Liturgical Poetry in the Middle Byzantine Period: Hymns Attributed to Germanos I, Patriarch of Constantinople (715-730)

Kosta Simic

Submitted to the School of Theology, Faculty of Theology and Philosophy, Australian Catholic University

This thesis is presented for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

7th of December 2017

Contents

Abstract

The present thesis explores aspects of the liturgical hymns transmitted under the name of Germanos, a figure frequently identified with Germanos I, patriarch of Constantinople (715-730). The corpus of hymns associated with this name includes about 65 *kanons* (nine-ode hymns) and 52 *stichera* (monostrophic stanzas), mostly composed during the Middle Byzantine period. By focusing on this large body of texts, the purpose of my research is to contribute to the study of Byzantine hymnography, a largely neglected genre of Byzantine literature despite its enormous fertility and importance.

The dissertation consists of an introduction, three chapters corresponding to the three main themes of the thesis, and a conclusion. Chapter One is devoted to Mariological poetry and deals with the *kanons* and *stichera* for the Nativity of the Mother of God (8 September), the Annunciation (25 March), and the *Hypapante* (2 February).

Chapter Two deals with hagiographical poetry. It deals with the hymns, both *kanons* and *stichera*, devoted to the saints, the most voluminous category in the extant corpus. The saints eulogised in these hymns include apostles, martyrs, holy bishops, and ascetics. The topics discussed in Chapter Two include references to saints as imitators of Christ and his sacrifice; a vocabulary from painting applied to Christian saints; modelling the saints on biblical figures; and presenting them as exemplars for emulation by the faithful.

The cult of relics and icons is the subject in Chapter Three. The veneration of sacred objects, especially the instruments of Christ's Passion and the saints' physical remains, found a notable expression in Middle Byzantine liturgical poetry. There are seven such hymns preserved under the name of Germanos. Five of them are devoted to the so-called primary relics, i.e., saints' bodies or bodily parts. The hymn for the feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross (14 September) has for its subject the Holy Cross and the Holy Lance.

In the conclusion, I summarise the results of my research.

Statement of Sources

I certify that the work in this thesis entitled "Liturgical Poetry in the Middle Byzantine Period: Hymns Attributed to Germanos I, Patriarch of Constantinople (715-730)" contains no material published elsewhere or extracted in whole or in part from a thesis by which I have qualified for or been awarded another degree or diploma.

No parts of this thesis have been submitted towards the award of any other degree or diploma in any other tertiary institution.

No other person's work has been used without due acknowledgment in the main text of the thesis.

All research procedures reported in the thesis received the approval of the relevant Ethics/Safety Committees (where required).

Kosta Simic /
Student Number: S00156258
7th of December 2017

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to express my most sincere gratitude and appreciation to my supervisors Professors Pauline Allen and Bronwen Neil for their guidance, encouragement and support at all stages of the research. Without their invaluable and substantial support and friendship during some very difficult moments I endured during the write-up, the completion of this thesis would not be possible.

I extend my deepest appreciation to Professor Wendy Mayer for her help and advice.

I would like to thank Australian Catholic University for generous financial support, which allowed me not only to work on my thesis but also sojourn in Australia, and attend several international overseas conferences.

This kind of research is inconceivable without the help of librarians and archivists. I owe special thanks to colleagues working in various European libraries and archives, including the Centre of Sinaitic Studies (Athens), Cultural Foundation of the National Bank of Greece (Athens), National Library of Greece (Athens), Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies (Thessaloniki), Bibliothèque nationale de France (Paris), Russian State Museum (Moscow) and Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (Rome). Last, but by no means least, my sincere thanks to librarians and the Interlibrary Loan Service of ACU.

I would also like to extend my gratitude to my family and friends for their support.

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	*Analecta Bollandiana*
AHG	*Analecta Hymnica Graeca*
BHG	*Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca*
BZ	*Byzantinische Zeitschrift*
CCSG	Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum Series Latina
CFHB	Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae
CNRS	Centre Nationnal de la Recherche Scientifique
CPG	*Clavis Patrum Graecorum*
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
DOP	*Dumbarton Oaks Papers*
GCS	Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte
GOThR	*Greek Orthodox Theological Review*
JEChS	*Journal of Early Christian Studies*
JÖB	*Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik*
JRS	*The Journal of Roman Studies*
Mansi	Mansi, J. D. *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, vols. 1-53, Paris-Leipzig, 1901-1927. Reprint: Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1960-1961.
OCA	*Orientalia Christiana Analecta*
OCP	*Orientalia Christiana Periodica*
ODB	*The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vols. 1-3, A. Kazhdan et al., Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
PG	*Patrologia Graeca*
PL	*Patrologia Latina*
PO	*Patrologia Orientalis*
RÉB	*Revue des études byzantines*
RSBN	*La Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici*
SC	Sources Chrétiennes

Introduction

As an integral part of the Church ritual, liturgical hymns provided what was possibly the most effective means of communicating dogmatic truths and conveying ethical ideals to the congregation. As a combination of words and music, hymns can produce a strong impression upon the minds of the faithful and play an important role in their spiritual edification. Quite contrary to many other genres of medieval literature mostly destined for the educated elite or at least fairly literate people, liturgical poetry with its easily understandable language was accessible to ordinary, illiterate audiences in both monasteries and parish churches. In the epoch when people were less exposed to acoustic and visual impressions than nowadays, hymnography, along with sacred images, frequently valued as a way of preaching to the illiterate, was an extremely influential medium. Accordingly, as a highly effective agent, with its dogmatic, pastoral, and edifying character, Byzantine liturgical poetry is a key source for understanding Byzantine theological doctrine, piety, morality, and asceticism. For this reason, hymnographic texts deserve far greater attention than they have received so far.

The present dissertation is intended to contribute to the study of Byzantine hymnography by focusing primarily on the hymnographic production of the Middle Byzantine period, roughly from the period of the iconoclastic controversy to the beginning of the thirteenth century. My research is, however, limited to the corpus of hymns of Constantinopolitan provenance attributed to Germanos I, patriarch of Constantinople (715-730), one of the leading figures of the first phase of the iconoclastic controversy.[1] Over one hundred hymns attributed to him, composed to be sung on various Church feasts, have been preserved. The vast majority of these texts were composed before the eleventh century, as the manuscript tradition testifies. About one-third of the hymns is currently used in the liturgy of the Orthodox Church while one-third still remains unedited.

Overview of scholarship and current trends

The issues surrounding the authenticity of hymnographic works and their use as a historical source are highly complicated. The nature of this body of texts and their manuscript transmission raise difficult methodological questions, which may be one of the reasons why

---

[1] For his life, see L. Lamza, *Patriarch Germanos I. von Konstantinopel (715-730): Versuch einer endgültigen chronologischen Fixierung des Lebens und Wirkens des Patriarchen: mit dem griechisch-deutschen Text der Vita Germani am Schluss der Arbeit*, Würzburg: Augustinus-Verlag, 1975; and D. Stein, *Germanos I. (715-730)*, in: R.-J. Lilie, ed., *Die Patriarchen der ikonoklastischen Zeit: Germanos I. – Methodios I. (715-847)*, Berliner Byzantinistische Studien, Band 5, Frankfurt am Main, etc.: Peter Lang, 1999, 5-21.

hymnography has largely remained on the margins of scholarly attention. This holds especially true for the treatment of the liturgical poetry produced from the eighth century onwards, when the genre of the *kanon* was invented and its enormous expansion took place. Even the most basic research, which would include critical editions of hymnographic texts of this period, has yet to be undertaken.

Nevertheless, despite the many difficulties that any study of liturgical hymns entails, a number of scholars have turned their attention to this genre of Byzantine literature. It was Cardinal Pitra who, by his discovery that the liturgical hymns of the Greek service books were composed in strophes of an equal metre, laid the basis for systematic research into Byzantine hymnography.[2] W. Christ and M. Paranikas gave a further impulse for the study of liturgical poetry with their collection of Greek ecclesiastical hymns, which was the only scholarly edition of hymnographic works for a long period.[3] The founder of Byzantine studies, K. Krumbacher, in his *History of Byzantine Literature* devoted a chapter to hymnography, giving it a place in the general study of Byzantine literary production.[4]

The twentieth century saw several books dealing with Byzantine hymnography that can be regarded as introductions into the study of the genre. Among them, E. Wellezs's *History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961) remains the standard work on this topic. Recent decades have witnessed a growing interest in a more systematic study of Byzantine liturgical poetry. The most common approach that scholars adopt to examine hymnography includes the treatment of corpora of hymns, which, on the basis of their acrostics or the manuscript tradition, have been attributed to one particular author. The hymnographers from the eighth and ninth centuries who have been the subject of more detailed research, are Kosmas the Melode,[5] Kassia,[6] Joseph the Hymnographer[7] and Theophanes.[8] The primary preoccupation of all these studies was to reconstruct the biography of the hymnographers and to establish a corpus of the authentic hymns based on their formal

---

[2] J. B. Pitra, *Hymnographie de l'église grecque*, Rome: La Civiltà Cattolica, 1867. Before him, it was believed that the Greek liturgical hymns were not poetry.

[3] *Anthologia Graeca carminum Christianorum*, Leipzig: Teubner, 1871.

[4] *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur von Justinian biz zum Ende des Oströmischen Reiches (527–1453)*, Munich: Beck, 1897.

[5] T. Detorakis, *Κοσμᾶς ὁ Μελῳδός. Βίος καὶ Ἔργο*, Thessaloniki: Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, 1980.

[6] I. Rochow, *Studien zu der Person, den Werken und dem Nachleben der Dichterin Kassia*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1967.

[7] Eu. Tomadakis, *Ἰωσὴφ ὁ Ὑμνογράφος. Βίος καὶ Ἔργον*, Athens: Ἀδελφοὶ Μυρτίδη, 1971. See also V. A. Rybakov, *Saint Joseph the Hymnographer and His Poetic Activity*, Moscow: Russkaya Kniga, 2002 (in Russian, reprint).

[8] A. Zervoudaki, *Θεοφάνης ὁ Γραπτός. Βίος καὶ Ἔργο*, (unpublished Ph.D. thesis), Rethymnon: University of Crete, 2002.

features and the manuscript tradition. Despite the usefulness of these studies, they have some serious shortcomings. First of all, the conclusions regarding the authenticity of the poetic texts transmitted under the names of these hymnographers are far from being indisputable. What is more, they do not deal with the content of the hymns, and, accordingly, do not propose any methodological approaches that could be employed in the investigation of hymnography as a literary genre, which was and still is in practical ecclesiastical use.

Another approach, which is becoming more popular, is dealing with hymnography composed for one particular feast. Two most recent examples of such an approach include the treatment of various hymns from different periods for the feasts of the Annunciation of the Virgin Mary[9] and of her Entrance to the temple[10], respectively.

Among the historians of Byzantine literature, A. Kazhdan is the only one who not only gave a prominent place to hymnography in his two-volume *History of Byzantine Literature*[11] but also addressed methodological questions regarding its study. Kazhdan proposed historical contextualisation of liturgical poetry. He illustrated his method by an analysis of several hymns attributed to specific authors, as, for example, to an obscure hymnographer known from acrostics as Clement (eighth/ninth century). In his analysis, Kazhdan searched for historical reality hidden behind rhetorical devices. He was especially interested in extracting from the texts information about the individuality of their authors and to what extent the hymns reflect their authors' involvement in contemporary political or religious disputes. Kazhdan's proposal for a similar examination of other highly rhetorical genres of Byzantine literature, particularly secular poetry, was criticised for overlooking the fact that rhetoric in medieval societies had another status. It often was the only socially acceptable way of communication and, therefore, had its practical function.[12] This holds especially true for hymnographic texts. Rhetorical devices employed in these compositions

---

[9] C. C. Rogobete, *Ἡ ἑορτὴ τοῦ Εὐαγγελισμοῦ στὸ χριστιανικὸ ἑορτολόγιο* (PhD dissertation), University of Thessaloniki, 2009.
[10] J. Olkinuora, *Byzantine Hymnography for the Feast of the Entrance of the Theotokos* (PhD dissertation), University of Eastern Finland, 2015.
[11] *A History of Byzantine Literature* (650-850) and A *History of Byzantine Literature (850-100)*, Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation, 1999 and 2006.
[12] For more on this, see F. Bernard, *Writing and Reading Byzantine Secular Poetry 1025-1081*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014, 1-10. See also M. Mullett, "Rhetoric, Theory, and the Imperative of Performance: Byzantium and Now", in: E. Jeffreys, ed., *Rhetoric in Byzantium*, Aldershot 2003, 151-170.

are much more than empty formulae. Rather, they functioned as effective tools to teach and convey specific ideas to the congregation.[13]

More recently, there has also been a tendency to study liturgical hymns as agents of major importance for the formation of the self-understanding of the faithful in the Byzantine Empire, with D. Krueger as one of the most prominent exponents of this approach.[14]

Scope of the thesis: approach and methodology

What I propose in this thesis is a new approach to the extremely rich hymnographic production of the Middle Byzantine period. It involves the focus on a selection of the hymns that are attributed to one particular author, belong to one specific tradition, and can roughly be dated to a certain period of time. I test this approach in my thesis, where the case study is Germanos, the author to whom the hymns are ascribed, the tradition is Constantinopolitan, and the period is the Middle Byzantine, mostly up to the end of the eleventh century. Therefore, instead of focusing exclusively on the issues of authenticity and authorship—these will be addressed in the second part of this chapter—I will pay special attention to the content and certain important formal features of a set of largely unpublished hymns composed during the iconoclastic and mostly post-iconoclastic periods. Aside from bringing to light a considerable body of unpublished hymnographic material, the aim of my dissertation is to examine these hymns as a separate genre of Byzantine literature that served a practical function. One of its primary goals was to convey dogmatic and ethical teachings to the congregation in a more effective way, as well as to lend a voice to the faithful for establishing communication with the transcendent world.

One of the fundamental questions addressed here is how to deal methodologically with texts that cannot be precisely anchored in time or tied to a particular author, but instead appear "timeless." What I wish to propose is that depending on the kind of information one wishes to extract, the date and authorship are not always of crucial importance. This is especially true of texts that, like hymns, are designed for congregational use. Since my primary objective is to see these hymns as agents of conveying certain messages to the congregation, my methodological approach is primarily thematic. In other words, in my analysis, I have confined myself to examining how the hymns both responded and

---

[13] For the function of rhetoric in Romanos the Melode's *kontakia*, see S. Gador-Whyte, *Rhetoric and Ideas in the Kontakia of Romanos the Melodist*, (unpublished PhD thesis), University of Melbourne, 2011.
[14] See his *Liturgical Subjects. Christian Ritual, Biblical Narrative, and the Formation of the Self in Byzantium*, Philadelphia: University of Pensilvania Press, 2014.

contributed to the development of the three predominant cults of the period, namely, those of the Virgin Mary, the saints, and the relics. To achieve this, I place the hymns devoted to these topics in dialogue with other genres and type of discourse, including sermons, the lives of the saints, theological writings on image veneration, biblical hermeneutics, and liturgical commentaries, as well as with the ritual itself.

Furthermore, since a considerable number of the poetic works under examination remain unpublished, a significant aspect of my research concerns palaeographical analysis of the relevant manuscripts. I have assembled material drawn from Greek medieval manuscripts held in many different libraries and archives, among them Mount Sinai, the National Library of France (Paris), the National Library of Greece (Athens), the monastic libraries of Mount Athos, the Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies (Thessaloniki), and the Historical Museum of Russia (Moscow). In cases when a particular hymn has been transmitted in more than one manuscript, I have made an effort to obtain all of the witnesses in order to ascertain the consistency of the attribution and the integrity of the text of the hymn. For the purposes of the present research, I have examined about seventy-three manuscripts dating from the ninth to the nineteenth centuries.

The first major theme that this thesis addresses is Mariology. It would not be an exaggeration to claim that the cult of Mary, due to her pivotal role in Christ's incarnation, enormously "benefited" from both the Christological and iconoclastic disputes. Her cult, in fact, reached its peak during the iconoclastic period, as can be inferred from the great number of homilies and hymns in her honour, composed by the protagonists of the first phase of the conflict over the veneration of icons, namely, John of Damascus,[15] Andrew of Crete and Patriarch Germanos.[16] As a powerful expression of devotion to the Virgin, Mariological hymns experienced an unprecedented development during the period that this thesis investigates. They abound with terms and formulations coined in relation to the prolonged controversy over the person of Christ, while, at the same time, emphasising Mary's

---

[15] For transliteration of Greek names and locales, I have mostly followed the spellings in *ODB*.

[16] See B. E. Daley, trans., *On the Dormation of Mary. Early Patristic Homilies*, Crestwood, NY: Saint Vladimir Seminary's Press, 1998; M. Cunningham, *'Wider Than Heaven': Eighth-Century Homilies on the Mother of God*, Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 2008, and M. Cunningham & L. Brubaker, eds., *The Cult of the Mother of God in Byzantium: Texts and Images*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2011. Andrew was also recognised by later tradition as an active supporter of the veneration of the sacred images. A hymn in his honour states the following: τῶν σεπτῶν εἰκόνων γὰρ ἐτράνωσας, παναληθῶς, ἱερομύστα, προσκύνησιν (You made clear [the teaching about] veneration of reverenced images, O the one who is initiated in holy things). *Greek Menaion*, 4 July. Kazhdan, however, notes that on the basis of Andrew's preserved works it is not possible to determine whether he was an iconophile. Kazhdan, *History of Byzantine Literature*, 63.

intercessory role on behalf of the faithful. Marian hymns sung in the context of the liturgy not only served to praise the Virgin but also to bring her closer to the faithful and allow them to approach her on a more personal and experiential level. They could now appeal to her directly, even initiate a dialogue, and also confess their sins and ask for intercession with God.

The cult of the saints and their relics, which flourished since late antiquity,[17] is also reflected in liturgical poetry, especially from the eighth century onwards. This cult is hence the second major topic explored in my thesis. Hagiographic hymns composed in this period and incorporated in the Byzantine twelve-volume *Menaion* (the Book of Months) provided a supplement to the Constantinopolitan Synaxarium, a collection of short accounts of saints' and martyrs' lives organised by date. Moreover, Nancy Patterson-Ševčenko has demonstrated that during the period under discussion, particularly in the ninth century, hymnographers contributed directly to the further development of the calendar by composing hymns devoted to known and unknown saints.[18] Hymns in honour of the saints dominate the corpus of liturgical poetry ascribed to Germanos.

My analysis of this large body of hagiographic poems is carried out against the background of the contemporary debates concerning the proper way to represent holy events and holy persons, a central issue during the iconoclastic controversy and the period that followed. According to iconophile theologians, material pictures and narrative representations have equal value. They are both images capable of bringing "past events to memory" and rendering the past "beneficial" to the present.[19] Taking this notion as a point of departure, I seek to demonstrate that literary representations of the saints' virtues perform a function comparable to that of icons; their goal is ultimately to prompt the faithful to imitate the virtuous life of the heroes they celebrate.

Furthermore, I situate the liturgical hymns attributed to Germanos within the context of biblical hermeneutics. Biblical scholars have stressed the lack of development of biblical

---

[17] P. Brown, "The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity", *JRS* 61 (1971) 80–101; idem, "A Dark-Age Crisis: Aspects of the Iconographic Controversy", *English Historical Review* 88/346 (1973) 1-34; J. Howard-Johnston and P. A. Hayward, *The Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages: Essays on the Contribution of Peter Brown*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

[18] N. Patterson-Ševčenko, "Canon and Calendar: The Role of a Ninth-Century Hymnographer in Shaping the Celebration of Saints", in: L. Brubaker, ed., *Byzantium in the Ninth Century: Dead or Alive?*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009, 101-114.

[19] S. Papaioannou, "Byzantine *historia*", in: K. A. Raaflaub, ed., *Thinking, Recording, and Writing History in the Ancient World*, Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2014, 297-313, here 298.

exegesis in the East after the epoch of the great Church Fathers (the fourth to fifth centuries). Exegetical activities were limited to commentaries on selected biblical passages undertaken by Maximos the Confessor or the Patriarch Photios. Christian Hannick points out, however, that hymnographic texts took on the role of biblical commentaries during this critical period.[20] After having regarded hymnography as "the privileged bearer of scriptural exegesis", he provides the following explanation of his claim:

> In terms of the history of liturgy, hymnography grew out of the singing of the Psalter, and afterwards of non-biblical refrains (ἐφύμνια) and antiphons. The *kontakion* of the sixth to seventh centuries presents an independent form of biblical commentary, in which the poet uses dialogue and elaboration of the text to convey to his audience the content of Holy Scripture.[21]

He states further that liturgical poetry from the time of John of Damascus continued to fulfil the role of biblical commentaries, and specified that "typology and allegory are the two principal exegetical methods employed by hymnography. Only in this genre of theological literature were these methods so abundantly and widely applied, and in this way hymnography assembled a content of incomparable exegetical value".[22] The corpus of hymns ascribed to Patriarch Germanos confirms Hannick's observations, and that aspect of these poetic writings is addressed throughout this thesis.

Closely related to biblical hermeneutics are liturgical commentaries, another new genre of Byzantine theological literature, whose development roughly coincides with the outbreak of the iconoclastic controversy.[23] Typology and allegory are widely applied to the words and actions of the Eucharistic liturgy, a characteristic that brings this literary genre fairly close to hymnography as well. The use of Eucharistic imagery is especially extensive in hymns celebrating Christian martyrs and their relics, and therefore it will be addressed in the present study.

---

[20] Ch. Hannick, "The Theotokos in Byzantine Hymnography: Typology and Allegory", in: M. Vassilaki, ed., *Images of the Mother of God. Perceptions of the Theotokos in Byzantium*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005, 69-76.
[21] Hannick, "The Theotokos in Byzantine Hymnography", 76.
[22] Hannick, "The Theotokos in Byzantine Hymnography", 76.
[23] On the genesis and development of this genre of Byzantine theological literature, see the classic study by R. Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins de la divine liturgie du VIIe au XVe siècle*, Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1966. See also R. Taft, "The Liturgy of the Great Church: An Initial Synthesis of Structure and Interpretation on the Eve of Iconoclasm," *DOP* 34/35 (1982) 45-75, which is particularly relevant for the present discussion.

Overall, the nature of my research is multidisciplinary. It brings together several disciplines in other to analyse and contextualise an important but largely neglected body of texts.

The Problem of Authorship

Why Germanos?

The success of the iconophile cause that Germanos espoused, his subsequently acclaimed orthodoxy, as well as his canonisation as a saint, cemented his reputation. As a result, a great number of hymns produced during the Middle Byzantine period came to be attributed to his pen regardless of whether they contained iconophile ideas or not. In the Byzantine tradition Patriarch Germanos I was remembered primarily for his defence of image veneration. He was regarded as one of the leading figures during the first phase of the iconoclastic crisis, as he opposed the iconoclastic policy of Leo III. According to the *Chronicle* of Theophanes, "this holy and admirable man Germanos was prominent in defending pious doctrine in Byzantium and fought the wild beast Leo (fitly so named) and the latter's supporters".[24] One should recall that, aside from being deposed in 730, the patriarch was also posthumously anathematised—along with John of Damascus and George of Cyprus, two other prominent iconophiles—by the iconoclastic council of Hieria in 754. In the text of the anathema he is characterised as a "worshipper of wood" and as a *dignōmos*, that is "two-minded" or "of two opinions".[25] One of the rare contemporary reports about Germanos' anti-iconoclastic activity belongs to John of Damascus. In his second oration *Against Those Decrying the Holy Images*, John writes that Germanos was driven into exile: "And now the blessed Germanos, radiant in his life and his words, is flogged and sent into exile".[26]

---

[24] Πρόμαχος τῶν ὑπὲρ εὐσεβείας δογμάτων ὁ ἱερὸς οὗτος καὶ θεσπέσιος ἤκμαζε Γερμανὸς θηριομαχῶν πρὸς τὸν φερώνυμον Λέοντα καὶ τοὺς αὐτοῦ συνασπιστάς. C. de Boor, ed., *Theophanis chronographia*, Leipzig: Teubner, 1885 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1963), 408. For the English translation, see C. Mango and R. Scott, trans. and intr., *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor. Byzantine and Near Eastern History AD 284-813*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997, 564.

[25] Γερμανοῦ, Γεωργίου καὶ Μανσοὺρ τῶν κακοδόξων φρόνημα ὑμεῖς διελύσατε. Γερμανῷ τῷ διγνώμῳ καὶ ξυλολάτρῃ ἀνάθεμα. Mansi 13, 356C-D. Cf. also C. Mango, ed., *Nicephori Patriarchae Constantinopolitani Breviarium Historicum*, CFHB, Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 1990, 145, and C. de Boor, ed., *Theophanis chronographia*, 428. For an analysis, see L. Brubaker and J. Haldon, *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era, c. 680-850: A History*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 187-188.

[26] *Oration* 2, 12, in: P. B. Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, 3, Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1975, 103. For the English translation, see *St John Damascene, Three Treatises on the Divine Images*, trans. and intr. A. Louth, Crestwood, New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003, 69. According to Kotter this oration was probably written in 730 or a bit later. See Kotter, op. cit., p. 7.

Although Germanos' disagreement with the imperial policy toward icons is indisputable, his subsequent reputation should also be related, at least to a certain extent, to the fact that he was the last orthodox patriarch before Tarasios (d. 806), during whose patriarchate the veneration of sacred images was temporarily restored in 787.[27] The very influential *Life* of Stephen the Younger is an example of contemporary patriarchal propaganda, which exaggerated Germanos' role in opposing Leo III's introduction of iconoclasm.[28] Stephen, who was one of the few confirmed victims from the first phase of the iconoclastic disputes, is presented in his *Life* as having been baptised by the newly consecrated Patriarch Germanos in 715. It seems likely, however, that Constantine V's motives for Stephen's execution were not exclusively related to the emperor's religious policy. According to Theophanes' *Chronicle*, Stephen's death was connected with a more widespread persecution of monks who were either caught in or suspected of conspiracy against Emperor Constantine.[29] As a result, the general consensus among scholars is that the episode regarding Stephen's baptism by Germanos was invented by his biographer Stephen the Deacon.[30] This distortion was certainly destined to present the patriarch as a spiritual father of the iconodule martyr and was intended to boost enthusiasm among iconophile patriarchs and monks for the uncompromising defence of icons against imperial authorities. The continuity with Germanos regarding orthodoxy was undoubtedly important to iconophile patriarchs, who came to the throne after the end of the first and the second phases of Iconoclasm (726-787 and 815-843).

Portrayed as a vigorous opponent of iconoclasts, whom he allegedly compared to those who had demanded the crucifixion of Christ,[31] Germanos's name was included among the patriarchs of Constantinople acclaimed for their support of icons in the *Synodikon* of

---

[27] Three other patriarchs, who occupied the throne between Germanos and Tarasios, namely Anastasios (730-754), Konstantinos II (754-766), and Paul IV (780-784), were iconoclasts. For their life, see Lilie, ed., *Die Patriarchen der ikonoklastischen Zeit: Germanos I. – Methodios I. (715-847)*, 22-56.

[28] *BHG* 1666. See the introduction to the critical edition of Stephen's *Life* by M.-F. Auzépy, ed., *La Vie d' Étienne le Jeune par Étienne le Diacre*, Birmingham Byzantine and Ottoman Monographs 3, Aldershot/Brookfield: Variorum, 1997.

[29] *Theophanis chronographia*, 436-437; cf. *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor*, 604-606. Cf. Nikephoros' *Short History*, in which it is stated that the emperor "falsely brought under grave accusation several men in high positions and dignities, <alleging> that they were attempting to plot against his authority", Mango, ed., op. cit., 83, p. 157. It is notable that Stephen's name is not mentioned in this regard. For an analysis of this persecution with further bibliography, see P. Hatlie, *The Monks and Monasteries of Constantinople, ca. 350-850*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007, 362-365.

[30] See Warren Treadgold's review on Auzépy's edition of Stephen's *Life* in *Speculum* 77.2 (2002) 468-470.

[31] Ὁ γὰρ ἐν ἁγίοις πατὴρ ἡμῶν Γερμανὸς τοὺς καθαιρέτας τῶν ἁγίων εἰκόνων μετ' ἐκείνων ἔταξε τῶν κραζόντων· ἆρον, ἆρον, σταύρωσον τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ υἱόν. *La Vie d'Étienne le Jeune par Étienne le Diacre*, 57, 33.

orthodoxy.[32] As a consequence of both historical facts and legends, Germanos was relatively early recognised as a saint and his feast day was included in the Church calendar. In the *Typikon* of the Great Church (Hagia Sophia), which is the earliest complete liturgical *typikon* of the Byzantine rite, drawn up at the end of the ninth or the beginning of the tenth centuries,[33] Germanos' annual liturgical commemoration is celebrated together with that of Saint Epiphanios of Cyprus on 12 May.[34]

The Fathers of the Second Council of Nicaea in 787 showed great respect to Germanos by reading his letters and including them in the acts of the Synod. Three letters by Germanos, all related to the origins of the iconoclastic controversy, were read out at its fourth session.[35] In the first, addressed to John, bishop of Synnada, the patriarch set out the arguments which he had used to explain and justify the veneration of icons to the bishop of Nakoleia, Konstantinos. The Council, through Tarasios, declared his views to be in harmony with those of the Fathers of the Church.[36] The letter addressed to Konstantinos was then read out, in which the patriarch recalled his former correspondence with the bishop where he had defended the veneration of icons and then criticised the bishop for failing to send it to his metropolitan John of Synnada.[37] In the end, his third and most extensive letter, addressed to Thomas, bishop of Klaudiopolis, was also read out.[38] At the seventh session of the Council, Germanos was acclaimed for his orthodoxy: Γερμανοῦ τοῦ ὀρθοδόξου αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη ("May the memory of Germanos the orthodox be eternal").[39]

The opus of the hymnographic works attributed to Germanos is vast. However, it is not an easy task to prove whether the attributions are justifiable or not. Authenticity is one of the insuperable problems related to hymnography in general.[40] This may be one of the main

---

[32] J. Gouillard, "Le Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie: Édition et commentaire", *Travaux et Mémoires* 2 (1967) 1-316, here 51, 53, and 103.

[33] For this *Typikon*, see briefly *ODB* 3, 2132-2133. For its edition, see J. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 2 vols, OCA 165-166, Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1962-1963.

[34] Mateos, *Typicon*, 1, 290. His commemoration is also included in the *Typikon* of the monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, dated to the end of the eleventh century. The *Typikon* prescribes the use of Theophanes' *kanon* composed in honour of Germanos. See A. Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie liturgicheskih rukopisej chraniaschichsja v bibliotekah pravoslavnago vostoka*, vol. 1, Kiev: Tipografija G. T. Korchak–Novickago, 1895, 454.

[35] Mansi 13, 100-128. The prevailing opinion today in scholarship is that these letters abound with interpolations. Cf. P. Speck, *Artabasdos, der rechtgläubige Vorkämpfer der göttlichen Lehren. Untersuchungen zur Revolte des Artabasdos und ihrer Darstellung in der byzantinischen Historiographie*, Poikila Byzantina 2, Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1981, 267-281, for the letter to Thomas Klaudiopolis; idem, "Die Affäre um Konstantin von Nakoleia", *BZ* 88 (1995) 148-154, for the letters to John of Synnada and Constantine of Nakoleia.

[36] Mansi 13, 100-105.

[37] Mansi 13, 105.

[38] Mansi 13, 108-128.

[39] Mansi 13, 400.

[40] Cf. Hatlie, *The Monks and Monasteries of Constantinople*, 425.

reasons why the hymnographic genre has largely been left untouched by all but a few specialists. Even though the ultimate solution to the problem of the genuineness of these hymns is beyond the scope of the present research, for methodological reasons it is necessary to assess all available evidence, especially the manuscript tradition and contemporary and later testimonies that refer to this Constantinopolitan patriarch as an author of liturgical hymns.

The most explicit testimony about Germanos's poetic activity is found in the *Synaxarium of the Church of Constantinople* (drawn up in the tenth century). This source, which contains either factual or legendary information about Germanos's life, provides the following detail:

> ἀπὸ τῆς Κυζίκου πρὸς τὴν μεγάλην τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως καθέδραν ἀνάγεται· ἔνθα ἀπείρους λαοὺς τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ φωτίσας καὶ τὰ βαθύτερα καὶ ἀσαφῆ τῆς γραφῆς ἑρμηνεύσας καὶ πανηγυρικοῖς καὶ ἐγκωμιαστικοῖς λόγοις τὴν ἐκκλησίαν φαιδρύνας καὶ μελῳδίαις καὶ ᾄσμασι τὸ ἐν ταῖς ἀγρυπνίαις σκληρόν τε καὶ σύντονον καταθέλξας.

> [Germanos] was brought from Kyzikos to the great throne of Constantinople, where he illuminated multitudes of people with his teachings and elucidated the deepest and most obscure extracts from the Scriptures, and with panegyric and encomiastic speeches made the Church bright, and with his melodies and hymns alleviated the difficulty of vigils.[41]

In spite of its unreliability as a historical source, the *Synaxarium* offers an important piece of evidence about the existence and obviously liturgical use of a number of hymns ascribed to Germanos.

Furthermore, the preamble to the Latin translation of the *Akathistos* hymn, produced at the beginning of the ninth century, credits Patriarch Germanos and his successors with introducing the hymn into liturgical use.[42] Moreover, in the title of the preamble the whole *Akathistos* hymn is ascribed to Patriarch Germanos. Although some scholars, including Alexander Kazhdan, have entertained the possibility of Germanos's authorship,[43] such an

---

[41] H. Delehaye, ed., *Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae e Codice Sirmondiano nunc berolinensi*, Paris: Apud Socios Bollandianos 1902, 678.

