remarks”, xiv.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, xiv.

⁴⁵ Hemmerdinger offers a well-aimed example, “Les sources...”, 146.

⁴⁶ Pseudo-Damascene, *Letter to Emperor Theophilos on the Holy and Venerated Icons*, in Munitiz et. al., *The Letter of the Three Patriarchs*, 4.a-6.d, 149-154.

⁴⁷ See for example the Lydda prodigy, the Germanos prodigy, and Synesios *lithoxoos* below.

⁴⁸ Von Dobschütz presents a version of the story in his *Christusbilder*, 234**.-266**, and published yet another in his article “*Maria Romaia*”, *BZ*, 12 (1903), 193-206. We shall be examining the case of the *Maria Rhomaia* in relation to stories of the current compilation in **2.1.**, **2.2.**, **2.3.**

⁴⁹ 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 *BHG, Auctarium*, 1386-1394^l.

⁵⁰ Von Dobschütz, *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*.”⁵¹ 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.⁵² He does find the narrations too long to be read during mass though, and proposes their recounting at the table of the Feast.⁵³ 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.⁵⁴ Lastly, he notices a close relation of the stories in his edition with those in the *Letter of the Three Patriarchs*.⁵⁵ 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*,”⁵⁶ 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.*, 207**. 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,⁵⁷ and their comparison was the basis of the current edition.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,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"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-ῶ* which initially means "to mutilate," however from Plutarch onwards, when combined with the genitive *τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν*, means specifically the blinding of the eyes.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 ἁγίαν καὶ σεβάσιμον εἰκόνα* in *Vat. gr.* 1587 is a plain *θαυμασίαν εἰκόνα* in von Dobschütz.⁶² Likewise, *ὁ ἄθλιος Ἰουδαῖος* in von Dobschütz becomes *ὁ ἐπάρατος καὶ θεοστυγῆς Ἰουδαῖος* in *Vat. gr.* 1587.⁶³ 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.

⁵⁷ And consequently, of the versions of the stories, but this we shall be examining below.

⁵⁸ On the principles of the edition, see **1.4.**, 15.

⁵⁹ **2.4.**, §3, 58.

⁶⁰ LSJ, 1355, *πείρω*

⁶¹ LSJ, 1401-2, *πηρ-όω* and Δημήτριος Δημητράκος, *Μέγα Λεξικόν Ὁλης τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Γλώσσας*, IA', 5802, *πήρωσις-εως*. Cf. the exact wording from the prodigy: τὴν πήρωσιν τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ.

⁶² **2.2.**, §3, 32.

⁶³ **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 dossier⁶⁴ and von Dobschütz's compilation is also testimony to texts without a widespread tradition.⁶⁵

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 November⁶⁶ of the year 1389 by father Michael the nomophylax,⁶⁷ on a Wednesday of the martyr Eleftherios' feast. It consists of 372 folia (recto-verso) and is made of paper. The pages measure a compact 20,5x13,5 cm⁶⁸ and can contain a total of 23 written lines. The codex is dispersed in two volumes, the first reaching f. 176^v and the second beginning from f. 177^r and ending at f. 372^v.⁶⁹ The manuscript comprises an array of texts, most of which are homilies from various church fathers written explicitly for the occasion of Holy Days.⁷⁰ 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.⁷¹ The complete list of texts contained in the manuscript is the following:

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

⁶⁴ Walter, "Iconographical Considerations", lviii-lxiii.

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.

⁶⁸ Ehrhard, *Überlieferung*, Teil I, Band II, (Leipzig 1938), 258.

⁶⁹ Cyrus Giannelli, *Codices Vaticani Graeci 1485-1683*, Cataloghi ed inventari di manoscritti 35, (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1961), 199.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 199

⁷¹ Ehrhard, *Überlieferung*, 258.

- (29^r-42^r) Maximus Planudes, *In sepulturam Christi*
- (42^v-56^v) Georgius Nicomediensis mtr., *In SS. martyres Cosmam et Damianum*
- (58^r-73^r) Pepagomenus Nicolaus, *Encomium in S. Isidorum*
- (79^r-85^v) Basilius Caesariensis, *In quadraginta martyres Sebastenos*
- (85^v-102^v) Sophronius Hierosolymitanus, *Vita Mariae Aegyptiacae*
- (103^r-113^v) Andreas Cretensis, *In adnuntiationem ss. Deiparae*
- (113^v-139^v) Iohannes Chrysostomus, *De beato Philogonio*
- (140^r-143^v) Iohannes Chrysostomus, *In Publicanum et Pharisaicum*
- (144^r-150^r) Iohannes Chrysostomus, *In parabolam de filio prodigo*
- (151^r -166^r) Andreas Cretensis, *De humana uita et de defunctis*
- (166^r -170^r) Ephraem Graecus, *In uanam uitam, et de paenitentia,*
- (170^r -179^v) Iohannes Chrysostomus, *In Genesim, sermo 3*
- (180^r -193^r) Anastasius Sinaita, *In sextum Psalmum*
- (193^r -201^r) Nectarius Constantinopolitanus, *Sermo de festo S. Theodori*
- (201^v-204^v) Athanasius Alexandrinus, *Narratio de Cruce seu imagine Berytensi*
- **(204^v-210^v) Hagiographica Varia**
- **(211^r-213^v) Synesius quidam**
- (214^r -215^v) Iohannes Chrysostomus, *Thema: Ieiunium*
- (216^r -218^r) Iohannes Chrysostomus, *Thema: Ieiunium*
- (218^r-221^v) Ioseph Thessalonicensis ep. (Studita), *Homilia in Sanctam Crucem 2*
- (221^v-225^v) Iohannes Chrysostomus, *Opera*
- (226^r -231^r) Iohannes Chrysostomus, *De ieiunio, De Dauide*
- (231^r -236^r) 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 Matthaicum homiliae 1-90*
- 260v-265v Iohannes Chrysostomus, *In decem uirgines*
- 265-269v Iohannes Chrysostomus, *In meretricem et pharisaicum*
- 269v-275 Iohannes Chrysostomus, *In illud : Pater si possibile est*
- 275-278v Basilius Seleuciensis, *Homilia in feriam V et in prodicionem Iudae*
- 278v-281v Iohannes Chrysostomus, *In latronem*
- 281v-288 Iohannes Chrysostomus, *In uiuificam sepulturam et triduanam resurrectionem Christi*
- 288-294 Georgius Nicomediensis mtr., *De Deipara et Christo rediuiuo*
- 288-294 Georgius Nicomediensis mtr., *In S. Mariam assistentem Cruci*
- 294-306 Epiphanius Constantiensis, *In diuini corporis sepulturam*
- 306v-308 Gregorius Nazianzenus, *In sanctum Pascha 1-2 (or. 1 et 45)*
- 308v-313v Theodorus Studita, *In Sanctum Pascha*
- 314-319 Proclus Constantinopolitanus, *Hom 33 : In S. Thomam ap.*
- 319-325 Gregorius Antiochenus, *In mulieres unguentiferas*
- 325-330 Iohannes Chrysostomus, *Thema: Paralyticus*
- 330-332 Iohannes Chrysostomus, *In Mediam Pentecosten*
- 338v-345v Leontius CP. presbyter, *Hom. 10 in mediam 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*⁷²

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 νηστειῶν, the Feast of Orthodoxy,⁷³ 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.⁷⁴ Ehrhard refers to "red Tagesrubriken"⁷⁵ (which are the days ascribed to each text) in the upper margins of the folia, but sadly the pictures in the manuscript's digital archive⁷⁶ 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 descenders. 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 *ov* complex, but in many cases are also written separately. Above the *iota* and

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

psilon there is the symbol of diaeresis, regardless of its proper use.⁷⁷ The use of *nomina sacra* does not limit itself to references of Holy Persons, but is dispersed freely throughout the text.

⁷⁷ See Ernst Gamillscheg, Dieter Harlfinger, Herbert Hunger, *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten*, 3. Teil: *Handschriften aus Bibliotheken Roms mit dem Vatikan*, B: *Paläographische Charakteristika*, (Wien, 1997), #473.

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 compilation 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 regiis*, IV, (Paris 1832), 471-3.

⁴ Von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder*, 79-80.

Tomadakis on a linguistic basis in 1993,⁵ however up until 1999 scholarly cycles continued to accept this attribution.⁶ 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 Theophilus* among others, and continues to place its writing in the early 10th century.⁷

The remainder of texts preserving the legend aren't much earlier than this. *The Letter of the Three Patriarchs* and the *Letter to Theophilus* both preserve a similar between them version of the story, and as we have seen earlier,⁸ date to the late 9th century. Another two texts of the early to mid-9th century, the *Refutatio ed eversio* 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,⁹ though the manuscripts containing the text date from the 12th century onwards.¹⁰ The earliest-dating manuscripts containing compilations of icon-miracles such as the current one are from the 11th century,¹¹ 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.¹² 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

⁵ See Νικόλαος Β. Τωμαδάκης, *Η Βυζαντινή Υμνογραφία και Ποίησης*, (Θεσσαλονίκη 1993), 192.

⁶ Walter also adheres to this belief, see "Iconographical Considerations", liv

⁷ Τσορμπατζόγλου, "Παρατηρήσεις σχετικά με την προέλευση του αποδιδόμενου στον Ανδρέα Κρήτης έργου "περί τῆς προσκυνήσεως τῶν ἁγίων εἰκόνων" BHG 1125 = CPG 8193)", *ΕΕΘΣΑΠΘ/ Τμήμα Ποιμαντικής και Κοινωνικής Θεολογίας* 6 (1999) 133-148.

⁸ **1.1.**, 8-9.

⁹ Von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder*, 204** -205**.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 211** -212**

¹¹ See Joseph A. Munitiz, "Manuscript Tradition", in Joseph A. Munitiz, Julian Chrysostomides, Eirene Harvalia-Crook and Charalambos Dendrinos, *The Letter of the Three Patriarchs to Emperor Theophilus and Related Texts*, (Porphyrogenitus, Athens, 1997), xciv-xcv.

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..."¹³.

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*.¹⁴ 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 illnesses, such as leprosy.¹⁵

The Patriarch Nikephoros I¹⁶ 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.¹⁷ 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'

¹³ Ernst von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder. Untersuchungen zur christlichen Legende*, [Texte und Untersuchungen, Neue Folge 3], (Leipzig, 1899), 204**.

¹⁴ Munitiz et al., *The Letter of the Three Patriarchs*, 7.3-7.4, 38-9.

¹⁵ Ps.-Damascene, *Letter to Theophilus*, in Munitiz et. al, *The Letter...*, 4.b-4.d, 150-1.

¹⁶ For more on the life and works of Nikephoros I, see *PmBZ*, 1.3, 5301.

¹⁷ Jeffrey M. Featherstone, "Introduction: Author and Text" in *Nicephori Patriarchae Constantinopolitani: Refutatio et eversio definitionis synodalis anni 815*. [*Corpus Christianorum. Series Graeca* 33] (Brepols, 1997), xiii-xxv.

narration of the *ἀχειρότευκτος* icon, which here is described as *πλαζῖ τετυπωμένον λαμπραῖς 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 it 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.¹⁸ 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 840.¹⁹ Depending however on the edition of the text, which seems to have been yet another complex undertaking,²⁰ 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.²¹ In the earlier editions of E. de Murlat 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 promise²² 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.²³

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

¹⁸ Ibid., 82,73-92, 142-3.

¹⁹ See Απόστολος Καρπόζηλος, *Βυζαντινοί Ιστορικοί και Χρονογράφοι*, II, (Athens, 2002), 213-4.

²⁰ Ibid. same pages.

²¹ Carl de Boor, *Georgii monachi chronicon*, II, (Leipzig: Teubner, 1904), 785-6.

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.

²³ PG, 110, 688B-C, and Immanuel Bekker, (ed.) *Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus*. [*Corpus scriptorium historiae Byzantinae*] (Bonn: Weber, 1838), 19, 774.

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 πλαζί πάνυ καθαράϊς*, rather than *ἐφ’ ἐνὶ τῶν κίωνων*. 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.²⁶ 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 harmless 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 *Ἐπίμνημα εἰς τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν τῆς ἀχράντου καὶ προσκυνητῆς εἰκόνοσ τῆσ παναμώμου δεσποίνης ἡμῶν θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας τῆσ Ρωμαίας*.²⁷ As we can see, the title "*Romaia*"²⁸ 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 ψυχοφελῆσ περὶ τῶν γεγονότων θαυμάτων παρὰ τῆσ ἁγίας καὶ σεβασμίας εἰκόνοσ τῆσ Θεοτόκου τῆσ ἐπονομαζομένησ Ρωμαίας*.²⁹ 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

²⁶ Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, IV, 471-2.

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 *Ἐπίμνημα* 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 *Υπόμνηγμα*, 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 204^v – 205^v)

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^v) <Ό>¹ Κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ Θεὸς Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, διὰ τὴν πάντων ἡμῶν τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν σωτηρίαν, *πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως*^a θαυματοποιεῖν ἐξ ἀρχῆς καὶ ἄνωθεν οὐ διέλειπεν, τὰ μὲν δι' ἑαυτοῦ, τὰ δέ, διὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν θεραπόντων αὐτοῦ, τὰ δέ, καὶ διὰ θείων καὶ ἱερῶν εἰκόνων, χειροποιήτων τε καὶ ἀχειροποιήτων, αὐτοῦ τε καὶ τῆς τούτου μητρός. Καὶ ἔξεστι² τῷ βουλομένῳ καὶ φιλοπόνως ἀνιχνεύοντι, πολλὰ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα διὰ τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ καὶ σεβασμίων εἰκόνων εὔρεῖν· οὐ μόνον γὰρ νοσημάτων δεινῶν ἀπαλλάττουσι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ δαίμονας διώκουσιν καὶ μύρα βρύουσι, ἀλλὰ καὶ προσομιλοῦσι καὶ προσβλέπουσι, τινὰς δὲ καὶ ἀποστρέφονται.

Τοιγαροῦν, τῆς ὑπεραγίας δεσποίνης ἡμῶν Θεοτόκου σω|| (fol. 205^r)ματικῶς ἔτι ἐν τῇ γῆ ἀναστρεφομένης³, οἱ μακάριοι καὶ κορυφαῖοι τῶν ἀποστόλων Πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης τὰς διατριβὰς ποιούμενοι πρὸ μιλίων ὀκτωκαίδεκα ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων ἐν Λύδδῃ τῇ καλουμένη Διοσπόλει, εὐκτήριον οἰκοδόμησαν⁴ οἶκον ἐπ' ὄνοματι τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου μητρός, χερσὶν οἰκείαις τοῦτον κατασκευάσαντες. Εἶτα ἐκεῖθεν ἀπάραντες, κατέλαβον ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ ἐν ᾧ ἡ Θεοτόκος κατέμενε, καὶ πρὸς γῆν κατακλίναντες, ἐλιτάνεον αὐτῇ λέγοντες τὰ εἰκότα⁵ «Θεοτόκε παρθένε καὶ μητὲρ τοῦ Κυρίου· ἡ τῶν ἐν σοὶ προστρεχόντων προστάτις καὶ⁶ ἀντίληψις βεβαία, ποῦ ἦσθα ἡμῶν σχολαζόντων καὶ καταρτιζόντων τὸν οἶκόν σου ἐν Διοσπόλει;»⁷.

^a Heb. 1.1

¹ *addidi* ² *εξ ἔστι, cod.* ³ τοιγαροῦν ... ἀναστρεφομένης] Περὶ τῆς ἐν τῷ μαρμάρῳ ἀναδοθείσης ἀχειροποιήτου εἰκόνας τῆς ὑπεραγίας δεσποίνης ἡμῶν θεοτόκου ἐν Λύδδῃ τῇ καλουμένη Διοσπόλει, εὐλόγησον, vD, 219**, 10-12 ⁴ *sic cod.*, οἰκτήριον ὠκοδόμησαν vD, 219**, 14 ⁵ οἱ μακάριοι καὶ... τὰ εἰκότα] ὅτι φησὶ πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης οἱ ἐκκριτοὶ τῶν μαθητῶν καὶ ἀποστόλων τοῦ Κυρίου ναὸν κάλλιστον δειμάμενοι τῇ Θεοτόκῳ ἐν Λύδδῃ τῇ καλουμένη Διοσπόλει καὶ τοῦτον εὐφυῶς ἀπαρτήσαντες ἱκετήριους φωνὰς μετὰ δακρῶν καὶ στεναγμῶν καρδίας προσφέροντες ἐλιτάνεον λέγοντες, vD, 219**-220**, 1.13-1.4 ⁶ προστάτις καὶ *cod., om.* vD, 220**, 1.2 ⁷ ποῦ ἦσθα... Διοσπόλει] φάνηθι ἡμῖν τοῖς ταπεινοῖς καὶ ἀναξίοις δούλοις σου καὶ πληροφόρησον ἡμῶν τόδε ἔργον, ὃ εἰργασάμεθα ἐν τῷ σῷ τιμίῳ καὶ σεβασμίῳ ὀνόματι, vD, 220**, 1.3-6

2. Ὡς δὲ τοιαῦτα οἱ ἀπόστολοι πρὸς αὐτὴν διελέγοντο, αὕτη¹ πρὸς αὐτοὺς χαριεντῶς ἀπεκρίνατο· «Κἀγὼ αὐτόθι ἤμην, καὶ εἰμι καὶ ἔσομαι»· καὶ ἐν ὅσῳ ταῦτα παρὰ τῆς ἁγίας Θεοτόκου ἐλέγετο πρὸς τοὺς πανευφήμους ἀποστόλους, αὕτῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἔνδοθεν τοῦ τιμίου ἐκείνου καὶ νεοκτίστου ναοῦ εἰς ἓνα² τῶν κίωνων³, ἀνεδόθη ἡ τῆς πανάγνου Θεομήτορος ἀγνή καὶ σεβασμία εἰκὼν ἐν τῷ μαρμάρῳ⁴ τριπηχυαῖον ἔχουσα τὸ ἀνάστημα, ὡς ἀπὸ χειρὸς ζωγράφου κυρίως ἐγγεγραμμένη, ἢ τε πορφύρα καὶ ὁ στολισμὸς ἅπας, αἱ χεῖρες καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ ἡ λοιπὴ διαγραφὴ τῶν ὄψεων. Τοῦτο τὸ παράδοξον καὶ ἐξαισίον θαῦμα⁵, ἅπαντας ἐξέστησεν καὶ εἰς φόβον καὶ ἀγωνίαν ἐνέβαλε λέγοντας· «Τίς εἶδε, τίς ἤκουσε τοιοῦτον παράδοξον θαῦμα⁶ ποτε γενόμενον;⁷ ὄντως οὐδεὶς οὐδέπω· θαυμαστὸς|| (fol. 205^v) εἶ Κύριε^a, καὶ θαυμαστὰ τὰ ἔργα σου^b, καὶ ἀνεξιχνίαστοι αἱ ὁδοί^c σου⁸».

^a Esth. 5.2a ^b Αποκ. 15.3 ^c Rom. 11.33

¹ αὕτῃ *cod.* ² ἐν *cod.* ³ Ὡς δὲ τοιαῦτα ... κίωνων, *om.* vD] καὶ εὐθύς καὶ παραχρῆμα, vD, 220**, 2.7

⁴ ἢ τῆς πανάγνου... μαρμάρῳ] εἰκὼν ἢ τῆς θεοτόκου ἐν καθαρῷ τῷ μαρμάρῳ, vD, 220**, 2.7

⁵ θαῦμα *om.* vD ⁶ θαῦμα] πρᾶγμα, vD, 220**, 3.13 ⁷ γεγονός, vD, 220**, 3.13

⁸ καὶ... σου] καὶ αἱ ὁδοί σου ἀνεξιχνίαστοι, vD, 220**, 3.14-15

3. Ταύτην οὖν τὴν τιμίαν¹ καὶ σεβάσιμον εἰκόνα τῆς ὑπερενδόξου θεομήτορος² ὡς ἦσθετο ὁ παραβάτης Ἰουλιανὸς³ τιμωμένην τε⁴ καὶ προσκυνουμένην ὑπὸ πάντων⁵ τῶν πιστῶν, θυμῷ ἀσχέτῳ⁶ ληφθεὶς ὁ τύραννος καὶ παλαμναῖος⁷, ἀποστείλας λιθοξόους ἐπειράτο⁸ ὁ ἀλιτήριος⁹ καταξέσαι¹⁰ καὶ ἀφανίσαι τὸ τοιοῦτον ἅγιον ἐκτύπωμα.¹¹ Ἀλλ' ὅσον οὗτοι ἔξεον¹² μανιωδῶς, τοσοῦτον¹³ ἔτι καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον φαιδρότερον¹⁴ ἀπεδείκνυτο. Οὐ μόνον δὲ οὗτος ὁ παμμίαιρος¹⁵, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕτεροι μετ' αὐτὸν ἀσεβεῖς¹⁶, πολλάκις τὰ αὐτὰ διαπραξάμενοι κατ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἀγίας καὶ σεβασμίας εἰκόνας¹⁷ καὶ εἰς μηδὲν ἐνεργήσαντες, ἀποκαμόντες¹⁸ ἀπῆλθον ἄπρακτοι, ἐξιστάμενοι μᾶλλον καὶ θαυμάζοντες¹⁹ ἐπὶ τῷ παραδόξῳ τοῦ θαύματος²⁰.

Ἐκτοτε οὖν καὶ μέχρι τοῦ νῦν διαμένει τὸ τοιοῦτον ἅγιον ἀπεικόνισμα τῆς ὑπεραγίας δεσποίνης ἡμῶν Θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας ἐν Λύδῃ τῇ καλουμένῃ Διοσπόλει, ἐν ᾗ καὶ πολλαὶ ἰάσεις καὶ θαυματουργίαι ἐπιτελοῦνται καθεκᾶστην ἀεννάως ὑπ' αὐτῆς τῆς πανάγνου Θεομήτορος, εἰς τοὺς πίστει καὶ πόθῳ αὐτῇ προστρέχοντας, δοξάζοντας καὶ προσκυνοῦντας τὸν ἐξ αὐτῆς τεχθέντα Χριστὸν τὸν ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν ἡμῶν, ᾧ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν²¹.+

¹ ἀγίαν, vD, 220**, 4.16 ² τῆς...θεομήτορος, om. vD, 220**, 4.16 ³ ἰουλιανός, cod. ⁴ τὲ, om. vD, 220**, 4.16 ⁵ πάντων, om. vD, 220**, 4.18 ⁶ ἀσχέτῳ, cod. ⁷ om. vD, 220**, 4.18
⁸ ἐπειράτο, cod. ⁹ ἀλιτήριος, cod. ¹⁰ καταξάσαι, cod. ¹¹ τὸ τοιοῦτον ἅγιον ἀπεικόνισμα, vD, 221**, 4.2
¹² ἔξαιον, cod. ¹³ τοσοῦτον, om. vD, 221**, 4.1 ¹⁴ καθαρότερον καὶ φαιδρότερον, vD, 221**, 4.1
¹⁵ οὐ...παμμίαιρος, om. vD, 221, 4.3 ¹⁶ ἀσεβεῖς, om. vD, 221**, 4.3
¹⁷ κατ'...εἰκόνας, om. vD, 221**, 4.3 ¹⁸ ἀλλὰ ἀποκαμόντες, vD, 221**, 4.4 ¹⁹ καὶ θαυμάζοντες, om. vD, 221**, 4.5
²⁰ ἐπὶ τῷ παραδόξῳ τοῦ θαύματος] ἐπὶ τὸ ὑπερέχον τοῦ πράγματος, vD, 221**, 4.5 ²¹ ἔκτοτε...ἀμήν, om. vD, 221**, 4.5

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

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 *acheiropoieta*, see Ch.1 a., 5.

² The most typical kind of miracles performed by icons, as abounding 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: “Καὶ ἄλλα δὲ πολλὰ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα ἐν τῇ τῆς παναγίας Θεομήτορος εἰκόνι, τῇ αὐτῇ θείᾳ ἐνεργείᾳ διαδεικνύται· δι’ ἧς καὶ δαίμονες ἐλαύνονται, νόσοι θεραπεύονται, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται, δυνάμεις ἐνεργοῦνται, πᾶσα μαλακία καὶ ἀσθενεῖα ῥώννυται”, see *PG*, 352A-B. And the conclusion of the Aeneas prodigy in *The Letter of the Three Patriarchs*: “Καὶ ἄλλα δὲ πολλὰ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα ἐν τῇ τῆς Πανάγνου καὶ Θεομήτορος σεπτῆ εἰκόνι ἐνδοξά τε καὶ ἐξαισία ὧν οὐκ ἔστιν ἀριθμὸς, τεθανυματούργηται τῇ αὐτῆς χάριτι, δι’ ἧς δαίμονες ἐλαύνονται, ἀσθενοῦντες θεραπεύονται, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται, καὶ μάλα ἀραρότως”, see Munitiz et. al, *The Letter ...*, 7.3-7.4, 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 Protoevangelion of James supplies information on 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 Thutmose III. The name *Διόσπολις* seems to have been given by Emperor Septimius 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 Placentini 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 abode⁶ 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 IIII-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 apostles, there issued forth the pure and revered icon of the most pure mother of God, engraved on one of the honorable newly-built church’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.⁷ 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 “ὄλην ἐκτετυπωμένην τὴν ἡλικίαν, ἢ τε πορφύρα καὶ ὁ στολισμός”; the Three Patriarchs’ “ὄλην ἐντετυπωμένην τὴν ἡλικίαν, ἢ τε πορφύρα καὶ ὁ στολισμός”; pseudo-Andrew of Crete’s “τρίπηχον παραδηλοῦσαι, ... οὕτω κυρίως ἐγγεγραμμένην ὡς ἀπὸ χειρὸς ζωγράφου, τὴν τε πορφύραν φημι καὶ τὸν στολισμόν, 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 θεοῦ ἰλαστηρίου τριπηχαῖον ἔχουσα τὸ ἀνάστημα ὡς ἀπὸ χειρὸς ζωγράφου κυρίως ἐγγεγραμμένη, ἢ τε πορφύρα καὶ ὁ στολισμός ἅπας, αἱ χεῖρες καὶ ἡ μορφή 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 ἐγγεγραμμένην ἐν σχήματι γυναικείῳ τρίπηχον 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 Julian⁸ perceived 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 26th 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.¹ The Patriarch goes to the *Amantiou*² 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.³

It has been supported that the earliest version of the prodigy is preserved in *The Letter of the Three Patriarchs*,⁴ 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 icon⁵ 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 height 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 8th 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 9th 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 11th 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 9th 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.

⁶ Munitiz et. al, *The Letter...*, 7.14.b, 48.

⁷ Ibid. 7.14.a-7.14.c, 48-51.

⁸ *PG* 110, col. 921C.

⁹ Gero, *Byzantine Iconoclasm...*, 95-99.

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**.

Ἐπόμνημα 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 Ἐπόμνημα informs us that Germanos takes this icon *and* an icon of Christ to the *Amantiou* 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.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.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.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

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

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

¹³ Von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder*, §11, 247**–9**. The authenticity of Pope Gregory's letters has been much debated. For a review of the matter see Jean Gouillard, “Aux origines de l'icône de Grégoire II”, *TM* 3 (1968), 243–308.

¹⁴ Von Dobschütz, “*Maria Romaia*”, §5.11–7, 195.

¹⁵ Von Dobschütz, “*Maria Romaia*”, §§21–23, 201–2 and *Christusbilder*, § 14, 253**–4**.