[42] For the text of the preamble, see M. Huglo, "L'ancienne version latine de l'Hymne Acathiste", *Muséon* 64 (1951) 27-61, here 33-34.

[43] Kazhdan implies it not only by including his discussion about the *Akathistos* in the chapter on Germanos in his *History of Byzantine Literature*, but also by putting forward as an argument the fact that in the hymn the Virgin Mary is called an "indestructible wall of the Kingdom" by which "foes are stricken". Oikos 23. Kazhdan, *History of Byzantine Literature (650-850)*, 103.

attribution can hardly be justified.[44] However, with regard to the *prooimion* Τῇ ὑπερμάχῳ στρατηγῷ, it may be ascribed to him with a higher degree of certainty.[45] It is apparent from its content that the *prooimion* was composed on behalf of the city of Constantinople after its deliverance "from danger". The rescue from a year-long Arab siege in 718 provided a suitable occasion for its composition. Based on the aforementioned preamble as well as the letter of Pope Gregory II to Patriarch Germanos, in which the pope extols the patriarch for his contribution to the rescue of the Byzantine capital, Michel Huglo considers the *prooimion* to be the work of Germanos.[46] In developing his argument, Huglo quotes an extract from the letter, which explicitly mentions the incipit of this *prooimion*:

> Verum hinc ad propositum redeamus *propugnatricis tuae* (τῆς ὑπερμάχου σου), o sanctissime et omnium christianorum domine, magnificationes qualis ipse ostensus fueris in cunctis *ab illa* directus et *salvatus et contra inimicos* confortatus admirantes.[47]

Despite the fact that the question of authenticity is important for the study of any literary genre, it cannot be regarded as crucial in regard to hymnography. Otherwise, scholars would find themselves faced with insurmountable difficulties because the vast majority of liturgical hymns are either anonymous or of dubious attribution. This can be observed even for those poets who left their name in acrostics of their *kanons*. For example, the appearance of the name "John" in acrostics does not help much to identify the author, considering how common this name was among the Byzantines. Furthermore, acrostics were used to establish the "authenticity" of forged works or can even contain the name of the person to whom a particular hymn was dedicated.[48] Therefore, the presence of an acrostic is usually more important as a witness for the integrity of a hymn than for its reliable attribution. The name attached is important, but cannot be taken as proof of authorship without additional evidence. Wendy Mayer's observation that, regardless of their attributions, pseudepigraphic homilies

---

[44] Bibliography on the *Akathistos* hymn is extensive. Several important titles are: E. Wellesz, "The 'Akathistos'. A Study in Byzantine Hymnography", *DOP* 9 (1956) 142-174; V. M. Limberis, *Divine Heiress. The Virgin Mary and the Creation of Christian Constantinople*, London – New York: Routledge 1994, 89-97; L. M. Peltomaa, *The Image of the Virgin Mary in the Akathistos Hymn*, The Medieval Mediterranean 35, Leiden: Brill 2001, and a review of this book by Nicholas Constas, *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 49.3 (2005) 355-358.

[45] For its text and the English translation, see L. Gambero, *Mary and the Fathers of the Church. The Blessed Virgin Mary in Patristic Thought*, trans. by T. Buffer, San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1999, 342.

[46] M. Huglo, "L'ancienne version latine de l'Hymne Acathiste", *Muséon* 64 (1951) 27-61, here 52-54. Paul Speck agrees with Huglo's opinion and accepts Gregory II's letter as authentic at its core. See his *Artabasdos*, 169-171. For the text of the letter, see Mansi 13, 92C-100A. Speck maintains that the excerpt from 93 C2 to 97 D3 is a later interpolation. Speck, *Artabasdos*, 155-178.

[47] Mansi 13, 98D.

[48] D. Krueger, *Writing and Holiness: The Practice of Authorship in the Early Christian East*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004, 171.

"had a life of their own"[49] can be equally applied to liturgical hymns. There is another parameter, however, which, in my opinion, truly gives life to all writings intended for use in the liturgy. That parameter is the reception of such texts by the Church community. In the end, what actually matters is the integration of the hymns into the liturgical life of the faithful, which means their adoption in the Church's spiritual life and their role in shaping the ethos of the community. Judging by the number and type of manuscripts, namely festal *menaia*, in which the hymns ascribed to Germanos are preserved, they enjoyed a broad reception, although the overwhelming majority of them were removed from liturgical use at some later point.

Removal from the liturgy not only of the hymns under discussion but also of a large number of other hymns either anonymous or attributed to other hymnographers was due to the hyperproduction of liturgical poetry during the Middle Byzantine period. Selection criteria for hymns to be included in liturgical books are not known. However, a rubric from a Typikon published in Venice in 1691, but probably dated to the eleventh/twelfth centuries, provides an insight into the selection process. It reads as follows:

> If in the *menaion*, at the commemoration of a particular saint, there are *kanons* of different hymnographers, one should prefer the *kanon* of Kyr ('Sir') Kosmas [the Melode]. If there is a *kanon* of Kyr John [of Damascus] and of other hymnographers, prefer John's; if of Kyr Theophanes and of others, that of Kyr Theophanes is preferred, for he is to be preferred before the others. If there is a *kanon* of Joseph [the Hymnographer], he is preferred before the other poets. If no [*kanon*] by these, the [*kanons*] of Kyr John [are preferred]. If his [*kanons*] do not exist, those of Kyr Theophanes [are preferred]. Of all these, those of Kyr Joseph [are preferred] before all the others.[50]

As can easily be observed, the names of Germanos and Andrew do not appear in this instruction. While *kanons* attributed to Andrew figure fairly prominently in liturgical books, only two *kanons* ascribed to Germanos are currently in liturgical use in the Eastern Church:

---

[49] W. Mayer, "A Life of Their Own: Preaching, Radicalisation, and the Early ps-Chrysostomica in Greek and Latin", forthcoming.

[50] Ἰστέον δὲ καὶ τοῦτο, ὡς εἴπερ ἔχει τὸ μηναῖον ἐν μνήμῃ ἁγίου τινὸς κανόνας διαφόρων ποιητῶν, εἰ μέν ἐστι κανὼν τοῦ Κῦρ Κοσμᾶ, προκρίνεται· εἰ δὲ τοῦ κῦρ Ἰωάννου καὶ ἑτέρων, τοῦ Ἰωάννου προκρίνεται· εἰ δὲ τοῦ κῦρ Θεοφάνους καὶ ἑτέρων, ὁ τοῦ κῦρ Θεοφάνους προκρίνεται – προτιμητέος γάρ ἐστι τῶν ἄλλων – εἰ δὲ τοῦ κῦρ Ἰωσήφ, οὗτος τῶν λοιπῶν προτετίμηται ποιητῶν· τούτων δὲ μὴ ὄντων, οἱ τοῦ κῦρ Ἰωάννου· αὐτῶν δὲ μὴ ὄντων οἱ τοῦ κῦρ Θεοφάνους· ἁπάντων δὲ τούτων οἱ τοῦ κῦρ Ἰωσὴφ τῶν λοιπῶν ἁπάντων προκρίνονται. L. Allatius, "De libris et rebus ecclesiasticis graecorum", in: J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, vol. 5, Hamburg: Christian Liebezeit, 1723, 60. All translations from Greek and Latin are my own, unless otherwise indicated.

one on the annual commemoration of Saint John the Faster (2 September) and the other on the Forefeast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross (13 September).[51]

The name "Germanos", which is attached to a considerable number of Church hymns in both manuscripts and printed liturgical books, has been usually identified with the famous patriarch of Constantinople (715-730). Among the scholars who referred to Patriarch Germanos I as the author of Church hymns were Sophronios Eustratiadis,[52] Henrica Follieri, (who differentiated between Germanos I, Germanos II and Germanos the Monk),[53] Milos Velimirovic,[54] and Alexander Kazhdan.[55] More recently, Alexandra Nikiforova in her book on the history of the festal *menaion* devoted a brief chapter to Germanos,[56] in which she provides a list of liturgical works preserved under this name in contemporary liturgical books and a semi-critical edition of *Analecta Hymnica Graeca*. For unedited *kanons*, she used the catalogue by E. Papailiopoulou-Photopoulou.[57] At the end of the chapter, she included an edition and a Russian translation of two *kanons* attributed to Germanos: one for the Invention of the Head of John the Baptist, and the other for the Nativity of Christ. In this chapter Nikiforova, taking as a point of departure the aforementioned *Synaxarion*, seems convinced that Germanos was an important hymnographer. Contrary to all the above scholars, Hans Georg Beck was more cautious, suggesting that the authenticity of the hymns under Germanos's name cannot be determined without a special investigation.[58]

Notably, the attribution of these hymns to the patriarch Germanos is not only common in the scholarship devoted to Byzantine literature and hymnography, but we find it too in the Byzantine manuscript tradition. For example, there is at least one nine-ode hymn which is explicitly attributed to Germanos the patriarch in the manuscript tradition. In a festal *menaion*

---

[51] The name of the patriarch Germanos is also attached to the *kanon* for the Translation of the *Acheiropoietos* or "not made by hand" icon, known as Mandylion (16 August). However, the hymn obviously does not belong to Germanos I, since this relic was transferred to Constantinople in 944. Its translation is described in the *Story of the Image of Edessa* (PG 113: 421-454), attributed to the Byzantine emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (944-959).

[52] S. Eustratiadis, *Εἱρμολόγιον*, Paris: Chennevières-sur-Marne, 1932, 1.

[53] *Initia*, 5.1, 259-260.

[54] M. Velimirovic, "The Byzantine Heirmos and Heirmologion", in: W. Arlt, E. Lichtenhahn and H. Oesch, eds., *Gattungen der Musik in Einzeldarstellungen: Gedenkschrift Leo Schrade I*, Bern-Munich: Francke Verlag, 1973, 192-244, at 198.

[55] *ODB* 2, 846-847.

[56] A. Nikiforova, *From the History of the Menaion in Byzantium. Hymnographic Monuments from the Eighth to the Twelfth Century from the Collection of Saint Catherine's Monastery on Mt. Sinai*, Moscow: Pravoslavnyj Svyato-Tichonovskiy Gumanitarnyj Universitet, 2012, 172-189.

[57] E. Papailiopoulou-Photopoulou, *Ταμεῖον ἀνέκδοτων βυζαντινῶν ἀσματικῶν κανόνων seu Analecta Hymnica Graeca e codicibus eruta Orientis Christiani*, Athens: Σύλλογος πρὸς διάδοσιν ὠφελίμων βιβλίων, 1996.

[58] H.-G. Beck, *Kirche und Theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich*, Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959, 475.

for September, Sinait. gr. 552 dated to the eleventh century,[59] the *kanon* for the Exaltation of the Holy Cross is designated as Ποίημα Γερμανοῦ Πατριάρχου (ff. 127v) in its rubrics. Considering that this manuscript predates Germanos II, patriarch of Constantinople (1223-1240), there is no doubt that its copyist/editor had Germanos I in mind.

Manuscripts from the collection of the monastery of Saint Catherine on Mount Sinai are the most consistent in attributing these *kanons* to Germanos.[60] At first glance, this can be explained in only two ways: first, the patriarch Germanos I was indeed a distinguished hymnographer, whose poetic works were used in the liturgy for a certain period of time, but ultimately the majority of them, especially *kanons*, were replaced by works of other poets; second, such attributions simply represent another example of "the Byzantine preoccupation with authority", as Stratis Papaioannou characterises the widespread tendency of the middle Byzantine authors to strengthen the authority of their texts by attributing them to earlier authorities.[61] In other words, either the author or authors of the hymns under investigation preferred to keep their anonymity and ascribed them to the famous patriarch or later editors and copyists of festal *menaia* attributed these anonymous texts to Germanos I.

In Constantinople, there was a long tradition of attributing important works of liturgical character to acknowledged authorities, especially patriarchs. One of the best examples is the attribution of the main Constantinopolitan Eucharistic liturgy to John Chrysostom, although it is hard to prove its authenticity. Chrysostom is also credited with a great number of homilies. Just like his illustrious predecessor on the Constantinopolitan throne, Patriarch Germanos I was also remembered as an outstanding liturgical writer. His name was attached to the enormously influential liturgical commentary, the *Historia Mystica*, which enjoyed a quasi-official status in both the Byzantine world and in the areas under Byzantine cultural influence.[62] The commentary gave him an extremely important place within the Byzantine liturgical tradition that can only be compared to that of Chrysostom. While John was perceived as the author of the main Constantinopolitan liturgy, Germanos was considered its most authentic interpreter.

---

[59] V. E. Gardthausen, *Catalogus Codicum Graecorum Sinaiticorum*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1886, 133.

[60] See the catalogue below.

[61] S. Papaioannou, "Voice, Signature, Mask: The Byzantine Author", in: A. Pizzone, ed., *The Author in Middle Byzantine Literature: Modes, Functions, and Identities*, Berlin and Boston: W. de Gruyter, 2014, 21-40, at 24.

[62] P. Meyendorff, ed. and trans., *St Germanus of Constantinople on the Divine Liturgy*, New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984. The fact that it was included in the first printed edition of the three Byzantine liturgies in 1526 testifies to its profound and long-lasting authority in the eastern liturgical tradition. E. Legrand, *Bibliographie Hellénique aux XVe et XVIe siècles*, vol. 1, Paris: Leroux, 1885, 192-195. See also V. Marinis, "The Historia Ekklesiastike kai Mystike Theoria: A Symbolic Understanding of the Byzantine Church Building", *BZ* 108 (2015) 753-770.

Other liturgical writings ascribed to Germanos I also include several homilies, mostly devoted to the Mother of God. Therefore, when seen in the light of his broader activity as a liturgical writer, the attribution of liturgical hymns to Germanos seems to make more sense, since his name was closely associated with the development of the Constantinopolitan liturgical tradition. Needless to say, the authority of Germanos's name may have also enhanced the authority of these hymns and recommended them for inclusion in the liturgy.

An additional reason for attaching these hymns to the name of the Constantinopolitan patriarch may also be to give the necessary impetus to and ensure a broader reception of the *kanon*, as a new liturgical genre in the Constantinopolitan milieu, where the dominant poetic form had previously been the *kontakion*.

There is no evidence regarding the exact time of the introduction of the *kanon*, a hymnographic genre of Palestinian provenance, to Constantinople. Scholars usually credit Andrew of Crete (660–740), as one of the leading hymnographers of his time, with this. He lived in the Byzantine capital on two occasions, namely between 685 and 711 and from 730 to 740. He first arrived in Constantinople as an envoy of the Church of Jerusalem in 685 and decided to stay in the Byzantine capital. After spending a decade living a simple monastic life, Andrew was ordained a deacon of Hagia Sophia. Afterwards, he took over the office of *orphanotrophos* of Zotikos's foundation before he became metropolitan of Gortyna, Crete.[63] Andrew stayed in Crete until 730, when Leo III recalled him to Constantinople, because of the opposition he expressed against the emperor's new religious policy. In 740, he was sent into exile to Mitylene, where he died.[64] His presence in Constantinople must have given a strong impetus to the development of liturgical poetry in the Byzantine capital, and may also have inspired Germanos to compose *kanons*.

Besides the aforementioned indirect evidence, one could also invoke apparent similarities in terms of ideas and vocabulary between some hymns attributed to Germanos and other works that are traditionally regarded as his writings, such as the *Historia Mystica*. Here is one of the most striking examples:

The after-feast of the Nativity,
Troparia on the Beatitudes

Historia mystica, 25

---

[63] M.-F. Auzépy, "La carrière d'André de Crète", *BZ* 88 (1995) 1-12, here 5.
[64] Auzépy, "La carrière d'André de Crète", 5.

Ὁ τρισάγιος ὕμνος ἐστὶν οὕτως· ἐκεῖ μὲν
ἄγγελοι εἶπον· «δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ»·

Μετὰ τῶν μάγων καὶ ἡμεῖς δῶρα   ἐνταῦθα δὲ ὡς οἱ μάγοι τὰ δῶρα
προσάξωμεν Χριστῷ τῷ Λυτρωτῇ,   ἡμεῖς προσφέροντες τῷ Χριστῷ,
ἐκ τῆς Παρθένου σαρκουμένῳ,
πίστιν, ἐλπίδα πάντες   πίστιν, ἐλπίδα,
καὶ κραταιὰν ἀγάπην οἱ πιστοί·   ἀγάπην,
ὡς χρυσὸν καὶ σμύρναν καὶ λίβανον·   ὡς χρυσὸν καὶ λίβανον καὶ σμύρναν
μνήσθητι…[65]   τῶν ᾀσμάτων τὸ ᾆσμα πιστῶς
                                      βοῶντες…[66]

However, despite the remarkable resemblance between the two texts, this does not necessarily mean that they belong to the same author, since this topic was very common in Byzantine religious literature, especially in homiletics and hymnography for the feast of Christ's Nativity, and both parallels can be explained as allusions to the Scriptures (Matt. 2:11).

Nevertheless, I tend to believe that Germanos may have composed a certain number of hymns, especially monostrophic ones, for great feasts. These feasts possibly include the Nativity of Christ or the celebration of the Virgin Mary, considering that many liturgical writings eulogizing events and personages related to Christ's incarnation and the reality of his human nature were produced during the eighth century. As far as the *kanons* ascribed to him are concerned, his authorship of some of them cannot be excluded either. However, their study causes serious difficulties, which need to be addressed separately.

The structure and main characteristics of "Germanos's" kanons

The *kanon*[67] is a complex hymnographic composition made of eight or nine odes. It is an essential element of Matins and serves as an expression of spirituality that is regarded as primarily of monastic character.[68] It came into existence by the multiplication of *troparia* or stanzas that were inserted between the nine biblical odes chanted at matins. There is no

---

[65] Sinait. gr. 578, f. 96 (tenth/eleventh centuries).
[66] Meyendorff, ed. and trans., *St Germanus of Constantinople on the Divine Liturgy*, 74.
[67] For the *kanon* as a genre of liturgical poetry, see E. Wellesz, *A History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961, 198-245; J. Grosdidier de Matons, "Liturgie et Hymnographie: Kontakion et Canon", *DOP* 34 (1980–81) 31-43; T. Detorakis, *Βυζαντινὴ Ὑμνογραφία*, Herakleion: University of Crete, 1997, 69-76, and S. Harris, "The 'Kanon' and the Heirmologion", *Music and Letters* 85.2 (2004) 175-197.
[68] De Matons, "Liturgie et Hymnographie: Kontakion et Canon", 41.

consensus among scholar of Byzantine hymnography as to who was the first poet to compose nine-ode hymns. Many believe that it was Andrew of Crete,[69] and therefore that the *kanon* was first created at the end of the seventh century.[70] Its roots, however, can be traced back to the second half of the sixth century, as clearly indicated in the tales of Abba Nilos.[71] According to tradition, Abba Nilos with his two friends, John Moschos and Sophronios of Jerusalem, chanted the nocturnal liturgy before Sunday. Although their service was based on reading the Psalms[72] and the three catholic epistles, namely, the Epistle of James, the First Epistle of Peter, and the First Epistle of John[73] without a single troparion, it is clear from the question one of Nilos's friends (John) asked that, at that time, there had already been a large number of *troparia* inserted between the verses of biblical odes. "I said to him [Nilos], how come at vespers on the eve of Holy Sunday you did not sing *troparia* at *Lord, I have cried* nor at *O joyful light*, nor even at *Let my prayer arise*, nor at *The Lord is God*, nor even when [chanting] kathismata of the departed at the stichology of the psalms or *troparia* of the Songs of the Three Holy Children, nor at the Magnificat, and the Praises, nor at the Doxology*, The Resurrection of the Saviour we praise?*"[74] The insertion of *troparia* between biblical songs largely resembles the structure of the *kanon*.[75]

As a genre of liturgical poetry, the *kanon* is a blend of biblical songs and hymnographic compositions – *heirmoi* and *troparia*,[76] which are more or less inspired by the

---

[69] Wellesz, *A History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography*, 204; Eustratiadis, however, ascribes the invention of *kanon* to John of Damascus, and Detorakis to Kosmas of Maiouma. T. Detorakis, Κοσμᾶς ὁ μελῳδός. Βίος καὶ ἔργο, Ἀνάλεκτα Βλατάδων 28, Thessaloniki: Patriarchikon Idryma Paterikon Meleton, 1979, 149–154.

[70] It has been argued that acrostics of Theophanes the Hymnographer (d. 945) provide the earliest the earliest use of the word "kanon" as designation of the new hymnographic genre. W. Weyh, *Die Akrostichis in der byzantinischen Kanonesdichtung*, Leipzig: Teubner, 1907, 7; Detorakis, Βυζαντινὴ Ὑμνογραφία, 73.

[71] Pitra was the first to publish this narrative in his *Juris ecclesiastici Graecorum historia et monumenta*, vol. 1, Rome: Typis S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, 1864, 220–221, and after him Christ-Paranikas 1871, XXX–XXXI. For a critical edition, see A. Longo, "Il testo integrale della Narrazione degli abati Giovanni e Sofronio attraverso le Hermêneiai di Nicone", *RSBN* 12–13 (1965/66) 230–267, at 253. Cf. Wellesz, *History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography*, 173–174, and J. Grosdidier de Matons, *Romanos le Mélode et les origines de la poésie religieuse à Byzance*, Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1977, 13.

[72] The Psalms were the following: 3, 37, 62, 87, 102 and 142. Cf. Wellesz, *History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography*, 173 and de Matons, *Romanos le Mélode et les origines de la poésie religieuse à Byzance*, 101, n. 329. They are still read at Matins in the Byzantine liturgical tradition.

[73] De Matons, *Romanos le Mélode et les origines de la poésie religieuse à Byzance*, 101, n. 329.

[74] Καὶ λέγω αὐτῷ· πῶς σὺ αὐτός, ὀψέ, εἰς τὰ ἑσπερινὰ τῆς ἁγίας Κυριακῆς, οὔτε εἰς τὸ Κύριε ἐκέκραξα τροπάρια, οὔτε εἰς τὸ Φῶς ἱλαρόν, οὔτε τὸ Κατευθυνθήτω, οὔτε εἰς τὸν κανόνα τὸ Θεὸς κύριος, οὔτε εἰς τὴν στιχολογίαν τῶν ψαλμῶν καθίσματα ἀναπαύσιμα, οὔτε εἰς τὰς ᾠδὰς τῶν Τριῶν παίδων τροπάρια; ἀλλ᾽ οὔτε εἰς τὸ Μεγαλεῖον τὸ Πᾶσα πνοή, ἀλλ᾽ οὔτε εἰς τὴν Δοξολογίαν, Τὴν Ἀνάστασιν τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἣν αἰνοῦμεν εἶπας; Longo, "Il testo integrale", 253.

[75] De Matons, *Romanos le Mélode et les origines de la poésie religieuse à Byzance*, 103.

[76] The Greek word τροπάριον is a diminutive of the noun τρόπος – melody, harmony. Pindar used the word τρόπος in this meaning. H. G. Liddell, and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996, 1827. For the etymology of the word, see J. B. Hofmann, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des griechischen*, Munich: Oldenbourg, 1950, 446. For the *troparion*, see also *ODB*, 3, 2124 and K. Mitsakis, Βυζαντινὴ Ὑμνογραφία. Ἀπὸ τὴν Καινὴ Διαθήκη ὡς τὴν Εἰκονομαχία, Athens: Γρηγόρης, 1986, 72–77.

content of the biblical odes that precede them.[77] The *kanon* is, therefore, a composition of eight or nine odes (ᾠδή – song). Each ode consists of one *heirmos*[78] and several *troparia*, written on the model of the *heirmos* both in terms of melody and the number of syllables and accent positions. Cardinal Pitra found this rule in a Vatican codex,[79] a scholion of pseudo-Theodosios, a writer from the eighth/ninth century, where it is stated that one who wants to write a *kanon* needs first to establish the melody of the *heirmos*, then add *troparia* which should match with the *heirmos*, both in terms of the number of syllables and accents, and retain the same melody.[80]

The structure of the *kanon* is determined by the fact that it was originally intended to accompany the reading of nine biblical odes at Matins. For that reason *heirmoi*, and frequently the whole *kanon*, are inspired by biblical odes. The nine biblical odes are the following:

1. The Ode of Moses (Ex. 15, 1-19)
2. The Ode of Moses (Dt. 32, 1-43)
3. The Prayer of Hannah, the mother of Samuel the Prophet (1Sm. 2, 1-10)
4. The Prayer of Habakkuk the Prophet (Hab. 3, 2-19)
5. The Prayer of Isaiah the Prophet (Is. 26, 9-20)
6. The Prayer of Jonah the Prophet (Jon. 2, 3-10)
7. The Prayer of the Three Holy Children (Dn. 3, 26-56)
8. The Song of the Three Holy Children (Dn. 3, 57-88)

---

[77] It is worth noting that in the oldest preserved musical manuscript, Laura γ 67, dated to the tenth century, biblical verses taken from the first twelve of the so-called fifteen Psalms of Degrees or stairs (from 119 to 133 that are entitled ᾠδαὶ τῶν ἀναβαθμῶν–"odes of degrees"–in the Bible) precede the so-called antiphons of degrees, which are chanted at Matins. Before the third antiphon the doxology is sung, and this is still in liturgical use. See O. Strunk, "The Antiphons of the Octoechos," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 13 (1960) 50–67, at 51, and S. Lazarević „Στιχηράριον: An Early Byzantine Hymn Collection with Music", *Byzantinoslavica* 2 (1968) 290–318, at 296, n. 20. The fact that Psalm verses also precede *stichera* at *Lord, I have cried*, the *Aposticha*, the *Praises*, etc., suggests that hymnographers believed that all liturgical poetry needs to be permeated with biblical content.

[78] Εἱρμός – series, chain, sequence. Liddell, and Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 490 and G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961, 421.

[79] *Cod. Barberinus* I, 150 (fifteenth century). The title of the work or, more precisely, of the first chapter of this work is as follows: Ἀρχὴ σὺν Θεῷ τῶν ἐρωτημάτων Θεοδοσίου γραμματέως Ἀλεξανδρέως περὶ προσῳδιῶν. Pitra, *Hymnographie de l'église grecque*, 31; Wellesz, *History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography*, 181, and de Matons, *Romanos le Mélode et les origines de la poésie religieuse à Byzance*, 124.

[80] Ἐάν τις θέλῃ ποιῆσαι κανόνα, πρῶτον δεῖ μελίσαι τὸν εἱρμόν, εἶτα ἐπαγαγεῖν τὰ τροπάρια, ἰσοσυλλαβοῦντα καὶ ὁμοτονοῦντα τῷ εἱρμῷ, καὶ τὸν σκοπὸν ἀποσώζοντα", Pitra, *Hymnographie de l'église grecque*, 31–32 and De Matons, *Romanos le Mélode et les origines de la poésie religieuse à Byzance*, 125. John Zonara (fl. in the twelfth century) expresses a similar idea. See Mitsakis, *Βυζαντινὴ Ὑμνογραφία*, 76, n. 3.

9. The Song of the Theotokos (Lk. 1, 46-55) and The Prayer of Zechariah the Prophet (Lk. 1, 68-79).

The second ode was gradually excluded from the liturgy, especially from the twelfth century on, and is currently sung only during Great Lent. Hence, while the *kanon* theoretically consists of nine odes, in practice it comprises eight odes. Theocharis Detorakis has demonstrated that the two most famous Palestinian hymnographers, Kosmas the Melode and John of Damascus, composed *kanons* without the second ode.[81] Andrew of Crete's *kanons*, on the other hand, all contain the second ode. The practice of including the second ode in *kanons* can be observed in the preserved hymns of many other great poets who were active in Constantinople, as for instance Theophanes the Graptos (d. 845), Joseph the Hymnographer (d. ca. 886) and Kassia (d. before 867), to mention only a few. However, it is worth noting that Theophanes[82] and Joseph[83] composed *kanons* both with and without the second ode. Why this one was omitted from nine-ode hymns was discussed during the Byzantine period. John Zonaras (d. after 1259?) provided the earliest explanation: "The second ode is omitted because it is not a hymn to God, but a warning to Jews and a threat and reproof of their evil, and a prediction of future harms they will experience".[84] This explanation is not very convincing, nor is another one, frequently adopted by modern scholars, according to which the second ode was excluded from liturgy because of its penitential and mournful character. However, there is a considerable number of unpublished *kanons* for different great feasts, including the Saturday of Lazaros, Palm Sunday, Easter Sunday, Easter Week, Mid-Pentecost, Ascension of Christ, etc., with the second ode.[85]

At some later point, *heirmoi* were separated from *kanons* and united in collections of *heirmoi* called *Heirmologia*. The main reason behind this was certainly practical, namely to make more convenient their use as rhythmic-melodic models for later composers of new

---

[81] Detorakis, *Κοσμᾶς ὁ μελῳδός*, 126–128, and Detorakis, *Βυζαντινὴ Ὑμνογραφία*, 71.

[82] A. Zervoudaki, *Θεοφάνης ὁ Γραπτός. Βίος καὶ ἔργο*, Diss., University of Crete, 2003, 109.

[83] Nikiforova, *From the History of the Menaion in Byzantium*, 124.

[84] Παραλιμπάνεται δὲ ἡ δευτέρα ᾠδή, ὅτι οὐχ ὕμνος ἐστὶ πρὸς θεόν, ἀλλὰ προμαρτυρία πρὸς Ἰουδαίους καὶ ἀπειλὴ καὶ ἔλεγχος τῆς πονηρίας αὐτῶν, καὶ τῶν μελλόντων αὐτοὺς καταλήψεσθαι κακῶν προαγόρευσις. J. Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον, sive rituale Graecorum*, Venice: Simeon Piget, 1730, 132. For the second ode of the *kanon*, see L. Bernhard, "Der Ausfall der 2. Ode im byzantinischen Neunodenkanon", in: T. Michels, ed., *Heuresis: Festschrift für A. Rohracher*, Salzburg: Otto Müller, 1969, 91–101, and Harris, "The 'Kanon' and the Heirmologion", 187–189. For the edition of second odes excluded from liturgical use, see T. Kollyropoulou, "Ἔκδοση τῶν β΄ ᾠδῶν οἱ ὁποῖες ἐξέπεσαν ἀπὸ τοὺς ἐκδιδομένους κανόνες στὰ λειτουργικὰ βιβλία καὶ τὰ AHG", *Ἐπετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν* 51 (2003) 404-479.

[85] For the Greek text and the Slavonic translation of the second ode for these feasts, see Rybakov, *Svyatoj Iosif Pesnopisec i ego pesnotvorcheskaya deyatel'nost'*, 496-571.

kanons as well as for the performance of the old ones.[86] There are two main types of Greek *Heirmologia*: a) in *Kanon* Order (KaO), with the *heirmoi* arranged in the order of various *kanons* of each mode, and b) in Ode Order (OdO), with all *heirmoi* of one ode grouped in a block.[87]

In regard to the *kanons* attributed to Germanos, several formal features may prove their Constantinopolitan provenance. The first of them is the presence of the second ode, which, as we have seen, is a characteristic of Constantinopolitan hymns. However, this cannot be taken for granted, because, as has been pointed out, some manuscripts, dating back as early as the ninth century, testify to interpolations of the second ode in *kanons* of Palestinian provenance that originally did not contain it. For example, in a majuscule *Tropologion*,[88] Sinait. gr. NE/ΜΓ 5, dated to the ninth century[89] and discovered among more than eight hundred Greek parchment manuscripts at Saint Catherine's Monastery in 1975,[90] we find four such interpolations in the following hymns: 1) Kosmas's *kanon* on the Nativity, 2) John's iambic *kanon* on the Theophany,[91] 3) Kosmas's *kanon* on the Theophany,[92] and Kosmas's two-ode *kanon* on Holy Tuesday.[93] In all four instances the interpolations can be

---

[86] In order to perform a *kanon* the singers only need to learn the melodies of the *heirmoi*. For *heirmoi* and *heirmologia*, see: Velimirovic, "The Byzantine Heirmos and Heirmologion", 192-244; H. Métrévéli and B. Outtier, "Anciens Hirmologia Géorgiens", *Muséon* 88.3-4 (1975) 331-359, at 333, and J. Raasted, "The Princeton Heirmologion Palimpsest", *Cahiers de l'Institut du Moyen-Âge grec et latin* 62 (1992) 219-232.

[87] This distinction, made by E. Koschmieder, has been generally accepted. See his "Die ältesten Novgoroder Hirmologien-Fragmente II", *Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, Neue Folge* 37, Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1955, 69.

[88] A service book of Palestinian provenance containing hymnographic repertoire for all the cycles of the liturgical year from which the other liturgical books, particularly *Menaion* and *Triodion*, evolved. *Tropologion* is known in two versions: ancient and new. Its ancient version, called *Iadgari*, is preserved only in Georgian translation. The key study for the Ancient *Tropologion* is: L. M. Khevsuriani, *The Structure of the Most Ancient Tropologion*, Tbilisi: Academy of Sciences, Georgian SSR, 1984 (in Russian).

[89] Nikolopoulos dated Sinait. gr. NE/ΜΓ 5 to the eighth/ninth century. However, A. Nikiforova adopts the ninth-century dating for the whole manuscript as the earliest (Nikiforova, *From the History of the Menaion in Byzantium*), citing the wide use of breathing marks and accents pointed out by Canart (P. Canart, *Lezioni di paleografia e di codicologia greca*, Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1980, 81–82), as well as Nikolopoulos's dating of the folia of Sinait. gr. NE/ΜΓ 56, which belong to Sinait. gr. NE/ΜΓ 5, to the ninth century. P. Géhin and S. Frøyshov, "Nouvelles découvertes sinaïtiques: à propos de la parution de l'inventaire des manuscrits grecs", *RÉB* (2000) 167-184, at 179. Nikiforova in her more recent publication opts for even later dating, namely to the second half of the ninth century. See her "The Oldest Greek Tropologion Sin.Gr. ΜΓ 56+5: A New Witnes to the Liturgy of Jerusalem from Outside Jerusalem with First Edition of the Text", *Oriens Christianus* 98 (2015) 138-174, at 142.