B'

1. (fol. 206^r) <Τ>οὔ¹ ἀγιωτάτου καὶ οἰκουμενικοῦ πατριάρχου Γερμανοῦ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ καλῶς καὶ θεοφιλῶς οἰακίζοντος καὶ πηδαλιουχοῦντος,² ὁ ἀεὶ φθονῶν καὶ βασκαίνων τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ζωὴν καὶ σωτηρίαν διάβολος, ἐξήγειρε καθ' ἡμῶν βασιλέα ὀλέθριον καὶ δεινόν, Λέοντά φημι, τὸν ἐναγῆ καὶ παμμίαρον, τὸν ἐπωνομαζόμενον Ἰσαυρον. Τῆς βασιλείας γὰρ δραξάμενος ὁ δεῖλαιος τυραννικῶς καὶ κατενεγκῶν τῆς ἀρχῆς τὸν βασιλέα Θεοδόσιον τὸν καλούμενον Ἀδραμυττῖνον καὶ ἀποκείρας, χειροτονεῖ³ τοῦτον ἐπίσκοπον Ἐφέσου, καὶ πάσας⁴, ὡς ἀλλοιωθεὶς τὰς φρένας ὁ δεῖλαιος, τὰς τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ Θεοῦ πυργοβάρεις πολιορκήσας⁵, τουτέστιν τοὺς ἀρχηγοὺς αὐτῆς καὶ ἱερεῖς, κατέβαλε, καὶ τὸν μέγαν ἐν πατριάρχεις καὶ φωστῆρα Γερμανὸν, ἰδίαις χερσὶ⁶ τύψας ὁ ἐμβρόντητος καὶ θεομάχος, τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀτίμως ἐξέωσε, Ἀναστάσιον δὲ τὸν μοιχὸν καὶ ἰουδαιοφρονα ἀντ' αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὸν αὐτοῦ θρόνον ἀναξίως ὁ ἄθλιος ἐνίδρυσε.

Τότε ὁ μακάριος⁷ Γερμανός, ὁ πολλὰ δεινὰ πεπονθὼς παρὰ τῶν ἀσεβῶν καὶ ἀθέων εἰκονομάχων⁸, τὸ τελευταῖον⁹, ἐν ἐξορίᾳ παρ' αὐτῶν στελλόμενος¹⁰, ἀπάρας ἐκ τοῦ πατριαρχικοῦ οἴκου¹¹, εἰληφῶς δὲ μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν καὶ Θεοῦ τιμίαν καὶ σεβασμίαν εἰκόνα ἐν σανίδι¹² ψηφίσι κεκοσμημένην κατήλθεν ἐν ἀγκάλαις αὐτοῦ κατέχων¹³ παρὰ || (fol. 206^v) τῷ τῆς θαλάσσης αἰγιαλῷ, τ' Ἀμαντίου προσαγορευομένῳ¹⁴, καὶ γράψας ἐν πιττακίῳ χερσὶν ἰδίαις τὴν τε ὥραν καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν, ἐκόλλησεν αὐτὸ ἐν τῷ τῆς σεβασμίας εἰκόνης μετώπῳ καὶ κατασπασάμενος αὐτήν, καὶ ἐμβάλων ἐξ ὀρθοῦ τῇ θαλάσσει προσκλαύσας τε καὶ προσκυνήσας, τὸ τελευταῖον ἐξεβόησε: «*Ἰησοῦ ἐπιστάτα^a, σῶσον σεαυτὸν καὶ ἡμᾶς, ὅτι ἀπολλύμεθα^b*, καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ ἡμῶν παρὰ βραχὺ τῷ Ἄδῃ προσήγγισε^c», καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν, εἶχετο τῆς ἐξορίας¹⁵.

^a Luke 17:13.

^b Matt. 8:25; cf. Luke 8:24

^c Ps. 84.4

¹ οὔ, *cod.*

² πηδαλιουχοῦντος, *cod.*

³ χειροτονῆ *cod.*

⁴ πάντες, *cod.*

⁵ πολιορκήσας, *cod.*

⁶ γερσί, *cod.*

⁷ <τ>οὔ...μακάριος, *om.* vD] καὶ πρῶτον μὲν ἔσται κεφάλαιον τοῦτο, θαύματος μεγίστου ἀνάπλεον, ὅτι περ Γερμανὸς ὁ ἀγιώτατος καὶ οἰκουμενικὸς πατριάρχης, vD, 213**, 3.16-18

⁸ παρὰ... εἰκονομάχων] ὑπὸ τῶν μισοχρίστων καὶ ἀθέων εἰκονοκαστῶν, vD, 213**-214**, 3.18-3.1

⁹ τὸ δὲ τελευταῖον, vD, 213**, 3.1 ¹⁰ παραπεμφθεὶς, vD, 213**, 3.2 ¹¹ οἴκου, *om.* vD, 213**, 3.2

¹² σανίσι, *cod.*

¹³ εἰληφῶς δὲ... κατέχων] καὶ μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ εἰληφῶς τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν καὶ θεοῦ ἁγίαν εἰκόνα ἐν σανίδι ψηφίσι κεκοσμημένην κατήλθεν ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτήν, vD, 214**, 3.2-4

¹⁴ προσαγορευομένα, vD, 214**, 3.5

¹⁵ καὶ γράψας... τῆς ἐξορίας] καὶ γράψας ἐν πιττακίῳ χερσὶν οἰκείαις «διδάσκαλε, σῶσον σεαυτὸν καὶ ἡμᾶς» ἐκόλλησεν αὐτὸ ἐν τῷ τῆς εἰκόνης μετώπῳ καὶ κατασπασάμενος αὐτήν καὶ ἐμβάλων ἐξ ὀρθοῦ τῇ θαλάσσει προσκλαύσας τε καὶ προσκυνήσας εἶχετο τῆς ἐξορίας, vD, 214**, 3.5-9

2. Κατ' αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν ἡμέραν, ἐν ἧ καὶ ἀπεστάλη, ἐφάνη¹ ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ Ῥώμῃ, κατὰ τὸν ποταμὸν τὸν λεγόμενον Τιβέριον, στύλος πυρσοφαῆς διήκων² ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, διὰ πάσης τῆς νυκτός· καὶ οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τί ἦν τὸ σημεῖον καὶ τίς ἡ δήλωσις αὐτοῦ, μόνω δὲ ἐγνωρίσθη τῷ πάπα Γρηγορίῳ δι' ἀποκαλύψεως θείας. Σπεύσας οὖν αὐθις ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος, Γρηγόριος ὁ πάπας, καὶ τῆς κλίνης ταχὺ ἐξαναστὰς καὶ πανδημεὶ λιτὴν ποιήσας, τὸν ποταμὸν κατέλαβε· πορθμίους καὶ ξύλους τῶν λαῶν καλυψάντων τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ λαμπαδιφορούντων³ ἀπάντων, μύροις τε καὶ θυμιάμασι, ἅπας ὁ ἀὴρ ἐκεῖνος ἐπεπλήρωτο⁴. ὡς δὲ ἐνέβη⁵ ὁ πάπας ἐν τῷ πλοιαρίῳ κυβερνώμενος τῇ ἄνωθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ⁶ προνοίᾳ, εἶδεν αὐτὴν τὴν ἁγίαν τοῦ σωτῆρος εἰκόνα⁷ καὶ πλησίον ταύτης⁸ ἐγένετο· ἀκούσατε λοιπὸν τὸ θαυμαστὸν⁹ καὶ ἐκπλήξεως γέμον¹⁰, καὶ φρίζατε τὸ ὑπέρογκον τοῦ πράγματος¹¹.

¹ ἐφάνει, *cod.* ² διήκων, *cod.* ³ λαμπαδιφορούντων, *cod.* ⁴ κατ' αὐτὴν...ἐπεπλήρωτο, *om.* vD] ἡ δὲ τοιαύτη σεβασμία εἰκόν, ὡς φησιν ὁ ἀληθὴς λόγος, διὰ νυχθημέρου εὐρέθη ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ Ῥώμῃ, καὶ διὰ θείας ἀποκαλύψεως γνωρισθεῖσα τῷ πάπα Γρηγορίῳ τῷ πατριάρχῃ ἢ τούτου ἔλευσις καὶ παρουσία, σπεύσας ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος ἐξῆλθεν εἰς ἀπάντησιν αὐτῆς, vD, 214**.-215**, 4.10-4.1
⁵ ἀνέβη, vD, 215**, 4.2 ⁶ τοῦ θεοῦ, *ita* vD, 215**, 4.2] τούτου *cod.* ⁷ τὴν...εἰκόνα, *om.* vD, 215**, 4.3 ⁸ ταύτης, *om.* vD, 215**, 4.3 ⁹ θαυμάσιον, vD, 215**, 5.3 ¹⁰ γέμων, *cod.*
¹¹ θαύματος, vD, 215**, 5.5

3. Ὡς γὰρ μόνον|| (fol. 207^r) ὄρμησεν ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς πρὸς τὴν θαύματος¹ γέμουσαν ἀγίαν καὶ σεβάσμιον² εἰκόνα, ἐνατενίζων³ μὲν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, ἐκτείνας δὲ τὰς χεῖρας καὶ πρὸ πάντων τὴν καρδίαν, δακρύων⁴ ὄλος ἐπληροῦτο· εὐθύς δὲ καὶ παραχρῆμα⁵ ἀρθεῖσα ὑπεράνω τῶν ὑδάτων ἢ ἀγία εἰκὼν⁶, ἐναπετέθη ἐν ταῖς ἀγκάλαις τοῦ ταύτης ἀξίου λάτρου ἱσταμένου κατὰ τὸ μέσον τοῦ πλοίου· ὦ τοῦ παραδόξου θαύματος ὄντως⁷ καὶ ἐκπλήκτου⁸ πράγματος, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἀκούσματος· τίς γὰρ⁹ ἀκούων ταῦτα οὐ φρίττει καὶ γέγηθεν¹⁰ καὶ τὸν φιλόανθρωπον Θεὸν μεγάλη τῇ φωνῇ ἀνυμνήσειεν καὶ δοξάσειεν διὰ παντός¹¹; Ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἔλαττον τοῦτο, ὡς οἴμεν, τὸ παράδοξον τερατούργημα¹² ὑπάρχει Συμεῶν τοῦ¹³ θεοδόχου, ὃς ἐν ταῖς ἀγκάλαις αὐτοῦ ὑπεδέξατο τοῦτον πρότερον¹⁴ ὡς βρέφος¹⁵, τὸν τὰ¹⁶ πάντα λόγου¹⁷ κελεύσει δημιουργήσαντα, ἢ καὶ τοῦ πρὸ αὐτοῦ γενομένου Μωσέως, ὃς δακτύλῳ Θεοῦ γραφεῖσας¹⁸ πλάκας ποτὲ¹⁹ οἰκεία χειρὶ²⁰ ἐδέξατο. Τότε τοίνυν²¹ λαβὼν ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἱερεὺς²² τὸν ἅγιον καὶ ἔνδοξον χαρακτῆρα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν ταῖς ἀγκάλαις αὐτοῦ μετὰ δέους καὶ ἐκπλήξεως, καὶ ἀφελόμενος τὴν ἐπιστολὴν καὶ ἀναγνοῦς, διηγόρευεν πᾶσι τὰ ἐν τῷ Βυζαντίῳ διαπραχθέντα· καὶ γέγονέ τις βοή δακρύων σύμμικτος, κραζόντων καὶ βοώντων ἀπαύστως τὸ «κύριε ἐλέησον».²³

¹ θαυμασίαν, vD, 215**, 5.6 ² γέμουσαν...σεβάσμιον, om. vD, 215**, 5.6 ³ἐνατενίζον, cod.
⁴ γὰρ, vD, 215** ⁵ παραπὰ, vD, 215**, 5.8 ⁶ ἢ ἀγία εἰκὼν, om. vD, 215**, 5.9
⁷καὶ ἐξαισίου θαύματος, vD, 215**, 6.10-11. ⁸ἐκπλήκτου, om. vD, 215**, 6.11
⁹γὰρ, om vD, 215**, 6.11 ¹⁰γέγηθεν, ita vD, 215**, 6.12] γεγήθει cod.
¹¹ἀνυμνήσειεν καὶ δοξάσειεν διὰ παντός cod.] οὐ δοξάζει καὶ ανυμνεῖ; vD, 215**, 6.13
¹²ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἔλαττον... τερατούργημα cod.] οἴμαι τοῦτο ἀγαπητοὶ νομισθήσεται ὑπάρχειν τὸ φοβερόν
καὶ ἐκπλήκτον τερατούργημα, vD, 216**, 8.4-5 ¹³δικαίου καὶ, vD, 216**, 8.6
¹⁴ πρότερον τοῦτον ὑπεδέξατο, vD, 216**, 8.7 ¹⁵ ἐν μικρῷ βρέφει, vD, 216**, 8.7-8
¹⁶ τὰ, om. vD, 216**, 8.8 ¹⁷ λόγου, emendavi] λόγω cod., λόγω καὶ, vD, 216**, 8.8
¹⁸ γραφίσας, cod. ¹⁹ ποτὲ, om. vD, 216**, 8.10 ²⁰ χειρὶ οἰκεία, vD, 216, 8.10
²¹ οὖν, vD, 215**, 7.13 ²² ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἱερεὺς] ὁ πάπας, vD, 215**, 6.14 ²³καὶ ἀφελόμενος...
ἐλέησον, om. vD, 215**, 6.14

4. Εἴθ' οὕτως¹ δὲ ἀπάρας ἐκ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ὁ πάππας² ἅμα τοῦ πλήθους τοῦ λαοῦ μετὰ λαμπάδων καὶ ὕμνων καὶ ἀρωμάτων³ – τῶν|| (fol. 207^v) μὲν προοδοποιούντων, τῶν δὲ ἐπακολουθούντων⁴ – εἰσήνεγκαν τὸν ἅγιον χαρακτῆρα ἐκεῖνον⁵ ἐν τῷ τεμένει τοῦ ἀγίου καὶ κορυφαίου τῶν ἀποστόλων Πέτρου. Καὶ ἐκτενοῦς δεήσεως γενομένης, καὶ τῆς συνήθους δοξολογίας πέρας λαβούσης⁶, κατετέθη⁷ ἐν τῷ ἐνδοτέρῳ οἴκῳ τῶν ἱερῶν σκευῶν⁸, ἐν ᾧ καὶ μέχρι τῆς σήμερον⁹ ἐκεῖσε ἐναπόκειται, ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν πιστῶν σεβόμενόν τε¹⁰ καὶ προσκυνούμενον τοῦτο τό¹¹ ἅγιον¹² ἀπεικόνισμα διασῶζον¹³ καὶ περιφέρον¹⁴ νεαράν¹⁵ ἔτι τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς θαλάσσης νοτίδα καὶ ὑγρότητα διαμετρομένην μέχρι δακτύλων πέντε· δι' ἧς πολλαὶ ἰάσεις καὶ παντοδαπαὶ ἀεὶ ἐπιτελεῖσθαι οὐ διαλειπάνουσι¹⁶. Αἰσχυνέσθωσαν λοιπὸν¹⁷ καὶ ἐκλειπέτωσαν¹⁸ ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς οἱ μὴ σεβόμενοι ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας καὶ προσκυνοῦντες ἐκ ψυχῆς τὴν ἁγίαν καὶ σεβάσιμον¹⁹ εἰκόνα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῆς πανάγου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας, τῆς τοῦτον κατὰ σάρκα τεκούσης καὶ πάντων αὐτοῦ τῶν ἁγίων· ἔστωσαν δὲ καὶ ἀλλότριοι²⁰ τῆς τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείας, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐφ' ἑτέρου θαύματος διήγησιν τὸν λόγον τρέψομεν.

¹ εἴθ' οὕτως, *om.* vD, 215**, 7.15 ² ὁ πάππας, *om.* vD, 215**, 7.15 ³ πλήθους αρωμάτων, vD, 215**, 7.17 ⁴ τῶν μὲν ...ἐπακολουθούντων, *om.* vD, 215**, 7.18 ⁵ τον... ἐκεῖνον] αὐτὸν, vD, 215**, 7.18 ⁶ παραλαβούσης, vD, 215**, 7.20 ⁷ ὁ ἅγιος καὶ πολυόλβος θησαυρὸς, *add.* vD, 215**, 7.20-21 ⁸ ἔνθα καὶ τὰ ἅγια τῆς θείας λειτουργίας ἐναπόκεινται σκεύη, vD, 215**, 7.22-23
⁹ δεῦρο, vD, 215**, 7.23 ¹⁰ σεβαζόμενον, vD, 216**, 7.1 ¹¹ το τοιοῦτον, vD, 216**, 7.1
¹² καὶ σεβάσιμον, vD, 216**, 7.2 ¹³ διασῶζον, *cod.* ¹⁴ περιφέρων, *cod.* ¹⁵ νοεράν, vD, 216**, 7.3 ¹⁶ δι' ἧς... διαλειπάνουσι (*cod.*), *om.* vD, 216**, 8.10 ¹⁷ τοίνυν, vD, 216**, 9.10
¹⁸ μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἀπολέσθωσαν, vD, 216**, 9.11 ¹⁹ σεβασμίαν, vD, 216**, 9.13
²⁰ δὲ ἀλλότριοι καὶ, vD, 216**, 9.16

II

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, despotically 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 Kyzikos 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 Atramyttion, 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: τῆ τῶν ἀρειανικῶν φρενῶν φενακιζόμενος ἀπάτη, τοὺς προβόλους καὶ στυλοὺς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν κατασείσας κατέρραξε. 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

down to the so-called *of Amantios* sea-shore,⁷ 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."⁸ 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.

⁷ The *Amantiou* 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.

⁸ 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, transfixed [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-receiver¹⁰ 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.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 *kyrie eleison* incessantly.

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.

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.¹² 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,¹³ 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 Encyclopædia 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 Tours³ 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.⁸ 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 Χριστιανούς, μετὰ Ἀθανασίου καὶ Κυρίλλου, περὶ σταυροῦ καὶ εἰκόνων*”, a christian text refuting the “Judaic” arguments against icon worship,⁹ to the first Iconoclasm, rather than to the second as was generally accepted.¹⁰ 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,¹¹ 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.¹² 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 204^v – 205^v)

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.

⁹ Even though Andrist established that it was addressed to Christians rather than Jews, see Patrick Andrist, “Les Objections des Hébreux : Un Document du premier Iconoclasme?”, *REB* 57 (1999), 99.

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 ἀνάμνησιν βουλόμενος ὑμῖν διηγῆσασθαι ποθεινότατοι ἀδελφοί, ἀγωνία καὶ φόβῳ συνέχομαι μὴ δυνάμενος κατ' ἀξίαν ἐκφράσαι τὸ παρ' ὑμῶν¹ || (fol. 208^r) προτεθὲν πρόβλημα, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο παρακαλῶ πάντας ὑμᾶς τοῦ συνεύξασθαι μοι, καὶ τὰς ἀκοὰς ὑμῶν ὑφαπλώσατε πιστῶς καὶ ἀκούσατε².

Ἐν τῷ τεμένει τῆς ἀγίας καὶ μεγάλης τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας κατὰ τὴν πύλην τὴν ἀποβλέπουσαν καὶ φέρουσαν πρὸς τὸ ἀνατολικὸν³ μέρος, ἐν ᾧ καὶ οἱ τίμιοι καὶ ζωοποιοί⁴ σταυροὶ ἔνθεν κάκειθεν ἔξωθεν τῆς αὐτῆς⁵ πύλης ἀπηρωρημένοι⁶ ἐν Προκοννησίαις πλαξί⁷ ἀχειρότευκτοι ἴστανται⁸, παράδοξον κατὰ τὴν ἐκεῖσε πάροδον δεικνύντες⁹ πᾶσιν ἐκπληξιν, προσκυνούμενοί τε καὶ σεβαζόμενοι παρὰ πάντων τῶν πιστῶν¹⁰. Ἐνδοθεν τούτων¹¹ ὑπάρχει καὶ προσαγορεύεται τὸ ἅγιον ἐκεῖνο καὶ θαυματόβρυτον φρέαρ, διὰ τὸ τὴν πηγὴν τῆς σοφίας, τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, ἐν αὐτῷ καταψύξαι καὶ τὸν τῆς ὁδοιπορίας ἀπώσασθαι κόπον, ἐν ᾧ καὶ τῇ Σαμαρείτιδι τὰ τῆς γνώσεως καὶ σοφίας προσωμίλησεν¹² ἀπόρρητα.

¹ ἡμῶν, *cod.* ² <Δ>εσποτικῶν καὶ... καὶ ἀκούσατε, *om.* vD, 216**, 1.20 ³ ἐξῶν, vD, 217**, 1.1
⁴ θαυμαστοὶ, vD, 217**, 1.1 ⁵ τῆς αὐτοῦ, vD, 217**, 1.2 ⁶ ἀπηρωρισμένοι, vD, 217**, 1.2
⁷ πλαξίν, vD, 217**, 1.3 ⁸ εἴστανται, *cod.*, ἴστανται, vD, 217**, 1.3 ⁹ δεικνύοντες, vD, 217**, 1.4
¹⁰ παρὰ...πιστῶν, *om.* vD, 217**, 1.5 ¹¹ τούτων, *om.* vD, 217**, 1.5 ¹² προσωμίλησεν, *cod.*

2. Ἐν τούτῳ τοίνυν τῷ σεβασμίῳ καὶ προσκυνητῷ¹ τόπῳ καὶ τῆς τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν καὶ Θεοῦ τιμίας καὶ ἀγίας εἰκόνας ἐν σανίδι μετεώρῳ² ἀναστηλωμένης³ πρὸς ἀνατολάς, Ἰουδαῖός τις πολλάκις διερχόμενος διὰ⁴ τῶν ἐκεῖσε – πάροδος γάρ ἐστι – βλέπων τὸ ἅγιον καὶ σεβάσιμον ἐκεῖνο⁵ ἀπεικόνισμα σεβαζόμενόν τε καὶ προσκυνούμενον ὑπὸ πάντων⁶ τῶν πιστῶν, δαχθεῖς⁷ τε τὴν καρδίαν ὁ δεῖλαιος ταῖς τοῦ πονηροῦ δαίμονος ἀκίσι, καὶ μὴ μελλήσας, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον βουλευσάμενος ὁ ἄθλιος βουλὴν ἄθεον καὶ ἀλλόκοτον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, ἐν μιᾷ οὖν τῶν ἡμερῶν διὰ τοῦ τόπου ἐκεῖνου διερχόμενος|| (fol. 208^v) ὁ θεοστυγῆς ἐκεῖνος Ἰουδαῖος⁸, εὐρὼν ἄδειαν καὶ λαθῶν ἅπαντας,⁹ ἀράμενος¹⁰ μάχαιραν ὁ δύστηνος¹¹, ἐνέπειρεν¹² αὐτὴν μέσον τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν¹³ ἀγίας¹⁴ εἰκόνας, καὶ παραχρῆμα¹⁵, ὡς τοῦ φοβεροῦ καὶ ἐξαισίου θαύματος τε καὶ πράγματος¹⁶, ἔβλυσεν αἷμα τίμιον ἐκεῖθεν, καὶ κατέρρανε¹⁷ τὸν τοῦ παρανόμου Ἰουδαίου χιτῶνα· τί εἶπω καὶ¹⁸ τί λαλήσω, ὦ Χριστέ καὶ Θεέ μου, ὅσα καὶ οἷα ὑποφέρεις παρὰ τῶν ἀγνωμόνων Ἰουδαίων καθ’ ἐκάστην¹⁹. καὶ οὐ μόνον παρ’ αὐτῶν²⁰, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρ’ ἡμῶν τῶν σὲ καθ’ ἐκάστην²¹ παροργιζόντων διὰ τῶν ἀτόπων πράξεων καὶ ἔργων ἡμῶν²². Ὁ δὲ ἄθεος²³ καὶ παράνομος οὗτος Ἰουδαῖος ὑπὸ τοῦ δέους καὶ τοῦ φόβου τοῦ μεγίστου²⁴ θαύματος ἰλιγγιάσας καὶ ἐξαπορηθεὶς δραξάμενός τε τῆς ἀγίας καὶ σεβασμίας²⁵ εἰκόνας ἐκεῖνης²⁶ καὶ κατασπάσας αὐτὴν ἄνωθεν, ἔρριψε ταύτην²⁷ ἔνδον τοῦ ἀγίου²⁸ φρέατος, αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ ἀλητήριος²⁹, φυγὰς ὄχγετο.

¹ σεβασμίῳ καὶ προσκυνητῷ, *om.* vD, 217**, 2.10 ² ἐν σανίδῃ μετεώρῳ, *cod.*] ἐμμετεώρῳ, vD, 217**, 2.11 ³ ἀνεστηλωμένης, vD, 217**, 2.11 ⁴ διὰ, *om.* vD, 217**, 2.12
⁵ βλέπων τὸ ἅγιον καὶ σεβάσιμον ἐκεῖνο] καὶ βλέπων το θεῖον ἐκεῖνο καὶ ἅγιον, vD, 217**, 2.13
⁶ πάντων, *om.* vD, 217**, 2.14 ⁷ δηχθεῖς, vD, 217**, 2.15 ⁸ ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον βουλευσάμενος ... εὐρὼν] ἀλλὰ βουλευσάμενος βουλὴν ἄθεσμον καὶ ἀλλόκοτον καὶ οἷαν ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ ὁ διάβολος ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ἐνέσπειρεν, εὐρὼν, vD, 218**, 2.1-3 ⁹ πάντα, vD, 218**, 2.3 ¹⁰ εὐράμενός τε, vD, 218**, 2.3-4 ¹¹ ὁ δύστηνος, *om.* vD, 218**, 2.4 ¹² ἔπηξεν, vD, 218**, 2.4 ¹³ καὶ θεοῦ ἡμῶν, *om.* vD, 218**, 2.4 ¹⁴ ἐκεῖνης ἀγίας, vD, 218**, 2.4 ¹⁵ παρὰ χρῆμα *cod.*] παραντίκα, vD, 218**, 2.5
¹⁶ ὡς...πράγματος, *om.* vD, 218**, 2.5 ¹⁷ κατέρρανε, vD, 218**, 2.6 ¹⁸ ἦ, vD, 218**, 3.6
¹⁹ ὅσα καὶ... καθ’ ἐκάστην] ὅσα καὶ οἷα τα παρὰ τῶν ἀχαρίστων καὶ θεοκτόνων Ἰουδαίων ὑποφέρεις καθ’ ἐκάστην, vD, 218**, 3.7-8 ²⁰ παρὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, vD, 218**, 3.9 ²¹ καθ’ ἐκάστην, *om.* vD, 218**, 3.10 ²² παροργιζόντων... ἡμῶν] παροργιζόντων καὶ μὴ ἐμμενόντων ταῖς θεῖαις ἐντολαῖς σου; vD, 218**, 3.10-11 ²³ ἄθεος, *om.* vD, 218**, 4.11 ²⁴ καὶ τοῦ...μεγίστου, *om.* vD, 218**, 4.11 ²⁵ καὶ σεβασμίας, *om.* vD, 218**, 4.12 ²⁶ ἐκεῖνης, *om.* vD, 218**, 4.13 ²⁷ ταύτην, *om.* vD, 218**, 4.13 ²⁸ ἀγίου, *om.* vD, 218**, 4.14 ²⁹ ὁ ἀλητήριος, *om.* vD, 218**, 4.14

3. Ὡς δὲ ἐγνώσθη ὁ ἐπάρατος¹ καὶ θεοστυγῆς² Ἰουδαῖος παρὰ τῶν παροδευόντων χριστιανῶν φεύγων ἐν σπουδῇ³, καὶ τὰ τῶν ἁγίων αἱμάτων ἐκείνων λείψανα⁴ φέρων ἐν τῷ χιτῶνι, ἐφωράθη⁵, τοῦτέστιν⁶ ἐνομίσθη, ὡς φονεύς· καὶ κρατηθεὶς παρ' αὐτῶν, ἀπηλέγχετο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος⁷. Ὅθεν⁸, ἀναγκασθεὶς ὁ δεῖλαιος⁹ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐκεῖσε συνδραμόντος ὄχλου, ἐφανέρωσε, καὶ μὴ βουλόμενος, ὅπερ ἔδρασεν ἀτόπημα¹⁰, καί· «Εἰ ἀπιστεῖτε», φησὶν ὁ Ἰουδαῖος¹¹, «ἴδε καὶ ἡ εἰκὼν ἔνδοθεν ὑπάρχει τοῦ φρέατος». Εὐθέως οὖν ἀνάψαντες λαμπάδας¹² καὶ ἀνελόμενοι¹³ αὐτὴν ἐκεῖθεν εἶδον ξένον καὶ ἀπόρρητον θαῦμα, τὴν μάχαιραν ἐμπεπαρμένην¹⁴ (fol. 209^r) τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ σεβασμίᾳ¹⁵ εἰκόνι, αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν σεβασμίαν¹⁶ εἰκόνα ἔτι βλύζουσαν αἷμα θεῖον.