[90] For the first catalogue of the new finds, see P. G. Nikolopoulos, *Τὰ νέα εὑρήματα τοῦ Σινᾶ*, Athens: Ministry of Culture, 1998.

[91] This and the two other iambic *kanons*, on Theophany and Pentecost, traditionally ascribed to John of Damascus (d. ca 750), Marc Lauxtermann attributes to a certain John Arklas who lived in the monastery of Mar Sabas, probably in the eighth century. M. D. Lauxtermann, *Byzantine Poetry from Pisides to Geometres. Texts and Contexts*, vol. 1, Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 2003, 135.

[92] R. N. Krivko, "Синайско-славянские гимнографические параллели", *Вестник Православного Свято-Тихоновского Гуманитарного Университета, Филология*, 1.11 (2008) 56–102, at 64-66.

[93] Nikiforova, *From the History of the Menaion in Byzantium.*, 124.

easily proven, thanks to the existence of the acrostic which is complete without the second ode. In the case of the nine-ode hymns ascribed to Germanos, it is much more difficult to prove whether the second ode was originally included in the *kanons* or represents a later interpolation because of the lack of an acrostic. Although this practice was a rare exception, it nevertheless causes additional difficulties in any attempt to determine the genuineness of the nine-ode hymns preserved under Germanos' name.

There are other indicators that do suggest more definitively, however, that these hymns originated within the milieu of Constantinople. The existence of *triadikon* as a penultimate *troparion* of the *kanon* also relates the large set of nine-ode hymns ascribed to Germanos to the Constantinopolitan tradition. *Triadika* are regularly found in *kanons* attributed to Andrew of Crete, who is another representative of the Constantinopolitan hymnographic tradition.[94] In addition, the nine-ode hymns attributed to Germanos, like those composed by Andrew, do not contain any acrostics, except for one case, namely on the veneration of the chains of Saint Peter.[95] However, the presence of the acrostic is usually considered as a sound argument against Patriarch Germanos' authorship of this hymn,[96] since this is the only acrostic found in the hymns attached to his name.

Another attribute of the *kanons* ascribed to Germanos is the use of the third and third plagal or barys modes.[97] This characteristic is occasionally invoked to prove their early date since these modes went out of use during the ninth century.

Germanos's heirmoi *in Heirmologia*

In the earliest preserved *Heirmologia*, among the four hymnographers whose sequences of *heirmoi* are placed at the beginning of each mode is also Germanos, who is mostly designated as "patriarch".[98] For example, in the *Heirmologion* of the Great Laura on Mount Athos (Ms.

---

[94] Nikiforova, *From the History of the Menaion in Byzantium*, 292.

[95] Sinait. gr. 598, ff. 111r-v, 121. The acrostic is as follows: Οἶδας, φιλῶ σε, Πέτρε, τὸν Θεοῦ φίλον (O Peter, you know I love you, the friend of God).

[96] Papailiopoulou-Photopoulou, *Ταμεῖον ἀνέκδοτων βυζαντινῶν ἀσματικῶν κανόνων*, 156, n. 389.

[97] For the system of melodic formulas of Byzantine chant, see briefly *ODB* 2, 1386. Nikiforova, *From the History of the Menaion in Byzantium*, 133.

[98] The other three poets are John the Monk, Kosmas the Monk and Andrew of Crete. J. Raasted, ed., *Hirmologium Sabbaiticum*: Pars Suppletoria, Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae 8.1, Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1968; idem, "Observations on the Manuscript Tradition of Byzantine Music, II: The Contents of Some Early Heirmologia", *Cahiers de l'Institut du Moyen-Âge grec et latin* 8 (1972) 35-47; idem, "The Princeton Heirmologion Palimpsest", 222-223.

B32), dated to the mid-tenth century,[99] which contains twenty-one sequences of *heirmoi* under Germanos's name, he is designated as patriarch in eighteen of them.[100] As we have seen above, in one instance he is even designated as "Germanos, patriarch of Constantinople". Here is a list of all the sequences:

Ποίημα Γερμανοῦ Πατριάρχου: 16 (21) (1st mode); 78 (110) (3rd mode); 78-79 (111) (3rd mode); 79-80 (112) (3rd mode); 103-104 (146) (4th mode); 129 (179) (4th mode) (*heirmoi* of 3rd and 7th odes); 130 (181) (4th mode) (*heirmoi* of 1st, 3rd and 5th odes); 135-136 (189) (1st plagal mode); 136 (190) (1st plagal mode); 167-168 (235) (2nd plagal mode); 168 (236) (2nd plagal mode); 168-169 (237) (2nd plagal mode); 202-203 (287) (barys mode); 203 (288) (barys mode); 203-204 (289) (barys mode); 225-226 (323) (4th plagal mode); 226 (324) (4th plagal mode).

Ποίημα Γερμανοῦ Πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως: 229 (328) (4th plagal mode).

Ποίημα Γερμανοῦ: 43 (58) (2nd mode); 44 (59) (2nd mode); 72-73 (103) (3rd mode) (?).

However, in the Princeton *Heirmologion* Palimpsest (usually dated to the end of the eighth century), discovered and studied by Raasted,[101] which contains nine or ten of John's *heirmoi*, seven or eight of Kosmas's and one of Andrew's, Germanos is not represented at all. Yet, the author notes that he was not able to decipher all the *heirmoi* and allows the possibility that one or more of them could have been attributed to Germanos by its compiler.

Of particular interest for the present discussion is the presence of composite sequences of *heirmoi* in later *heirmologia*, especially from the thirteenth century and afterwards. This means that a sequence of *heirmoi* in one mode includes *heirmoi* from two or more other sequences. The use of composite sequences of *heirmoi* is also one of the main features of *kanons* ascribed to Germanos. This may indicate that one or more later hymnographers combined *heirmoi* traditionally attributed to Germanos in the Byzantine manuscript tradition to write their own hymns, whereas the attribution could refer only to the *heirmoi*, and not to the *troparia* composed on the model of the *heirmoi*. An example that conclusively proves that the ascription can apply only to the *heirmoi* is the *kanon* for Eustathios the Confessor, bishop of Bithynia. In Sinait. gr. 607 (ninth/tenth century) the

---

[99] For its edition, see Eustratiadis, *Heirmologion*, who inaccurately dated it to the thirteenth century. For its redating, see O. Strunk, *Specimina Notationum Antiquiorum*, Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1966, 11-15.
[100] Eustratiadis, *Heirmologion*, passim.
[101] Raasted, "The Princeton Heirmologion Palimpsest", 219-232.

hymn is ascribed to Germanos, although the saint died in the first half of the ninth century, that is a generation after Germanos' death.[102]

Another characteristic feature of the majority of *kanons* attributed to Germanos, which suggests that their author or authors lived in a later period, is the frequent pairing of the same *heirmoi* and *theotokia* in *kanons* for different saints. For example, if two or more *kanons* contain odes with identical *heirmoi*, they frequently end with a *theotokion* which corresponds with the *heirmos*.[103] For the purpose of the present discussion, I will provide only a few examples to illustrate this phenomenon. The *heirmos* of the first ode (fourth plagal mode) with the incipit Τῷ ἐκτινάξαντι is accompanied by the *theotokion* Ἡ συλλαβοῦσα τὸν πρὸ αἰώνων in the following *kanons*: Saint John the Faster (2 September; in liturgical use); Saint Proklos, Archbishop of Constantinople (20 November; Athen. Bibl. Nat. 842, f. 98); Saint Basil (1 January; Sinait. gr. 598, f. 16v; Sinait. gr. 646, f. 119v); Hieromartyr Pionios (15 March; *AHG* 7, p. 179); Finding of the Relics of Unmercenaries Kyros and John (28 Jun; Sinait. gr. 620, ff. 137r-v); and Saint Dios (19 July; *AHG* 11, p. 349). The *heirmos* of the third ode (mode fourth), which has as its incipit Ἐν Κυρίῳ Θεῷ μου, ἐστερεώθη ἡ καρδία μου, is accompanied by the *theotokion* Τὴν Θεομήτορα Παρθένον, ὀρθοδόξως ἀνυμνήσωμεν in the following *kanons*: Saint Bassos (18 September; *AHG* 1, p. 264); Annunciation (25 March; Sinait.gr. 609, ff. 104v-105); Saint Andrew (30 November; Paris. 259, f. 304)

This indicates that in the Byzantine tradition there were collections of *heirmologia* in which a particular *heirmos* was accompanied by its corresponding *theotokion*. Scholars of Byzantine hymnography have suspected their existence,[104] even though no such collection has been discovered yet. However, *heirmologia* that belong to the Georgian tradition contain both *heirmoi* and *theotokia*; hence their name "Heirmoi and Theotokia". After each *heirmos*, a corresponding *theotokion* is included to be sung at the end of each ode in the mode of the *heirmos*.[105] The structure of the *kanons* under the name of Germanos may serve as an argument in favour of the existence of this kind of collection in Byzantium as well. Hence, I would argue that one or several later hymnographers used still unidentified collections of

---

[102] On this manuscript, see Nikiforova, *From the History of the Menaion in Byzantium*, 125.

[103] This is also the case in regard to *kanons* ascribed to Andrew, who did not use acrostics either.

[104] Roman Krivko has pointed out that in some eighth and ninth century Sinaitic *Tropologia*, discovered in 1975, it is quite common that only initials of *theotokia* at the end of the odes are indicated. This suggests that collections of *theotokia* circulated as separate liturgical books. Krivko, "Синайско-славянские гимнографические параллели", 79-80.

[105] Métrévéli and Outtier, "Anciens Hirmologia Géorgiens", 331-359, esp. 336.

heirmoi and *theotokia* to write hymns for different feasts. Later editors or copyists or even hymnographers themselves ascribed them to Germanos.

Patriarch Germanos' authorship of a considerable number of hagiographical kanons can also be excluded on the basis of the calendars in use during the period under consideration. The two calendars that reflect the existing cults of saints in the eighth and ninth century Constantinople are the so-called Morcelli calendar, dated to the turn of the eight and ninth centuries, and the Synaxarium of Constantinople from the tenth century. A comparison between hagiographical kanons ascribed to Germanos and commemorations attested in these two calendars clearly shows that these kanons reflect hagiographical cults in the latter. First of all, the Morcelli calendar does not contain entries for a significant number of days of the liturgical year for which kanons attached to the name of Germanos are composed. These days and commemorated saints are the following: 18 September (Saint Bassos); 8 October (Saint Pelagia); 10 October (Martyrs Eulampios and Eulampia); 22 October (Saint Aberkios of Hieropolis); 9 December (Conception of the Virgin Mary); 12 December (Saint Spyridon); 3 March (Martyrs Eutropios, Kleonikos and Basiliskos); 15 March (Hieromartys Pionios); 17 March (Alexios the Man of God); 1 April (Mary of Egypt); 24 May (Martyr Meletios); 12 June (Onuphrios of Egypt); 17 June (Martyrs Manuel, Sabel and Ismael); 26 June (Hieromartyr Olbianos); 28 June (Inventions of the Relics of Unmercenaries Kyros and John); 19 July (Dios the Abbot); 23 July (Martyrs Trophimos and Theophilos) and 31 July (Consecration of the Church of Blachernae). Other convincing evidence suggesting the relationship between the hymns attributed to Germanos and the tenth-century Synaxarium, rather than the Morcelli calendar, we can observe on the days with multiple commemorations. For example, if we look at the commemorations on 1 September, we have the following situation: 1) The Morcelli calendar mentions the Beginning of the Indiction, Symeon the Stylite and the Synaxis of the Virgin Mary; 2) The Synaxarium mentions the Beginning of the Indiction, Symeon the Stylite, Symeon's mother Martha, Forty Holy Women, Holly Martyrs Calliste and others, Joshua the son of Nun and the Virgin Mary; finally, 3) The kanon ascribed to Germanos refers to the Beginning of the Indiction, Symeon the Stylite, Symeon's mother Martha, Forty Holy Women, Holly Martyrs Calliste and others, and Joshua the son of Nun. As can be easily observed, the commemorations mentioned in the Synaxarium and the kanon are virtually identical, which means that the author of the kanon followed the Synaxarium of Constantinople and, therefore, must have lived later. Other similar examples include 11 October (Martys Zenais); 25 October (Saint Uaros of Egypt); 12

December (*Saint Spyridon*); 1 January (*Saint Basil the Great*) and 28 June (*Translation of the Relics of Unmercenaries Kyros and John*). All these commemorations are not mentioned in the Morcelli calendar, but they exist in the Synaxarium of Constantinople and are praised in the hymns attributed to Germanos.

Concerning the question of authenticity of *kanons* in general, one of the major problems is their composite structure. Since they consist of multiple strophes, which could easily be removed or even replaced with new ones, it is hard to prove their original form, if they are not united by an acrostic. Such examples abound in hymns related to the name of Germanos as well. The same *kanons* in later manuscripts often do not contain the second ode or have fewer *troparia*. For example, the unpublished *kanon* for the Nativity of the Virgin Mary (8 September), which is preserved in three manuscripts, contains the second ode in the earliest one, Sinait. gr. 552, dated to the eleventh century, while in the other two, Sinait. gr. 645 and Sinait. gr. 671, both from the fourteenth century, the ode is absent. Similarly, all the odes of the *kanon* for the annual commemoration of Saint Nicholas (6 December) have more *troparia* in Sinait.gr. 583 (eleventh century) than in Sinait.gr. 590 (thirteenth century). Still more difficult problems arise when there are two or more versions of the same *kanon*, that is, when the majority of the *troparia* have been replaced by new ones. In such instances, it is hardly possible to speak about the same hymn. This is the case with the *kanon* for Saint Symeon the Stylite (1st September), which is found in multiple manuscripts. In the earliest two, Sinait. gr. 552 and Sinait. gr. 579 (both dated to the eleventh century), differences in the content of the *kanon* are minor. However, in the manuscript from the patriarchate of Alexandria No. 156 (fourteenth century), in the *kanon* for the same day, all but a few *troparia* in all the odes are replaced by new ones, and it does not contain the second ode.[106]

Hymnographers frequently used various series of *heirmoi* that could even belong to different authors. This is also the case regarding hymns that are the subject of the present research. For example, in the nine-ode *kanon* for Mary of Egypt, found in the oldest preserved Greek *menaion*, which is also the earliest manuscript that contains a hymn under Germanos's name, Sinait. gr. 607 (dated to the end of the ninth century), the *heirmos* of the seventh ode does not belong to Germanos, but to Andrew, according to the tenth-century *Heirmologion* edited by Eustratiadis.[107]

---

[106] Systematic removal of the second ode began in the twelfth century. One of the most representative examples is the twelfth-century *menaion* for April (Vindob. Hist. gr. 66) in which the ode was deleted from all *kanons*. Only their incipits were preserved.

[107] Eustratiadis, *Εἱρμολόγιον*, No. 109, p. 77.

The fact that the vast majority of the *kanons* attributed to Germanos are contained in manuscripts dated earlier than the thirteenth century allows us effectively to exclude the authorship of Germanos II, patriarch of Constantinople (1223-1240). We can even be more specific and determine the eleventh century as their *terminus ante quem*. This conclusion can be drawn on the basis of the manuscript tradition since the majority of these *kanons* or their versions have been preserved in manuscripts dated to the eleventh century or earlier.

Aside from the structure, another problem that students of Byzantine hymnography face, especially when dealing with the material postdating the ninth century, is the uniformity of vocabulary and style. This, in connection with the use of common rhetorical devices, poses major difficulties in distinguishing individual characteristics of a particular hymnographer.

To conclude the discussion concerning the authenticity and authorship of the hymns under investigation, we need to take into consideration the fact that the Byzantines looked at this issue in a different way. While the authors themselves, especially those of liturgical texts, frequently preferred to remain anonymous, later scribes and/or compilers of liturgical books tended to attribute those works to prominent figures, including patriarchs, to give them more authority. In the case of the hymns, as a literary genre orally performed for large and mostly ill-educated audiences, the question of authorship was regarded to be of even less importance. This is the main reason why I found it more important to focus on what the audience of a particular place during a specific period of time heard at their liturgical gatherings, namely on the content of the hymns, instead of concentrating my research on whether Germanos was the real author of these texts or not.

Overview of Chapters

My dissertation comprises three chapters corresponding to the three main themes of the thesis. Chapter One is devoted to Mariological poetry and consists of an introduction, three sub-chapters, and a brief conclusion. After the introduction, which provides an overview of Mariological hymns preserved under the name of Germanos, I proceed with an analysis of the *kanons* and *stichera* (monostrophic hymns)[108] for three different Mariological feasts, namely

---

[108] For *stichera* as a genre of liturgical poetry and their Byzantine collections called *sticheraria*, see J. Raasted, "Some Observations of the Structure of the Stichera in the Byzantine Rite", *Byzantion* 28 (1958) 520-541 and C. Troelsgård, "What Kind of Chant Books Were the Byzantine Sticherária?", in: L. Dobszay, *Cantus Planus:*

the Nativity of the Mother of God (8 September); The Annunciation (25 March), and The *Hypapante* (2 February), respectively. The hymns for the Virgin's Nativity include one unpublished *kanon* transmitted in three manuscripts: Sinait. gr. 552, ff. 76-78v (11th c.); Sinait. gr. 645, 29v-35 (14th c.); and Sinait. gr. 671, ff. 24v-29 (14th c.), and three *stichera*, which are still in the liturgical use of the Eastern Church. The *kanon* for the Annunciation is preserved in three manuscripts: Sinait. gr. 609, ff. 104v-106; (11th c.) Sinait. gr. 611, ff. 149-151v (14th c.); and Sinait. gr. 645, ff. 200-204 (14th c.). Finally, the last section of this chapter is devoted to an unpublished *kanon* and four *stichera* for the *Hypapante* or the Presentation of the child Christ in the Temple (2 February). I offer an analysis of these hymns in light of the iconoclastic controversy, and investigate how they served other spiritual needs of the congregation.

Chapter Two deals with hagiographical poetry. It deals with the hymns, both *kanons* and *stichera*, devoted to the saints, the most numerous category in the extant corpus. The saints eulogized in these hymns include apostles, martyr saints, holy bishops, and ascetics. The chapter begins with an introduction to the origin of hagiographical poetry and its relation to other hagiographical genres, and refers to the importance of the hymns ascribed to Germanos in this regard. The topics discussed in Chapter Two include references to saints as imitators of Christ and his sacrifice with a focus on the parallelism that the author or authors of these hymns draw between Christ and representatives of each of the subcategories of the saints, especially martyrs. In Germanos's hymns, martyrs are frequently presented offering themselves as a living sacrifice to God.

Another topic considered is the use of a vocabulary from image-making applied to Christian saints in hymns attached to the name of Germanos, a phenomenon closely related to the iconoclastic controversy.

In the same chapter, I focus most on the modelling of the saints on biblical figures, a widespread idea among Christian writers in general. In this way, they obviously wanted to demonstrate the unity between the Old and New Testaments and especially the perception of continuity in the history of the chosen people of the "Old" and "New" Israel. Byzantine hymnographers made a major contribution in this regard, by embracing and elaborating upon this form of typology in their hagiographical hymns. Among the scriptural personages most invoked in their hymns are Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, David, and Elijah. From the New

---

Testament, the favourite figures were Paul, Peter, and John the Baptist. The faithful were exhorted to recognise biblical personages in the saints they praised. The large number of such examples in the corpus of the hymns under consideration suggests that their author or authors used them as an additional and highly effective avenue of biblical interpretation, too. In addition to this, by presenting the saints as images of biblical figures, the hymnographer wished to strengthen their authority among the congregants and present them as exemplars for emulation by the faithful. Since the ultimate goal of liturgical hymns is the edification of the faithful, hymnographers not only praised Christian martyrs and ascetics, but also prompted the congregation to imitate the martyrs' virtuous life similar to their biblical prototypes.

The cult of relics and icons is the subject in Chapter Three. The veneration of sacred objects, especially the instruments of Christ's Passion and the saints' physical remains, which had gained momentum in late antiquity, found a notable expression in Middle Byzantine liturgical poetry. There are seven such hymns preserved under the name of Germanos, five of which are devoted to so-called primary relics, i.e., saints' bodies or bodily parts. They are composed for the following feasts: 1) Translation of the relics of John Chrysostom (27 January), which includes one nine-ode hymn and one *sticheron*; 2) First and Second Inventions of the Head of John the Baptist (24 February), one nine-ode hymn; 3) Translation of the relics of Athanasios the Great (2 May), one *sticheron*; and 4) Invention of the relics of Kyros and John, the unmercenary physicians (28 June), one nine-ode hymn. The hymn for the feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross (14 September) has for its subject the central relics of the Passion, namely, the Holy Cross and the Holy Lance. The most revered relic of the apostle Peter, the chain that bound him during his imprisonment, is praised in the *kanon* for the feast known in the Byzantine tradition as the veneration of the apostle Peter's precious chains (16 January). Both of these hymns still remain unpublished. The first one is transmitted in two manuscripts: Sinait. gr. 552, ff. 127v-130v (11th c.) and Chalc. Panaghias 61, ff. 39-41 (16th c.). The second one is preserved in a single manuscript, Sinait. gr. 598, ff. 111r-v – ?, whose largest part is in poor condition and almost illegible.

In this part of my thesis I also discuss references to sacred images. Although icons are mentioned in many of these hymns, the *kanon* for the annual celebration of Mary of Egypt is of special interest. Its author refers several times to the well-known episode from Mary's life when an icon of the Virgin Mary prevented her from entering the church of the Holy

Sepulchre in Jerusalem to venerate the Holy Cross. In this way, he invests the image with a miracle-working power comparable to that of relics.

In the conclusion, I summarise the results of my research followed by the catalogue of hymns attributed to Germanos I.

Chapter One

Mariological Poetry

In this chapter I deal with Mariological hymnographic works transmitted under the name of the patriarch Germanos I. The chapter is divided into three sections corresponding to three unpublished Marian *kanons* ascribed to the patriarch. It is preceded by a brief introduction to the tradition that developed around his activity as a "Marian" homilist and hymnographer and even the author of the Akathistos hymn. The analysis of the three *kanons* is situated in the context of the iconoclastic controversy, which coincided with and gave a further impetus to the rapid development of the Marian cult.

Germanos I and the authorship of Mariological poetry

The name of the patriarch Germanos I is traditionally closely associated with the development of the cult of the Mother of God in Constantinople.[1] This follows from the fact that he was early credited with authorship of both homilies and hymns in her honour. Germanos's name is attached to three homilies on the Dormition of the Virgin Mary,[2] two on her Entrance into the temple,[3] and one on the Annunciation, written almost entirely in the form of a dialogue.[4]

Hymns in honour of the Virgin Mary attributed to the patriarch Germanos include *kanons* and *stichera* composed to be sung on several feasts dedicated to the Mother of God. They also potentially include *theotokia*,[5] which as the final *troparion* conclude each ode of all

[1] T. Horvath, "*Germanus of Constantinople and the Cult of the Virgin Mary*, *Mother of God*, *Mediatrix* of All Human Beings," *De Cultu Mariano Saeculis VI-IX*, vol. 4, Rome: *Pontificia Academia Mariana Internationalis*, 1972, 285-299.
[2] *CPG* 8010-8012. PG 98, 340-372.
[3] *CPG* 8007-8008. PG 98, 292-320.
[4] *CPG* 8009. The edition of this homily in PG 98, 319-340 is incomplete. For its most comprehensive edition, although based on one single manuscript, see D. Fecioru, ed., Τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Γερμανοῦ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τοῦ ὁμολογητοῦ Λόγος εἰς τὸν Εὐαγγελισμὸν τῆς ὑπεραγίας Θεοτόκου ὡς ἐν σχήματι διαλόγου, *Biserica Orthodoxă Română* 64 (1946) 65-91; 180-192; 386-396. M. Cunningham is preparing a critical edition of this sermon. See her "The Reception of Romanos in Middle Byzantine Homiletics and Hymnography", *DOP* 62 (2008), 251-260. For an analysis of the dialogic form of this homily, see A. Kazhdan, *A History of Byzantine Literature (650-850)*, in collaboration with L. F. Sherry – C. Angelidi, [Research Series 2], Athens: The National Hellenic Research Foundation, Institute for Byzantine Research, 1999, 61-64. Its dramatic character also attracted the interest of the scholars who investigated Byzantine theatre. See in this regard L. Piana, "The Byzantine Theatre", *Speculum* 11.2 (1936) 171-211, here 182, and more recently W. Puchner, "Τὸ βυζαντινὸ θέατρο", *Κέντρον ἐπιστημονικῶν ἐρευνῶν: Ἐπετηρίς* 11 (1981-1982) 214-217.
[5] For *theotokia* see briefly *ODB* 3, 2070.

the *kanons* preserved under the name of the Constantinopolitan patriarch. *Kanons* for three Marian feasts are preserved, and all still remain unpublished. They are the following: 1) For the Nativity of the Virgin Mary (9 September),[6] 2) For the *Hypapante* (2 February),[7] and 3) For the Annunciation (25 March).[8] There is also a set of three *stichera* for the first two feasts attributed to Germanos that are currently used in the liturgy of the Eastern Church. The *kanon* with a set of *stichera* could have formed a complete *akolouthia* for these feasts. Germanos also expresses interest in the Theotokos in his *Historia Mystica* as, for instance, when he allegorically interprets the censer: "The interior of the censer is understood as the [sanctified] womb of the [holy] virgin [and Theotokos] who bore the divine coal, Christ, in whom 'the whole fullness of deity dwells bodily' (Col 2:9). All together, therefore, give forth the sweet-smelling fragrance".[9]

Moreover, a comparison between Germanos's liturgical commentary and some hymns ascribed to Germanos could even be invoked in support of their genuineness. For example, in the second *sticheron* for the *Hypapante* the hymnographer invites Symeon to "receive as an infant and subject to the Law him whom Moses foresaw on Mount Sinai under the darkness giving the Law. It is he who spoke through the Law; it is he who was proclaimed by prophets...".[10] The following passage from the *Historia mystica,* where the author allegorically interprets the Gospel (liturgical book) as the arrival of God into human history, may be seen as a parallel to the quoted *sticheron*. The whole excerpt is as follows: "He is no longer speaking to us as through a cloud and indistinctly, as he did to Moses through thunder and lightning and trumpets, by a voice, by darkness and fire on the mountain. Nor does he appear through dreams as to the prophets, but appeared visibly as a true man".[11] In both

---

[6] Sinait. gr. 552, ff. 76-78v (eleventh century), Sinait. gr. 645, 29v-35 (fourteenth century), and Sinait. gr. 671, ff. 24v-29 (fourteenth century).

[7] Athos, Kausokalyvion (?). For the problems regarding Eustratiadis' frequent but unspecified reference to a manuscript or manuscripts of the Athonite Skete of Kausokalyvion, see E. Papailiopoulou-Photopoulou, *Ταμεῖον ἀνεκδότων βυζαντινῶν ἀσματικῶν κανόνων seu Analecta Hymnica Graeca e codicibus eruta Orientis Christiani*, Athens: Σύλλογος πρὸς διάδοσιν ὠφελίμων βιβλίων, 1996, 50, n. 51.

[8] The *kanon* is preserved in three Sinai manuscripts: Sinait. gr. 609, ff. 104v-106 (eleventh century), Sinait. gr. 611, ff. 149-151v (fourteenth century) and Sinait. gr. 645, ff. 200-204 (fourteenth century).

[9] Ἤ πάλιν ἡ γαστὴρ τοῦ θυματηρίου νοηθείη ἂν (ἡμῖν) ἡ (ἡγιασμένη) μήτρα τῆς (ἁγίας) παρθένου (καὶ Θεοτόκου) φοροῦσα τὸν θεῖον ἄνθρακα Χριστόν, «ἐν ᾧ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς», διὸ καὶ τὴν ὀσμὴν τῆς εὐωδίας ἀναδίδωσιν εὐωδιάζων τὰ σύμπαντα. Meyendorff, ed. and trans., *St Germanus of Constantinople on the Divine Liturgy*, 79-81. See also 75, 85 and 97.

[10] Δέχου Συμεών, ὃν ὑπὸ τὸν γνόφον, Μωσῆς νομοθετοῦντα, προεώρα ἐν Σινᾷ, βρέφος γενόμενον, νόμῳ ὑποταττόμενον. Οὗτός ἐστιν, ὁ διὰ νόμου λαλήσας, οὗτός ἐστιν, ὁ ἐν προφήταις ῥηθείς, ὁ σαρκωθεὶς δι᾽ ἡμᾶς, καὶ σώσας τὸν ἄνθρωπον. Αὐτὸν προσκυνήσωμεν.

[11] Τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν ἐστιν ἡ παρουσία τοῦ Θεοῦ καθ᾽ ἣν ὡράθη ἡμῖν, οὐκ ἔτι διὰ νεφελῶν καὶ αἰνιγμάτων λαλῶν ἡμῖν ὥς ποτε τῷ Μωϋσῇ διὰ φωνῶν καὶ ἀστραπῶν καὶ σαλπίγγων ἤχω καὶ γνόφῳ καὶ πυρὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους, ἢ τοῖς προφήταις δι᾽ ἐνυπνίων, ἀλλ᾽ ἐμφανῶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἀληθινὸς ἐφάνη. St Germanus of Constantinople, *On the Divine Liturgy*, 80-81.

passages the author juxtaposes God's apparition to Moses on Mount Sinai in the form of different symbols with his appearance in flesh as an infant and a true man.

The patriarch's great interest in themes related to the Mother of God, widely observed in his writings, can be put forward as a strong indication in favour of the authenticity of the Mariological hymns attributed to him. Yet, his authorship is not easy to prove, as is clear throughout my analysis of these hymns.

While the number of *kanons* and *stichera* in honour of the Virgin Mary is relatively small, the number of *theotokia* is extremely large and exceeds six hundred. This figure comes from the total number of *kanons*, which is about sixty-five, multiplied by nine odes. However, the *theotokia* found in the corpus of the *kanons* ascribed to Germanos are also encountered in hymns attached to the names of other Byzantine hymnographers. This means that they do not belong to the same author and, therefore, will not be treated in this thesis. An exception to this are the *theotokia* in the *kanon* for the annual commemoration of Mary of Egypt. Their content, which is mostly focused on Mary's encounter with the Virgin Mary's icon, clearly shows that they represent an integral part of the hymn.

Germanos and the Akathistos hymn

The Akathistos hymn needs also to be mentioned in the context of the Mariological hymns attributed to Germanos, since several scholars have argued in favour of his authorship either of the entire hymn or at least of its second *prooimion* Τῇ ὑπερμάχῳ στρατηγῷ. Many hypotheses have been proposed concerning the date of the Akathistos hymn's composition that range from the fourth to the eighth centuries.[12] Of primary importance for the present discussion is a piece of evidence recorded in a preamble to the Latin translation of the Akathistos, completed at the beginning of the ninth century, which ascribes this masterpiece to Patriarch Germanos and relates it to the Arab siege of Constantinople in 717/718.[13] Alexander Kazhdan tends to accept Germanos's authorship. Kazhdan implies this not only by including his discussion about the Akathistos in the chapter on Germanos of his *History of*

---

[12] For an overview of various attributions, see E. Wellesz, "The 'Akathistos'. A Study in Byzantine Hymnography", *DOP* 9 (1956) 141-174, who personally ascribes the Akathistos to Romanos the Melode. L. M. Peltomaa, on the other hand, firmly supports an early date of its compostition by situating it in the context of the Third Oecumenical Council (431), when the Marian doctrine was formulated. L. M. Peltomaa, *The Image of the Virgin Mary in the Akathistos Hymn*, Leiden: Brill, 2001.

[13] M. Huglo, "L'ancienne version latine de l'Hymne Acathiste", *Muséon* 64 (1951) 27-61.

Byzantine Literature,[14] but also by pointing to the fact that in the hymn the Virgin Mary is called an "indestructible rampart of the empire, who destroyed the enemy and triumphed over him".[15] Kazhdan continues that this, in combination with Mary's characterisation as "the thunderbolt striking the enemy,"[16] and her praise for redeeming the Byzantines "from the barbarian religion," as well as from "the veneration of fire",[17] alludes to a certain time when the Empire or its capital was rescued from an invasion or siege. The reference to "the veneration of fire", which hints at the Persians, may also be an allusion to the Arabs, as the knowledge of Islam was rather limited at that time. Moreover, examples of this kind of confusion are attested by some contemporary sources.[18] The three prolonged sieges of Constantinople that took place during the seventh and eighth centuries, namely in 626, 674-678 and 717/718, could provide a chronological frame for the Akathistos' composition. Hence, the association of the origin of the Akathistos hymn with one of these three sieges sounds very plausible for Kazhdan. This seems highly likely at least for the second *prooimion*, Τῇ ὑπερμάχῳ στρατηγῷ, which was composed on behalf of Constantinople after the city's deliverance "from danger". Its text reads as follows:

> Τῇ ὑπερμάχῳ στρατηγῷ τὰ νικητήρια
>
> ὡς λυτρωθεῖσα τῶν δεινῶν εὐχαριστήρια
>
> ἀναγράφω σοι ἡ πόλις σου, θεοτόκε·
>
> ἀλλ᾽ ὡς ἔχουσα τὸ κράτος ἀπροσμάχητον
>
> ἐκ παντοίων με κινδύνων ἐλευθέρωσον,
>
> ἵνα κράζω σοι·
>
> "Χαῖρε, νύμφη ἀνύμφευτε".