Τοῦτο τοίνυν τὸ μέγα καὶ¹⁷ παράδοξον καὶ ὑπερανεστηκὸς¹⁸ τῶν ἄλλων σημείων καὶ τεράτων τοὺς μὲν πιστοὺς¹⁹ εἰς χαρὰν καὶ εὐφροσύνην²⁰ μετέβαλεν καὶ²¹ τοὺς ἀμφιβόλους ἐβεβαίωσεν, τοὺς δὲ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐχθροὺς καὶ ματαιόφρονας²² κατήσχυνεν καὶ τῇ ἀπωλείᾳ παρέδωκε. Τούτου δὲ τοῦ μεγίστου θαύματος παντοῦ διαφημισθέντος²³, ἣν ιδέσθαι ποταμηδὸν²⁴ τὰ πλήθη τῶν λαῶν ἐπιρρέοντα τῷ τόπῳ ἐκείνῳ· σχεδὸν γὰρ πᾶσα ἡ πόλις, ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ ἡ περίχωρος²⁵, ἅπασα ἐκενώθη τῶν οἰκητόρων, θαυμάζοντες καὶ ἐκπληττόμενοι τὴν μεγαλοπρέπειαν καὶ ὑπερβολὴν τοῦ τοιούτου παραδόξου καὶ ἐξαισίου θαύματος· τίνα γὰρ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τοῦτο οὐκ ἐξέπληξεν καὶ εἰς ἔρωτα καὶ θάμβος²⁶ ἐνήλασεν, ὀρῶντας ἐκ τῆς νεκρᾶς καὶ ἀψύχου εἰκόνοσ ἀἷμα γεόμενον ἀείζων; Τοιγαροῦν ὅσοι δαιμονιῶντες καὶ πεπηρωμένοι τὰς ὄψεις καὶ χωλοὶ τὰς βάσεις καὶ πυρετιῶντες τῷ σώματι καὶ λεπροὶ²⁷ ταῖς σαρκὶ καὶ ἑτέροις λοιποῖς συνεχόμενοι νοσήμασι, προσήρχοντο τῷ ἁγίῳ ἐκείνῳ χαρακτηρι τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, καὶ τῷ θείῳ λύθρῳ τοῦ ἁγίου ἐκείνου αἵματος χριώμενοι τῆς ὑγιείας αὐτῶν ἕκαστος παραχρῆμα²⁸ ἀπέλαυεν, δοξάζοντες καὶ εὐχαριστοῦντες ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοις τὸν ἀπειροδύναμον καὶ φιλόανθρωπον Θεὸν ἡμῶν²⁹.

¹ ὁ ἄθλιος, vD, 218**, 4.14 ² καὶ θεοστυγῆς om. vD, 218**, 4.14 ³ ἐν σπουδῇ, om. vD, 218**, 4.15 ⁴ τὰ τῶν ἁγίων... λείψανα] τὰ λείψανα τοῦ αἵματος, vD, 218**, 4.15-16
⁵ ἐφωράθη, cod. ⁶ ἐφωράθη· τοῦτέστιν, om. vD, 218**, 4.16 ⁷ καὶ κρατηθεὶς... αἵματος] καὶ κρατηθεὶς ἀπηλέγχετο, vD, 218**, 4.16-17 ⁸ Ὅθεν, om. vD, 218**, 4.17 ⁹ ὁ δεῖλαιος, om. vD, 218**, 4.17 ¹⁰ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐκεῖσε... ἀτόπημα] ἀναγκασθεὶς δε, ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐκεῖσε συνδραμόντος θεοσεβοῦς ὄχλου ἐφανέρωσεν ὅπερ ἔδρασεν τολμηρόν, vD, 218**-219**, 4.17-1 ¹¹ ὁ ἰουδαῖος, om. vD, 219**, 4.2 ¹² λαμπάδας ἀνάψαντες, vD, 219**, 5.3 ¹³ ἀνελόμενοι, cod.
¹⁴ ἐμπεπηγμένην, vD, 219**, 5.3-4 ¹⁵ ἁγία καὶ σεβασμία, om. vD, 219**, 5.5 ¹⁶ αὐτὴν... σεβασμίαν, om. vD, 219**, 5.5 ¹⁷ τοίνυν...καί, om. vD, 219**, 5.6 ¹⁸ ὑπερανεστηκὸς, cod. ¹⁹ τοὺς πιστοὺς μὲν, vD, 219**, 5.7 ²⁰ καὶ εὐφροσύνην, om. vD, 219**, 5.7
²¹ καί, om. vD, 219**, 5.7 ²² ματαιοφρονοῦντας, vD, 219**, 5.9 ²³ διαδημισθέντος, cod. ²⁴ ποταμηδὸν cod. ²⁵ περίχωρος cod. ²⁶ θάμβος, cod. ²⁷ λαιπροὶ, cod.
²⁸ παρὰ χρῆμα, cod. ²⁹ τοῦτο...θεὸν ἡμῶν, om. vD

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.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;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 (τῆ καρδία πηζόμενος), something which could also be inferred from the phrasing here, see *The Letter of the Three Patriarchs*, in Munitiz 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.⁸ 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 referring 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 Theophilus*. 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.

² Raymond Janin, *Les églises et les monastères*, (Paris, 1953), 214.

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 precedes 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 *Διήγησις* 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.⁸ 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.⁹ 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.¹⁰ 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 Constanteia 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-witnesses.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.”¹² A version of this story,¹³ is attested also in John Moschos’ *Pratum Spirituale*, dating to the early 7th century.¹⁴ 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 persecutors. 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*.¹⁵ A priest preparing the *prospora* gouges out the right eye of St Andrew with his lance.¹⁶ His own right eye then immediately falls out with a plop (κλοῦς), and takes the place of the icon’s missing one.¹⁷ 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 intervention¹⁸ 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...”, lviii and John Moschos, *Pratum spirituale* 47, PG 87. 3, col. 2901C-D (BHG 1076c).

¹⁵ Walter, “Iconographical...”, lviii, 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 *prospora* 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-lxiii, 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 1.1., 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 204^v – 205^v)

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. 209^v) <N>αός τις ὑπάρχει περικαλλῆς καὶ σεβάσμιος¹, τῆς ἀγίας ὑπερενδόξου καὶ πανυμνήτου θεομήτορος, μονασταῖς προσανατεθειμένος², καὶ σεμνεῖον μοναζουσῶν εἶναι ἀφορισμένον³, ὃν οἱ τῆς βασιλίδος περίοικοι ἀστικοὶ τε καὶ ἀγρόται⁴, Ὁδηγοὺς πατρίως προσαγορεύειν εἰώθασι. Ἐφ' ὃν <εἰσπορευομένῳ> κατὰ⁵ τὸ εὐάνυμον μέρος, ἀφωρισμένη⁶ ταῖς γυναξὶ στάσις ἀπονενέμηται, καθ' ἣν συνιοῦσαι, τῆς θείας ὑμνωδίας καὶ μεταλήψεως μετέχειν εἰώθασι. Ἐν ταύτῃ τοίνυν τῇ γυναικεῖα στάσει⁷, ἱερὸς καὶ θεῖος χαρακτήρ τῆς ἀχράντου καὶ θεομήτορος ἐξεικονίζεται, ἀγκάλαις φερούσης τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς ἐξ αὐτῆς σαρκωθέντα⁸, Χριστὸν τὸν ἀληθινὸν⁹ Θεὸν ἡμῶν, οὐ πρὸς τέλειον καὶ ποδῆρες σκῆνος παρατεινόμενον τὸ ἅγιον ἐκεῖνο καὶ ἱερὸν¹⁰ ἐκτύπωμα, μέχρι δὲ τοῦ στήθους σκιογραφούμενον¹¹. Τοῦτο οἱ τὸν αὐτὸν ναὸν καθυπηρετοῦντες τὸ του τυράννου Λέοντος δεδιότες¹² ἀνηλεῆς καὶ ἀπάνθρωπον¹³ πρόσταγμα, ὡς δὴ τι εὐσεβέστερον δυσσεβεῖν λογιζόμενοι, ὀθόνη περικαλύψαντες¹⁴ καὶ ἥλοις ἐκατέρωθεν προσπήξαντες, ἀσβέστω ἐφύπερθεν¹⁵ καταπλάσαντες, ἐπεκονίασαν¹⁶, ἀφανῆ δῆθεν διὰ τῆς φαινομένης ἐπαλειφῆς¹⁷ ἀπεργασάμενοι ὡς τέλειον¹⁸ αὐτὸν ἐξαφανισθῆναι πᾶσι δοκῆ.

¹ Ναός τις ἐστὶ σεβάσμιος καὶ περικαλλῆς, vD, 221**, 1.9 ² προσανατιθέμενος, *cod.* ³ καὶ... ἀφορισμένον, om vD, 221**, 1.11 ⁴ ἀγρόται, *cod.* ⁵ ἐφ' ὃν κατὰ] ἐφ' ὃν εἰσπορευομένῳ κατὰ, vD, 221**, 1.12-13 ⁶ ἀφορισμένη *cod.* ⁷ τοίνυν... στάσει, om vD**, 221, 1.12 ⁸ ἱερὸς καὶ θεῖος χαρακτήρ... ἐξ αὐτῆς σαρκωθέντα] τῆς παναχράντου θεοκλήτορος ἱερὸς χαρακτήρ ἐξεικονίζεται ἀγκάλαις τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς ἐξ αὐτῆς ἐνανθρωπήσαντα φερούσης, vD, 221**, 1.15-17 ⁹ ἀληθινόν, om vD, 221**, 1.17 ¹⁰ τὸ ἅγιον καὶ ἱερὸν ἐκεῖνο, vD, 221**, 1.18-19 ¹¹ μέχρι... σκιογραφούμενον, om vD, 221**, 1.19 ¹² δεδειώτες, *cod.* ¹³ καὶ ἀπάνθρωπον, om vD, 221**, 2.20 ¹⁴ ὑφαπλώσαντες, vD, 221**, 2.22 ¹⁵ ὑπερθεν, vD, 221**, 2.23 ¹⁶ ἀπεκονίασαν, vD, 221**, 2.23 ¹⁷ ἀλειφῆς, vD, 222**, 2.1 ¹⁸ τέλειον, *cod.*

2. Ὅθεν, τούτου γενομένου καί¹ ἐφ' ἱκανὰς ἡμέρας² τοῦ ἁγίου συγκεκαλυμμένου³ ὁμοιώματος τῆς θεομήτορος⁴, ἐξάπινα τῆς κεκονιαμένης⁵ ἀσβέστου καταπεσούσης⁶ καὶ τῆς || (fol. 210^r) ὑφαπλουμένης⁷ ὀθόνης ἀφαιρεθείσης, εἴτε θεία δυνάμει, εἴτε καὶ⁸ ἀνθρωπεία⁹ χειρί, ὁ Θεὸς οἶδε μόνος¹⁰, ὅμως, ἐπειδὴ ἀμφίβολον τὸ γεγονός καὶ λέγειν οὐκ ἔχω, εἰ καὶ πολλοῖς θεῖον εἶναι¹¹ ἔδοξε τὸ πραχθέν, ἡ ἀγία καὶ σεβασμία τῆς θεομήτορος¹² εἰκὼν ἀνεκαλύφθη πᾶσι εἰς τοῦμφανές¹³ προκειμένη καὶ θεωμένη¹⁴. Ταύτην¹⁵ γυνή τις προσπελάσασα δυσσεβῆς καὶ κατάπτυστος, εἰ καὶ πρὸς εὐσέβειαν μετέπειτα μετενήνεκται, Ἄννα τοῦνομα – λεγέσθω γὰρ καὶ ἡ κλῆσις, εἰς βεβαίαν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπόδειξιν¹⁶ – ἀνακεκαλυμμένον τὸν θεῖον καὶ ἅγιον¹⁷ χαρακτῆρα θεασαμένη¹⁸, <θ>υμοῦ¹⁹ πολλοῦ πλησθεῖσα ἡ ἀσύνητος²⁰ καὶ λίαν ἐμμανῆς καταστᾶσα, ὕβρεσι κατεβλασφήμει καὶ ὀνειδέσιν ἔβαλλε «Τῆς ἐλληνικῆς εἰδωλολατρείας» βοῶσα ἡ ἀθλία²¹, «πάλιν ἀνακαλυπτομένης», εἴτα καὶ ἕτερα πολλὰ²² ἐπειποῦσα, ἃ γυναιξὶ παροινούσαις καὶ παρανομούσαις ληρωδεῖν²³ ἔνεστι, μὴ οἷα τε οὔσα ἐπισχεῖν ἡ τάλαινα²⁴ τὴν τῆς δυσσεβείας ὀρμήν, ἣν περιέφερε χερσὶν ἐπιλαβομένη²⁵ μάχαιραν, κατὰ τῆς θείας καὶ²⁶ σωτηρίου εἰκόνας Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν μανικώτερον²⁷ ἐκέντησεν²⁸ καθυβρίζουσα καὶ τὸν εὐώνυμον ὀργίλως²⁹ ἐξώρυξεν ὀφθαλμόν.

¹ ὅθεν... καί, *om.* vD, 222**, 3.2 ² *post* ἐφ' ἱκανὰς *add.* τε vD, 222**, 3.2 ³ *post* τοῦ ἁγίου *add.* καὶ σεβασμίου vD, 222**, 3.2-3 ⁴ τῆς θεομήτορος, *om.* vD, 222**, 3.3 ⁵ ἐπικεκονιαμένης, vD, 222**, 3.3-4 ⁶ ἀποπεσούσης, vD, 222**, 3.4 ⁷ ὑφ' ἀπλουμένης *cod.*, ἐφηπλωμένης, vD, 222**, 3.4 ⁸ καί, *om.* vD, 222**, 3.5 ⁹ ἀνθρωπίνη, vD, 222**, 3.5 ¹⁰ ὁ θεός... μόνος, *om.* vD, 222**, 3.5 ¹¹ εἶναι, *om.* vD, 222**, 3.7 ¹² θεομήτερος *cod.* ¹³ τὸ ἐμφανές, vD, 222**, 3.9 ¹⁴ θεωμένη *cod.* ¹⁵ ταύτη, vD, 222**, 4.9 ¹⁶ εἰς... ἀπόδειξιν, *om.* vD, 222**, 3.5 ¹⁷ καὶ ἅγιον, *om.* vD, 222**, 4.12 ¹⁸ τεθεαμένη, vD, 222**, 4.12 ¹⁹ θυμοῦ, *emendavi*] υμοῦ *cod.* ²⁰ ἡ ταλαίπωρος, vD, 222**, 4.13-14 ²¹ ἡ ἀθλία, *om.* vD, 222**, 4.14 ²² τινα, vD, 222**, 4.15 ²³ ληρωδεῖν, *cod.* ²⁴ ἡ τάλαινα, *om.* vD, 222**, 4.17 ²⁵ ἐπανελομένη, vD, 222**, 4.18 ²⁶ τῆς θείας καί, *om.* vD, 222**, 4.14 ²⁷ μανικώτερον, *cod.* ²⁸ ἐκέντησεν *cod.* ²⁹ ὀργύλος, *cod.*

3. Καὶ δὴ, ἔτι τῆς δεινῆς καὶ ἀσεβεστάτης βλασφημίας οὔσης ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῆς¹, καὶ ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀνέβη ἐπ’ αὐτήν^a, ψαλμικῶς φάναι. Τὸ γὰρ περιταπτόμενον χιτῶνιον τοῦ εὐωνύμου αὐτῆς ὀφθαλμοῦ, ὡσπερ διὰ ξίφους αὐτίκα, οὕτως διερράγη², καθ’ οὗ τὴν παράνομον χεῖρα ἢ τάλαινα ἐξώπλισεν³, ὡς αἰσθομένην του ἄλλου|| (fol. 210^v) αὐτίκα ἐπιστυγνᾶσαι. Εἶτά τε δακρυροεῖν ἀρξαμένου⁴, οὐ πρότερον εἰς τὰ οἰκεῖα ἐπανῆλθεν, μέχρις ἂν ἅπαν τὸ ὀπτικὸν τοῦ εὐωνύμου αὐτῆς ὀφθαλμοῦ ἐναπεσβέσθη⁵, ὥστε⁶ μονόφθαλμον καὶ παράσημον αὐτήν⁷ οἴκαδε ἐπανιέναι, δικαίᾳ κρίσει καὶ⁸ ψήφῳ τὴν ἀμοιβὴν ἀνταπολαβοῦσα ἢ ἀθλία καὶ ταλαίπωρος⁹, καὶ γὰρ κατὰ τοῦ εὐωνύμου τῆς ἀγίας καὶ χριστομόρφου εἰκόνας τολμηρὰς χεῖρας ἐξωπλίσασα¹⁰ ἢ παλαμναία, παρευθὺ καὶ αὐτὴ ἢ δύστηνος¹¹ τὸν εὐώνυμον αὐτῆς ὀφθαλμὸν ἀπέβαλε¹², ἀνάγραπτον καὶ ζῶσαν στήλην τῆς δυσσεβείας αὐτῆς θριαμβεύουσα ἢ ἀθλία¹³. Οὕτω τε τὸν ἐπίλοιπον αὐτῆς¹⁴ διαβιοῦσα χρόνον καὶ τῷ ἐνὶ ὀφθαλμῷ περιοῦσα, ἐμφανῶς πᾶσιν ἐκήρυττεν τῆς βλασφημίας τὸ τόλμημα, διδασκαλίαν¹⁵ προβαλλομένη τὴν πῆρῳσιν¹⁶ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ¹⁷, ἣν εἴληφε τῆς βλασφημίας ἀντίδοσιν¹⁸. Ὅσῳ δὲ¹⁹ ἢ θεία καὶ σωτήριος²⁰ Χάρις τὸν ἐκτὸς αὐτῆς²¹ ὀφθαλμὸν ἐξετύφλωσεν, κατὰ τοσοῦτον μᾶλλον τὸν ἐντὸς ἀπεκάλυψε²², ὡς, ἀποβαλοῦσαν τὴν δεινὴν καὶ πονηρὰν²³ βλασφημίαν, ἀνακηρύττειν τὴν καλλίστην καὶ θείαν²⁴ σωτηρίαν, καὶ ἄλλους πολλοὺς ὀδηγεῖν²⁵ πρὸς εὐσέβειαν, καὶ ἐν δάκρυσιν καὶ θρήνοις²⁶ ἐξαγγέλλειν τὴν δυσσεβείαν ἅπασαν. Ἀλλ’ οὖν τὰ περὶ αὐτῆς ἰκανῶς εἰρηῆσθαι νομίσαντες, ἐφ’ ἐτέραν θεοσημείαν καὶ καλλίστην διήγησιν²⁷ τὸν λόγον τρέψομεν²⁸:

^a Ps. 77.31

¹ Καὶ δὴ... στόματι αὐτῆς] Καὶ ἔτι τῆς ἀσεβεστάτης ἐγχειρήσεως καὶ βλασφημίας οὔσης ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῆς, vD, 222**, 5.20-21 ² τὸ γὰρ περιταπτόμενον... διερράγη] τὸ γὰρ περιτεταμμένον χιτῶνιον τοῦ εὐωνύμου αὐτῆς ὡς διὰ ξίφους αὐτίκα διερράγη ὀφθαλμοῦ, vD, 222**, 5.23-24 ³ ἐξώπλισεν cod. ⁴ εἶτα... ἀρξαμένου] εἶτά τε δακρυροεῖν καὶ διαρρεῖν ἀρξαμένου, vD, 222**, 5.26 ⁵ ἐναπεσβέσθη, om. vD, 222**, 5.28 (lacuna) ⁶ ὥστε] ὡς vD, 222**, 5.28 ⁷ καὶ παράσημον αὐτήν, om. vD, 222**, 5.28 ⁸ κρίσει καὶ, om. vD, 222**, 5.29 ⁹ ἢ ἀθλία καὶ ταλαίπωρος, om. vD, 222**, 5.29 ¹⁰ ἐξωπλίσασα cod. ¹¹ δύστηνος cod. ¹² καὶ γὰρ κατὰ τοῦ... ὀφθαλμὸν ἀπέβαλε] ὡς γὰρ κατὰ τοῦ εὐωνύμου τῆς χριστομόρφου εἰκόνας χεῖρας ἐξώπλισεν. τὸν εὐώνυμον αὐτῆς ἀπέβαλεν ὀφθαλμὸν vD, 222**, 6.29-31 ¹³ αὐτῆς θριαμβεύουσα (cod.) ἢ ἀθλία] ἑαυτήν ἢ ἀθλία θριαμβεύουσα, vD, 223**, 6.1 ¹⁴ τῆς ζωῆς, vD, 223**, 6.2 ¹⁵ διδασκαλείαν cod. ¹⁶ πείρῳσιν, vD, 223**, 6.4 ¹⁷ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ, om. vD, 223**, 6.4 ¹⁸ ἀντίδοσιν, cod. ¹⁹ γὰρ, vD, 223**, 6.5 ²⁰ καὶ σωτήριος, om. vD, 223**, 6.5 ²¹ αὐτῆς, om. vD, 223**, 6.5 ²² ἀνεκάλυψεν, vD, 223**, 6.6 ²³ δεινὴν καὶ πονηρὰν, om. vD, 223**, 6.7 ²⁴ καλλίστην καὶ θείαν, om. vD, 223**, 6.7 ²⁵ ὀδηγεῖν cod. ²⁶ καὶ ἐν δάκρυσιν καὶ θρήνοις] καὶ θρόνοις, vD, 223**, 6.8 ²⁷ καὶ καλλίστην διήγησιν, om. vD, 223**, 6.11 ²⁸ τραπώμεθα, vD, 223**, 6.11

IV

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 Unfiled 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 *ton Hodegon*, otherwise called *tes 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 (*ὁδηγοί*) 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 Nicomedie*, AB 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.⁷ Now some woman, impious and abominable,⁸ 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 –⁹ 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 drunkenness 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.¹⁰

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 δυσσεβῆς τῶν εἰκονοκαστῶν 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 εἶχεν ἑπωνυμίαν*, *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 judgmet 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.

2.5 Synesios *lithoxoos*

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 refernece to Spektas is of great value for two reasons. First of all, it provides us with more information on an otherwise underepresented, 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.¹ In the aforementioned *Vita*, we are indeed informed that he was a senator, one of the two Leo the Armenian gathers around himself

¹ *PmbZ*2.1, #3251.

to enforce his iconoclast policies.² In the *Vita* of Nikephorus I of Constantinople, his name is referred to as one of “the best examples” of the threat of Iconoclasm.³ 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.’⁴ 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.⁵

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 211^r – 212^v)

² The latest edition of St. Niketas’ life can be found in the doctoral dissertation of Όλγα Π. Κουσουρή, «Έπιτάφιος εἰς τόν ὄσιον πατέρα ἡμῶν καί ὁμολογητήν Νικήταν συγγραφείς ὑπό Θεοσηρίκτου, μαθητοῦ αὐτοῦ μακαριωτάτου» (*BHG* 1341), (Ioannina, 2016); on Spektas see 40, 49, 134.

³ See Carl de Boor, *Nicephori Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani*, *Opuscula Historica* (Leipzig 1880, repr. New York 1975), 209 and Alice-Mary Talbot (ed.), *Byzantine Defenders of Images: Eight Saints’ Lives in English Translation* (Byzantine Saints’ Lives in Translation, 2.), (Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, Washington, DC, 1998), 129.

⁴ Alexander, *The Patriarch Nicephorus*, 126-128.

⁵ For more, see fn. 6, 22.

Ε΄

1. (fol. 211^r) <Π>ρὸς τῇ δημοσίᾳ λεωφόρῳ¹ τῶν Λαύσου ἐχόμενα τῆς συνεγγιζούσης ἵπποδρομίας, ναὸς ἴδρυται τῆς ἀγίας καὶ καλλινίκου μάρτυρος Εὐφημίας, τῆς ἐπονομαζομένης² πανευφήμου. Ἐφ' οὗ ἐν τοῖς ἀρκτώοις μέρεσι πρὸς ἀνατολήν, οἶκος ἕτερος συγκατεσκευάστο προσπεπλασμένος, φέρων καὶ κατὰ μέσον λάρνακα ἐστῶσαν μεγίστην, ἐν ἧ καὶ πρότερον τὸ τῆς ἀγίας καὶ καλλινίκου μάρτυρος Εὐφημίας ἐναπέκειτο τίμιον καὶ ἅγιον σῶμα, εἰ καὶ παρὰ δυσσεβῶν καὶ αἰρετικῶν χερσὶ μετὰ ταῦτα εἰς βυθὸν θαλάσσης ἐναπερρίφη³. Ἦς λάρνακος ἐφύπερθεν, τὴν προπαρασκευῆν τῆς θείας καὶ ἀναιμάκτου θυσίας καὶ τῶν λειτουργικῶν σκευῶν τὴν ἀπόθεσιν οἱ ἱερατεύοντες τελεῖν εἰώθασιν. Αὕτη τοίνυν ἡ λάρναξ τιμίος καὶ σεπτοῖς εἰκονίσμασι τὸ πρὶν εὐφυῶς πάνυ διαγεγλυμμένη, τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῶν θείων καὶ πανευφήμων ἀποστόλων ἐντετυπωμένη καθωραΐζετο⁴. Ἐν ἧ κατὰ περίοδον ἐπιστὰς ὁ τῆς δυσσεβείας ἀρχηγὸς καὶ προασπιστὴς τῶν ἀθλίων εἰκονομάχων, τὴν χαλεπὴν⁵ καὶ δυσσεβεστέραν ἀσέβειαν ἐπιδεικνύμενος ὁ ἀλιτήριος⁶ (εἰώθει γὰρ ὁ πανάθλιος πάντα περιερχόμενος, τὰ τίμια καὶ ἱερὰ ἐξαφανίζειν σεβάσματα —Σπαίκτας δὲ οὗτος ἦν ὁ τρισκατάρατος, ὁ τῆς ἀντιθέου καὶ μισαράς⁷ θρησκείας⁸ τῶν εἰκονοκαστῶν δεξιὸς ἀρχιστράτηγος) καὶ τὴν θείαν καὶ ἱεροφόρον σορὸν ἐκείνην θεασάμενος θείοις κεκοσμημένην εἰκονίσμασι, ἐπιπληκτικῶς ὁ ἄθλιος καὶ μεθ' ὕβρεων πολλῶν καὶ προπηλακισμῶν⁹ τοὺς αὐτόθι ἱερεῖς ἐνεκελεύετο πάσας ἐντεῦθεν ἐξάραι καὶ «μύσους», φησὶν, «ἐλευθερῶσαι τὴν λάρνακα». Οἱ δὲ τῷ φόβῳ τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς συσχεθέντες καὶ τῇ προστάξει τούτου καὶ ἄκοντες εἷξαντες⁹ λιθοξόον ἐκμισθωσάμενοι, ἀπαλεῖψαι τὰς ἱεροτύπους μορφὰς προσέταπτον.