> To thee, unconquered Queen, I thy city from danger freed an offering of thanks inscribe. O Forth-bringer of God! Yet for thy unconquerable might free me from all hurt that I may sing to thee: Hail! Bride unbrided.[19]

Based on the letter of Pope Gregory II to the patriarch Germanos, in which the pope extols the patriarch for his contribution to the rescue of the Byzantine capital, Michel Huglo

---

[14] Kazhdan, *History of Byzantine Literature (650-850)*, 70-73.
[15] Oikos 23. Kazhdan, *History of Byzantine Literature (650-850)*, 71.
[16] Oikos 21.
[17] Oikos 9.
[18] For the whole discussion with relevant examples, see Kazhdan, *History of Byzantine Literature (650-850)*, 70-73. Kazhdan also refers to some other evidence that can be proposed as an argument in favour of Germanos's authorship of this hymn, as, for instance its analogy, to a certain degree, with the aforementioned homily on the Annunciation. Ibid, 72.
[19] Gambero, trans., *Mary and the Fathers of the Church*, 342.

considers this *prooimion* to be the work of Germanos.[20] Paul Speck, despite his general caution in accepting authenticity of the sources produced during the iconoclastic period, accepts Gregory II's letter as authentic at its core and, therefore, agrees with Huglo's opinion that Germanos was the author of the *prooimion*.[21]

References to icons of the Virgin Mary in the hymnographic production attributed to the patriarch Germanos I also deserve a closer examination in relation to Marian hymnography. Of great interest in this regard is the aforementioned nine-ode hymn for the feast of Mary of Egypt. The poet, reworking the account of Mary's penitence in front of the image of the Virgin Mary, which appeared in front of her in the courtyard of the church of Constantine in Jerusalem,[22] emphasises that the Marian icon precipitated her repentance. This topic will be addressed in more detail in Chapter Three where I deal with hymns dedicated to various relics.

In what follows, I will carry out an analysis of three *kanons* for three Mariological feasts, namely for the Nativity of the Virgin Mary (8 September); for the Annunciation (25 March), and for the *Hypapante* (2 February). I put the *Hypapante* at the end, because it appears to be "less" Mariological than the previous two. In order to facilitate the understanding of the analysis of each of these hymns, an overview of the historical development and theological meaning of the feasts under consideration will be included.

---

[20] Huglo, "L'ancienne version latine de l'Hymne Acathiste", 52-54.

[21] See his *Artabasdos, der rechtgläubige Vorkämpfer der göttlichen Lehren. Untersuchungen zur Revolte des Artabasdos und ihrer Darstellung in der byzantinischen Historiographie* (Poikila Byzantina 2), Bonn: Habelt, 1981, 169-171. For the text of the letter, see Mansi 13, 92C-100A. Speck maintains that the excerpt from 93 C2 to 97 D3 is an interpolation. Speck, *Artabasdos*, 155-178.

[22] It is believed that the Virgin Mary's image, which according to the account of Mary's *Life* was displayed "on a raised place", occupied a prominent place in the courtyard in front of the church of Constantine. Both the Piacenza Pilgrim (ca. 570) and Epiphanios the Monk (8th century) mention it. Epiphanios states explicitly that he saw "on the left side of Saint Constantine . . . the icon of the very holy Theotokos, who forbade Saint Mary to enter the church on the day of the Exaltation." Cf. J. Wilkinson, *Jerusalem Pilgrims before the Crusades*, Warminster*:* Aris and Phillips, 1977, 83, 117, 177. M. Kouli, intr. and trans., *Life of St. Mary of Egypt*, in: A.-M. Talbot, ed., *Holy Women in Byzantium: Ten Saints' Lives in English Translation*, Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1996, 83, n. 49.

1. The Nativity of the Virgin Mary (8 September)

The institution of the feast of the Virgin Mary's birth[23] was based on an apocryphal text known as the *Protevangelion of James*, dated to the second half of the second century.[24] The feast is considered to be of Jerusalem origin, since it is mentioned in Georgian redactions of the Jerusalem Lectionary compiled between the fifth and eighth centuries. The entry for 8 September reads as follows:

> September 8. In Probatica. Where the house of Joachim was. The birth of the Holy Mother of God.
>
> *Troparion*, mode 1: Your birth, Theotokos
>
> Psalm, mode 1: He has sanctified his dwelling [45.5/46.4b]
>
> Line: The Lord of Forces is with us [45.8/46.7]
>
> First Reading, Wisdom of Solomon [8.2-4]
>
> Second Reading, the Prophet Isaiah [11.1-9]
>
> Third Reading, the Prophet Isaiah [11.10; 16.5]
>
> Fourth Reading, Paul to the Hebrews [8.7-9.10]
>
> Alleluia: To you is due praise [Ps 64.2/65.1]
>
> Gospel of Luke [11.27-32]
>
> Handwashing: At your birth, most holy Mother of God
>
> Sanctification: God reigns among the peoples [Ps 46.9/47.8].[25]

It has been proposed that the feast of the Nativity of Mary originated from the dedication of a church to the Virgin nearby the Bethesda Pool, close to Anna's house, in which Mary was supposedly born. According to this hypothesis, the church may have been consecrated on 8

---

[23] For a brief survey of the feast of Mary's birth, see: *ODB* 1, 291; M. Cunningham, *Wider than Heaven: Eighth-century Homilies on the Mother of God*, Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2008, 19-28, and D. Krausmüller, "Making the Most of Mary: The Cult of the Virgin in the Chalkoprateia from Late Antiquity to the Tenth Century", in: L. Brubaker and M. Cunningham, eds., *The Cult of the Mother of God in Byzantium: Texts and Images*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2011, 219-245, with earlier bibliography.

[24] For the critical edition of the *Protevangelion of James*, see: E. de Strycker, *La forme la plus ancienne du Protévangile de Jacques. Recherches sur le Papyrus Bodmer 5 avec une édition critique du texte grec et une traduction annotée*, Subsidia Hagiographica 33, Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1961, 64-191. For its English translation, see: J. K. Elliott, ed., *The Apocryphal New Testament. A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation Based on M.R. James*, Oxford: The Oxford University Press, 1993. For the use of the *Protevangelion* in Byzantine sermons, see M. Cunningham, "The Use of the *Protevangelion of James* in the Eighth-Century Homilies on the Mother of God", in: Brubaker and Cunningham, eds., *The Cult of the Mother of God in Byzantium*, 165-178.

[25] *http://www.bombaxo.com/renoux.html*

September 543 and subsequently this date began to be celebrated annually as the feast of Mary's birth.[26]

The earliest evidence for the celebration of the feast of Mary's Nativity in Constantinople is believed to be a *kontakion* composed by Romanos the Melode.[27] Mary Cunningham, based on internal evidence, namely on the following verse from the *prooimion* of this *kontakion*: ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ γεννήσει, αὐτὴν ἑορτάζει καὶ ὁ λαός σου ("in your holy nativity, which your people also celebrate"), seems to accept such an early date for the feast's introduction into the calendar. On the other hand, she also refers to scholars who are more cautious in dating this feast so early.[28] The *Paschal Chronicle*'s reference to the Virgin Mary's birth on 8 September bears indirect testimony to its celebration in the first half of the seventh century: "under these consuls in the month of September on the eighth day, indiction 15, our Lady Mother of God was born from Joachim and Anna".[29] However, the earliest known sermons delivered on this feast are four by Andrew of Crete and one by John of Damascus in the first half of the eighth century.[30] This gap of two centuries between the first mention of the feast and the oldest preserved homilies prevents scholars from drawing a definite conclusion regarding the precise date of the institution of this Mariological feast.[31]

As far as the hymnographic texts on Mary's birth are concerned, names of several poets figure as authors of hymns included in the feast's liturgical service. Along with prominent hymnographers like Andrew of Crete, John, possibly of Damascus, and Patriarch Germanos, there are several other more obscure poets, including Sergios, Sergios of the Holy City,[32] and Stephen of the Holy City. Two *kanons*, attributed to John and Andrew

---

[26] See I. M. Calabuig, "The Liturgical Cult of Mary in the East and West", in: A. Chupungco, ed., *Handbook of Liturgical Studies* 5, Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2000, 254, and P. Bradshaw and M. Johnson, *The Origins of Feasts, Fasts and Seasons in Early Christianity*, Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2011, 211-212.

[27] *ODB* 1, 291. For its edition, see: P. Maas and C. Trypanis, eds., *Sancti Romani Melodi Cantica: Cantica Genuina*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1963, 276-280.

[28] M. Cunningham, "The Use of the *Protevangelion of James*", 166 and n. 22. See also D. Krausmüller, "Making the Most of Mary: The Cult of the Virgin in the Chalkoprateia from Late Antiquity to the Tenth Century", in: Brubaker and Cunningham, eds., *The Cult of the Mother of God in Byzantium*, 219-245.

[29] ἐπὶ τούτων τῶν ὑπάτων μηνὶ σεπτεμβρίῳ η´ ἡμέρᾳ β´ ἰνδ. ιε' ἐγεννήθη ἡ δέσποινα ἡμῶν ἡ Θεοτόκος ἀπὸ Ἰωακεὶμ καὶ Ἄννης. *Chronicon Paschale*, ed. L. Dindorf, Bonn: Weber, 1832, vol. 1, 366. It is believed that the *Paschal Chronicle* was composed in the 630s. For the basic information about the *Chronicon Paschale* and the date of its composition, see *ODB* 1, 447. For a more extensive discussion, see *Chronicon Paschale 284-628*, trans. and intr. M. Whitby and M. Whitby, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1989, ix-xxix.

[30] For their English translation, see Cunningham, *Wider than Heaven*, 71-138 and 53-70, respectively.

[31] See, for instance, Cunningham, *Wider than Heaven*, 21, n. 26.

[32] Manuscripts and printed liturgical books preserve hymns ascribed to Sergios without any other attributes, to Sergios of Constantinople, Sergios the Logothetes, Sergios of the Holy City and Sergius the Monk. Sophronios Eustratiadis identifies Sergios of the Holy City as a monk of Mar Sabbas monastery in the Judean desert, dating

respectively, are still in liturgical use. Another one, which could also belong to Andrew, but not currently used in the liturgy of the Eastern Church, has been published.[33] Several other *kanons* on this feast, including the one under consideration, which is attributed to Germanos, remain unpublished.[34]

Germanos's *kanon*, composed in fourth plagal mode, has been preserved as ἕτερος κανών (another *kanon*) in three Sinaitic manuscripts, namely: Sinait. gr. 552, ff. 76-78v (11th c.), Sinait. gr. 645, ff. 29v-35 (14th c.) and Sinait. gr. 671, ff. 24v-29 (14th c.). Its attribution to Germanos is encountered in the rubrics of all three of them and reads Ποίημα Γερμανοῦ (Poem of Germanos).

Although the authenticity of this hymn is hard to prove, it is notable that the chief celebration of Mary's Nativity as well as the feast of her Annunciation were not related to the church of the Blachernae as the main Marian shrine in Constantinople. Rather, they were linked to the church of the Chalkoprateia, which was situated near Hagia Sophia, and therefore both the institution and development of these feasts' liturgical services, including the earliest layer of their hymnographic texts, may have been in a closer relation to Constantinopolitan patriarchs.[35] It is not without importance in this regard that Patriarch Germanos, for example, delivered a homily praising the Virgin Mary's "girdle" or "belt" (ζώνη), which was kept in the Chalkoprateia.[36] This broader context serves as a positive indication of the hymn's genuineness. Moreover, Germanos's contribution to the development of the liturgical service for the Virgin's Nativity is also attested by three other monostrophic hymns (*stichera*), which are currently in the liturgical use of the Eastern Church. If this attribution is correct, then it can be adduced as an additional argument in favour of Germanos's authorship of the *kanon*, too. The existence of the second ode could additionally point that its Constantinopolitan provenance.

---

his activity to the eighth or ninth centuries. For more on the "Sergios problem", see Kazhdan, *Byzantine Literature*, 352.

[33] *AHG* 1, 146-157. There is no attribution, but judging from the style as well as the fact that the author of the *heirmoi* is Andrew, it is very likely that the entire *kanon* also belongs to Andrew.

[34] See Papailiopoulou-Photopoulou, 39-40.

[35] For the description of the celebration of the Virgin Mary's birth in Constantinople, see: Mateos, ed., *Typicon of the Great Church*, vol. 1, 18, 8-10 and 20, 7-11, and A. Moffatt and M. Tall, trans., *The Book of Ceremonies*, vol. 1, Canberra: Byzantina Australiensia 18, 2012, pp. 26-33. For more on Mary's cult in Chalkoprateia, see: Krausmüller, "Making the Most of Mary", 219-245, here 223.

[36] M. Geerard, ed., 2nd ed. J. Noret, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, Turnhout: Brepols, 2003, vol. 3, 507, no. 8013. For the history of this relic, see S. Shoemaker, "The Cult of Fashion: The Earliest *Life of the Virgin* and Constantinople's Marian Relics", *DOP* 62 (2008) 53-74, at 56, 61-66.

Despite the aforementioned positive indications, which could suggest the genuineness of the hymn, other formal features of the present *kanon* prevent us from drawing a definite conclusion regarding its authenticity. First of all, the hymn displays heterogeneity in terms of the use of the *heirmoi*. From the nine *heirmoi* or model stanzas used in the *kanon*, possibly seven of them are regarded as Germanos I's works in the earliest collections of *heirmoi*, known as *heirmologia* (Paris. Coisl. 22 and Athos. Laur. B 32).[37] Yet, they do not belong to the same sequence of the *heirmoi*. To be more specific, the *heirmoi* of the first ode (Τῷ ἐκτινάξαντι ἐν θαλάσσῃ) and the seventh ode (Ὁ τοὺς παῖδας δροσίσας) are found in the same sequence, namely in the one under No. 328, according to Eustratiadis's numeration.[38] The *heirmoi* of the third (Οὐκ ἔστιν ἅγιος) and the eighth odes (Τὸν ἐν ὄρει ἁγίῳ) belong to another sequence, No. 323.[39] The *heirmoi* of the second (Πρόσεχε οὐρανέ) and the ninth odes (Τὸν προδηλωθέντα) are taken from a third different sequence, namely from the one under No. 324.[40] Finally, the *heirmos* of the fourth ode (Εἰσακήκοα τὴν ἀκοήν) may have been borrowed from the sequence under No. 134[41] or is the first troparion of the resurrection kanon of mode four plagal of the Ancient Iadgari, rendered in French as follows: "J'entendis ta renommée et je fus effrayé, Seigneur; gloire à ta puissance", which in Greek could be: Εἰσακήκοα τὴν ἀκοήν σου καὶ ἐφοβήθην, Κύριε, δόξα τῇ δυνάμει σου.[42] The *heirmos* of the fifth ode (Ὁ ἐκ νυκτὸς ἀγνοίας) could belong to two sequences of *heirmoi*, which are attributed to both Germanos (No. 323)[43] and Andrew of Crete (No. 329).[44] These *heirmoi* begin with the same opening words, but differ in their final part. Finally, the *heirmos* of the sixth ode (Χιτῶνά μοι παράσχου) is not found in any of the sequences attached to the name of Germanos, but is ascribed to John the Monk.[45] The presence of the *heirmoi* from four sequences and attributed to two or even three different hymnographers causes serious problems for any attempt to determine Germanos's authorship of the *kanon*. In other words, they could easily be borrowed by a later hymnographer to model the *troparia* for the present *kanon*.

---

[37] Eustratiadis, *Εἱρμολόγιον*, passim.
[38] Eustratiadis, *Εἱρμολόγιον*, 229.
[39] Eustratiadis, *Εἱρμολόγιον*, 226.
[40] Eustratiadis, *Εἱρμολόγιον*, 226.
[41] Eustratiadis, *Εἱρμολόγιον*, 95.
[42] Renoux, *Les hymnes de la résurrection*, 2, PO 52:1, 2010, 98.
[43] Eustratiadis, *Εἱρμολόγιον*, 226.
[44] Ποίημα Ἀνδρέου Κρήτης. Eustratiadis, *Εἱρμολόγιον*, No. 329, p. 229.
[45] Ἰωάννου Μοναχοῦ. Eustratiadis, *Εἱρμολόγιον*, No. 321, p. 224.

Another formal characteristic of this *kanon* demanding closer attention is an unequal number of *troparia* used in its odes. The first and second odes contain five *troparia*; the third, seventh, eighth and ninth ode have three *troparia*; and, finally, odes four, five and six contain four *troparia*. The *theotokia*, which conclude each ode, do not refer to the celebrated feast and must be seen either as a later addition by a scribe or an editor, if the hymn is genuine, or were borrowed by the anonymous author, who did the same in regard to the *heirmoi*. It is also notable that only the first ode includes a *triadikon*. Since it is unusual for *kanons* to have only one *triadikon*, it is very likely that initially the other odes had it too. However, a later copyist or even the one who copied the present manuscript decided to exclude them from this *kanon*, but omitted to do the same in the first ode.

Content of the kanon

The *kanon* on Mary's Nativity is highly rhetorical with dramatic elements strongly emphasised. Along with his emphatic calls directed to the congregation to praise the celebrated event, the hymnographer also employed elaborate monologues delivered either by himself, who performs the role of narrator, or by the key protagonists involved in the event, especially Mary's mother Anna.

The *kanon* consists of three main thematic sections, which are not strictly distinguished. Naturally, the person of the Virgin Mary occupies a dominant position in the hymn, although only the first two odes are entirely focused on her. Mary's parents, and especially her mother Anna, figure prominently in the *kanon* as well, particularly in odes three to five. Finally, great prominence is also given to Christ, mostly in odes seven and eight. Therefore, unlike many other hymns included in the liturgical service of this feast, in which salvation, through the use of common rhetorical exaggerations, is attributed almost exclusively to Mary, in this *kanon* we can discern a balance between Mariology and Christology. The close relationship between Mariology and Christology should possibly be seen in the light of the iconoclast controversy. It has generally been argued that increasing interest in Mary's conception, birth and early childhood as well as in her parents, which can be observed from the eighth century onwards, reveals "the needs of the Iconophiles to

support the dogma of the Incarnation, and to emphasise Christ's humanity, his earthly origins and thus his physical forebears".[46]

The hymn begins with a call by the hymnographer to the congregation to praise the Virgin Mary as the one who was "predestined before the ages to become the Mother of God" and whom "the prophets predicted". The first *troparion* of the first ode reads as follows:

Τὴν πρὸ αἰώνων προορισθεῖσαν Θεοῦ γενέσθαι μητέρα, σήμερον τεχθεῖσαν τὴν Παρθένον ὑμνήσωμεν.

Let us praise the Virgin, born today, who was predestined before the ages to become the Mother of God.[47]

This *troparion* could be inspired by Prov. 8:22-24, which reads: "The Lord created me at the beginning of his work, the first of his acts of old. Ages ago I was set up, at the first, before the beginning of the earth".[48] Even though the passage refers to the Eternal Wisdom, that is to Christ as God the Logos, the hymnographer could actually elaborate on it, because in patristic literature this extract was interpreted in a broader Christological context. Since Christ's incarnation was part of the eternal divine plan, it also included the Virgin Mary, who facilitated the realisation of this plan.[49]

In the second *troparion* the author then turns from eternity to the sacred history, since he refers to the prophets, who predicted her birth:

Ἣν προεκήρυξαν οἱ προφῆται, τὴν Θεοτόκον Μαρίαν, τὴν τῶν χερουβὶμ ἁγιωτέραν τιμήσωμεν.

Let us honour Mary the Mother of God, whom the prophets predicted and who is holier than the cherubim.[50]

The author, by referring to the prophecies regarding Mary, invests her birth with great significance within the sequence of the sacred events leading up to Christ's incarnation. On

---

[46] E. Panou, "Mary's Parents in Homilies before and after James Kokkinobaphos", in: A. Eastmond and L. James. eds., *Wonderful Things: Byzantium through its Art. Papers from the 42nd Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, London, 20-22 March 2009*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2013, 335-348, at 335.
[47] Sinaiticus gr. 552, f. 76.
[48] Κύριος ἔκτισέν με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐθεμελίωσέν με ἐν ἀρχῇ. Πρὸ τοῦ τὴν γῆν ποιῆσαι.
[49] Unlike in the Eastern Church, where this passage was not read on the Mariological feasts, it is notable that it was used in the Mass of the Nativity of Mary in the West after the age of Charlemagne. See K. McDonnell, "The Marian Liturgical Tradition", in: M. Johnson, ed., *Between Memory and Hope. Readings on the Liturgical Year*, Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2000, 385-400, at 386.
[50] Sinait. gr. 552, f. 76v.

the other hand, by a direct address to the congregation the hymnographer takes the role of narrator, following in this way a well-established tradition in Byzantine homiletics and liturgical poetry. For example, Romanos the Melode in his hymns on the same feast invites the audience to prayer and directs "their attention to the liturgical moment".[51] The ending of all *troparia* of the first ode reads ἡ γέννησις γὰρ αὐτῆς χαρὰν ἐμήνυσεν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ("her birth has brought joy to all the inhabited earth"),[52] and is virtually identical with the opening verse from the feast's *apolytikion*, which is still in liturgical use in the Eastern Church: Ἡ γέννησίς σου *Θεοτόκε*, χαρὰν ἐμήνυσε πάσῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ("Your birth, O Theotokos, has brought joy to all the inhabited earth…").[53] Since it serves as a refrain, it could have been repeated by the congregation during the hymn's performance.

Furthermore, it also deserves to be noted at this point that the message contained in the refrain clearly reflects a passage from the *Protevangelion of James* in which an angel announces to Anna that God will give her a child: "Anna, Anna, the Lord has heard your prayer. You shall conceive and bear, and your offspring shall be spoken of in the whole world (ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ)".[54] In addition to this, the hymnographer's use of the words προσφορά (offering) and περιστερά (dove) to characterise the Virgin Mary in the two following *troparia* respectively, also indicates the direct influence of this apocryphal writing on him. The first of these two words, used in the third *troparion*, Τὴν προσφορὰν τὴν ὄντως ἁγίαν … τιμήσωμεν (Let us honour the truly holy *offering*),[55] is reminiscent of Anna's promise to the angel to offer her expected child as a gift to God: "As the Lord my God lives, if I bear a child, whether male or female, I will bring it as a gift to the Lord my God, and it shall serve him all the days of its life".[56] Mary's characterisation as a dove in the fourth *troparion* of the first ode– Τὴν περὶ πάντα κεκαθαρμένην, τὴν ἁγνὴν περιστεράν… ὑμνήσωμεν (Let us praise the pure and chaste dove)[57]–is encountered in the context of her presentation in the temple, when

---

[51] D. Krueger, *Liturgical Subjects. Christian Ritual, Biblical Narrative, and the Formation of the Self in Byzantium*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014, 72.
[52] Sinait. gr. 552, ff. 76r-v. A similar phrase we also find in his second *sticheron* on this feast: τὴν χαρὰν προμηνύουσα παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ (proclaiming joy to all the world). Mother Mary and Archimandrite Kallistos, 106.
[53] Mother Mary and Archimandrite Kallistos, 107.
[54] Καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄγγελος Κυρίου ἔστη λέγων· ' Ἄννα Ἄννα, ἐπήκουσεν Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς τῆς δεήσεώς σου. Συλλήμψεις καὶ γεννήσεις, καὶ λαληθήσεται τὸ σπέρμα σου ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ'. De Strycker, *La forme la plus ancienne du Protévangile de Jacques*, 4.1, p. 78. For the English translation, see: Elliot, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, 58.
[55] Sinait. gr. 552, f. 76v.
[56] Ζῇ Κύριος ὁ Θεός· ἐὰν γεννήσω εἴτε ἄρσενα εἴτε θήλειαν, προσάξω αὐτὸ δῶρον [αὐτὸ] Κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ μου, καὶ ἔσται λειτουργῶν αὐτῷ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ. Elliot, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, 58.
[57] Sinait. gr. 552, f. 76v.

she was three years old: "And Mary was in the temple of the Lord nurtured like a dove and received food from the hand of an angel."[58]

In the second ode the hymnographer employs typology in order to demonstrate that Mary's birth was announced in the Old Testament. Each *troparion* begins with the word σήμερον (today) as epanaphora, which, along with the present tense of the verb γεννάω (bear, give birth) stresses that the celebration of this event is not simply the commemoration of the past event. Rather, the liturgical commemoration renders the event as though it is taking place at the moment of its celebration. With the use of the word "today", the poet underscores the insertion of the congregation into the celebrated event, which represents one of the great milestones in the divine economy of salvation with profound salvific consequences for the congregants.[59] The faithful are gathered to be "witnesses of their own salvation" as well as to "understand themselves as the objects of God's work on earth".[60] In other words, they are invited to experience the ultimate results of the celebrated event. The extensive use of the word "today" in the first homily *On the Entrance into the Temple* as well as in the sermon on the Annunciation, both considered Germanos's genuine work, should be noted, since it could point to the same author.[61]

In *troparia* two to five of the second ode, the hymnographer applies to Mary several most characteristic Old Testament types. By the use of typology, the author emphasises the Virgin Mary's meaning and importance for the salvation of humankind. He first refers to Mary as ἐπουράνιος κλίμαξ–"the ladder of heaven" (cf. Gen 28:12):

> Σήμερον, ἡ ἐπουράνιος κλίμαξ, ἣν ἴδεν πρὶν Ἰακώβ, ἡ Παρθένος γεννᾶται, εἰς δόξαν παντὸς τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν.

> Today, the ladder of heaven, which Jacob saw, the Virgin is born to the glory of the whole of our race.[62]

The image of Mary as "the ladder of heaven" has its origin in the Old Testament narrative of the biblical patriarch Jacob's dream in which he saw the ladder stretching from earth to

---

[58] Ἦν δὲ Μαρία ἐν ναῷ Κυρίου ὡσεὶ περιστερὰ νεμομένη καὶ ἐλάμβανε τροφὴν ἐκ χειρὸς ἀγγέλου. Elliot, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, p. 60.
[59] For more on the understanding of time in liturgical context, see K. W. Irwin, *Context and Text: Method in Liturgical Theology*, Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1993, 93, and Krueger, *Liturgical Subjects*, 75-76.
[60] Krueger, *Liturgical Subjects*, 67 and 72.
[61] *CPG* 3, 8007, p. 505.
[62] Sinait. gr. 552, f. 76v-77.

heaven, while the angels of God were ascending and descending it. This metaphor appears in both homilies[63] and hymnography, including the Akathistos hymn.[64]

In the third *troparion*, the Mother of God is identified as ἀκατάφλεκτος βάτος–"the bush that does not burn" (Ex. 3:2):

> Σήμερον, ἡ ἀκατάφλεκτος βάτος, ἣν ἴδεν πάλαι Μωσῆς, ἡ Παρθένος γεννᾶται, εἰς δόξαν παντὸς τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν.

> Today, the bush that does not burn, which Moses saw in the past, the Virgin is born to the glory of the whole of our race.[65]

The earliest evidence for a Mariological interpretation of the episode with Moses at the burning bush, which was not consumed, is attested in Gregory of Nyssa's *Life of Moses*. According to Gregory, this miraculous phenomenon, which Moses saw on Mount Sinai, explains Mary's virginity. As the bush burned, but was not consumed, so when the Virgin Mary gave birth to Jesus Christ, the birth did not consume her virginity.[66]

In the fourth *troparion* of the same ode, the Virgin Mary is characterised as ἐπουράνιος πύλη (the gate of heaven):

> Σήμερον, ἡ ἐπουράνιος πύλη, δι᾽ ἧς διῆλθεν Χριστός, ἡ Παρθένος γεννᾶται, εἰς δόξαν παντὸς τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν.

---

[63] See, for instance, John of Damascus's sermon on the Nativity of Mary: Ὁ βραχίων ὁ ἰσχυρὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου, ὡς ἑαυτοῦ δακτύλῳ, τῷ πνεύματι, ἀμβλυθὲν τὸ σκέπαρνον ἀκονήσας τῆς φύσεως κατεσκεύασεν ἑαυτῷ ἔμψυχον κλίμακα, ἧς ἡ βάσις ἐπὶ γῆς ἐστήρικται, ἡ δὲ κεφαλὴ πρὸς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν, ἐφ᾽ ἧς θεὸς ἀναπέπαυται, ἧς τὸν τύπον Ἰακὼβ ἐθεάσατο, δι᾽ ἧς θεὸς καταβὰς ἀμεταβάτως, μᾶλλον δὲ συγκαταβὰς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὤφθη καὶ τῆς ἀνθρώποις συνανεστράφη. (The strong arm of God the Highest, with the Spirit as his own finger, sharpening the blunted axe of [our] nature, has prepared for himself a living ladder whose base has been set on earth and whose top [reaches] to heaven itself; the type that Jacob saw was of her (cf. Gen 28:12). God descended without change through her, or in other words, having accommodated himself, he was seen on earth and lived along with humankind). B. Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, Patristische Texte und Studien 29, Berlin and New York: W. de Gruyter, 1988, vol. 5, 169-182, at 171-172; P. Voulet, *S. Jean Damascène, Homélies sur la nativité et la dormition*, SC 80, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1961, 46–78. For the English translation, see Cunningham, *Wider Than Heaven*, 56-57. The image is also found in the homily on Mary's Dormition attributed to Germanos I: κλίμακα πρὸς οὐρανὸν ἀνθρώπους ἀναβιβάζειν ἰσχύουσα. PG 98, 361D.

[64] 3.10: Χαῖρε, κλῖμαξ ἐπουράνιε, δι᾽ ἧς κατέβη ὁ Θεός (Hail, celestial ladder by which God descended). Peltomaa, *The Image of the Virgin Mary*, 4-5.

[65] Sinait. gr. 552, f. 77.

[66] Δι᾽ οὗ διδασκόμεθα καὶ τὸ κατὰ τὴν Παρθένον μυστήριον ἀφ᾽ ἧς τὸ τῆς θεότητος φῶς ἐπιλάμψαν τῷ ἀνθρωπίνῳ βίῳ διὰ γεννήσεως ἀδιάφθορον ἐφύλαξε τὴν ἐξάψασαν θάμνον, τοῦ βλαστοῦ τῆς παρθενίας μὴ καταμαρανθέντος τῷ τόκῳ. (From this we learn also the mystery of the Virgin: The light of divinity which through birth shone from her into human life did not consume the burning bush, even as the flower of her virginity was not withered by giving birth). J. Danielou, ed., *Grégoire de Nysse. La vie de Moise* 2.21, SC 1, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1968. For the English translation, see Gregory of Nyssa, *The Life of Moses*, A. Malherbe and E. Ferguson, trans., New York: Paulist Press, 1978, 58.

Today, the gate of heaven, through which Christ passed, the Virgin is born to the glory of the whole of our race.[67]

The hymnographer, by calling Mary "the gate of heaven" through which Christ passed, combines Ezekiel's vision about the closed gate through which God will pass, but the gate will remain closed (Ezekiel 44:2),[68] with the abovementioned text from the book of Genesis about the heavenly ladder Jacob saw in his dream (Gen. 28:11-17). In the last verse of the description of the famous biblical episode, Jacob uses the phrase ἡ πύλη τοῦ οὐρανοῦ to designate the place where he saw his dream: "And he was afraid, and said, How fearful is this place! This is none other than the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven".[69] It is notable that both these passages are still read in the liturgy of the Eastern Church at all Marian feasts.[70]

Finally, in the last *troparion* of the second ode the poet refers to Mary as τράπεζα (table) on which the heavenly bread was held:

Σήμερον, ἡ τὸν οὐράνιον ἄρτον φέρουσα τράπεζα, ἡ Παρθένος γεννᾶται, εἰς δόξαν παντὸς τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν.

Today, the table, which holds the heavenly bread, the Virgin is born to the glory of the whole of our race.[71]

Patriarch Germanos uses this Old Testament prefiguration in his *Historia Mystica* and relates it to the altar on which the Eucharist is celebrated: "This table was prefigured by the table of the Old Law upon which the manna, which was Christ, descended from heaven".[72] In the hymn, Mary is identified as a living table who held in her womb and bore Christ, who called himself "the bread of life" (John 6:35), which is offered to the faithful in the Eucharist.

---

[67] Sinait. gr. 552, f. 77.

[68] Καὶ εἶπεν Κύριος πρὸς με ἡ πύλη αὕτη κεκλεισμένη ἔσται οὐκ ἀνοιχθήσεται καὶ οὐδεὶς μὴ διέλθη δι᾽ αὐτῆς ὅτι Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ εἰσελεύσεται δι᾽ αὐτῆς καὶ ἔσται κεκλεισμένη (And th Lord said to me, "This gate shall be shut; it shall not be opened, and no-one shall enter by it, because the Lord God of Israel has entered by it; therefore it shall be shut).

[69] Καὶ ἐφοβήθη καὶ εἶπεν [Ἰακώβ] ὡς φοβερὸς ὁ τόπος οὗτος οὐκ ἔστιν τοῦτο ἀλλ᾽ ἢ οἶκος Θεοῦ καὶ αὕτη ἡ πύλη τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

[70] An exception to this is the feast of the Entrance of the Virgin Mary into the Temple (21 November), on which an extract from Exodus (40:1-35) is read instead of the passage from Genesis.

[71] Sinait. gr. 552, f. 77.

[72] Προετυπώθη δὲ καὶ ἐν τῇ νομικῇ τραπέζῃ ἔνθα ἦν τὸ μάννα, ὅ ἐστι ὁ Χριστός, ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς. Meyendorff, ed. and trans., *St Germanus of Constantinople on the Divine Liturgy*, 58-59. John of Damascus in his sermon for Mary's Nativity also uses this image. See Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, vol. 5, 169-182, at 176.

Furthermore, all four of them end with a refrain "the Virgin is born to the glory of the whole our race",[73] which could easily be repeated by the congregants.