¹ λεωφόρου, *cod.*
addito supra lineam
⁸ θρησκείας, *cod.*

² ἐπονομαζομένης, *cod.*
⁵ χαλαπιήν, *cod.*
⁹ προπηλακισμῶν, *cod.*

³ ἐν ἀπερρίφῃ, *cod.*
⁶ ἀλητήριος *cod.*
¹⁰ ἧξαντες

⁴ καθωραΐζετο *cod.* ω
⁷ μισαράς, *cod.*

2. Οὗτός τε ὁ ἐναγής¹ καὶ παμβέβηλος τὰς ἐκατέρωθεν ἐφεστώσας ἀποστολικὰς ἐξαφανίσας μορφάς, ἐπὶ τὴν σεβάσμιον καὶ ἀγίαν καὶ θεανδρικήν τοῦ κυρίου μορφήν τὴν χεῖρα κατεύθυνε· καὶ δὴ, σφυρηλατεῖν τὸ ἅγιον καὶ θεῖον ἐκτύπωμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀθλίου καὶ θεοστυγοῦς Συνεσίου τοῦ λιθοξόου κατάρξαντος, βραχυτάτη ἀποσπασθεῖσα ψηφίς, τὸν δεξιὸν αὐτοῦ ὀφθαλμὸν, εἰ καὶ μὴ καιρίαν, ἐπέπληξεν· ἀλγήσας τε βραχύ, μύσας τε τὸ ὄμμα καὶ τὴν ἐργασίαν ἐπισχών, ὅμως οὐκ ἀπέστη τῆς ἐγχειρήσεως ὁ δεῖλαιος· τὸ δὲ συμβὰν ἠγήσατο τύχης ἐπηρείᾳ² γεγενῆσθαι (καίπερ πολλοῖς ἔτεσι πρῶην ἠκμακῶς ὁ τάλας καὶ μήπω τοιοῦτόν τι πεπονθῶς) αὐτίκα τε κατὰ τῆς σωτηρίου καὶ θεοειδοῦς μορφῆς πάλιν ὁ δεῖλαιος τὰς χεῖρας ἐξώπλισε³· καὶ δὴ ὡς τῇ προτέρᾳ μὴ νουθετηθέντα⁴ πληγῇ καὶ ἀθεμίτου ἐκστῆναι μὴ ἐλόμενον ἐγχειρήσεως (ἔδει γὰρ συνιέναι τὸν ἀσύνετον—καὶ γὰρ Συνέσιος ὠνομάζετο—καὶ ἀνεῖναι ἐκ τῆς ἐγχειρήσεως τοῦ ἔργου), ὁ δὲ μᾶλλον ὑπὸ τῆς πρὶν πλεῖον ἐξαφθεις πληγῆς, τῆς δεινῆς καὶ παρανόμου ἐργασίας ἀντείχετο· καὶ δὴ μείζων⁵ καὶ τελεωτέρα ἀποσπασθεῖσα⁶ ψηφίς ῥαγδαίως τε κατὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὀρμή|| (fol. 212^r) σασα ὀφθαλμοῦ ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον διατρήσασα διέδου, ὡς αὐτίκα τελείως ἐκτυφλωθῆναι τὸν δεῖλαιον· ἐπὶ τοσοῦτόν τε τῷ δεινῷ καὶ ἀφορήτῳ⁷ τοῦ ἄλγους βεβλήσθαι, ὡς καὶ τῆς τοῦ ὀφθαμοῦ ἀλογῆσαι ζημίας. Ὅς οἴκαδε αὐθις ἀπελθὼν ἐν τῷ τοῦ ἀειμάρτυρος Ἀγαθονίκου παμμεγίστῳ τεμένει, ἔνθα καὶ καταμένειν τετύχηκεν ὁ ταλαίπωρος, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκείας⁸ εὐνῆς κατακλιθεὶς μηδὲ τρεῖς ἡμέρας τελείως ἐπιβιούς, ἀπέψυξεν ὁ ἄθλιος τῇ πληγῇ τὴν ζῶην συναποβαλὼν καὶ ταύτην εἰληφὼς τῆς εἰς Θεὸν παροινίας τὴν ἀντίδοσιν⁹ παραίνεσιν τε τὴν οἰκείαν ἀναίρεσιν καὶ διδασκαλεῖον σαφέστατον τοῖς δυσσεβεῖν προθ<υμου>μένοις ἑαυτὸν προθέμενος, ὡς μὴ τὰ ὅμοια δρῶντας τῶν ὁμοίων πειραθεῖεν. Ἐντεῦθεν δὲ ἐφ' ἕτερον μέτειμι¹⁰ θαῦμα.

¹ ἐν ἀγῆς, *cod.* ² ἐπέριαν, *cod.* ³ ἐξόπλησε, *cod.*

⁴ νουθετιθέντα, *cod.*

⁵ μεῖζον *cod.*

⁶ ἀποσπάσασα, *cod.* ⁷ ἀφόρτω, *cod.* ⁸ εἰκείας, *cod.*

⁹ ἀντίδωσιν, *cod.*

¹⁰ μέτημι *cod.*

V

1. Upon the public highway of the *Lausou* quarter¹ next to the neighboring hippodrome, a temple of the holy and gloriously triumphant martyr Euphemia, the so-called *paneuphemos*², was established; adjunct to which, on the north face and facing eastwards, another chapel was built attached³ to it, that bore in its midst a coffin⁴, 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.⁵ 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 Antiochos, 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 Theodosios 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 Lausus 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 description in the text and put it into the aforementioned context, we are provided with the following information: the "public highway" (*δημοσία λεωφόρος*) 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 *συνεγγίζουσα* in the phrase *συνεγγιζούσης ἵπποδρομίας* 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 *E/euphemia* (auspiciousness) and its derivative *paneuphemos* (all-praiseworthy).

³ The meaning of the participle *prospeplasmēnos* 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.

⁴ 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.

⁵ 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 to 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 severely. 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 Synesios⁷ – 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.⁸ 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,⁹ 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 Zotius, Zeno, Theoprepus, 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,¹ 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.² 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.³ 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.⁴

¹ See Ch.1 a., 4-5.

² Ibid., 4-5.

³ Price, "Icons before...", 4.

⁴ Lamberz, *Concilium universale...*, 122-4.

The Acts of 787 provide more such stories,⁵ 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 scorer in his sleep.⁶ Walter traces the story back to John Moschos' *Pratum Spirituale*.⁷ 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.⁸

Moschos' dark story seems to share more elements with the episode of Anthimos' trial;⁹ 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 Metanoëite 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."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 (14th cent. folios 211^r – 212^v)

¹⁰ Chrysostomides, "An Investigation...", xxxvii.

ΣΤ΄

1. Ἐν τῇ τοῦ Χαλκῆς τετραπύλου στάσει, ἥτις ἴδρυται πρὸς τὸ μεσότατον τῆς βασιλίδος πόλεως, τοῖς τεσσαράκοντα προσεγγίζουσα μάρτυσι, ὁδὸς ἐστὶ κατωφερῆς.¹ Πρὸς τῇ νοτιά² ταύτης πλευρᾷ³ ἐφ’ ἧς ἐπὶ τὸ προανέστερον⁴ κατάντικρυς καὶ βαθυνομένης, οἴκος τις δεδομημένος καθέστηκεν τῶν Ῥωμάνης προσαγορευόμενος. Ἐν τούτῳ τοῖνον τῷ οἴκῳ ἀνὴρ τις τῶν περιφανῶν τὰς οἰκίσεις ποιούμενος, εὐκτῆριον ἐκέκτητο τιμίαις καὶ σεβασμίαις εἰκόσι διαμεμορφωμένον. Τῆς οὖν τοῦ τυράννου || (fol. 212^v) καὶ θεομάχου καὶ δυσσεβεστάτου Λέοντος ἀσεβείας καὶ τυραννίδος πανταχόσε διαφημισθείσης⁵, ὡς πᾶσαν εἰκονικὴν ἀνατύπωσιν ἐκ πάσης οἰκίας⁶ καὶ ἐκκλησίας ἐξωρύττεσθαι⁷, φόβῳ τοῦ τυράννου ὁ εὐσεβῆς καὶ φιλόθεος ἀνὴρ συνεχόμενος, καὶ τοῦ θείου πόθου ἀντεχόμενος, ἐδεδείει⁸ αὐτόχειρ τὴν τῶν θείων καὶ ἁγίων εἰκόνων ποιήσασθαι κατένεξιν, οὐδέ γε πάλιν ἐπαλείφειν καὶ συγκαλύπτειν καὶ ἐναποκλείειν τετόλμηκε, τὸ τοῦ τυράννου βασιλέως δεδιῶς⁹ ἀνηλεὲς¹⁰ καὶ ἀπάνθρωπον. Κατάμφω οὖν πρὸς τὴν ἐγχείρησιν εὐλαβούμενος ὁ ἀνὴρ, οἰκέτη ἰδίῳ, Ἀνθίμῳ¹¹ τοῦνομα, τὴν περὶ τούτων φροντίδα ἀνετίθετο, ἐλπίζων ὡς συμπαθέστερόν τι οὗτος διατεθείς, ράκκει¹² συγκαλύψει καὶ ἐπαλείψει, καὶ τὸ τοῦ κινδύνου δέος ἐφ’ ἑαυτὸν ὑποστήσεται, εἰ ἄρα καὶ διαγνωσθῆ, προκάλυμμα τοῦτον τῆς τε παρανόμου ἐγχειρήσεως καὶ τῆς συγκεκριμένης δυσσεβείας εἰς ὕστερον διαγιγνωσκόμενης, τοῦτο ἐξάγειν πειρώμενος.

¹ κατωφερῆς *cod.* ² νοτεία *cod.* ³ πλευρᾷς *cod.* ⁴ προανέστερον *cod.* ⁵ πανταχόσαι
διαφημισθείσης *cod.* ⁶ οἰκείας *cod.* ⁷ ἐξωρύττεσθαι *cod.* ⁸ ἐδεδείει *cod.*
⁹ δεδειῶς *cod.* ¹⁰ ἀνελὲς *cod.* ¹¹ ἀνθίμῳ *cod.* ¹² ράκκη *cod.*

2. Ὁ δὲ πονηρὸς καὶ ἄθλιος καὶ ἀγνώμων ἐκεῖνος οἰκέτης, ὡς ἐπὶ τινι¹ πράγματι εὐτελεῖ καὶ καταπεφρονημένῳ ἀσυμπαθῶς εἰσιῶν ἐν τῷ εὐκτηρίῳ, μηδὲν φοβηθεῖς, μήδ' αὖ πάλιν αἰδοῦς ἄξια διαπράξασθαι διανοηθεῖς, ξυστήρα σεσιδηρωμένον μετὰ χειρᾶς ἐλών, κατὰ τῆς ὄψεως τῶν ἁγίων καὶ σεπτῶν εἰκονισμάτων ἠκόντιζεν² ὁ ταλαίπωρος, τῆς τε πανάγνου θεομήτορος καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγέλων καὶ ἀποστόλων. Οὕτως οὖν πάσας οὐ μόνον ὁ πανάθλιος ἐξαλλοιώσας τὰς τῶν ἁγίων τιμίας καὶ ἱεροτύπους || (fol. 213^r) θέας, ἀλλὰ γε καὶ ἀπηνῶς³ ἐξωρύξας ὁ κάκιστος καὶ ἀχρειώσας, τῇ ἐπιούσῃ νυκτί, μεθ' ἧν⁴ τὰ τοιάδε ὁ θεοστυγῆς καὶ ἀγνώμων οἰκέτης ἐξεργάσατο, ἑώρα καθ' ὕπνους τοὺς ἐξορωρυγμένους ἐκείνους ἄνδρας, ὧν καὶ τὰς τιμίας καὶ ἁγίας μορφὰς ὁ δύστηνος⁵ καὶ παλαμναῖος ἐξηφάνισεν⁶, ἐκ τῆς αὐτῶν στάσεως ἀποβεβηκότας καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐπιστάντας, δίκας εἰσπράττεσθαι τῶν εἰς αὐτοὺς εἰργασμένων, καὶ τί παρ' αὐτῶν ἠδικημένος, ταῦτα τετόλμηκεν εἰς αὐτοὺς διαπράξασθαι πυνθανομένους⁷, ποινὰς τε ἀπειλεῖν ἀντεπάγειν αὐτῷ καὶ χαλεπὰς βασάνους, ἀντὶ τῶν εἰς αὐτοὺς γεγενημένων⁸, καὶ οὐ δὴ⁹ ἐν ὄνειροις φαντασιώδεσι ταῦτα τελεῖσθαι ὑπονοεῖν, ἀλλ' οἷα¹⁰ τῷ ὕπνῳ <οὐ>¹¹ συναπίασι καὶ συναπολήγουσι· τὰ μὲν γὰρ βλεπόμενα, ὡς ἐν ἐκστάσει ἑώρατο τὰ δὲ τελούμενα ἐν στάσει ἐπληροῦντο. Ἦδη γὰρ καὶ τοῦ ἔργου εἶχοντο· ὅφ' ἐν τε τοῦτον συσχόντες τοῖς ἰμασίν ἐφ' ἅπαν τὸ σῶμα ἐπὶ ἱκανὰς τὰς ὥρας ἐμάστιζον, ὡς αὐτὸν μὲν τὸν ἄθλιον βιαίως ἀλαλάζειν καὶ γοερῶς ἐκβοᾶν, πάντας δὲ τοὺς περιοικοῦντας ἀφυπνισθέντας καὶ τὴν δεινὴν καὶ βιαίαν φωνὴν αἰσθομένους, τὸν τοῦ οἰκέτου δεσπότην ἐπαρᾶσθαι καὶ κατατιᾶσθαι ἀνηλεῶς ἐτάζειν ἀνεχόμενον καὶ μὴ δὲ τῷ μήκει τῆς ὥρας παύσασθαι ἐλούμενον· αὐτὸν¹² γὰρ τὰς μάστιγας ἐπάγειν τῷ πονηρῷ οἰκέτῃ ὑπελάμβανον, ὡς ταῖς γοεραῖς τοῦ οἰκέτου δεήσεσι μὴ ταχέως ἐπικαμπτόμενον. Εἴτά τε καὶ ἡ ὑπεραγία καὶ θεόπαις μήτηρ τοῦ κυρίου μέσον τούτων ἐπιφανεῖσα συναγηγεμένη, καὶ τὸ ἐκεῖνου οὕτως¹³ ὀργίλωσ|| (fol. 213^v) ἐξηχρεῖωσε πρόσωπον· καὶ ὡς δῆθεν τὸν αὐτὸν ἀνελομένη σεσιδηρωμένον ξυστήρα, κατὰ τῶν ὄψεων τοῦ ἀθλίου οἰκέτου ἰθύνασα, ἐπέπληξε.