In odes three to six a prominent place is given to Mary's parents, mainly to her mother, Anna. This theme is introduced in the first *troparion* of the third ode, which begins with a call by the narrator in first-person plural directed to all congregants to praise the Virgin Mary's parents:

Ὑμνήσωμεν ἅπαντες, τοὺς τεκόντας εὐσεβῶς, τὴν Παρθένον Μαρίαν καὶ Θεοτόκον, τὴν ἀεὶ δυσωποῦσαν Χριστὸν τὸν Θεὸν ἡμῶν, σωθῆναι τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν.

Let everybody praise in accordance with right faith those who bore the Virgin Mary and the Mother of God, who is constantly importuning Christ the God to save our souls.[74]

While in the second *troparion* of the same ode the narrator also addresses all the gathered faithful, inviting them to praise the Virgin Mary "born of Anna", in the following *troparion* he invites in the second-person plural two particular groups of the congregation, namely mothers and barren women, to "dance for joy" and "rejoice", because Anna, although "barren and sterile", became a mother:

Μητέρες χορεύσατε, καὶ εὐφράνθητε στεῖραι, ὅτι ἡ στεῖρα καὶ ἄγονος μήτηρ γεγένηται, ἡ θεόκλητος Ἄννα, καρπὸν ἀναβλαστήσασα, ἐξ ἧς ἡ σωτηρία Χριστός.

Mothers, dance for joy, and rejoice barren ones, because the barren and sterile one, the divine Anna, became a mother, shooting up the offspring from which Christ the saviour arrived.[75]

In ode six Anna herself addresses mothers in a direct speech, as if being present, inviting them to join her in exultation:

Ἀγάλλεσθαι μητέρες σὺν ἐμοί, μητέρα γὰρ ἔτεκον, τοῦ μήτραν ἀνοίξαντος, ἡ θεόφρων ἐκβοᾷ Ἄννα σήμερον.

Mothers, rejoice with me, since I bore the mother of the One who opened the womb [of her], Anna of godly mind is calling out today.[76]

There is little doubt that with references to barren women the hymnographer presents Anna as a source of solace and hope for women who faced a similar problem. Moreover, by

---

[73] ἡ Παρθένος γεννᾶται· εἰς δόξαν παντὸς τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν (f. 77).
[74] Sinait. gr. 552, f. 77.
[75] Sinait. gr. 552, f. 77.
[76] Sinait. gr. 552, f. 77v.

highlighting Anna's sterility the poet points to another widespread idea in both patristic literature and poetic texts according to which the Virgin Mary's birth from an old and sterile woman served as a prelude to her miraculous giving birth to Christ. Actually, this is clearly stated in the final *troparion* of ode four:

> Ἐκ τῆς στείρας ἡ ἁγνή, σήμερον κόρη προῆλθεν ἐξ ἧς ἐτέχθη, παραδόξως ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ Θεός.

> Today from the barren woman a pure daughter proceeded from whom was miraculously born Christ the God.[77]

Odes seven and eight, as well as the first *troparion* of the ninth ode, are of Christological character. In them Christ is extolled as the cause of this extraordinary birth, because he accepted Joachim and Anna's prayers and blessed Anna's womb in order to prepare his own incarnation, which is salvific for all humankind. This idea is expressed in two *troparia* of ode seven. The second *troparion* of ode seven reads as follows:

> Ὁ τῆς Ἄννης τὴν μήτραν εὐλογήσας, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς γεννηθῆναι, τὴν σὲ τεκοῦσαν εὐδοκήσας, εὐλογητὸς εἶ, Κύριε, ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν.

> You who blessed the womb of Anna, and chose that she who would bear you be born from her, blessed are you, O Lord, God of our fathers.[78]

The third *troparion* of the same ode is as follows:

> Ὁ τὰς εὐχὰς καὶ δεήσεις τῶν δικαίων Ἰωακεὶμ καὶ τῆς Ἄννης προσδεξάμενος ὡς οἰκτίρμων, εὐλογητὸς εἶ, Κύριε, ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν.

> You, who as the merciful one accepted the prayers and supplications of righteous Joachim and Anna, blessed are you, O Lord, God of our fathers.[79]

The fact that he answered Joachim's and Anna's prayers gives hope to the congregation that their supplications would also be accepted. This hope is expressed in the first *troparion* of ode nine:

> Ὁ τοὺς στεναγμοὺς καὶ τὰ δάκρυα τῶν δικαίων Ἰωακεὶμ καὶ Ἄννης προσδεξάμενος, οἰκτίρμων, καὶ ἡμῶν τῶν πιστῶν τὰς δεήσεις μὴ παρίδεις, μόνε ἀναμάρτητε.

---

[77] Sinait. gr. 552, f. 77v.
[78] Sinait. gr. 552, f. 78.
[79] Sinait. gr. 552, f. 78.

> You, who as the merciful one accepted the sighs and tears of righteous Joachim and Anna, do not disregard the supplications of us, your faithful, the only sinless one.[80]

The hymn ends with a prayer to the Virgin Mary to intercede without ceasing for her servants, because God the Logos dwelled in her and was ineffably born in flesh from her. The final *troparion* of ode nine reads as follows:

> Τὸν ἐν σοὶ Παρθένε οἰκήσαντα Θεὸν Λόγον, καὶ ἐκ σοῦ ἀρρήτως σαρκὶ προελθόντα ἀφράστῳ λόγῳ, δυσωποῦσα μὴ παύσῃ ὑπὲρ δούλων τῶν ἀκαταπαύστως ἀνυμνούντων σε.

> O Virgin, the God Logos who dwelled in you and inexplicably came from you in flesh through the ineffable word, do not cease to importune for your servants, who ceaselessly praise you.[81]

To sum up, the author of this hymn includes the Virgin Mary's birth in the sequence of the most important events leading up to Christ's incarnation, which he himself prepared by facilitating his mother's birth from her old parents. To achieve this, the hymnographer refers to Old Testament prophecies and applies typological and allegorical interpretations to events from sacred history. The author also shows great interest in Mary's parents, a detail undoubtedly betraying his intention to emphasise Christ's earthly origins, which was one of the main iconophile arguments in support of icon veneration, especially in the early stage of the iconoclastic controversy.

Now I will turn my attention to the *kanon* for Mary's Annunciation, the event presented in the hymn as the restoration of humankind and a recapitulation of the creation.

---

[80] Sinait. gr. 552, f. 78v.
[81] Sinait. gr. 552, f. 78v.

2. The Annunciation of the Virgin Mary (25 March)

The Annunciation is the feast celebrating the Archangel Gabriel's announcement to the Virgin Mary of the conception of Jesus Christ, which was to be accomplished by the coming of the Holy Spirit on her (Luke 1:26-38). This New Testament event, unlike the feast of the Nativity of the Virgin Mary that was not mentioned in the canonical gospels, began to be commemorated relatively early, although not as an independent feast. Rather, according to the Armenian Lectionary, at the beginning of the fifth century it constituted a part of the Epiphany cycle, which lasted for eight days and included the liturgical remembrance of the events related to Christ's birth.[82] Among them was the Annunciation, commemorated in Sion on the fourth day of the octave of the Epiphany. Here is how the feast was celebrated, according to the rubrics of the Lectionary:

> The fourth day, they assemble at Holy Sion, and this canon is performed:
> Psalm 109, antiphon: "In the splendour of the saints, before the morning star, I have begotten you" [110]
> Reading from the Letter of the Apostle Paul to the Galatians [4:1-7]
> Alleluia, Psalm 131 [132]
> Gospel according to Luke [1:26-38].[83]

Along with the Annunciation, the Lectionary also mentions the Visitation of Mary at Elizabeth's house, remembered on the third day in Sion.[84] Furthermore, as was noted above, the Presentation in the Temple (the *Hypapante*), with Mary as one of the four key protagonists in the event, along with the child Christ, Symeon and Anna, was also closely related to the Epiphany/Nativity cycle, as the date of its celebration on the fortieth day after the Epiphany demonstrates. Accordingly, all liturgical references to the Virgin Mary in the

---

[82] Renoux, *Le codex arménien*, 180-181. The Epiphany marks the beginning of the liturgical year in both the Armenian and Georgian Lectionaries. For an extensive discussion on these lectionaries, see S. Janeras, "Les lectionnaires de l'ancienne liturgie de Jérusalem", *Collectanea Christiana Orientalia* 2 (2005) 71-92, here 85, and D. Galadza, "The Jerusalem Lectionary and the Byzantine Rite", in: B. Groen, D. Galadza, N. Glibetic, and G. Radle, eds., *Rites and Rituals of the Christian East*, Leuven: Peeters, 2014, 181-199, here 188. With the vigil of Epiphany begins the liturgical section of Egeria's Travels, too. *Égérie: Journal de Voyage (Itinéraire)*, ed. and trans. Pierre Maraval, SC 296, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1982, 251. Generally for the feast of Epiphany and its origin, see M. Merras, *The Origins of the Celebration of the Christian Feast of Epiphany.An Ideological,Cultural and Historical Study*, Joensuu: University of Joensuu, 1995, and G. Winkler, "The Appearance of the Light at the Baptism of Jesus and the Origins of the Feast of Epiphany: An Investigation of Greek, Syriac, Armenian, and Latin Sources", in: Johnson, ed., *Between Memory and Hope*, 291–347.
[83] Renoux, *Le codex arménien*, 218-219. There is also evidence of the celebration of the Annunciation in Jerusalem during the period preceding Christmas on 25 December. See S. Janeras, "Le temps avant Noël dans l'ancienne liturgie de Jérusalem", *Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata* 4 (2007) 109-117.
[84] Ibid.

Jerusalem liturgy had a strong connection with the Epiphany/Nativity at an early stage of the development of the calendar. The same holds true for Constantinople,[85] where at the beginning of the fifth century some sort of Mariological feast, sometimes called "In Memory of the Holy Mary", was observed on one of the Sundays before Christmas or on 26 December, the day still dedicated to the honour of Mary in the Eastern Church.[86]

The *Commemoration of Mary Theotokos*, celebrated on the Marian shrine of the Kathisma on 15 August and first attested in the Armenian Lectionary, seems to be the earliest Marian feast exclusively devoted to the Virgin Mary, without any relation to Christ's birth.[87] Until relatively recently there was a general agreement on this in scholarship. However, a decade and a half ago it was proposed that even this Mariological feast was initially related to Christ's birth. Walter Ray, taking as a point of departure Bernard Botte's thesis regarding the date of Christ's Nativity celebration in the early Church,[88] posited that the institution of the feast on that specific date needs to be situated within the Judeo-Christian context and Isaac-Jesus typology.[89] More precisely, he links its establishment to the Essene *Book of Jubilees*, which is focused on the story of Isaac, who was born on 15 May and, accordingly, was conceived on 15 August. Support for his hypothesis he finds in the Armenian Lectionary in which the commemoration of the Holy Innocents occurs on 18 May instead of 28 December. In Ray's opinion, this "anomaly" may be an indication of a kind of celebration of Christ's Nativity in May as well.[90] While Paul Bradshaw and Maxwell Johnson tend to take this speculation into serious consideration, Rina Avner, who carried out archaeological excavations on the Kathisma site, rejects it categorically. Along with Egeria's silence regarding this feast in 381-384, Avner's other argument is the fact that there is no archaeological evidence for a shrine on this location before the beginning of the fifth

---

[85] Contrary to the Jerusalem tradition, the liturgical year in Constantinople commenced, and still commences, on 1 September. See Janeras, "Les lectionnaires de l'ancienne liturgie de Jérusalem", 85.

[86] There is no consensus among scholars on this issue. See Cunningham, *Wider than Heaven*, 19-20, with further bibliography. Paul Bradshaw and Maxwell Johnson have argued that there were two kinds of Marian feasts in Constantinople at the beginning of the fifth century: the one on the Sunday before and the other on the Sunday after Christmas. Bradshaw and Johnson, *The Origins of Feasts, Fasts and Seasons*, 210. Nicholas (Maximos) Constas, on the other hand, proposes 26 December as the feast's date. N. Constas, *Proclus of Constantinople and the Cult of the Virgin in Late Antiquity. Homilies 1-5, Texts and Translations*, Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2003, 58.

[87] For the Kathisma as the earliest *locus sanctus* of Mary in Jerusalem, see R. Avner, "The Initial Tradition of the Theotokos at the Kathisma: Earliest Celebrations and the Calendar", in: M. Cunningham and L. Brubaker, eds., *The Cult of the Mother of God in Byzantium*, 9-29.

[88] B. Botte, *Les Origines de la Noël et de l'Épiphanie. Étude historique*, Louvain: Mont Cesar, 1932, 17.

[89] W. Ray, *August 15 and the Development of the Jerusalem Calendar*, (PhD dissertation), University of Notre Dame 2000, 131, 136-137. Paul Bradshaw and Maxwell Johnson paid close attention to Ray's hypothesis in their book *The Origins of Feasts, Fasts and Seasons*, 207-210.

[90] Ray, *August 15 and the Development of the Jerusalem Calendar*, 129.

century.[91] In support of Avner's argument that Marian commemoration on 15 August should not be seen as a very early feast, I would draw attention to the epistle reading prescribed for this feast in the Armenian Lectionary. It was taken from Apostle Paul's Letter to the Galatians and, notably, represented the continuation of the reading prescribed for the *Hypapante*. More precisely, while for the "Fortieth day of the Nativity of our Lord Jesus Christ", as the future feast of the *Hypapante* is called in this lectionary, was prescribed a passage from the Epistle to the Galatians 3:24-29, on the commemoration "Of Mary the Theotokos, at the second mile from Bethlehem", that is at the Kathisma, the epistle reading begins with the last verse from the extract read on the *Hypapante* and includes the first seven verses of chapter four from the same epistle, namely Gal. 3:29-4:7. This piece of evidence may reasonably suggest that the latter feast was established after that of the *Hypapante*. Furthermore, the presence of the word Theotokos in the feast's name, although widely used earlier,[92] may indicate its institution in the context of the Nestorian controversy and probably reflects the triumph of the theology of the Council of Ephesus in 431, when the dogma about the Virgin Mary as Theotokos was formulated.[93]

As far as the feast of the Annunciation is concerned, it is not easy to determine when it was established on 25 March.[94] In the oldest anthology of the Jerusalem liturgical hymns, which is only preserved in the Georgian translation and is known as the Ancient Iadgari, the feast of Christ's Nativity is preceded by that of the Annunciation, while its celebration on 25 March is absent.[95] The same can be observed in some regions in the West, including Ravenna. For example, Peter Chrysologus, bishop of Ravenna (ca. 330-ca. 450), delivered eleven homilies on Luke 1, commenting on Gabriel's annunciations to Zechariah and the Virgin Mary, respectively. Franco Sottocornola in his study of Chrysologus's sermons

---

[91] Avner, "The Initial Tradition of the Theotokos at the Kathisma", 19.

[92] For the use of the title Theotokos before the Council of Ephesos, see M. Starowieyski, "Le Titre Θεοτόκος avant le concile d'Ephèse", in E. A. Livingstone, ed., *Studia Patristica* 19, Leuven: Peeters, 1987, 236-242.

[93] Juvenal, the bishop and patriarch of Jerusalem (422-458), supported this dogma in Ephesos. There is little doubt that he played a pivotal role in the development of the Marian cult in Jerusalem in the context of his effort to promote Jerusalem as a pilgrimage centre. See Avner, "The Initial Tradition of the Theotokos at the Kathisma: Earliest Celebrations and the Calendar", 24-25. On Juvenal, see E. Honigmann, "Juvenal of Jerusalem", *DOP* 5 (1950) 209-279.

[94] Th. Talley, *The Origins of the Liturgical Year*, Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1991, 153, and Bradshaw and Johnson, *The Origins of Feasts, Fasts and Seasons*, 210.

[95] L. Khevsuriani, *The Structure of the Most Ancient Tropologion*, (dissertation), Tbilisi 1984, 62-66. (in Russian) and A. Wade, "The Oldest Iadgari – The Jerusalem tropologion – 4th to 8th Centuries, 30 Years after the Publication", in: D. Atanassova and T. Chronz, eds., *Σύναξις Καθολική, Beiträge zu Gottesdienst und Geschichte der fünf altkirchlichen Patriarchate für Heinzgerd Brakmann zum 70. Geburtstag*, Münster: Lit Verlag, 2014, 717-750. According to Wade, 718 n. 4, the position of the Annunciation, seemingly out of chronological order, immediately before Christmas, is evidence for the pre-Justinian level of the Georgian Jerusalem calendar.

maintained that the five homilies on the annunciation to the Virgin were delivered on the Sunday before the feast of Christ's Nativity.[96] Hence, the Annunciation was celebrated during the pre-Christmas season. The earliest testimonies about the Annunciation's celebration in the East on 25 March date to the middle of the sixth century. Abraham of Ephesus (d. 553) delivered a homily on this feast,[97] while Romanos the Melode composed a *kontakion*, perhaps in order to boost its observance in Constantinople.[98] In 561, undoubtedly because of a certain ambivalence regarding the feast's date, Emperor Justinian issued a decree according to which the celebration of the Annunciation needs to be observed on 25 March all over the empire.[99]

The current liturgical service for this feast, which is contained in the Greek *Menaion* for 25 March, includes a great number of hymns composed by both identified and anonymous Byzantine hymnographers. Among the former are Andrew of Crete, named as the Jerusalemite, Kosmas the Monk, undoubtedly the Melode, John the Monk, probably of Damascus, and Theophanes. The most famous *kanon*, with the incipits Ἀνοίξω τὸ στόμα μου (*I shall open my mouth*), which is still in the liturgical use of the Eastern Church, is attributed either to John of Damascus or Theophanes.[100] The hymn represents a masterpiece of Byzantine hymnography in terms of both its content and form. It was composed in the form of a dialogue between the angel and the Virgin Mary and contains three alphabetic acrostics. The first, Α-Ω, consists of the first letters of the *troparia* of odes 1 to 7, without the *heirmoi*. The second, Α-Ω, and the third, Ω-Α, are comprised of both *troparia* and *heirmoi* of odes 8 and 9. Several other eight- and nine-ode *kanons* have been preserved, but they are not currently in liturgical use. Only one of them, attributed to Andrew of Crete, has been

---

[96] See F. Sottocornola, *L'anno liturgico nei sermoni di Pietro Crisologo: Ricerca storico-critica sulla liturgia di Ravenna antica*, Cesena: Centro Studi e Ricerche, 1973, 256-266; and M. J. Connell, "The Origins and Evolution of Advent in the West", in: Johnson, ed., *Between Memory and Hope*, 349-371, at 359 and 361. In the Mozarabic rite, the Annunciation was celebrated twice, namely on 18 December and 25 March. G. Dowden, *The Church Year and Kalendar*, Cambridge: The University Press, 1910, 50.

[97] See his *Homily on the Annunciation*, in: M. Jugie, ed., 1926, 442-447. For more on this topic, see R.A. Fletcher, "Celebrations at Jerusalem on March 25th in the Sixth Century A.D.", in: F.L. Cross, ed., *Papers Presented to the Third International Conference on Patristic Studies, Studia Patristica* 5, Berlin: W. de Gruyter 1962, 30-34.

[98] For a discussion regarding the feast establishment in Constantinople, see R.A. Fletcher, "Three Early Byzantine Hymns and their Place in the Liturgy of the Church of Constantinople", *BZ* 51 (1958) 53-65, at 58-59. For the edition of the *kontakion*, see Maas and Trypanis, *Sancti Romani Melodi Cantica*, 276-293. For a brief analysis of the hymn in the context of several contemporary works of the minor arts, see Krueger, *Liturgical Subjects*, 84-87.

[99] M. van Esbroeck, "La Lettre de l'empereur Justinien sur l'Annonciation et la Noël en 561", *AB* 86 (1968) 351–371; idem, "Encore la lettre de Justinien. Sa date: 560 et non 561*"*, *AB* 87 (1969) 442–444.

[100] For its English translation, see Mother Mary and Archimandrite Kallistos, trans., *Festal Menaion*, 448-458.

published.[101] Four other, ascribed to Germanos, Andrew, George and Theophilos, respectively, remain unedited.[102]

Germanos's *kanon*, which is the subject of the present discussion, is composed in the fourth mode and has been preserved in three Sinaitic manuscripts: Sinait. gr. 609, ff. 104v-106 (11th c.), Sinait. gr. 611, ff. 149-151v (14th c.) and Sinait. gr. 645, ff. 200-204 (14th c.). The first two manuscripts are *Menaia*, while the third one is an anthology of hymnographic material for selected feasts of the liturgical year. The hymn initially had the second ode, preserved in the oldest codex only (Sinait. gr. 609). The attribution to Germanos is found in the margin of two of these manuscripts: Sinait. gr. 609 and 645, and reads Γερμ(ανοῦ). As mentioned above, this feast along with that of Mary's Nativity was related to the Chalkoprateia church and, therefore, Germanos I, if he was the author of these *kanons*, may have given an impetus for their further development during his patriarchate. Notably, to his name is attached the famous homily for the Annunciation in a form of a dialogue between Mary and the Archangel, and Mary and Joseph, respectively.[103] The existence of the homily for the same feast as the *kanon* could be put forward as an argument for Germanos's authorship of the hymn as well, but this is not easy to prove since hymnographers frequently elaborated on homilies delivered by other authors.[104]

As far as the formal features of the *kanon* under discussion are concerned, several of them are notable and include heterogeneity in terms of the use of the *heirmoi*; the number of the *troparia* within a particular ode; the relation between the *troparia* and their *heirmoi* as well as their mutual interrelations; and, finally, the presence of the *theotokia* in the odes. First, it needs to be pointed out that although the earliest collections of *heirmoi*, known as *heirmologia* (Paris. Coisl. 22 and Athos. Laur. B 32),[105] contain all the *heirmoi* used in this *kanon*, they however neither form one series nor are attributed to the same author. More specifically, the last two *heirmoi*, namely of the eighth and ninth odes, are found in the series of *heirmoi* ascribed to Andrew of Crete and John the Monk, possibly of Damascus, respectively.[106] The first seven *heirmoi*, which all are attributed to Germanos, belong to two

---

[101] *AHG* 7, 275-289.

[102] Papailiopoulou-Photopoulou, 179-180.

[103] *CPG* 8009. See above, n. 4.

[104] See, for example, P. Karavites, "Gregory Nazianzinos and Byzantine Hymnography", *The Journal for Hellenic Studies* 113 (1993) 81-98, where the author deals with the use of Gregory's writtings by Byzantine hymnographers.

[105] Eustratiadis, *Εἱρμολόγιον*, passim.

[106] Eustratiadis, *Εἱρμολόγιον*, 107 and 97, respectively.

different series, precisely, the *heirmoi* of the first, third, fifth, sixth and seventh odes, are found in one series,[107] while the other two, of the second and fourth odes, belong to another.[108]

Second, while the majority of the odes contain four or five *troparia*, in odes six and eight there are only three. On the other hand, ode five has eight *troparia*. Furthermore, the *troparia* of the fifth, sixth, seventh and the ninth odes strongly resemble their model stanzas (*heirmoi*) in terms of the content. In the other five odes, *heirmoi* and *troparia* are only occasionally interconnected as, for example, in odes one and two in which only the first *troparia* are inspired by their *heirmoi*.

Third, the use of *theotokia* in the present *kanon* is not consistent. First of all, it is important to note that in the festal *Menaia*, which are currently in use in the Eastern Church, *kanons* for Mariological feasts, with the exception of Mary's Nativity,[109] do not contain *theotokia*. Undoubtedly, the main reason behind this is that Mariological *kanons* generally praise the Virgin Mary and, therefore, an addition of a *theotokion* at the end of each ode must have been regarded as redundancy by hymnographers. In the present *kanon*, the last *troparion* of all odes but sixth, eighth and ninth, are preceded by the letter Θ, which is used in the manuscript tradition as a symbol for the word *theotokion* (from Greek Θεοτοκίον). However, the *theotokia* should not be seen as an integral part of these odes. Rather, they represent an addition by the scribe or the redactor of the manuscript since we find these odes in a great number of other *kanons* attributed to other authors. An exception to this is the *theotokion* of ode one. However, from its content, which explicitly refers to the celebrated event–Σήμερον φυτεύεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις νέος παράδεισος τρυφῆς, ἐν μήτρᾳ Παρθένου ἀγνῆς (Today is planted for humankind a new paradise of delight in the womb of a pure virgin)–, it can be concluded that initially it was a part of this hymn as the fourth *troparion* of the first ode. Furthermore, it is not found in any other *kanons*. Hence, it is most likely that at some later point, the scribe, possibly the one who copied the present manuscript, labelled it as a *theotokion* by adding the letter Θ.

---

[107] Eustratiadis, *Εἱρμολόγιον*, 103-104.

[108] Eustratiadis, *Εἱρμολόγιον*, 95.

[109] There are two *kanons* for this feast, which are attributed to John and Andrew respectively, but only the second one contains *theotokia*. For its English translation, see Mother Mary and Archimandrite Kallistos, trans., *Festal Menaion*, 110-124.

Content of the kanon

The present *kanon* has a solemn and panegyric character in which the hymnographer praises God for his soteriological works, especially the incarnation, accomplished through the Virgin Mary for the salvation of humankind. The author provides a poetic exegesis of the entire mystery and meaning of the celebrated event by presenting it to the faithful in all its universal significance. Both this *kanon* and the one for the feast of Mary's Nativity share certain similarities in terms of form, vocabulary, Old Testament prefigurations and rhetorical devices, similarities that may point to the same author for both of them. Some remarkable resemblances between the Annunciation hymn and homilies preserved under either Germanos's or other authors' names will be addressed too.

Similarly to the *kanon* for Mary's birth, the hymn under discussion is not exclusively devoted to the Mother of God, since the figure of Christ holds an important place in it. This is clear from the *kanon*'s opening words, through which the poet by addressing God in the first-person singular praises him for sending his angel to announce his birth in the flesh from the Virgin Mary:

> Ἄσομαί σοι ὁ Θεός μου, ὅτι ἀπέστειλας τὸν σὸν ἄγγελον, μηνύοντα τὴν ἔνσαρκόν σου γέννησιν, τὴν ἐκ Παρθένου, Δέσποτα.

> I will sing to you, O my God, because you sent your angel, who announced your birth in the flesh from the Virgin, O Lord.[110]

The use of the verb μηνύω (announce) in this *troparion* is noteworthy, because we find it in other hymns attached to the name of Germanos, too. For example, the same verb is employed several times in the *kanon* for Mary's Nativity to highlight that her birth "announced joy to all the inhabited earth".[111] Furthermore, a similar verb, προμηνύω (announce beforehand; proclaim), is also encountered in another hymn performed on the feast of Mary's Nativity and ascribed to Germanos, namely in the second *sticheron* at the *aposticha* of Vespers:[112] ἐξ Ἰωακεὶμ καὶ τῆς Ἄννης τῶν δικαίων, σήμερον προῆλθες, Παρθένε,… τὴν χαρὰν

---

[110] The first *troparion* of the first ode, Sinait. gr. 609, f. 104v.
[111] ἡ γέννησις γὰρ αὐτῆς χαρὰν ἐμήνυσεν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ. Sinait. gr. 552, ff. 76r-v.
[112] *Aposticha* (Greek ἀπόστιχα) are *stichera* accompanied by verses (Greek στίχοι) taken from the Psalms. They are found 1) at the end of Vespers, both on feasts and on ordinary days, and 2) at the end of Matins. Mother Mary and Archimandrite Kallistos Ware, trans., "Glossary", *Festal Menaion*, London: Faber and Faber, 1979, 545-546.

προμηνύουσα παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ (Today, you came forth from righteous Joachim and Ann, O Virgin,… proclaiming joy to all the world).[113]

The second *troparion* of the first ode refers to God's incarnation as a mystery "determined before the ages", which became known through the annunciation:

Ὡρισμένον μυστήριον πρὸ αἰώνων, ἐνανθρωπήσεως Θεοῦ, γνωρίζεται σήμερον, λεγόμενον ἄρρητον, καὶ νοούμενον ἄγνωστον.

The mystery of God's incarnation determined before the ages is becoming known today, what is to be said of it is ineffable, and what is to be understood of it is unknowable.[114]

In patristic theology the episode of the annunciation is generally presented as the central event of God's eternal economy for the salvation of humankind, marking the beginning of the renewal of human nature and the beginning of its deification. Andrew of Crete in his *Homily on the Annunciation* summarises the traditional theological understanding of this feast in the following way:

Henceforth human nature receives the prologue of joy and takes the beginning of deification. … Henceforth our original formation receives a fresh renewal and the world that had grown old casts off its decayed condition of sin. For today 'the mystery which has been hidden from before the ages' (cf. Col 1:26) is revealed.[115]

As can be observed, both the author of the hymn and Andrew built upon Paul's words from Col 1:26 about the eternal mystery, which they identified with Christ's incarnation.

As we have already seen, the idea of predetermination of the great events, which belong to the divine economy of salvation, is also present in the *kanon* for the Virgin's Nativity, where, however, the author of the hymn refers to Mary as the one "predetermined before ages" to become the Mother of God.[116]

This *troparion* in its second part also demonstrates the author's profound knowledge of the *Corpus Dionysiacum*. It is based on Pseudo-Dionysios's short *Letter* to the monk Gaios, which is entirely devoted to the mystery of Christ's incarnation. Having as a point of

---

[113] Mother Mary and Archimandrite Kallistos, trans., *Festal Menaion*, 106.
[114] Sinait. gr. 609, f. 104v.
[115] Ἐντεῦθεν ἡ ἀνθρώπου φύσις χαρᾶς προοίμια δέχεται, καὶ ἀρχὴν λαμβάνει θεώσεως… Ἐντεῦθεν ἡμῶν ἡ πρώτη διάπλασις, νένα ἀνάπλασιν δέχεται, καὶ ὁ γηράσας κόσμος τὴν ἐξ ἁμαρτίας παλαίωσιν ἀποτίθεται. PG 97, 884B. For the English translation, see Cunningham, *Wider than Heaven*, 197-219, at 197-198.
[116] Τὴν πρὸ αἰώνων προορισθεῖσαν Θεοῦ γενέσθαι μητέρα... See above, p. 45.

departure the word ἐξαίφνης (suddenly) from Malachy's prophecy ("The Lord whom you seek shall suddenly come to his temple", Mal 3:1), Pseudo-Dionysios underscores the apophaticism of the divine mystery even after God's revelation in the incarnation:

> He is hidden even after his revelation, or, if I may speak in a more divine fashion, is hidden even amid the revelation. For this mystery of Jesus remains hidden and can be drawn out by no word or mind. What is to be said of it remains unsayable; what is to be understood of it remains unknowable.[117]

The fact that the author of the present *kanon* elaborated on this very short letter, which comprises only several lines, shows that he knew the *Corpus Dionysiacum* in depth and obviously was highly educated. This can even point to Germanos's authorship, since he used these writings in his *Historia Mystica*.

The third *troparion* of the first ode presents the annunciation of Christ's birth from the Virgin Mary as the release of Adam and Eve from the condemnation they were subjected to after their fall. In this way, the annunciation rather than the incarnation itself is presented as the beginning of redemption of humankind. Mary's acceptance of Gabriel's announcement is usually regarded as a crucial event of God's *oikonomia* or redemptive plan for the restoration and salvation of creation. In other words, Mary is put in the very centre of the divine economy. The *troparion* in question reads as follows:

> Σήμερον ἐλύθη τῶν πρωτοπλάστων ἡ καταδίκη τῆς ἀρᾶς, χαρὰν γὰρ ἐδέξατο, τοῦ τόκου αὐτῆς μήνυμα, ἡ μόνη Θεοτόκος ἁγνή.

> Today the first-created ones were released from the condemnation of the curse, because the only pure Mother of God received a delightful message of her giving birth.[118]

The present *troparion* is one of several in this *kanon* which refer to the event of the annunciation as a rectification of Adam's and Eve's fall and condemnation. This idea brings

---

[117] Κρύφιος δέ ἐστι καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἔκφανσιν ἤ, ἵνα τὸ θειότερον εἴπω, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐκφάνσει. Καὶ τοῦτο γὰρ Ἰησοῦ κέκρυπται, καὶ οὐδενὶ λόγῳ οὔτε νῷ τὸ κατ᾽ αὐτὸν ἐξῆκται μυστήριον, ἀλλὰ καὶ λεγόμενον ἄρρητον μένει καὶ νοούμενον ἄγνωστον. *Corpus Dionysiacum*, 2, ed. G. Heil and A. M. Ritter, eds., Patristische Texte und Studien, 36, Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1991, 159. For the English translation, see: *Pseudo-Dionysius: The Complete Works*, trans. C. Luibheid, New York: Paulist Press, 1987, 264. For the influence of the author of the *Corpus Dionysiacum* on Byzantine authors during the iconoclast period, see M. Cunningham, "The Impact of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite on Byzantine Theologians of the Eighth Century: The Concept of 'Image'", in J. Mihoc and L. Aldea, eds., *A Celebration of Living Theology: A Festschrift in Honour of Andrew Louth*, London: Bloomsbury, 2014, 41-58

[118] Sinait. gr. 609, 104v.

us to the important topic of the Mary-Eve parallelism. The importance of the theme requires a closer examination, which will be carried out below.