¹ τι *cod.*

² εἰκόντιζεν *cod.*

³ ἀπηνῶς *cod.*

⁴ ἧς *cod.*

⁵ δύστινος *cod.*

⁶ ἐξ ἠφάνησεν *cod.*

⁷ πυνθανομένων *cod.*

⁸ γεγενημένων *cod.*

⁹ οὐδὲ *cod.*

¹⁰ ἦ

¹¹ *addidi*

¹² αὐτῶν *cod.*

¹³ οὕτως *cod.*

3. Αὐτίκα τε, ὃ τοῦ θαύματος, τά τε ὄμματα καὶ ἅπαν τὸ σῶμα ἐν τῇ ἐκστάσει ὡς ἐν στάσει πληγεῖς, τῇ ἕωθεν ἀναστάς, καθ' ὅλου τοῦ σώματος τραυματίας καὶ μελανωμένος ἐφῶτο, καὶ μὴ βλέπων τὸ σύνολον. Τότε ὁ ἄθλιος πᾶσι τὰ συμβεβηκότα αὐτῷ διήγγειλεν, αὐτῶν τε ἐκείνων, ὧν καὶ τὰς μορφὰς ἐξώρυξε τὴν τε θεάν καὶ στάσιν, καὶ τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔλευσιν καὶ οἷαις πληγαῖς ἐπιστάντες κατέτρωσαν, ἀντὶ τῶν εἰς αὐτοὺς γεγενημένων τρώσεων, καὶ τί παρ' αὐτῶν ἠδικημένος, ἀνερευνῶντες τὸ αἴτιον· ἔτι τε καὶ ὅπως τὰς ὄψεις ὑπὸ τῆς θεομήτορος τῷ σιδηραίῳ ξυστήρι πληγεῖς, τὰς ὀράσεις εὐθέως ἀπέβαλε, τραχωθέντων δὲ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον, ὥστε πάσας ἀπογλαυκωθῆναι τὰς τῶν ὀμμάτων κόρας καὶ χειραγωγούμενον τὸν ἅπαντα τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ χρόνον καὶ τῆς οἰκείας κακίας καὶ δυσσεβείας εἰκόνα γεγενῆσθαι¹ περιουῶσαν καὶ στηλιτεύουσαν τῆς πρωτοτύπου ἀσεβείας, ὡς ἐν σκιογραφίᾳ², τὴν ἀντίδοσιν³. Οὕτως μὲν οὖν ὁ ἄθλιος καὶ ταλαίπωρος, ἀγαπητοί, οὕτω πεπονηκῶς καὶ ἐξαμαρτήσας, πέπονθεν δικαίᾳ κρίσει Θεοῦ πρὸς σωφρονισμὸν καὶ νουθεσίαν πολλῶν· ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐνταῦθα τὸν λόγον καταπαύσαντες, δόξαν τῷ μόνῳ θεῷ ἀναπέμψομεν, νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀτελευτήτους αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν.

¹ γεγενεῖσθαι *cod.*

² σκιογραφεία *cod.*

³ ἀντίδωσιν *cod.*

VI

1. Inside the structure of the Chalkes Tetrapylon,¹ which had been established in the very middle of the Queen city, approaching the forty 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 “*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 *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, *Brazen House*. Here, the fact that this one is *πρὸς τὸ μεσότατον τῆς βασιλίδος πόλεως* implies that it is a different *tetrapylon*, a bit higher than the Grand Palace and along the *Mese*, in between the Forum of Constantine and the Forum Tauri, near the so-called *Artopoleia* quarter. The present *chalkoun tetrapylon* was indeed situated next to a church of the 40 Martyrs and marked a crossroads of the *Mese* with the *embolos* of Domninos, which adorned a cross street that reached from the Golden Horn in the north to the Julian port in the south, see C. Mango, *Le développement urbain de Constantinople (IV^e - VII^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 *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 *embolos ton Troadesion* and reaching up to the *tetrapylon*, see Ludwig A Dindorf, *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 29th of June in the *Synaxarium Constantinopolitanum*, which adds that the earthquake persisted for three months, see *SynaxCP* col. 425.2. Johannes Malalas refers to this *tetrapylon* in an episode of a dispute between Greens and Blues, which accumulates in the burning of the house of Varsymios and the fire reaching the *tetrapylon* and the road across it, see Ioannes Thurn, *Ioannis Malalae chronographia*, *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*, (New York, 2000), 135. Other references to the *tetrapylon* are made again in the *Chronicon paschale* and the *Synaxarium Constantinopolitanum*, which simply confirm its vicinity to the monastery of the 40 martyrs, see Dindorf, *Chronicon paschale*, 699.1 and *SynaxCP*, cols. 356, 524. The remaining references in the *Synaxarium* are also the sole testimonies to the existence of a church of St. Theodore close to the *tetrapylon*, which however has not been verified due to the lack of sources, see *SynaxCP* cols. 94, 188 and Janin, *Les églises...*, 160-1.

² Most probably the monastery referred to here is the *Τεσσαράκοντα μάρτυρες πλησίον τοῦ 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 *Mese*, see Janin, *Les églises...*, 501, but according to Mango it must have been right next to the *chalkoun tetrapylon* described above, see Mango, *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 “*ton Romanes*” is a locality neighboring *ta Amantiou*, for which see 2.2., 38, ft.7.

⁴ Unfortunately, since the locality of “*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 senseless⁵ slave, disdainfully entering the chapel in fear of nothing, as if (he were approaching) something worthless and despicable, 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.

⁵ The accumulation of epithets here leaves no doubt as to Anthimos' course of action.

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 annouced 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.

Bibliography

PRIMARY SOURCES

- de Boor, Carl, *Nicephori Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani, Opuscula Historica*, (Leipzig, 1880, repr. New York, 1975).
- , *Theophanes chronographia*, (Leipzig, 1883 repr. 1963).
- , *Georgii monachi chronicon*, II, (Leipzig: Teubner, 1904).
- Bekker, Immanuel, (ed.) *Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus*. [*Corpus scriptorium historiae Byzantinae*] (Bonn: Weber, 1838).
- Boissonade, Jean-François, *Anecdota Graeca e codicibus regiis*, Vol. 4, (Paris, 1832).
- Dindorf, Ludwig A., *Chronicon paschale, ad exemplar vaticanum*. vol. 1, [*Corpus scriptorium historiae Byzantinae*] (Bonn: Weber, 1832).
- Featherstone, Jeffrey M., in *Nicephori Patriarchae Constantinopolitani: Refutatio et eversio definitionis synodalis anni 815*. [*Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca* 33] (Brepols, 1997).
- Geyer, Paul, *Itinera hierosolymitana saeculi IIII-VIII* [*Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*] (Vienna, 1898).
- Kotter, Bonifatius, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, vol. 3, [Patristische Texte und Studien 17]. (Berlin, De Gruyter, 1975).
- Κουσουρή, Όλγα Π., «Ἐπιτάφιος εἰς τὸν ὄσιον πατέρα ἡμῶν καὶ ὁμολογητὴν Νικήταν συγγραφεὶς ὑπὸ Θεοστηρίκτου, μαθητοῦ αὐτοῦ μακαριωτάτου» (*BHG* 1341), Unpublished PhD. Dissertation, (Ioannina, 2016).
- Lamberz, Erich (ed.). *Concilium universale Nicaenum secundum, Concilii Actiones VI– VII in Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum ser. II, vol. III*. Band 3. (De Gruyter, Berlin/Boston, 2016).
- Lemerle, Paul (ed.). *Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de saint Démétrius*. (Paris, 1979).
- Moschos, John, *Pratum spirituale*, PG 87. 3, cols. 2847-3114D (*BHG* 1076c).
- Munitiz, Joseph A., Julian Chrysostomides, Eirene Harvalia-Crook and Charalambos Dendrinou, *The Letter of the Three Patriarchs to Emperor Theophilus and Related Texts*, (Athens, Porphyrogenitus, 1997).
- Noret, Jacques, *Vitae duae antiquae sancti Athanasii Athonitae*, (Turnhout, 1982).

- Sullivan, Dennis, *The Life of Saint Nikon: Text, translation, and commentary* [The Archbishop Iakovos Library of ecclesiastical and historical sources] (Brookline, MA: Hellenic College Press, 1987)
- Thümmel, Hans Georg, *Die Frühgeschichte der östkirchlichen Bilderlehre. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Zeit vor dem Bilderstreit*, (Berlin, 1992).
- Thurn, Ioannes, *Ioannis Malalae chronographia*, [Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae], (New York, 2000).
- Tours, Gregory of, *De gloria martyrum*, PL 71, cols. 705-800.
- Vogt, Andrew P., *S. Theophylakte de Nicomedie*, AB 50 (1932), 67-82.

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Alexander, Paul J., *The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople*, (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1957).
- Andrist, Patrick, “Les Objections des Hébreux : Un Document du premier Iconoclasme?”, in *REB* 57 (1999), 99-140.
- Bardill, Jonathan, “The Palace of Lausus and Nearby Monuments in Constantinople: A Topographical Study”, in *American Journal of Archaeology* 101.1 (1997), 67-95.
- Bosworth, Clifford E., Emeri J. van Donzel, Bernard Lewis, and Charles Pellat (eds.), *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, V, (Leiden, Brill, 1983).
- Brubaker, Leslie and John Haldon, *Byzantium in the iconoclast era, c. 680-850*, (Cambridge, 2011).
- Darrouzès, Jean, “Deux textes inédits du patriarche Germain”, in *REB* 45 (1987), 5-13.
- Demus, Otto, “Two Palaeologan Mosaic Icons in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection,” *DOP* 14 (1960), 87-119.
- Déroche, Vincent, “L’apologie contre les Juifs de Léontios de Néapolis”, *TM* 12 (1994), 45-104.
- Δημητράκος, Δημήτριος, *Μέγα Λεξικόν Όλης της Ελληνικής Γλώσσας*, Athens, no d.
- von Dobschütz, Ernst, *Christusbilder. Untersuchungen zur christlichen Legende*, [TU, Neue Folge 3], (Leipzig, 1899).
- , “Maria Romaia”, in *BZ* 12 (1903), 173-214.
- Effenberger, Arne, “Images of Personal Devotion: Miniature Mosaic and Steatite

- Icons”, in *Byzantium: faith and power (1261-1557)*, edited by Helen C. Evans, (New York, 2004), 209-41.
- Evans, Helen C. and William D. Wixom (eds.), *The glory of Byzantium: art and culture of the Middle Byzantine era, A.D. 843-1261*, (New York, 1997).
- Furlan, Italo, *Le Icone Bizantine a Mosaico*, (Milan, 1979).
- Gero, Stephen, *Byzantine Iconoclasm during the reign of Leo III*, (Louvain, 1973).
- Giannelli, Cyrus, *Codices Vaticani Graeci 1485-1683*, [Cataloghi ed inventari di manoscritti 35], (Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1961).
- Greatrex, Geoffrey, *The chronicle of Pseudo-Zachariah: Church and War in Late Antiquity* [Translated Texts for Historians], (Liverpool, Liverpool University Press 2011).
- Guberti Bassett, Sarah, “Excellent Offerings: The Lausus Collection in Constantinople” *The Art Bulletin*, 82 (2000) 1, 6-25.
- Hemmerdinger, Bertrand, “Les sources de *BHG 1387* (*PG 95*, 345-385)”, *OCP* 34 (1968), 145-7.
- Hoeck, Johannes M., “Stand und Aufgaben der Damaskenos-Forschung”, *OCP* 17 (1951), 5-60.
- Janin, Raymond, *La Géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantin, I, 3: Les églises et les monastères*, (Paris, 1953).
- , *Constantinople Byzantine*, (Paris, 1950).
- Καρπόζηλος, Απόστολος, *Βυζαντινοί Ιστορικοί και Χρονογράφοι*, II, (Athens, 2002).
- Kitzinger, Ernst, “The cult of images in the age before iconoclasm”, in *DOP* 8 (1954), 83-150.
- Mango, Cyril, *The Brazen House*, (Copenhagen, 1959).
- , *Le développement urbain de Constantinople (IV^e - VII^e siècles)*, [Travaux et Mémoires du Centre de recherche d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance, Collège de France, Monographies 2], (Paris, 1985),
- Mango, Cyril, Michael Vickers, and Eric D. Francis, “The Palace of Lausus at Constantinople and Its Collection of Ancient Statues”, in *Journal of the History of Collections*, 4.1 (1992), 89-98.
- Pentcheva, Bissera M., “The ‘activated’ icon: the Hodegetria procession and Mary’s *Eisodos*”, in *Images of the Mother of God: Perceptions of the Theotokos in Byzantium*, edited by Maria Vassilaki, (Routledge, 2016), 195-207.

- Perry, Kenneth, *Depicting the World: Byzantine Iconophile Thought of the Eighth and Ninth Centuries*, (E.J. Brill, Leiden-New York-Köln, 1996).
- Price, Richard, “Icons before and during Iconoclasm”, Heythrop College, University of London
https://www.academia.edu/20430402/Icons_before_and_during_Iconoclasm
- Roberts, Walter E., Michael DiMaio, Jr., “Julian the Apostate”, in *An Online Encyclopedia of Roman Emperors*, <https://www.roman-emperors.org/julian.htm#Note%201> (last updated February 19, 2002).
- Schwartz, Joshua J., *Lod (Lydda), Israel: from its origins through the Byzantine period, 5600 B.C.-640 A.D.*, (Oxford, Tempus Reparatum, 1991).
- Speck, Paul, ‘Wunderheilige und Bilder. Zur Frage des Beginns der Bilderverehrung’, *Varia III*, [*Ποικίλα Βυζαντινά* 11], (Bonn, 1991).
- Stewart (trs.), Aubrey, *Palestine Pilgrims’ Text Society of the Holy Places visited by Antoninus Martyr*, (London, 1887).
- Talbot, Alice-Mary (ed.), *Byzantine Defenders of Images: Eight Saints’ Lives in English Translation* [Byzantine Saints’ Lives in Translation 2], (Washington DC, Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1998).
- Turyn, Alexander, *Codices Graeci Vaticani saeculi xii et xiv scripti annorumque notis instructi*, (Vatican, 1964).
- Varvounis, Manolis G. – Nikos Rodosthenous, “Religious Traditions of Mount Athos on Miraculous Icons of Panagia (The Mother of God)”, in *Balkan Studies* 52, (Thessaloniki 2017), 139 – 150.
- Τσορμπατζόγλου, Γεώργιος, “Παρατηρήσεις σχετικά με την προέλευση του αποδιδόμενου στον Ανδρέα Κρήτης έργου “περί τῆς προσκυνήσεως τῶν ἁγίων εἰκόνων” BHG 1125 = CPG 8193”, in *ΕΕΘΣΑΠΘ/ Τμήμα Ποιμαντικής και Κοινωνικής Θεολογίας* 6 (1999), 133-148.

WEB ADDRESSES

PINAKES, Manuscripts

<https://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/cote/68218/>