The Mary-Eve Analogy

A comparison between Mary and Eve is usually regarded as the earliest Mariological theme in Christian theology. The topic dates back to the second and third centuries, when several early Christian writers from both East and West, including Justin Martyr (d. 165), Irenaeus of Lyons (d. 202), Tertullian (d. 220) and Cyprian of Carthage (d. 258) developed it. A parallelism drawn between Adam and Christ in two of Paul's epistles, namely to the Romans and to the Corinthians, was undoubtedly their main source of inspiration. In the letter to the Corinthians, the analogy is made in the following way: "For as all die in Adam, so all will be made alive in Christ" (1 Cor. 15:22). In the epistle to the Romans, the parallel is elaborated more extensively: "Just as sin came into the world through one man, and death came through sin, and so death spread to all because all have sinned… For if the many died through the one man's trespass, much more surely have the grace of God and the free gift in the grace of the one man, Jesus Christ" (5:12-15). Apparently based on the Adam–Christ analogy, the above-mentioned writers extended this parallelism to Eve and Mary by highlighting the role of the Mother of God as a new Eve, who, contrary to the first Eve, showed her obedience to God and did not fall into sin. According to Justin Martyr, the obedience of Mary through her words γένοιτό μοι ("be it done unto me"), compensated for the disobedience of Eve. In this way, the Virgin Mary became a new Eve, as Christ became a New Adam. While Eve was corrupted by the words of a fallen angel, which resulted in distancing from God, Mary, on the contrary, by accepting the good news from the Archangel, after examination of his words, became the agent of salvation. Justin's words read as follows:

> He became man by the Virgin, in order that the disobedience which proceeded from the serpent might receive its destruction in the same manner in which it derived its origin. For Eve, who was a virgin and undefiled, having conceived the word of the serpent, brought forth disobedience and death. But the Virgin Mary received faith and joy, when the angel Gabriel

announced the good tidings to her that the Spirit of the Lord would come upon her, and the power of the Highest would overshadow her.[119]

Another early Church father worth mentioning in this regard, because of his long influence, is Irenaeus of Lyons (d. 202), who further elaborated on the theme in the following way:

> Like the Lord, the Virgin Mary is also found obedient when she says, "Behold your servant, Lord, may it be for me according to your word" (Luke 1:38), but Eve, disobedient, for she disobeyed while still a virgin. For just as Eve had Adam for a husband but was still a virgin… and disobeying became the cause of death for herself and whole human race, so also Mary with a husband predestined for her but yet a virgin, was obedient and became the cause of salvation for herself and the whole human race. … the knot of Eve's disobedience was loosed by Mary's obedience, for what the virgin Eve had bound by her unfaith, the virgin Mary loosed by her faith.[120]

Tertullian's understanding of an analogy between Mary and Eve in expressed in a way similar to the previous two authors, especially Justin:

> Earlier unto Eve, as yet a virgin, had crept the devil's word, the framer of death. Equally, unto a virgin was introduced God's word, the builder of life: so that what had been lost through one sex might by the same sex be restored and saved. Eve had believed the serpent; Mary believed Gabriel. That which one destroyed by unbelief, the other set straight by believing.[121]

Finally, the last author from the early Christian period worth mentioning at this point is Cyprian, who interrelates the prophecy of Isaiah 7:14 with the text of Genesis 3:15, known in the Christian tradition as the "First Gospel". Cyprian, after citing Isaiah's prophecy about a son born from a virgin, adds the following:

---

[119] διὰ τῆς Παρθένου ἄνθρωπος γεγονέναι, ἵνα καὶ δι᾽ ἧς ὁδοῦ ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄφεως παρακοὴ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔλαβε, καὶ διὰ ταύτης τῆς ὁδοῦ καὶ κατάλυσιν λάβῃ. Παρθένος γὰρ οὖσα Εὔα καὶ ἄφθορος, τὸν λόγον τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄφεως συλλαβοῦσα, παρακοὴν καὶ θάνατον ἔτεκε· πίστιν δὲ καὶ χαρὰν λαβοῦσα Μαρία ἡ παρθένος, εὐαγγελιζομένου αὐτῇ Γαβριὴλ ἀγγέλου ὅτι πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἐπ᾽ αὐτὴν ἐπελεύσεται. Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho*, in E. J. Goodspeed, ed., *Die ältesten Apologeten*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1915, 100.4.

[120] "Consequenter autem et Maria Virgo obaudiens inuenitur dicens: *Ecce ancilla tua, Domine, fiat mihi secundum uerbum tuum.* Eua uero inobaudiens: non obaudiuit enim adhuc cum esset uirgo. Quemadmodum illa uirum quidem habens Adam, uirgo tamen adhuc existens… inobaudiens facta, et sibi et uniuerso generi humano causa facta est mortis, sic et Maria habens praedestinatum uirum, et tamen Virgo obaudiens, et sibi et uniuerso generi humano causa facta est salutis… Euae inobaudientiae nodus solutionem accepit per obaudientiam Mariae. Quod enim adligauit uirgo Eua per incredulitatem, hoc Virgo Maria soluit per fidem". Irenaeus of Lyons, *Contre les hérésies*, liv. 3.22, ed. F. Sagnard, SC 34, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1952, 378-380. For the English translation, see: R. Grant, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, London and New York: Routledge, 1997, 140-141.

[121] "in virginem enim adhuc Evam irrepserat verbum aedificatorium mortis; in virginem aeque introducendum erat dei verbum structorium vitae". Tertullien, *La Chair du Christ* 17.5, ed. J.-P. Mahè, SC 216, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1975, 282.

God had predicted that the seed destined to crush the head of the devil would come forth from a woman. In Genesis it is written: "Then God said to the serpent, because you have done this, cursed are you from every kind of the beasts of the earth.… I will put enmity between you and the woman, between your seed and hers. He will crush your head and you will strike at his heel".[122]

Hence, according to the early established tradition, Eve's disobedience, which led to death, was redeemed by Mary's obedience, which generated restoration of the world through Christ's redemptive work as a new Adam.

Analogy between Mary and Eve regularly reappeared during the Byzantine period, especially in the homiletic tradition. For example, Andrew of Crete in his homily on the Annunciation built upon this idea by focusing on Christ's redemption of humankind from the "ancient curse": "For it was fitting for the One from whom, on account of whom, and in whom all things were established to repay with mercy the condemnation of the ancient curse against us".[123] The third *troparion* of the first ode quoted above, which also refers to the "condemnation of the curse" (ἡ καταδίκη τῆς ἀρᾶς) as a result of Christ's conception by the Virgin Mary, points to the close relationship between homiletics and hymnography in dealing with this topic. However, a common source for both Andrew and the author of the *kanon* under discussion may have also been the Akathistos Hymn. Its first *Oikos* refers to the cease of the curse, to the recalling of fallen Adam and to the deliverance of Eve's tears thanks to the Virgin Mary's receiving of good news from the angel:

χαῖρε, δι᾽ ἧς ἡ ἀρὰ ἐκλείψει,

χαῖρε, τοῦ πεσόντος Ἀδὰμ ἡ ἀνάκλησις,

χαῖρε, τῶν δακρύων τῆς Εὔας ἡ λύτρωσις.

---

[122] "Hoc semen praedixerat Deus de mueiere procedit, quod calcaret caput diaboli. In Genesis: Tunc dixit Deus ad serpentem: quia tu hoc fecisti, maledictus tu ab omni pecore et ab omni genere bestiarum terrae… Et ponam inimicitiam inter te et mulierem et inter semen tuum et semen eius. Ipse tuum obseruabit caput et tu obseruabis calcaneum eius". *Ad Quirinum*, 2.9; see R. Weber, ed., *Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera*, (CCSL 3.1), Turnhout: Brepols, 1972, 41. For the English translation, see A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers. The Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325, vol. 5: Fathers of the Third Century*, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1981, 519 (slightly modified).

[123] Ἔπρεπε γὰρ τῷ 'ἐξ οὗ, καὶ δι᾽ οὗ, καὶ ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα συνέστηκε' ἐλέῳ τῆς καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς ἀρχαίας ἀρᾶς τὴν καταδίκην ἀμείψασθαι. PG 97, 888A. For the English translation, see Cunningham, *Wider than Heaven*, 200. Cf. Χαίροις, τὸ τῆς χαρᾶς ὄργανον, δι᾽ οὗ τὸ τῆς ἀρᾶς ἐλύθη κατάκριμα (Hail, the instrument of joy, through which the condemnation of the curse was dissolved). PG 97, 893C. Cunningham, *Wider than Heaven*, 206. See also John of Damascus's sermon on the Virgin Mary's Nativity: Ὦ θυγάτριον ἀξιόθεν, τὸ κάλλος τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως, τῆς προμήτορος Εὔας ἡ ἐπανόρθωσις – διὰ γὰρ τῆς σῆς τεκνογονίας ἡ πεσοῦσα ἀνώρθωται… Εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἡ πρώτη Εὔα ἐν παραβάσει γέγονε καὶ δι᾽ αὐτῆς εἰσῆλθεν ὁ θάνατος διακονησαμένης τῷ ὄφει πρὸς τὸν προπάτορα, ἀλλ᾽ ἡ Μαρία ἐξυπηρετησαμένη τῷ θείῳ βουλήματι τὸν ἀπατήσαντα ὄφιν ἠπάτησεν καὶ τῷ κόσμῳ τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν εἰσήγαγεν. Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, vol. 5, 169-182, at 176.

> Hail, through whom the curse shall cease;
>
> Hail, recalling of fallen Adam;
>
> Hail, deliverance of the tears of Eve.[124]

Along with the reference to the cease of the curse and to the recalling of Adam, Eve's tears are also mentioned in the Annunciation *kanon* ascribed to Germanos, as we will see below.

The association between the fall in the Eden and the Annunciation, as well as the parallelism between Mary and Eve, is also employed in the Annunciation homily attributed to Germanos I. This is notable since the present *kanon* is ascribed to the same author. These topics are dealt with in one of the opening paragraphs of the sermon:

> Today the divinely planted Eden is opened, and the divinely moulded Adam, who is again enrolled in it by the goodness of [God's] benevolence, dwells there! Today the ancestral sentence of pain has been released, and the invidious humiliation of our ancestress Eve has ceased, along with her wearisome penalty![125]

This passage, similarly to the last two *troparia* of ode one cited above, refers to the restoration of the pre-fall conditions in Eden described in the first chapters of the Book of Genesis. Paradise is again accessible to humankind, personified in Adam, while the "wearisome penalty" imposed on Eve and, by extension, on all women (Gen. 3:16) has now ceased.

Another source of inspiration for the author of the *kanon* under consideration could also be Romanos's third *kontakion On the Nativity of Christ*, which represents a classic example of how hymnographers treated this topic. Furthermore, a parallelism between Mary and Eve reflects the extract from Irenaeus of Lyons's work *Against Heresies*, cited above. Romanos presents the Virgin Mary as the antitype of Eve in the following way:

> Ὤσθη Ἀδάμ, διὸ Θεὸς Ἀδὰμ τῷ Ἀδὰμ μηχανώμενος ἔγερσιν
>
> τῆς σῆς κοιλίας τοῦτον ἀνέλαβε,

---

[124] L. M. Peltomaa, *The Image of the Virgin Mary in the Akathistos Hymn*, Leiden: Brill, 2001, 4-5.

[125] Σήμερον ἡ θεοφύτευτος Ἐδὲμ ἐξανοίγεται, καὶ ὁ θεόπλαστος Ἀδὰμ φιλανθρωπίας ἀγαθότητι ἐν αὐτῇ πάλιν πολιτογραφούμενος εἰσοικίζεται. Σήμερον λέλυται τῆς λύπης ἡ προγονικὴ ἀπόφασις, καὶ πέπαυται τῆς προμήτορος ὁ ἐπίφθονος ἐξουθενισμός, καὶ τὸ ταύτης ἐπίμοχθον ἐπιτίμιον. D. Fecioru, ed., "Un nou gen de predica in omiletica ortodoxa", *Biserica Ortodoxa Romana* 64 (1946) 65-91; 180-192; 386-396, at 65. For the English translation, see Cunningham, *Wider than Heaven*, 222. References to the parallelism between Mary and Eve are also encountered in other Germanos's homilies, as, for example, in the Second Homily on the Dormition (PG 98: 349A); in the Second Homily on the Presentation (PG 98: 316D), and in the Third Homily on the Dormition (PG 98: 361D). For all relevant citations, see G. Roth, *Paradox beyond Nature. An Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholic Dialogue on the Marian Homilies of Germanos I, Patriarch of Constantinople (715-730)*, Bloomington: Authorhouse, 2012, 313-315.

γυνὴ τὸ πρὶν κατέβαλε, καὶ γυνὴ νῦν ἀνιστᾷ, ἐκ παρθένου παρθένος.

Τὴν Εὔαν Ἀδὰμ οὐκ ἔγνω τότε,

οὐδὲ τὴν Θεοτόκον ὁ Ἰωσὴφ νῦν.

Adam was thrust out; that is why God devised the renewal for Adam

and had him come forth from your womb.

A woman formerly cast him down, and now a woman raises him up – a virgin from a virgin.

At that time, Adam had not known Eve,

Nor did Joseph now know the mother of God.[126]

In the fourth *troparion* of the second ode of the Annunciation *kanon* under discussion, the author draws an explicit analogy between Eve and Mary. The archangel's annunciation to Mary about her conception of Christ is presented as an antidote to the "serpent's poison", which was poured into Eve's ear by a fallen angel in the form of a snake:

Ἰὸν τὸν τοῦ ὄφεως σήμερον ἐξετίναξεν, ἐκ τῶν τῆς Εὔας ἀκοῶν, τοῦ ἀρχαγγέλου ὁ λόγος.

Today the word of the archangel threw out the serpent's poison from Eve's ears.[127]

The quoted *troparion* needs to be seen in a broader context of the juxtaposition between Luke 1:26-38, where the description of the annunciation is given, and Gen. 3:2-7, which contains a description of the primordial fall. Christian writers interrelated these two events described at the beginning of the Old and New Testaments, respectively. For example, the author of the *Protevangelion of James*, which was written at the end of the second century, when describing Joseph's reaction to Mary's pregnancy presents him as recalling the story of Eve:

With what countenance shall I look towards the Lord my God? What prayer shall I offer for her [for this maiden]? For I received her as a virgin out of the temple of the Lord my God and have not protected her. Who has deceived me? Who has done this evil in my house and defiled her [the virgin]? Has the story (of Adam) been repeated in me? For as Adam was

---

[126] For the English translation, see *Kontakia of Romanos, Byzantine Melodist II*, trans. M. Carpenter, 22. It is worth remarking that Romanos sees the redemption of Adam and Eve already in Mary's birth, as his *kontakion On the Nativity of the Virgin Mary* demonstrates:
O Undefiled, in your birth Joachim and Anna
Were freed from the reproach of childlessness
And Adam and Eve from the corruption of death. (*Prooimion*). *Kontakia of Romanos, Byzantine Melodist II*, trans. M. Carpenter, 2.
[127] Sinait. gr. 609, f. 104v.

(absent) in the hour of his prayer and the serpent came and found Eve alone and deceived her and defiled her, so also has it happened to me.[128]

In both occasions, an unknown visitor approaches a virgin and manages to persuade her to accept his promise, which eventually changes the course of human history: the former leading to death, and the latter bringing salvation and eternal life. With the use of typology, Christian authors presented Mary's dialogue with the angel as a reflection of the conversation between Eve and the serpent, but with dramatically different consequences for humankind. The ears of both virgins were put in the centre of attention by having metaphorically been identified with a womb. Ephrem the Syrian (d. 373) was among the first authors to develop this idea in the following way: "Just as from the small womb of Eve's ear death entered in and was poured out, so too through a new ear, that was Mary's, Life entered and was poured out".[129]

Especially relevant for the present discussion is the development of this theme by Proklos of Constantinople (d. 446) including the use of the metaphor of "poison" regarding the primordial sin. In his *First Homily on the Virgin Mary* he writes the following:

> What was once the door of sin was made the gate of salvation. Through ears that disobeyed, the serpent poured in his poison; through ears that obeyed, the Word entered in order to build a living temple. From the place where Cain, the first disciple of sin, emerged, from there also did Christ, the redeemer of the race, sprout unsown into life.[130]

The concluding part of the quoted extract, which refers to a "living temple", has a parallel in the second *troparion* of the fourth ode of the same *kanon*:

> Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον ἐν τῇ γαστρί σου ἄχραντε μῆτηρ, τὸν ναὸν ἐζωοπλάστησεν, τοῦ πρὸ αἰώνων Θεοῦ ἡμῶν.

---

[128] Ποίῳ προσώπῳ ἀτενίσω πρὸς Κύριον τὸν Θεόν; Τί ἄρα δὲ εὔξωμαι περὶ αὐτῆς; Ὅτι παρθένον παρέλαβον ἐκ ναοῦ Κυρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐφύλαξα αὐτήν. Τίς ὁ θηρεύσας με; Τίς τὸ πονηρὸν τοῦτο ἐποίησεν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ μου; Τίς ᾐχμαλώτευσε τὴν παρθένον ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ καὶ ἐμίανεν αὐτήν; Μήτι ἐν ἐμοὶ ἀνεκεφαλαιώθη ἡ ἱστορίαα τοῦ Ἀδάμ; Ὥσπερ γὰρ Ἀδὰμ ἦν τῇ ὥρᾳ τῆς δοξολογίας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἦλθεν ὁ ὄφις καὶ εὗρεν τὴν Εὔαν μόνην καὶ ἐξηπάτησεν αὐτήν καὶ ἐμίανεν αὐτήν, οὕτως κἀμοὶ συνέβη. De Strycker, *La forme la plus ancienne du Protévangile de Jacques*, 13.1, pp. 122-124. For the English translation, see W. Schneemelcher, ed., *New Testament Apocrypha. Gospels and Related Writings*, vol. 1, London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003, 431.
[129] Ephrem, *Hymns on the Church*, ed. E. Beck, *CSCO* 199, Scriptores Syri 85, Louvain: Secretariat du Corpus SCO, 1960, 122. Cf. also another hymn from the Syriac tradition, in which, similarly to the quoted *troparion* from the *kanon* attributed to Germanos, poison is mentioned: "The serpent, with venomous intention, breathed poison in the ears of Eve… until there came forth from Mary the infant who slew the snake. The Word of the Father made his descent down to the ear by which misfortune had entered in… thus by the gate through which death had come, Life should enter in". S. Brock, *Bride of Light*, Kerala: St. Ephrem Ecumenical Research Institute, 1994, 27.4-6, 92-93.
[130] πύλην σωτηρίας ὁ τεχθεὶς τὴν πάλαι τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἔδειξεν θύραν. Ὅπου γὰρ ὁ ὄφις διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τὸν ἰὸν ἐνέχεεν, ἐκεῖ ὁ Λόγος διὰ τῆς ἀκοῆς εἰσελθὼν τὸν ναὸν ἐζωοπλάστησεν. N. Constas, ed., *Proclus of Constantinople and the Cult of the Virgin in Late Antiquity, Homilies 1-5*, Leiden: Brill, 2003, 138-139.

The Holy Spirit in your abdomen, O pure mother, built a living temple of our pre-eternal God.[131]

This can be advanced as an argument that the author of the present *kanon* may indeed have elaborated upon Proklos's sermon.

Finally, the last reference to Eve is found in the third *troparion* of ode seven, and reads as follows:

Ὁ δι᾽ ἀγγέλου τὴν χαρὰν ἀποστείλας καὶ λύσας τὰ δάκρυα τῆς πρώτης Εὔας: εὐλογητὸς εἶ, Κύριε, ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν.

You who sent joy through an angel and released the tears of the first Eve: blessed are you, O God of our fathers.[132]

It should be mentioned that a version of this *troparion* is encountered in the *kanon* prescribed to be sung on the Forefeast of the Nativity of Christ and preserved in a majuscule *Tropologion*, Sinait. gr. ΝΕ/ΜΓ 5 (eighth/ninth centuries). The second *troparion* of ode seven is as follows:

Ὁ δι᾽ ἀγγέλου τὴν χαρὰν ἀποστείλας τῇ Παρθένῳ, ἵνα Εὔαν λυτρουμένην εἰς χαρὰν μεταβάλῃς: εὐλογητὸς εἶ, Κύριε, ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν.

You who sent joy to the Virgin through an angel, in order to convert redeemed Eve into joy: blessed are you, O God of our fathers.[133]

The presence of virtually the same *troparion* in the liturgies of these two separate feasts brings us back to the question of the relationship between Christmas and the Annunciation in the Byzantine liturgical tradition. As has been already mentioned, the rapid development of the Marian cult prior to and especially in the aftermath of the Council of Ephesos in 431 resulted in the establishment of Mary's feast, which was closely associated with that of Christ's Nativity. Jugie's observation that the newly established Marian feast was dedicated, among others, to Mary as a new Eve is significant.[134] Scholars usually cite Theodotos of Ancyra's (d. before 446) Christmas homily with a strong Mariological character to illustrate

---

[131] Sinait. gr. 609, f. 105.
[132] Sinait. gr. 609, f. 105v.
[133] Nikiforova, *From the History of the Menaion in Byzantium*, 68.
[134] M. Jugie, *La Mort et l'Assomption de la Sainte Vierge: Étude historico-doctrinale*, Studi e Testi 114, Rome: Biblioteca Vaticana, 1944, 173.

the close connection between the two feasts.[135] Although the newly established feast was apparently an integral part of the Christmas celebration, it, however, marked the beginning of the fragmentation into its component parts of the complex feast commemorating Christ's incarnation. As we have already seen, originally, the liturgical commemoration of the feast of Christmas, after its separation from the Epiphany, encompassed the other Gospel stories surrounding Christ's birth, including the annunciation, circumcision and the adoration of the Magi. The subject of the newly established Marian feast was primarily Mary's Annunciation.[136] However, it took about a century before the Annunciation was established as a separate feast on 25 March to correspond to the Christmas date nine months later. The separation of these two liturgical commemorations affected the character and the content of the Christmas festival, as can be observed in Romanos the Melode's *kontakia* on Christmas and the Annunciation, respectively. They clearly show that the Annunciation ceased to be a part of the Christmas festival, being exclusively limited to the events which took place in Bethlehem. In the light of the aforementioned, the presence of the quoted *troparion* in the hymn prescribed to be sung on Christmas is fairly surprising. However, since it was found in an old manuscript (Sinait. gr. ΝΕ/ΜΓ 5), which preserves hymnographic texts from the Jerusalem liturgical tradition, this may indicate that in the Palestinian tradition the understanding of the unity of the two feasts outlived their formal separation in the sixth century. An additional argument in support of this assumption is the generally strong Mariological tone of the entire *kanon* preserved in Sinait. gr. ΝΕ/ΜΓ 5. The strong Marian tone is expressed by addressing Mary directly in order to praise her conception and giving birth to the God Logos. The second *troparion* of ode six is very characteristic in this regard:

> Τίς γνώσεται τὸν τόκον, τίς ἑρμηνεύσει σου θαῦμα, Παρθένε, Μήτηρ ἄχραντε, ἡ συλλαβοῦσα τὸν Λόγον ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, πρέσβευε ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν.

> Who will understand your childbirth? Who will explain the miracle, O Virgin, undefiled Mother? You who conceived the Logos from the Holy Spirit, intercede for us.[137]

It is significant that a version of the *kanon* from the *Tropologion* ΝΕ/ΜΓ 5 is preserved in a Sinai codex (Sinait. gr. 578, ff. 85-86) dated to the tenth or eleventh centuries and attributed

---

[135] Its title in the manuscript tradition is Εἰς τὴν Ἁγίαν Μαρίαν τὴν Θεοτόκον καὶ εἰς τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ Γέννησιν. See Fletcher, *Three Early Byzantine Hymns*, 60-61.

[136] M. Jugie, "La première fête mariale en Orient et en Occident, pavent primitif," *Échos d'Orient* 22 (1923) 129-152, at 131; M. Fassler, "The First Marian Feast in Constantinople and Jerusalem: Chant Texts, Readings, and Homiletic Literature," in: P. Jeffery, ed., *The Study of Medieval Chant: Paths and Bridges, East and West: In Honor of Kenneth Levy*, Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2001, 25-87.

[137] Nikiforova, *From the History of the Menaion in Byzantium*, 67.

to Germanos. However, in this manuscript the hymn is prescribed to be sung on 28 December, which means on the Afterfeast of the Nativity of Christ. The two versions of the *kanon* have common odes and *troparia*. For example, ode four is the same in both versions, with an addition of a *theotokion* in the newer one. Yet, the newer version, attached to the name of Germanos, is "cleared" from its distinctive Mariological character, which was achieved by replacing the two quoted *troparia* as well as others in which the author addresses the Virgin Mary.

In the Annunciation *kanon*, in the *kanon* for the Virgin's birth as well as in the Mariological homilies attributed to Germanos, including the first homily *On the Entrance into the Temple* and the one on the Annunciation, we found an extensive use of salutations (*chairetismoi*), of the word σήμερον (today) as well as of the present tense of verbs. Furthermore, the *kanon* contains a number of Marian attributes and images, which are common for homilies ascribed to the patriarch Germanos.

However, despite an obvious similarity in terms of the phraseology used, for example, in the last *troparion* of the first ode and in a passage from the aforementioned sermon *On the Entrance into the Temple*, this cannot be advanced as a convincing argument in favour of their common author. The main problem is the use of the metaphor of παράδεισος (paradise), which was almost exclusively employed as an attribute of Mary in both homiletics and hymnography.[138] However, in the *troparion* in question the author of the hymn applies it to Christ. The *troparion* reads as follows:

> Σήμερον φυτεύεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις νέος παράδεισος τρυφῆς ἐν μήτρᾳ Παρθένου ἀγνῆς, ἐν ᾧ ἀπολαύομεν τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ἀφθάρτου ζωῆς.

> Today is planted for humankind a new paradise of delight in the womb of the pure one, through which we enjoy the tree of the eternal life.[139]

In the homily for the feast of Mary's Entrance, the image of paradise is used in relation to Mary:

---

[138] For examples of its use in Byzantine hymns, see S. Eustratiadis, *Ἡ Θεοτόκος ἐν τῇ Ὑμνογραφίᾳ*, Paris: Éditions Honoré Champion, 1930, 56-57. Among many examples taken from different hymns, both published and unpublished, barely any of them refers to Christ.
[139] Sinait. gr. 609, f. 104v.

Χαίροις, ὁ τερπνότατος καὶ λογικὸς Θεοῦ παράδεισος, σήμερον πρὸς ἀνατολὰς τῆς αὐτοῦ θελήσεως φυτευόμενος δεξιᾷ παντοκράτορι ... ἐν ᾧ τὸ ζωοπάροχον ξύλον τῆς πρὸς ἀληθείας ἐπίγνωσιν ἐξανθεῖ, ἐξ οὗ οἱ γευσάμενοι ἀθανατίζονται.

Hail, most delightful and rational paradise of God, which today is planted towards the eastern parts of his will by the right hand of the ruler of all … [a paradise] in which the life-giving wood flowers into a knowledge of truth, and which bestows immortality on those who taste of it.[140]

A number of other Marian epithets, commonly used in homilies and hymns, are also found in the present *kanon*, especially in the ninth ode. Among them, θρόνος (throne) and παστάς (bridal chamber) are especially worth mentioning, since they are also encountered in the patriarch Germanos's homilies. Both of these attributes are found in the second *troparion* of the eighth ode:

Χαῖρε κεχαριτωμένη· προεῖπεν ὁ ἄγγελος· σεμνὴ Παρθένε· μετὰ σοῦ γὰρ ὁ Κύριος· Πνεύματος γὰρ Ἁγίου γέγονας παστὰς καὶ θρόνος Θεοῦ· ὃν ἀνυμνοῦμεν πιστῶς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

Rejoice, highly favoured one, honourable Virgin, the angel proclaimed, the Lord is with you; you became a bridal chamber of the Holy Spirit and a throne of God, whom we praise for ages.[141]

Germanos refers to the Virgin Mary as God's throne in the first sermon *On the Entrance into the Temple*: Χαίροις, ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἅγιος θρόνος (Hail, the holy throne of God),[142] as well as in his famous Annunciation homily: Ὁ θρόνος θεοβάστακτος, καὶ βασιλικὴ καθέδρα τοῦ ἐπουρανίου Βασιλέως κληθήσῃ (You will be called a God-bearing throne and royal seat of the heavenly King).[143] The epithet παστάς (bridal chamber) is used in the first homily for Mary's Entrance.[144] However, as in other similar cases, the use of the common vocabulary in hymns and sermons preserved under Germanos's name cannot be advanced as a decisive

---

[140] PG 98, 305B-C. For the English translation, see Cunningham, *Wider than Heaven*, 159. Proklos of Constantinople (d. 446) was probably the earliest writer who referred to Mary as "spiritual paradise": ὁ λογικὸς τοῦ δευτέρου Ἀδὰμ παράδεισος. See his first homily *On the Virgin Mary*, which was delivered in 430, in: Constas, *Proclus of Constantinople*, 136-137. In the eighth century, Andrew of Crete also referred to Mary as "paradise": Σὺ ἀληθῶς εὐλογημένη, ὁ νοητὸς τοῦ ζωηροῦ ξύλου τῆς σωτηρίας παράδεισος, ἡ αὐτὸν τῆς Ἐδὲμ τὸν φυτουργὸν ἔνδον ἔχουσα Χριστόν (You are truly blessed, [since you are] the spiritual paradise of the living wood of salvation). PG 97, 900B-C. Cunningham, *Wider than Heaven*, 209.

[141] Sinait. gr. 609, ff. 105v-106.

[142] PG 98, 308A. For the English translation, see Cunningham, *Wider than Heaven*, 160.

[143] Fecioru, ed., "Un nou gen de predica in omiletica ortodoxa", 77. For the English translation, see Cunningham, *Wider than Heaven*, 229.

[144] PG 98, 305C.

argument in favour of the authenticity of this poetic work, since they were widely used in both homiletic and hymnographic traditions during the Middle Byzantine period.

The author of the hymn also refers to several Old Testament Marian prefigurations, which are related to Christ's incarnation from her. In the second *troparion* of the fifth ode, for example, the hymnographer refers to the Virgin as a fleece upon which Christ, the dew or rain of life, descended:

> Ὁ τῆς ζωῆς ὑετός, ἐπὶ τὸν ἔμψυχον πόκον, κατῆλθες τῆς Παρθένου, δόξα σοι, δόξα σοι, Ἰησοῦ Υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

> You who are the dew of life came on the Virgin as a living fleece; glory to you, glory to you, Jesus, son of the God.[145]

This prefiguration came into use by the fifth century, when Proklos of Constantinople applied it to the Mother of God. In his first homily to the Virgin Mary, Proklos addresses her as "the purest fleece drenched with the rain which came down from heaven, whereby the shepherd clothed himself with the sheep".[146] The source of inspiration for this Marian image in Byzantine literature, including both homiletics and hymnography, was usually the episode with Gideon and the fleece (Judges 6, 36-40). However, some fathers of the Church applied the Mariological interpretation to another Old Testament mention of fleece, namely the one in Psalm 71:6: Καταβήσεται ὡς ὑετὸς ἐπὶ πόκον καὶ ὡσεὶ σταγόνες στάζουσαι ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν (He shall come down like rain upon the fleece, like showers that water the earth). For example, Theodoret of Cyrrhus (d. ca. 466) elaborated on this verse in his commentary on Psalms. He saw in it a prefiguration of Christ's miraculous conception. Theodoret comments on this verse in the following way:

> Through this he [the psalmist] gave us a clear glimpse of the human birth happening silently, very tranquilly, and secretly. Just as a fleece receives a shower without giving rise to any din, and drops of dew fall on the ground without affecting the sense of hearing, so did the Lord's conception happen, without her living together with any obvious suitor. Later, following the conception, he suspected some impropriety and wanted to send her away unobtrusively, but through an angel was made aware that the birth was spiritual, not human.[147]

---

[145] Sinait. gr. 609, f. 105.
[146] ὁ τοῦ ἐξ οὐρανῶν ὑετοῦ καθαρώτατο πόκος ἐξ οὗ ὁ ποιμὴν τὸ πρόβατον ἐνεδύσατο. Proclus of Constantinople, *Homily 1*, 136-137.
[147] Διὰ τούτων σαφῶς σαφῶς ἡμῖν τὴν ἀνθρωπείαν ὑπέδειξεν γέννησιν ἀφοφητὶ γεγενημένην, καὶ λίαν ἡσύχως καὶ μυστικῶς. Καθάπερ γὰρ πόκος δεχόμενος ὑετόν, οὐδένα κτύπον ἀποτελεῖ, καὶ ψεκάδες εἰς γῆς δροσώδεις φερόμεναι, αἴσθησιν ταῖς ἀκοαῖς οὐδεμίαν περέχουσιν, οὕτως ἡ δεσποτικὴ γεγένηται σύλληψις, οὐδὲ τοῦ

Byzantine hymnographers frequently elaborated on the topic of the fleece, but they only occasionally make an explicit association between the fleece and Gideon.[148] As a result, it is not an easy task to determine whether the source of their inspiration was the episode with Gideon or Psalm 71.[149]

To conclude, by elaborating on the well-established early Christian and early Byzantine traditions, the author of the hymn focuses on Mary's key role in the divine economy of salvation. To achieve this, the hymnographer draws parallels between the Virgin Mary and Eve, who stand as protagonists at the beginning of the two Testaments, respectively. By highlighting the former's disobedience and the latter's obedience, the celebrated event is presented not only as a rectification of Adam's and Eve's fall and condemnation, but also as a sort of new creation.

The last set of Mariological hymns to be discussed includes a *kanon* and three stichera for the *Hypapante*.

συνοικοῦντος αἰσθομένου μνηστῆρος. Ὕστερον γάρ, μετὰ μετὰ τὴν κύησιν, ἀτοπίαν ὑποτοπήσας τινά, ἠβουλήθη λάθρα ἀπολῦσαι αὐτήν, ἀλλὰ δι᾽ ἀγγέλου μεμάθηκεν ὡς πνευματικὸς ὁ τόκος, καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπινος. Theodoret of Cyrrhus, PG 80, 1433A. For the English translation, see Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Commentary on the Psalms. Psalms 1-71*, trans. R. C. Hill, Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2000, 415. Cf. John of Damascus's homily on the Nativity of the Virgin Mary in which the author also elaborated on Psalm 71:6: ὡς ἐπὶ πόκον ἀψοφητὶ καταβάντα ὑετὸν ἀγαθότητος (dropping noiselessly onto a fleece as a rain of beneficence). Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, vol. 5, 169-182, at 181. For the English translation, see Cunningham, *Wider than Heaven*, 68.

[148] For example, Joseph the Hymnographer links the fleece to Gideon in his *kanon* for the Akathistos hymn: χαῖρε ὁ πόκος ὁ ἔνδροσος ὃν Γεδεών, Παρθένε, προεθεάσατο (Rejoice, the dewy fleece, which Gideon clearly saw in advance), *Canon ad hymnum Acathiston*, 6.2 (PG 105: 1024A).

[149] For references to the fleece as a Marian image in selected Byzantine hymns, see Eustratiadis, *Ἡ Θεοτόκος ἐν τῇ ὑμνογραφίᾳ*, 63. In an obvious attempt to merge both existing traditions the Annunciation *kanon* attributed to Andrew of Crete and published by Follieri, among several references to the fleece, provides us also with an example, in which both Gideon and David are mentioned. Andrew presented David as elaborating on the episode of Gideon and the fleece by interpreting it in a Mariological sense. The second *troparion* of ode five reads as follows: Χαῖρε, ὅπερ Γεδεὼν ἑώρακεν ὡς ὑετὸν ἐπὶ πόκον φρικτὸν ὅραμα, καθὼς ἐμελῴδησε Δαυῒδ ἐν τῇ λύρᾳ τῶν ᾀσμάτων, ψάλλων ἐν πνεύματι (Rejoice the one whom Gideon saw as rain on fleece in a vision inspiring fear and awe, as David made a melody on the lyre of [his] songs, singing in the spirit). E. Follieri, "Un canone inedito di s. Andrea di Creta", *Collectanea Vaticana in honorem Anselmi M. Card. Albareda*, Studi e Testi 219, Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1962, 345-357, at 351. For other references to the fleece in this *kanon*, see the fourth *troparion* of the sixth ode: πόκον [σὲ ἐκάλει] Γεδεὼν ἐν ᾧ κατέβη ὁ Θεὸς ὡς ὑετός (Gideon called you a fleece, upon which God descended as rain), p. 353, as well as the third *troparion* of the seventh ode: ὁ γὰρ πάντων Κύριος ὡς ὑετὸς ἐπὶ πόκον ἐν μήτρᾳ τῇ σῇ καταβέβηκεν (the Lord of all descended upon your womb as rain upon the fleece), p. 354.

3. Hymns for the *Hypapante* (2 February)

There are four hymns for the *Hypapante* ascribed to Germanos, namely an eight-ode *kanon* and three *stichera*. While the *stichera* are in liturgical use of the Eastern Church, the *kanon* still remains unpublished.

A historical overview of the feast

The oldest historical evidence regarding the celebration of the Presentation of the child Christ in the Temple dates back to the second half of the fourth century. Egeria in her *Travels*, dated between 381 and 384, refers to its liturgical celebration on "the fortieth day after Epiphany".[150]

Although testimonies about the exact year of this feast's introduction into Constantinople are inconsistent, they all point to the first half of the sixth century. In a homily delivered in 518, Severos of Antioch (d. 538) refers to its recent adoption in the Byzantine capital,[151] while the Byzantine chronicler Kedrenos (twelfth century) credits Emperor Justin with the establishment of this feast in Constantinople in 527.[152] The *Chronographia* of Theophanes the Confessor (d. 817) provides a piece of information about Justinian's transfer of the feast from 14 to 2 February in 542: "In the same period the feast of the Presentation of the Lord was first celebrated in Byzantium on 2 February",[153] indirectly confirming its pre-existence in Constantinople. In the seventh century the celebration, complete with candles, was adopted in Rome, from where it spread through the West.[154]

---

[150] *Égérie: Journal de Voyage (Itinéraire)*, ed. P. Maraval, SC 296, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1982, 26.

[151] Talley, *The Origins of the Liturgical Year*, 1991, 186.

[152] ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ δὲ ἐτυπώθη ἑορτάζειν ἡμᾶς καὶ τὴν ἑορτὴν τῆς ὑπαπαντῆς τῆς μέχρι τότε μὴ ἑορταζομένης. I. Bekker ed., *Historiarum compendium*, vol. 1, Bonn: Weber, 1838, 641.

[153] C. Mango and R. Scott (with the assistance of G. Greatrex), *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor. Byzantine and Near Eastern History, AD 284-813*, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1997, 322. Some manuscripts of the Chronicle of George the Monk confirm Theophanes's statement more explicitly: Καὶ ἡ Ὑπαπαντὴ μετηνέχθη καὶ ἔλαβεν ἀρχὴν ἑορτάζεσθαι Φεβρουαρίῳ μηνὶ εἰς τὴν β΄, γενομένη πρότερον τῇ ιδ΄ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μηνὸς. *Georgii Monachi Chronicon breve*, 4, PG 110, 777A.

[154] P. Allen, "The Role of Mary in the Early Byzantine Feast of the Hypapante", in: K. Demura and N. Kamimura, eds., *Patristica*, Supplementary vol. 2, *Festschrift in Honour of Shinro Kato on His 80ᵗʰ Birthday*, Nagoya 2006, 3.

The question of the feast's character

A certain ambivalence can be observed in liturgical experience concerning whether the *Hypapante* needs to be regarded as a Mariological or dominical feast.[155] The Gospel narrative (Luke 2:21) by relating the event to the Old Testament rite of purification, which is primarily associated with women (Leviticus 12), was perhaps the main reason why the feast was and is still usually considered as Mariological. This understanding undoubtedly lay behind the early name of the feast encountered in the opening words of Hesychios of Jerusalem's first sermon on *Hypapante*, in which it is called "the feast of purification" (ἡ μὲν ἑορτὴ λέγεται καθαρσίων).[156] In Migne's edition of George the Monk's *Chronicle* (composed in the second half of the ninth century) the above-quoted passage about Justinian's transfer of the feast of the Presentation on 2 February is extended with a notice that the *Hypapante* "is not numbered among the dominical feasts".[157] This implies that the feast was rather regarded as Mariological.

An answer to the question of the feast's character and Mary's place in it has usually been sought in homilies delivered on this day.[158] Kenneth Stevenson has demonstrated that early homilies from both the Eastern and Western traditions, up to the beginning of the fifth century, are primarily, but not exclusively, focused on Christological and sacrificial aspects of this New Testament event.[159] Pauline Allen, also based on homiletic tradition, concludes that in that literary genre the feast definitely acquired Mariological character by the ninth century.[160]

However, other liturgical sources, especially lectionaries and hymnographic texts intended to be sung in the service of this feast, including the *kanon* attributed to Germanos I, reveal that in the eastern tradition a heavy emphasis was diachronically placed on several other aspects of the feast. As we will see below, the emphasis could vary depending on the current theological context.

---

[155] N. Denysenko, "The *Hypapante* Feast in Fourth to Eighth Century Jerusalem", *SL* 37 (2007) 73-97, here 73.

[156] M. Aubineau, *Les homélies festales d'Hésychius de Jérusalem, Vol. 1, Les homélies i-xv*, Subsidia hagiographica 59, Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1978, 22-42.

[157] ἥτις οὐκ ἔστιν ἐναριθμουμένη ταῖς Δεσποτικαῖς ἑορταῖς. *Georgii Monachi Chronicon breve*, 4, PG 110, 777A.

[158] See for instance P. Allen, "The Role of Mary in the Early Byzantine Feast of the Hypapante", in: Demura and Kamimura, eds., *Patristica*, 1-22, with further bibliography.

[159] K. Stevenson, "The Origins and Development of Candlemas: A Struggle for Identity and Coherence?", *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 102 (1988) 316-346, esp. 320-321.

[160] Allen, "The Role of Mary in the Early Byzantine Feast of the Hypapante", 8.

The first group of sources to be considered are lectionaries. Their paramount importance is not only related to their antiquity, but also to the fact that they contain incipits of biblical readings and other texts, including poetry, required for performing liturgical services. Two of the earliest lectionaries, both representing the practice of the Jerusalem Church, contain the service on Christ's Presentation in the Temple. The earliest one is the earliest redaction of the Armenian Lectionary, translated from Greek between 417 and 439.[161] The entry for the Presentation in the Temple in this lectionary reads as follows:

> 14 February. Fortieth day of the Nativity of our Lord Jesus Christ.
>
> They assemble in the Holy Martyrium in the City, and this canon is performed:
>
> Psalm 97, antiphon: All the ends of the earth have seen the salvation of our God [98]
>
> Reading from the Letter of the Apostle Paul to the Galatians [3:24-29]
>
> Alleluia, Psalm 95 [96]
>
> Gospel according to Luke [2:22-40].[162]

These components clearly show that initially at the annual liturgical commemoration of this event its soteriological dimension was especially stressed. This is apparent from the antiphon taken from Psalm 97 (98):3 "All the ends of the earth have seen the salvation (σωτήριον) of our God", and from the Alleluia accompanied by Psalm 95 (96), which along with the reference to salvation (verse 2) urges the faithful to bring an offering to God and worship him (verses 7 and 8). The phrase from the prayer uttered by Symeon when he took the child Jesus in his arms: "my eyes have seen your salvation (σωτήριον), which you have prepared before the face of all peoples" (Luke 3:31), in which the key word is also salvation (σωτήριον), must had been the reason for the selection of the Psalms in question for liturgical use on this feast.[163] The reading from Paul's epistle to Galatians (3:24-29), along with announcing Christ's fulfilment of the law, also refers to the consequence of the incarnation, which represents the adoption by God. What is noteworthy is the absence from the lectionary of any Old Testament readings traditionally linked with the Virgin Mary. On the occasion of the reading from the letter to Galatians, I would like to point out that its continuation, namely 3:29-4:7, was read on the earliest feast devoted exclusively to the Virgin Mary which was celebrated on 15 August. They even slightly overlap with each other, as the last verse of the

---

[161] A. Renoux, "Liturgie arménienne et liturgie hiérosolymitaine", *Liturgie de l'Église particulière et liturgie de l'Église universelle*, Bibliotheca Ephemerides Liturgicae Subsidia 7, Rome: Edizioni Liturgiche, 1976, 277. Quoted according to Denysenko, "The *Hypapante* Feast", 78-79, with further discussion.

[162] Quoted according to Denysenko, "The *Hypapante* Feast", 78.

[163] Renoux believes that "the congruence of verses eight and nine with the contents of the gospel reading", namely the reference to an offering, was behind selection of this Psalm. Quoted according to Denysenko, "The *Hypapante* Feast", 79.

Hypapante reading represents the beginning of the reading on the feast celebrated on 15 August. The entry on that Marian feast day is as follows:

15 August: Day of Mariam Theotokos At the third milestone from Jerusalem.	Ps 132 (resp. 8); Isa 7.10-15	Gal. 3:29-4:7; Alleluia Ps. 110; Luke 2:1-7

This suggests that it was established after the Presentation and, possibly, quite close in time to the Council of Ephesus in 431, as has been proposed.[164] Furthermore, this can be regarded as the earliest indirect evidence of a Mariological character attaching to the feast of the Presentation of the child Christ in the Temple. In the context of the Council of Ephesus, which gave an impetus to the development of the Marian cult, the feast in which Mary was one of the main protagonists could easily be invested with a Mariological character for dogmatic purposes. Establishment of feasts for theological and apologetic reasons has been widely recognised among liturgiologists, including R. Taft, who has stressed apologetic reasons behind the origin of the Nativity-Epiphany cycle in the fourth century.[165]

The Georgian redactions of the Jerusalem Lectionary reflect the Jerusalem liturgical practice between the fifth and eighth centuries.[166] This lectionary is far more developed than the previous one, since it contains incipits not only of biblical readings, but also of hymns used on liturgical commemorations throughout the year. That makes it an inestimable source of the early layer of liturgical poetry as well. The entry for the feast of *Hypapante* reads as follows:

> February 2. Feast of *Hypapantis* (Meeting, or Presentation)
>
> The day before: Troparion, mode 5: Hail, full of joy
>
> Psalm, mode 4: All the ends [97:3b/98:3b]
>
> Line: The Lord has made known [97:2/98:2]
>
> Reading, Paul to the Colossians [2:8-15]
>
> Alleluia, mode 8: Gifts of gold [Ps. 44:13-15a/45:12-14a]

---

[164] Avner, "The Initial Tradition of the Theotokos at the Kathisma", 20.

[165] R. Taft, "Historicism Revisited", *Studia Liturgica* 14 (1982) 97-109.

[166] For the edition, see M. Tarchnisvili, *Le grand lectionnaire de l'Église de Jérusalem V-VIII siècle*, CSCO 188, 189, 204, 205, Louven: Peeters, 1959-1960.

For Liturgy:

Troparion, mode 8: Symeon was made like the Nativity

Psalm, mode 4: All the ends [97:3/98:3b]

Line: The Lord has made known [97:2/98:2]

Reading 1, Proverbs [22:11-18]

Reading 2, Wisdom of Solomon [4:8-12]

Reading 4, Paul to the Galatians [3:24-4:7]

Alleluia, mode 8: Hear, daughter, and see [Ps. 44:11-12/45:10-11]

Gospel of Luke [2:22-40]

Handwashing song, mode 4: Today is indescribable in glory, and today is indescribable and unseen

Sanctification song: Today, all praise who.[167]

Judging from the Old Testament readings, the Psalms, and the incipits of the hymns contained in the Georgian Lectionary, the twofold character of *Hypapante* is apparent: the Christological one, which is predominant, and the Mariological. The most evident element that can be characterised as Mariological is the Psalm verse accompanying the Alleluia after the reading of Paul's epistle: "Hear, daughter, and see" (Ps. 44:11-12/45:10-11), since it is exclusively used on feasts devoted to the Virgin Mary.[168] This also holds true for the reading from Isaiah 19:1-4, which refers to the Lord sitting on a swift cloud and is the only one still used in the liturgy of this feast.[169] Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444) is one of the earliest theologians to testify to Mariological connotations attached to this extract, implying at the same time that this interpretation was not accepted by all. In his commentary on the Book of the Prophet Isaiah he writes the following: "Some of the commentators said that a swift cloud is the holy flesh of the Lord, namely the temple that he received from the Virgin… Others in turn believed that a swift cloud referred to the Virgin Mary".[170] The two other readings are not currently related to any Mariological feasts.

As far as the hymns mentioned in the Georgian Lectionary are concerned, their Christological character is obvious, although the majority of them have not been preserved in

---

[167] Quoted according to Denysenko, "The *Hypapante* Feast", 86-87.

[168] For instance, this verse is currently used as a *prokeimenon* on the Entrance of the Virgin Mary into the Temple. See *The Festal Menaion*, 174.

[169] See *The Festal Menaion*, 411-412, where this reading is more extensive: Isaiah 19:1, 3-5, 12, 16, 19-21.

[170] Τινὲς μὲν τῶν ἐξηγητῶν κούφην ἔφησαν εἶναι νεφέλην τὴν ἁγίαν τοῦ Κυρίου σάρκα, τουτ' ἔστι, τὸν ἐκ τῆς Παρθένου ληφθέντα ναόν. … Ἕτεροι δὲ αὖ κούφην ὠνομάσθαι νεφέλην ὑπειλήφασι τὴν ἁγίαν Παρθένον. *Cyrilli Alexandriae Archiepiscopi Commentarius in Isaiam Prophetam*, PG 70, 9A-1449C, at 452B.

their entirety, but are only known from the quoted incipits. The exception to this is, to a certain extent, the first one designated as *troparion*, whose incipit is *Hail, full of joy [Theotokos Virgin]*. This hymn is still chanted as the *apolytikion* of the feast. Since its opening words are addressed to the Virgin Mary, it is plausible to treat it as Mariological, although the other protagonist of the celebrated event, Symeon, is addressed in it, too.

The rapid development of hymnography throughout this period resulted in the formation of a new service book called *Tropologion*, which contained hymns sung during both movable and immovable feasts over the entire liturgical year. Its earliest version has been preserved only in Georgian translation and is known under the name *Iadgari*.[171] The significance of this book for the history of liturgical poetry is enormous, since it preserves the oldest layer of the Palestine hymnographic production, which predates poets of the seventh and eighth centuries. Judging by the *Hypapante* hymns, whose incipits or entire texts Kekelidze gives in Slavonic translation, their Christological character is evident. Hymnographic texts concerning this feast day are provided as follows:

> At 'Lord, I have cried' *stichera* tone 4: 'You who voluntarily became a child through the Virgin…'; 'The Elder understood…' Other *stichera*: 'We offer you, O Christ, an evening hymn and spiritual worship; you who sit upon the cherubim and resting in the arms of the earthborn in order to accomplish the law and unite the earthborn [people]';[172] 'You who established the Law, subordinated yourself to the Law in order to release…'; 'Today the elder Symeon receives the Lord in his arms and joyfully says: you may now dismiss your servant, O Lord, for I saw you, for whom my soul longed'. *Kanon*: 'Let us sing of Christ, the Son of God, in a new song, for he is exalted. The prophet and elder Symeon filled with joy and the Holy Spirit, when he saw you brought into the Temple, cheerfully said to the people: this is the Son of God…' Dismissal *troparion*: 'Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord,

[171] Its part was first published in Slavonic translation by K. Kekelidze, *Liturgicheskie gruzinskie pamjatniki v otecestvennyh knigohranilischah i ih nauchnoe znachenie [Liturgical Georgian Monuments in Native Libraries and Their Scientific Significance]*, Tbilisi: Tipografija Bratstvo, 1908, 351-372. For more on *Tropologion*, see A. Wade, "The Oldest Iadgari: The Jerusalem Tropologion, V-VIII c.", *OCP* 50 (1984) 451-456; L. Hevsuriani, *The Structure of the Most Ancient Tropologion*, Tbilisi: Academy of Sciences, Georgian SSR, 1984 (in Russian); S. R. Frøyshov, "The Georgian Witness to the Jerusalem Liturgy: New Sources and Studies", in: B. Groen, S. Hawkes-Teeples and S. Alexopoulos, (eds.), *Inquiries into Eastern Christian Worship. Selected Papers of the Second International Congress of the Society of Oriental Liturgy, Rome, 17-21 September 2008*, Leuven: Peeters, 2012, 227-267, esp. 233-238; A. Wade, "The Oldest Iadgari – The Jerusalem Tropologion – 4th to 8th Centuries, 30 Years after the Publication", in: D. Atanassova and T. Chronz, eds., *Σύναξις Καθολική, Beiträge zu Gottesdienst und Geschichte der fünf altkirchlichen Patriarchate für Heinzgerd Brakmann zum 70. Geburtstag*, Münster: Lit Verlag, 2014, 717-750.
[172] The first half of the *sticheron*, up to the word "worship", is identical with that from Paraklitiki, sung on Saturday evening of the plagal tone of the fourth. That *sticheron* reads as follows: "We offer you, O Christ, an evening hymn and spiritual worship; because you were well-pleased to have mercy on us through the Resurrection".

God Lord Jesus Christ, who appeared in the flesh; let us meet him, for he is God, Lord of all, Lord lover of humankind and Saviour, who comes in the name of the Lord and is coming again, whom we are not worthy to look at, for he will abolish the sins of the world, because of his love for humankind, alleluia, alleluia.[173]

As we can easily observe, there is only one reference to the Virgin Mary among the quoted hymns and it is related to her role in the incarnation. In addition to this, a strong emphasis is placed on the central role of Symeon, whose close association with the celebrated event perfectly matches the scriptural reading of the day. Finally, the last hymn has a clear eschatological character, which is established through a connection between Christ's first appearance in the flesh and his second coming.

Kanons for the *Hypapante*

The next stage in the development of hymnography intended to be performed in the liturgy of the *Hypapante* feast comprises hymns composed by great Byzantine hymnographers of the iconoclastic and post-iconoclastic periods, including Andrew of Crete, Kosmas the Melode, Joseph the Hymnographer, possibly Germanos, and others. A considerable number of their poetic works are still in liturgical use. Among the preserved hymns which are not included in the liturgy the most prominent place is occupied by a *kanon* attributed to Andrew of Crete, comprised of 156 *troparia*.[174] Each ode of this hymn is divided into two, three or four parts, each with its own *heirmos* or rhythmic and melodic pattern of *troparia*. The Virgin Mary is mentioned in about 51 *troparia* and is exalted mainly for her contribution to the salvation of humankind. However, on several occasions the hymnographer puts her as the central figure of a particular *troparion*. For example, in the *theotokion* of the fourth ode the poet addresses Mary, referring to her "divine purification" (ὁ θεῖος ἁγνισμός σου).[175] Furthermore, in a number of *troparia* Symeon's words to the Theotokos are cited, as, for instance, in a *troparion* of the sixth ode in which Luke's reference to "the fall and rising of many" (2:34) is related to the call to pagans:

Πρὸς τὴν παρθένον προανεφώνει ὁ πρέσβυς, ἐθνῶν τὴν κλῆσιν προδιαγράφων:

---

[173] Kekelidze, *Liturgicheskie gruzinskie pamjatniki*, 360-361.
[174] *AHG* 6, 1-41.
[175] *AHG* 6, 19. See also a *troparion* from the third ode, where it is said that "the pure Virgin who bore the God subjected to the law is being purified today (ἁγνίζεται σήμερον) and sanctifies us", p. 14. Cf. the fifth *troparion* of the seventh ode in which the celebrated event is called purifications: ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῶν καθαρσίων, p. 28.

οὗτος εἰς πτῶσίν τε καὶ ἀνάστασιν πολλῶν ἐν κόσμῳ κεῖται, παρθένε.

The elder uttered a prediction to the Virgin, delineating in advance the invitation to the pagans: this is destined to cause the falling and rising of many.[176]

In the seventh ode a sword, which will pierce through Mary's soul, is linked to the crucifixion.[177]

In continuation of Andrew's *kanon* and its several variations,[178] is published an anonymous eight-ode *kanon* (without the second ode) in which a soteriological dimension is also stressed.[179]

The same holds true for Kosmas the Melode's *kanon* Χέρσον ἀβυσσοτόκον πέδον ἥλιος ἐπεπόλευσέ ποτε (*The sun once shone with its rays upon dry land in the midst of the deep*), which ultimately prevailed and is the only one currently in liturgical use in the Orthodox Church.

There are two other *kanons* on this feast attributed to Germanos I and Joseph the Hymnographer (d. 886), respectively, which still remain unpublished. Both are preserved in an anthology of old *kanons*, composed in 1893 and named after the Skete of Kausokalyvia on Mount Athos,[180] but now held in the monastery of the Great Lavra. The attribution of the second one is based on its acrostic, since the first letters of the last *troparion* of the eighth and all *troparia* of the ninth odes give the name Joseph (ΙΩΣΗΦ). The entire acrostic reads as follows: Χριστὸν πρέσβυς ὠλέναις ἐδέξατο. Ὠδὴ Ἰωσήφ (Elderly man received Christ in his arms. Ode by Joseph). It is important to note that all *heirmoi* of this *kanon* are borrowed from the Christmas' *kanon* whose author is identified as Kosmas the Melode. For example, the *heirmos* of the first ode of Kosmas' *kanon* reads: Χριστὸς γεννᾶται, δοξάσατε, while the opening words of the first *troparion* of Joseph's *kanon* are Χριστὸς σαρκὶ πεφανέρωται. Since both *kanons* are in the same tone and have the same metrics, this means that the *kanon* for the *Hypapante* sounded to the congregation like the Christmas *kanon*, which praises Christ's incarnation. The striking similarity between these two hymns in terms of their formal characteristics and content undoubtedly betrays the author's aim to highlight the relationship between the two feasts they were composed for.

---

[176] *AHG* 6, 21.
[177] *AHG* 6, 31.
[178] *AHG* 6, 42-66.
[179] *AHG* 6, 67-75.
[180] See the next footnote.

To conclude my discussion of the feast's character in hymnographic texts, and before proceeding with an analysis of the *kanon* attributed to Germanos, it is possible to argue that by the end of the ninth century liturgical hymns for the Presentation of the child Christ in the temple gradually acquired a Mariological character, although not as strong as in the homiletic tradition. Rather, it seems that hymnographers wished to maintain the feast's original character closely related to its soteriological meaning, which is reflected in its biblical content. In this context, we probably need to understand the treatment of the feast in relation to two other feasts associated with Christ's incarnation, namely the Nativity of Christ and Epiphany. Similar features can also be observed in the *kanon* attributed to Germanos, patriarch of Constantinople, which will be the primary focus of my attention in the following pages.

Germanos's hymns for the Hypapante

The *kanon* for the *Hypapante*, entitled Ποίημα Γερμανοῦ Πατριάρχου (Poem of Germanos the Patriarch), is preserved in one single manuscript, which in the catalogue of unpublished *kanons* composed by Papailiopoulou-Photopoulou is named after the Skete of Kausokalyvia on Mount Athos.[181] The author of the catalogue admits that she was not able to identify this codex. She, however, quotes Sophronios Eustratiadis, according to whom the manuscript is an anthology of old *kanons*, composed in 1893, now held in the monastery of the Great Lavra.[182] My analysis of this hymn is based on a transcription obtained at Saint Paul's monastery on Mount Athos in which both this *kanon* and the previous one composed by Joseph are currently in liturgical use.[183] The monastery's main church (*katholikon*) is dedicated to the *Hypapante*, hence the reason why the service chanted on that day contains three *kanons*, while the "official" service, which we find in the *Menaion* for February, includes only one *kanon* in both Greek and Slavic liturgical traditions, namely the one whose author is Kosmas the Melode.[184]

The *kanon* is in the fourth mode. Its *troparia* are based on the model of the *heirmoi* traditionally attributed to John of Damascus that are sung as model stanzas for the hymn on

---

[181] Papailiopoulou-Photopoulou, *Ταμεῖον ἀνεκδότων βυζαντινῶν ἀσματικῶν κανόνων*, 162.
[182] Papailiopoulou-Photopoulou, *Ταμεῖον ἀνεκδότων βυζαντινῶν ἀσματικῶν κανόνων*, 50, n. 51.
[183] I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to Father Nikodemos from Saint Paul's monastery for his help in obtaining the transcription of this hymn.
[184] Mother Marry and Archimandrite Kallistos, *The Festal Menaion*, 419-428.

Annunciation of the Virgin Mary, with the incipits Ἀνοίξω τὸ στόμα μου (I shall open my mouth).[185] The content of the hymn has a strong Christological character with a heavy emphasis placed on the mystery of the incarnation and its soteriological implications. In the first ode alone, four out of its five *troparia* highlight the importance of Christ's assumption of the "form of slave" (ὁ δεσπόζων γάρ, μορφὴν δούλου ὑπέδυ)[186] in order to recover the "divine form of the image formerly destroyed by the serpent".

> Ὦ ξένου θεάματος, ὁ Χερουβὶμ ἐποχούμενος, φρικτῶς ἐποχεῖται νῦν, πρεσβυτικαῖς ἐν χερσίν, ἀνακτώμενος, τὴν πάλαι συντριβεῖσαν, ἀπάτῃ τοῦ ὄφεως, εἰκόνος θείαν μορφήν.

> O marvellous spectacle! The one who is carried upon the Cherubim, now is carried on the arms of the elderly man in an awe-inspiring manner, recovering the divine form of the image formerly destroyed by the serpent.[187]

God's manifestation in the flesh brought joy to the whole humanity, including Adam and Eve:

> Ἀγάλλεται σήμερον ἡ Εὔα, σκιρτᾷ καὶ χορεύει ὁ Ἀδάμ, ὁρῶντες πλαστουργούμενον, τὸν πλαστουργὸν τῆς κτίσεως, ναῷ τε προσαγόμενον, καὶ τοὺς μακρὰν οἰκειούμενον.

> Today Eve rejoices, Adam leaps and dances, seeing the Creator of the creation created, brought into the temple, and making his own those who are far away.[188]

The reference to Adam and Eve recalls the *kanon* for the Annunciation discussed above, where the author praises the celebrated event as the restoration of the fallen human nature. Here, the poet, when praising Christ's manifestation in the flesh, especially highlights the greatness of his accommodation to the human condition (συγκατάβασις) and emptiness (κένωσις). These closely related Christological terms, which occur several times in the *kanon*,[189] refer to God's concession to the limitations of humanity,[190] particularly evident in Christ's incarnation. Both of them are also used in this sense in Byzantine homiletics and hymnography alike.[191] For example, Basil the Great writes that the union of God the Logos with human flesh and his accommodation (συγκατάβασις) to human weakness is a testament

---

[185] For the publication of the *heirmoi*, see Eustratiadis, Εἱρμολόγιον, 99-100.
[186] The third *troparion* of the first ode.
[187] The fifth *troparion* of the first ode.
[188] The first *troparion* of the third ode.
[189] The term συγκατάβασις is encountered five times in the *kanon*: in the first *troparion* of the fourth, the first and third *troparia* of the fifth, the third *troparion* of the sixth and the first *troparion* of the ninth odes. The word κένωσις is found in the second *troparion* of the seventh ode.
[190] Lampe, op. cit., 1268.
[191] See Lampe, op. cit., 744-746 and 1267-1268, respectively.

to God's utmost power.[192] Romanos the Melode in the first *prooimion* of his *kontakion* for the feast of the Presentation sees God's ineffable condescension in the fact that the one before whom the powers of Heaven tremble, is now embraced by the hands of an elderly man:

Χορὸς ἀγγελικὸς ἐκπληττέσθω τὸ θαῦμα,

βροτοὶ δὲ ταῖς φωναῖς ἀνακράξωμεν ὕμνον,

ὁρῶντες τὴν ἄφατον τοῦ Θεοῦ συγκατάβασιν·

ὃν γὰρ τρέμουσι τῶν οὐρανῶν αἱ δυνάμεις,

νῦν γηράλαιαι ἐναγκαλίζονται χεῖρες

τὸν μόνον φιλάνθρωπον.

Let the chorus of angels be amazed at the marvel,

And let us mortals lift up our voices in a hymn,

As we see the ineffable accommodation of God;

For the hands of an old man embrace

The One at whom the powers of Heaven tremble.[193]

It is worth noting at this point that in the first sermon for the Entrance into the Temple of the Virgin Mary, also ascribed to the patriarch Germanos I, an analogy was drawn between this event and Christ's Presentation in the temple: "Today an infant is offered to the priest, [the infant] who will [later] dedicate the forty-day-old High-Priest God, who alone was made an infant in flesh on our account, holding in her own arms the limitless one who is beyond all mortal understanding".[194]

The author of the *kanon* for the *Hypapante*, apparently in order to underscore the reality of Christ's human nature, refers to other events related to his infancy. For example, a reference to Jesus' circumcision needs to be seen in this light if we keep in mind that in both

---

[192] ἐπειδὴ μέλλει τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ συνάπτεσθαι τῆς σαρκὸς ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος, καλῶς πρόσκειται τὸ, *Δυνατέ·* διότι μεγίστης ἀπόδειξιν δυνάμεως ἔχει τὸ δυνηθῆναι Θεὸν ἐν ἀνθρώπου φύσει γενέσθαι. Οὐ γὰρ τοσοῦτον οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς σύστασις ... τὴν δύναμιν παρίστησι τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου, ὅσον ἡ περὶ τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν οἰκονομία καὶ ἡ πρὸς τὸ ταπεινὸν καὶ ἀσθενὲς τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος *συγκατάβασις.* S. *Basilii Magni Homilia in Psalmum* 44, 5 (PG 29/2 400B).

[193] Romanos le Mélode, *Hymnes*, vol. 2, Προοίμιον 1, p. 174. For the English translation, see: M. Carpenter, ed., *Kontakia of Romanos, Byzantine Melodist, 1: On the Person of Christ*, Columbia, MO: University of Missouri 1970, 39.

[194] Σήμερον τῷ ἱερεῖ βρέφος ἀποδίδοται, ἡ τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς βρεφωθέντα σαρκὶ μόνον Ἀρχιερέα Θεὸν τεσσαρακονθήμερον ἀναθησομένη οἰκείαις ὠλέναις τὸν ἄσχετον κατέχουσα, ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν βρότειον ἔννοιαν. Germanos of Constantinople, *On the Entrance into the Temple I*, PG 98, 292-309, at 293. For the English translation, see: Cunningham, *Wider than Heaven*, 146-147.

New Testament events, along with his subjection to the law, he manifested his real human nature. The mention of the circumcision is made in the second *troparion* of the fourth ode:

Ὥσπερ ὀκταήμερον περιτομήν, δι᾽ ἡμᾶς ὑπήνεγκας Δέσποτα, οὕτω καὶ νῦν δέ, κατεδέξω τῷ ναῷ, προσενεχθῆναι νήπιος, δόξα τῇ πολλῇ εὐσπλαγχνίᾳ σου.

Just as you endured circumcision on the eighth day, O Lord, so also now you accepted to be brought to the temple as an infant. Glory to your great compassion.

Other means that the hymnographer employs in this hymn for the same purpose is a frequent use of verbs associated with the sense of vision, including ὁράω, καθοράω and βλέπω. At first glance, their presence in the poem is fairly natural, since Symeon used the verb ὁράω in his prayer. However, it seems that this characteristic, along with the ones discussed above, indicates that the hymnographer expresses subtle anti-iconoclastic ideas in this *kanon*. As is well known, the iconophiles repeatedly insisted on the visibility of the incarnate Christ in order to vindicate the legitimacy of his pictorial representations. Scholars have noted that already Patriarch Germanos I and especially John of Damascus, as the most prominent defenders of the sacred images during the first phase of the iconoclastic controversy, identified "visuality as a specifically Christian property".[195] The following statement of John of Damascus (d. 749) is very representative: "when the invisible becomes visible in the flesh, then you may depict the likeness of something seen".[196] The patriarch Germanos in advancing his argument against the iconoclasts also emphasises the idea that Christ in his incarnation displayed the divinity to visibility: "Faith comes not only through hearing, but already through sight the things which are seen are imprinted on thoughts and compel us to cry aloud the fact that God has revealed himself in the flesh".[197]

---

[195] C. Barber, *Figure and Likeness. On the Limits of Representation in Byzantine Iconoclasm*, Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2002, 72. This argument was also put forward by subsequent iconophile authors. Very characteristic is Patriarch Nikephoros's assertion that "sight is the most honoured and necessary of the senses" (ὄψις τῶν αἰσθητηρίων τὸ τιμιώτατον καὶ ἀναγκαιότατον). J. M. Featherstone, ed., *Nicephori Patriarchae Constantinopolitani refutatio et eversio definitionis synodalis anni 815*, CCSG 33, Turnhout: Brepols, 1997, 211. For this argument as part of the ninth-century iconophile rhetorical arsenal, see J.-M. Sansterre, "La parole, le texte et l'image selon les auteurs byzantins des époques iconoclaste et posticonoclaste", *Testo e immagine nell'alto medioevo* 41, Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1994, 197-240.

[196] Ὅταν ὁρατὸς σαρκὶ ὁ ἀόρατος γένηται, τότε εἰκονίσεις τὸ τοῦ ὁραθέντος ὁμοίωμα. B. Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos III. Contra imaginum calumniatores orationes tres*, Patristische Texte und Studien 17, Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1975, 82. (*CPG* 8045). For the English translation, see St John of Damascus, *Three Treatises on the Divine Images*, trans. and intr. by A. Louth, Crestwood, New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003, 24.

[197] μὴ μόνον ἐξ ἀκοῆς τὴν πίστιν ἔχειν, ἀλλ᾽ ἤδη καὶ δι᾽ ὁράσεως ἐντυποῦσθαι τῶν ὁρώντων ταῖς διανοίαις, καὶ δυνάμει ἐκεῖνο βοᾶν, ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί. *Epistola Germani episcopi Constantinopoleos ad Thomam episcopum Claudiopoleos*, Mansi 13, 116B. (*CPG* 8004).

While all the aforementioned may be seen just as veiled allusions to iconoclasm, the following *troparion* from the sixth ode demonstrates the author's interest in the matter in the most apparent way:

> Ὁ φύσει ὢν ἀπερίγραπτος, σαρκὶ περιεγράφη, βουλόμενος σῶσαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ὃν Συμεὼν ὥσπερ νήπιον, χαίρων καὶ τρέμων ἅμα περιεπτύξατο.

> He who is indescribable according to [his] nature, was described by the flesh in order to save the man, whom Symeon, rejoicing and trembling at the same time, embraced as an infant.

The idea that the indescribable one (ἀπερίγραπτος) became describable (περιγραπτός) through the incarnation was the main weapon in the arsenal of arguments deployed by the iconophiles.[198]

The hypothesis about the anti-iconoclastic character of this *kanon* seems more plausible if we keep in mind that other poets of the iconoclastic period, including Andrew of Crete and the most famous female hymnographer and an active iconophile, Kassia,[199] in their hymns for this feast day also stress Christ's visibility in the flesh on account of the incarnation. While Andrew regularly reiterates that Symeon saw him in the flesh, Kassia in a highly original way relates the *Hypapante* not only to Christ's Nativity, but also to the Epiphany, another feast of his manifestation par excellence in the world. A striking similarity between her four *stichera* on the Nativity of Christ, the first *sticheron* on the Epiphany and the first *sticheron* on the Presentation in the Temple is significant. All of them have the same incipit—Ὡς ὡράθης Χριστέ (or Σωτήρ), the same number of verses,[200] and a similar ending in the form of a quatrain-refrain, in which an emphasis on Christ's human nature is laid. Because of this, it was proposed that the *stichera* on these three feasts initially formed a single composition, similarly to the Latin hymn *A solis ortus cardine*,[201] and was divided into three parts at some later point.[202] However, such an opinion needs to be dismissed for several reasons. First of all, judging by the structure of the contemporary liturgical books, the main

---

[198] See, among others, Germanos's letters as well.

[199] For the life of Kassia and for her poetic works, see: I. Rochow, *Studien zu der Person, den Werken und dem Nachleben der Dichterin Kassia*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1967; A. Tripolitis, ed. and trans., *Kassia: The Legend, the Woman, and Her Work*, New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1992; A. Silvas, "Kassia the Nun c.810-c.865: an Appreciation", in: L. Garland, ed., *Byzantine Women: Varieties of Experience AD 800-1200,* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006, 17-39; K. Simic, *The Poetess Kassia: Liturgical Poetry of the Poetess Kassia and its Slavic Translation,* Belgrade-Novi Sad: Akademska knjiga, 2011 (English translation forthcoming).

[200] An exception to this is the second *sticheron*, which is twelve verses long.

[201] For this hymn, see: C.P.E. Springer, "Sedulius' 'A solus ortus cardine': The Hymn and its Tradition", *Ephemerides liturgicae* 101 (1987) 69–75.

[202] B. Grumel, "Cassia", *Dictionnaire d' Histoire et Géographie Ecclésiastique* 11 (1949) 1312–1315, here 1314.

feasts related to Christ's birth and infancy were perceived as a united whole. For example, in the majuscule *Tropologion*, dated to the first half of the ninth century, the Nativity-Epiphany circle begins with the Christmas, includes the Epiphany and ends with the *Hypapante*.[203] Furthermore, the aforementioned *kanon* by Joseph in which a close parallel between the Nativity and *Hypapante* is also drawn, but in a different way, needs to be seen in this light, too. In addition to this, pictorial representations on artistic objects from the contemporary period reflect the understanding of the feasts related to Christ's birth and infancy as one cycle. For example, the famous Vicopisano reliquary cross (Pieve di S. Maria e S. Giovanni, Pisa), dated to the first half of the ninth century, is decorated with depictions of the Annunciation, the Nativity, the Epiphany and the Presentation of the child Christ in the temple.

It is obvious that Kassia's *stichera* largely reflect the concurrent understanding that the feasts related to the mystery of the incarnation represent one whole.

As for the reasons behind the emphasis placed on the unity of the feasts related to Christ's infancy, it seems highly plausible that they need to be sought in the contemporary iconoclastic controversy, and, accordingly, they should be identified as theological. The content of the quatrains in which Kassia's *stichera* on the Nativity of Christ, the Epiphany and the *Hypapante* end, appear to prove this. The four Christmas *stichera* end in the following quatrain-refrain:[204]

ὁ διὰ σπλάγχνα οἰκτιρμῶν	You who through the deepest compassion
σάρκα περιβαλλόμενος	put on a body
καὶ τὸ πρόσλημμα θεώσας	and deified the mortal being;
τῶν βροτῶν, Κύριε, δόξα σοι.	glory to you, Lord.

The quatrain of the Epiphany *sticheron* reads as follows:

ὁ βαπτισθῆναι δι᾽ ἡμᾶς	You who accepted

---

[203] I would like to take this opportunity to express my thanks to Alexandra Nikiforova for providing me with her unpublished paper with a full description of the hymnographical content of this Tropologion: "Tropologion Sinait. Gr. ΜΓ 56–5 (9ᵗʰ c.): A new source for Byzantine hymnography". The paper was presented and discussed at the *Third Cyrillo-Methodian Congress* (February 2013, University of Florence, Russian Academy of Sciences, Institute for Slavic Studies, Rome-Florence). See also her book: *From the History of the Menaion in Byzantium*, 28-93 and 195–236, 31-32, and Appendix, 195-207.

[204] The same refrain for a couple of *stichera* may suggest that it was sung by the entire congregation, as in the case of Romanos's *kontakia*. Cf. J. Grosdidier de Matons, "Liturgie et Hymnographie: Kontakion et Canon », *DOP* 34 (1980-1981) 31-43, here 41.

σαρκὶ καταδεξάμενος	to be baptized for our sake in the flesh
καὶ τοὺς σπίλους ἀποσμήξας	and wiped clean (of sins)
τῶν βροτῶν, Κύριε, δόξα σοι.	of mortals; glory to you, Lord.

Finally, the *sticheron* on the *Hypapante* ends with a quatrain in which Symeon's hymn from the New Testament (cf. Luke, 2:29-30) is paraphrased:

νῦν ἀπολύεις με τὸν σὸν	now you release me, your servant,
δοῦλον, κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου,	from this world to eternal life,
τῆς προσκαίρου πρὸς αἰώνιον	according to your word,
ζωήν·[205] σαρκὶ γὰρ εἶδόν σε.	for I have seen you in the flesh.

Although these three quatrains differ in their content, given that each of them is adapted to a particular festal celebration, there is a common thread that runs through all of them. It is the emphasis on Christ's human nature evident in the use of the word "flesh" (σάρξ). In the concluding quatrain of the Christmas *stichera*, what is underlined is that Christ, out of his deepest compassion, "put on flesh" (σάρκα περιβαλλόμενος). Likewise, in the *sticheron* on the Epiphany we read that he accepted to be baptised "in the flesh" (σαρκὶ καταδεξάμενος). Finally, in the quatrain from the Presentation *sticheron*, Symeon rejoices in the fact that he has seen Christ "in the flesh" (σαρκὶ γὰρ εἶδόν σε). The last phrase occurs in Romanos's *kontakion* for the same feast, in which instead of the word σάρξ Romanos uses the word σῶμα (body): ἐν σώματί σε εἶδον (I saw you in the body).[206] The choice of the word σάρξ needs to be seen in the context of the poetess's polemic against the iconoclasts. The iconophile authors commonly underscored the material aspect of Christ's human nature by using this term.[207] Accordingly, I would argue that both in Kassia's *stichera* and in the *kanon* for the *Hypapante* attributed to Patriarch Germanos by stressing the unity of the feasts commemorating events, in which the reality of Christ's human body (flesh) was revealed, their authors implicitly advanced an anti-iconoclast argument.

---

[205] In Romanos's *kontakion* Symeon says to the Christ child: Νῦν οὖν προσκαίρων χώρισόν με, κτίστα, and Christ answers him: Νῦν σε ἀπολύω τῶν προσκαίρων, ὦ φίλε μου, πρὸς χωρία αἰώνια. *Romanos le Mélode, Hymnes*, vol. 2, 15.8 and 17.3, p. 194.
[206] Romanos le Mélode, *Hymnes*, vol. 2, 16.7, p. 194.
[207] See indicatively: Barber, *Figure and Likeness*, passim.

The three *stichera* for the *Hypapante* ascribed to Germanos and currently sung at *Lord, I Have Cried*[208] are also united by a refrain, which refers to the incarnation. It seems that it also invokes the incarnation in order to associate it with the veneration of icons. The link between the incarnation and the veneration of icons is established through the use of the verbs σαρκόω and προσκυνάω:

ὁ σαρκωθεὶς δι᾽ ἡμᾶς,	He who for our sakes
καὶ σώσας τὸν ἄνθρωπον·	has taken flesh and has saved humankind;
Αὐτὸν προσκυνήσωμεν.	let us venerate him.

Furthermore, these examples from the poetry of Germanos and Kassia demonstrate that refrains, similarly to other rhetorical devices such as dialogues, were an agent in conveying doctrinal teachings to the congregation,[209] regardless of whether they were intended to engage the congregants in a more active way in the worship or not.

However, generally speaking, references and allusions to the Virgin Mary in Germanos' *kanon* for the *Hypapante* are not very frequent, since only five out of thirty-nine *troparia* can be characterised as Mariological. Three of them are addressed directly to Mary, namely, the fourth *troparion* of ode four:

Θείαν μυροθήκην σε ὡς ἀληθῶς, μύρον τὸ οὐράνιον φέρουσαν, ὁ θεῖος πρέσβυς, ὡς ἐπέγνω προφανῶς, προσφόρως ἀνεκραύγαζε, δόξα τῇ κυήσει σου Δέσποινα.

When the divine elder clearly recognised you as a divine vase of perfume, truly bearing heavenly perfume, he cried aloud: Glory to your conception, O mistress.[210]

The second *troparion* of the fifth ode:

Ποικίλοις αἰνίγμασι, καὶ τυπικαῖς ἐμφάσεσι, πόρρωθεν ἁγνὴ προεσημάνθη, τοῦ τοκετοῦ σου σεπτὸν μυστήριον, ὃ κατανοήσας Συμεών, φόβῳ προσεκύνησε, καὶ πιστῶς ἐμεγάλυνε.

---

[208] *Menaion* for February 2. For the English translation, see Mother Mary and Archimandrite Kallistos, *Festal Menaion*, 408, slightly modified.
[209] On the function of dialogues in homiletics, see: I. Lunde, "Dialogue and the Rhetoric of Authority in Medieval Preaching", in: I. Lunde (ed.), "Dialogue and Rhetoric: Communication Strategies in Russian Text and Theory", *Slavica Bergensia* 1, Bergen: University of Bergen, 1999, 84-101, and M. Cunningham, "Dramatic Device or Didactic Tool? The Function of Dialogue in Byzantine Preaching", in: E. Jeffreys (ed.), *Rhetoric in Byzantium: Papers from the Thirty-Fifth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies*, Exeter College, University of Oxford, March 2001. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003, 101-113.
[210] The word μυροθήκη is encountered in one of Romanos the Melode's genuine hymns, namely Hymn 56, 1, 28, and in two others regarded as dubious: Hymn 77, 6, 3 and 84, 1, 28.

In manifold riddles and figurative stories, the mystery of your birth, O pure one, was announced long ago, which Symeon, having understood, venerated with fear and glorified with faith.[211]

And the fifth troparion of the ninth ode:

Δέσποινα ἀγνή, ῥομφαία διῆλθέ σου τὴν παναγίαν ψυχήν, ὅτε προσπηγνύμενον σταυρῷ κατεῖδες τὸν σὸν υἱὸν καὶ Θεόν, καθά σοι διὰ Πνεύματος προανηγόρευσεν ὁ πρέσβυς Συμεών τε καὶ δίκαιος, μεθ᾿ οὗ πάντες ἀεί σε δοξάζομεν.

Mistress pure, sword pierced your all-holy soul, when you saw your son and God fixed to the cross, as the elder and righteous Symeon foretold you through the Holy Spirit, with him we all praise you for ever.

The other two, which indirectly refer to the Mother of God, fit well in the anti-iconoclastic tone of the poem. In both cases the poet addresses Christ and stresses that he assumed flesh from Mary in order to save human beings.[212] These *troparia* read as follow:

Οἰκτείρων φιλάνθρωπε, τὸν πλανηθέντα ἄνθρωπον, σάρκα ἐκ παρθένου προσελάβου, καὶ παρεγένου ἐν τῷ σεπτῷ σου ναῷ, ὅθεν Συμεὼν σε κατιδών, μέγα ἀνεβόησε, σὺ Θεός μου καὶ Κύριος.

Feeling pity for the deceived man, O benevolent one, you assumed flesh from the Virgin and arrived at your venerable temple, where Symeon, having seen you, loudly cried out: you are my God and Lord.[213]

Βουλὴν πατρῴαν φιλάνθρωπε, πληρῶσαι βουληθεὶς μήτρα ᾤκησας, σὰρξ ἐχρημάτισας, ἐν τῷ ναῷ προσενήνεξαι, καὶ πάντα ὑπομένεις ὁ ἀναμάρτητος.

Willing to fulfil your father's plan, O benevolent one, you dwelled in a womb, received flesh, were brought to the temple, and endured everything, O sinless one.[214]

---

[211] It is worth noting the similarity between this *troparion* and the *theotokion* of the seventh ode of the *kanon* to John Chrystostom written by Theophanes (d. 845): Σωματικαῖς μορφώσεσι, καὶ ποικίλοις αἰνίγμασι, καὶ συμβολικαῖς καὶ τυπικαῖς ἐμφάσεσι, τὴν σὴν προεμήνυον, οἱ θεηγόροι γέννησιν, τὴν ὑπερφυᾶ, καὶ θαυμαστήν σου Παρθένε· διὸ σε γεγηθότες, εὐσεβῶς ἀνυμνοῦμεν, Χριστὸν ὑπερυψοῦντες, εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας. (The Prophets foretold in bodily forms, manifold riddles and symbolic and figurative stories your wondrous birthgiving beyond nature, O Virgin. And so with joy we devoutly sing your praise, as we highly exalt Christ to the ages). *Menaion* for 13 November. For the English translation of the *kanon*, see www.anastasis.org.uk.

[212] For references to the Virgin Mary during the iconoclastic disputes, see N. Tsironis, "The Mother of God in the Iconoclastic Controversy", in M. Vassilaki, ed., *Mother of God: Representations of the Virgin Mary in Byzantine Art*, Milan and Athens: Museum Benaki, 2000, 27-39.

[213] The fourth *troparion* of the fifth ode.

[214] The first *troparion* of the sixth ode.

Therefore, judging from rare references to the Virgin Mary, the present *kanon* cannot be regarded as exclusively Mariological. Rather, Mary's role is confined to facilitating the incarnation, while her intercessory function is not mentioned at all. On the other hand, Symeon's role in the event is highlighted and needs to be addressed, too.

The place of Symeon in the kanon

In the *kanon* under discussion, among the protagonists involved in the event, Symeon probably occupies the predominant place. The author of the hymn highlights his role as a witness of Christ's incarnation and his redemptive work. Physical contact between Symeon and the child Jesus is frequently reiterated throughout the hymn. The fact that on several occasions the hymnographer associates the physical contact with the incarnation indicates that in this way he wished to portray Symeon as a witness par excellence of God's revelation in the flesh. Two particularly notable examples are the following: "The Lord of all is held in the arms of the elderly man and seen as an infant"[215] and "incarnated and held in the arms of the elderly man".[216]

In addition to this, Symeon is even presented as a precursor of Christ's descent into Hades. The fourth *troparion* of ode six reads as follows:

> Τῷ πρέσβυ Δέσποτα σπεύδοντι, κομίσαι τῷ Ἀδὰμ εὐαγγέλια, τῆς παρουσίας σου, προσηνέχθης βοῶντί σοι, ἀπόλυσόν με Λόγε Θεοῦ τὸν δοῦλόν σου.

> O Lord, you were brought to the elderly man, who was in haste to announce to Adam good news of your arrival, and shouting to you: O Logos of God, release me, your servant.

This is an extremely rare idea in Christian literature. To the best of my knowledge, it has parallels only in liturgical poetry. It seems that the first hints of this idea appeared in Romanos the Melode's *kontakion* for the *Hypapante*. In strophe 14, Symeon is presented as asking the Christ child to send him to Abraham and the patriarchs: "Send me, O most holy, to Abraham and the patriarchs" (πρὸς τὸν Ἀβραάμ με καὶ τοὺς πατριάρχας ἀπόστειλον, πανάγιε).[217] Although the concept of Symeon's announcement of Christ's forthcoming appearance among the dead is not mentioned in these words, they, however, could have served as a point of departure for the development of the idea by subsequent hymnographers. Furthermore, the use of this theme in the sixth ode of the *kanon* ascribed to Germanos can be related to the biblical canticle, namely to the canticle of Jonah, which generally

---

[215] συνέχεται πρεσβυτικαῖς ὠλέναις καὶ ὁρᾶται νήπιος ὁ πάντων Κύριος (the fourth *troparion* of the first ode).

[216] σεσαρκωμένον καὶ συνεχόμενον ἀγκάλαις πρεσβύτου (the first *troparion* of the fifth ode).

[217] De Matons, *Hymnes. Nouveau Testament*, vol. 2, 192. For the English translation, see Carpenter, *Kontakia of Romanos, Byzantine Melodist*, vol. 1, *On the Person of Christ*, 44, modified.

served as a basis for the sixth ode of the *kanon* as a genre. Since Jonah's sojourn in the sea monster was commonly compared with Christ's descent into Hades in patristic literature, the present ode was the most appropriate for applying a similar theme to Symeon, too.

In the *kanon* by Kosmas the Melode, the idea is fully developed, as the first *troparion* of the seventh ode clearly shows:

Ἀδὰμ ἐμφανίσων ἄπειμι, εἰς ᾅδου διατρίβοντι, καὶ τῇ Εὔᾳ προσκομίσων εὐαγγέλια, Συμεὼν ἀνεβόα, σὺν προφήταις χορεύων· εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεός, ὁ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν.

I am departing to appear to Adam, who resides in Hades, and to Eve to bring good news, Symeon shouted aloud, dancing with prophets: Blessed are you, O God, of our fathers.

Furthermore, Joseph's *kanon* also contains a similar concept in the first *troparion* of the fifth ode:

Σαρκώσεως μέγα μυστήριον νῦν τῆς ἐμῆς κατιδὼν σύνες πνεύματι, ὡς ἦλθε τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ νέου Ἰσραήλ, Συμεὼν Θεοδόχε, διὸ πρόδραμε φέρων τῷ Ἀδὰμ καὶ ἄπασι, τοῖς ἐν τῷ ᾅδη εὐαγγέλια.

Having seen a great mystery of my incarnation now, understand by your spirit that the salvation of the new Israel has arrived, O Symeon the God-Receiver, hence run forward to bring good news to Adam and to all in Hades.[218]

Finally, the last example of a hymn with a reference to Symeon's preaching in hell is found in the anonymous eight-ode *kanon* on the *Hypapante* published in the series *Analecta Hymnica Graeca*. The third *troparion* of ode seven reads as follows:

Τοὺς λόγους τοῦ πρεσβύτου ὁ προπάτωρ ἀκούων ἠγάλλετο, Χριστὸν γὰρ ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Ἄδου καταβῆναι κηρύττοντα τρανῶς, ἵνα τοὺς κατακρίτους ἐκ τῶν δεσμῶν ἐκλυτρώσηται.

The forefather [Adam] rejoiced hearing the words of the elderly man that Christ would descend into Hades to preach clearly in order to redeem the condemned from the bonds.[219]

---

[218] In both Greek and Slavonic traditions, Joseph the Hymnographer is also credited with a *kanon* for the annual commemoration of Symeon on 3 February. The *kanon* is currently in liturgical use in the Eastern Church. Its sixth ode contains two *troparia* with references to Symeon's descent into Hades. The first *troparion* reads as follows: Ἐβόησας, ὁπηνίκα κατεῖδες τὸν Κύριον. Ὡς ὑπέσχου, νῦν τὸν δοῦλόν σου Σῶτερ ἀπόλυσον, τοῖς ἐν Ἄδη πᾶσι, σοῦ τὴν θείαν μηνύσοντα σάρκωσιν (You cried aloud when you saw the Lord. Now, as you promised, release, O Saviour, your servant to announce your divine incarnation to everyone in Hades). The third *troparion*: Ναμάτων σε, πεπλησμένον τῶν θείων ἀπάραντα, καὶ πρὸς Ἄδου, τοὺς κευθμῶνας χωρίσαντα βλέψαντες, οἱ ἐκεῖ δεσμῶται, Συμεὼν θείας δρόσου ἐπλήσθησαν (Having seen you departed full of divine streams and coming to the netherworld of Hades, its captives were filled with divine dew, O Symeon).
[219] *AHG* 6, 67-75, at 71.

From the examples containing references to Symeon, it becomes evident that Byzantine hymnographers gave him a more prominent place in the celebrated event than scholars usually acknowledge in their treatment of the *Hypapante*. Having been concerned with the question whether the feast has Christological or Mariological character, they commonly overlook the importance of Symeon, who is frequently presented as the main protagonist of the event in both homilies and hymns. The poets ingeniously utilised all aspects of the celebrated event to stress his role as a witness of Christ's manifestation in the flesh, death and preaching in Hades as well as his testimony to Mary as the Mother of God who gave Christ human nature for the sake of the salvation of humankind.

The hymnography for the feast points us to the fact that from the beginning both its Christological and Mariological aspects were present, while the one or the other received greater emphasis in the ensuing centuries, depending on the theological debates and ecclesiastical concerns of the time. During the iconoclastic and post-iconoclastic periods, we can observe the Christological aspect coming to the fore in iconophile liturgical texts, subtly mingled with the Mariological and emerging most visibly in the emphasis on Symeon.

Conclusion

From the analysis of a set of the hymns for Mary's Nativity, the Annunciation and the *Hypapante*, it becomes evident that their author or authors are not exclusively focused on Mary's intercessory roles,[220] as one could expect from liturgical texts intended to be used in liturgy. Rather, they primarily underscore the Virgin's pivotal role in the incarnation and, accordingly, her place in the economy of salvation with a substantial contribution to the salvation of humankind. Accordingly, the hymns under discussion summarise the main points of the Mariological teachings against the background of the recent or even contemporary iconoclastic disputes. The controversy initiated a profound recapitulation of Christology, especially the teachings about Christ's incarnation facilitated by the Virgin Mary's synergy in the event.

Another important point is that Marian devotion generated a sort of Mariological interpretation of the Scriptures. Hymnographers, including the authors of the hymns under

---

[220] For the Virgin Mary's intercessory role, see L. M. Peltomaa, A. Külzer and P. Allen, eds, *Presbeia Theotokou. The Intercessory Role of Mary across Times and Places in Byzantium (4th-9th Century)*, Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences, 2015.

discussion, followed the well-established patristic tradition of looking for Marian types in various biblical episodes, especially those from the Old Testament. As a result, the Mariological hymns analysed here abound with such types.

Chapter Two

Hagiographical Poetry

In Chapter One, I have dealt with the Mariological hymnographic works attributed to Patriarch Germanos I, paying special attention to three unpublished *kanons* transmitted under this name. In what follows, I will focus on hagiographical hymns. As a matter of fact, the largest set of hymns attributed to the patriarch are devoted to the celebration of saints.[1] However, since the present study is concerned with the entire corpus of liturgical poetry preserved under the patriarch's name, a comprehensive analysis of "Germanos's" hagiographical composition and all the pertinent topics is hardly an attainable task in this chapter and goes beyond its aims. Such an analysis requires an in-depth study of its own. For the purposes of the present thesis, I will confine myself to some representative examples related to several aspects relevant for the broader context of the iconoclastic and post-iconoclastic periods. After a general overview of the hagiographical hymnography within the corpus and its links to other similar genres, especially hagiography and homiletics, I will focus on the specific issues of typological links and exemplarity. I will explore how the author or authors of these texts use biblical figures as models for the celebrated saints or present the saints as models for the faithful. Special attention will be paid to the use of a vocabulary of image-making in these poetic works. Since virtually all these topics are present in the *kanons* on Saint Basil the Great and Saint Nicholas, these two *kanons* will occupy the centre stage in the following discussion, although examples from other hymns will be also addressed.

On the development of hagiographical hymnography

The cult of saints is an aspect of the hymnographic works attributed to Patriarch Germanos I that deserves particular examination. While the poetry of the *kontakion*, the dominant hymnographic form during the sixth and seventh centuries, was mainly devoted to Christological and Mariological themes,[2] with the invention of the *kanon* in the late seventh century, Byzantine hymnography witnessed a thematic expansion, most notably in an

---

[1] For the list of all hagiographical hymns attributed to Germanos, see the catalogue below.

[2] All hagiographical *kontakia* attributed to Romanos the Melode eventually proved to belong to a later period. T. Detorakis, "Οἱ ἅγιοι καὶ οἱ μάρτυρες στὴν ὑμνογραφία", in: *Ὁ ἅγιος καὶ μάρτυρας στὴ ζωὴ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, Athens: Ἀποστολικὴ Διακονία τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, 1994, 211 (203-215), and A. Giannouli, "Byzantine Hagiography and Hymnography: An Interrelationship", in: S. Efthymiadis, ed., *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography, vol. 2: Genres and Contexts*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2014, 285–312.

increasing interest in the liturgical celebration of saints. As an illustration of this rapid development of individual saints' commemoration and hagiographical poetry, especially *kanons*, from the ninth century onward, it is sufficient to compare the content of the *Tropologion* (МГ 5, eighth/ninth century) with the *menaion* for March-April and the two days of May (Sinait. gr. 607, dated to the end of the ninth century). While the *Tropologion* contains liturgical offices for commemorations of only three saints: Saint George (23 April), the apostle Mark (25 April), and Saint Athanasios of Alexandria (2 May), in the *menaion* we find 64 commemorations for the same period of the liturgical year.[3]

The development and flourishing of hagiographical hymnography in Byzantium coincides with the diffusion and popularity of other genres of hagiographical literature, especially saints' lives, *enkomia*, miracle narratives, etc.[4] All of these genres are closely related to the rapid development of the cult of saints from the seventh century onwards. Their aim was either to promote new cults or to spread those already in existence. Saints' *lives* composed during the period in question do not deal only with contemporary figures, nor are all of them original writings. Rather, a high proportion of these texts praise early Christian martyrs and represent *metaphraseis*, that is, rewritings of earlier saints' *lives*.[5] This activity of reworking hagiographical texts as well as their compiling into collections in the form of *menologia* and *synaxaria* goes back to as early as the seventh century. It reaches its peak in the tenth century, when Symeon Metaphrastes edited his *Menologion*, which replaced the earlier compilations.[6] If we bear in mind that this large enterprise of the rewriting and compilation of hagiographical works was accompanied by unprecedented development of hagiographical hymnography and that both activities were destined for liturgical purpose, then they need to be seen as two sides of the same process. This argument can be supported by the mutual influence and similarity of the two genres in some aspects, which is undoubtedly a result of their concurrent expansion and the liturgical context of their production. The two genres were intimately intertwined through mutual influence. Although hymnographers relied heavily on the work of hagiographers, the influence flowed in the other

---

[3] See Nikiforova, *From the History of the Menaion in Byzantium*, 101-102.

[4] For the hagiography of this period, see S. Efthymiadis, "Hagiography from the 'Dark Age' to the Age of Symeon Metaphrastes (Eighth-Tenth Centuries)", *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography, vol. 1: Periods and Places*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2011, 95-142, with the most relevant bibliography up-to-date.

[5] On the practice of *metaphrasis* in Byzantium, see: C. Hoegel, ed., Metaphrasis: *Redactions and Audiences in Middle Byzantine Hagiography*, Oslo: The Research Council of Norway, 2011.

[6] C. Rapp, "Byzantine Hagiographers as Antiquarians, Seventh to Tenth Centuries", in: S. Efthymiadis, C. Rapp and D. Tsougarakis, eds., *Bosphorus. Essays in Honour of Cyril Mango*, Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1995, 31-44. For Symeon Metaphrastes' project, see C. Hoegel, *Symeon Metaphrastes: Rewriting and Canonization*, Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2002.

direction too. Indeed, the impact of hymnography on the *lives* of saints and *synaxaria* was more common than one would expect, especially in the later periods.[7] It is important to stress that hymnographers perused hagiographical literature not simply in order to cull biographical information about specific holy figures. They also borrowed specific literary strategies, for instance, the idea of presenting saints as exemplars for the faithful. In addition, hymnographers employed a range of rhetorical devices characteristic of hagiographical literature, especially figures and tropes seen in encomiastic homilies.

To illustrate the impact of such homilies on hagiographical hymnography, we may turn the following anonymous *sticheron*, which borrows from a sermon penned by Gregory of Nazianzos:

Ἱερεῖα ἔμψυχα, ὁλοκαυτώματα λογικά, μάρτυρες Κυρίου, θύματα τέλεια Θεοῦ, Θεὸν γινώσκοντα καὶ Θεῷ γινωσκόμενα πρόβατα, ὧν ἡ μάνδρα λύκοις ἀνεπίβατος, πρεσβεύσατε καὶ ἡμᾶς συμποιμανθῆναι ὑμῖν.

O living sacrificial victims, rational totally consumed offerings, martyrs of the Lord, perfect sacrifices of God, sheep that know God and are known by God, whose fold is unapproachable to wolves, intercede on our behalf to be shepherds with you.[8]

The resemblance of these lines to a passage from Gregory's sermon 33 is striking:

They have shrines, we have the one who dwells in them; they have temples, while we have God and the fact of being "temples of the living God" and living temples, living offerings, living sacrifices, reasonable totally consumed offerings, gods through the worshipped Trinity. […] My fold is scanty, but unapproachable to wolves… They [the faithful] know God, and God knows them.[9]

In Gregory's homily, however, this excerpt does not refer to martyrs, but to the faithful who did not accept Arianism. Hence, it is likely that his words found their way into the *sticheron* through an intermediary, namely, Instruction 23 of Dorotheos of Gaza (d. between 560 and 580), which reads: "Let us take a look again at what saying Gregory (of Nazianzos) wants to teach us about the holy martyrs. Because he says... '(they are) living sacrifices, rational totally consumed offerings,... and perfect sacrifices to God.' Then, the following, 'sheep that

---

[7] For a brief discussion on the use of hymns in hagiographical texts, see Giannouli, "Byzantine Hagiography and Hymnography", 286-287, with further bibliography.

[8] *Pentekostarion*, Vespers on Friday after the Sunday of the Samaritan Woman (the fourth Sunday after Easter).

[9] Ἔχουσιν οὗτοι τοὺς οἴκους, ἡμεῖς τὸν ἔνοικον· οὗτοι τοὺς ναούς, ἡμεῖς τὸν Θεόν· καὶ τὸ "ναοὶ γενέσθαι Θεοῦ ζῶντος" καὶ ζῶντες, *ἱερεῖα ἔμψυχα, ὁλοκαυτώματα λογικά, θύματα τέλεια*, θεοὶ διὰ Τριάδος προσκυνουμένης... Στενή μοι *ἡ μάνδρα, πλὴν λύκοις ἀνεπίβατος... Τοιαῦτα τὰ Θεὸν γινώσκοντα, καὶ Θεῷ γινωσκόμενα*. Gregory of Nazianzos, *Oration 33*, in: C. Moreschini and P. Gallay, eds. and trans., *Grégoire de Nazianze, Discours 32-37*, SC 318, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1985, 188-190.

know God, and are known by God... whose fold is unapproachable to wolves...'"[10] Dorotheos, like the anonymous author of the hymn, explicitly cites Gregory's words and relates them to the martyr saints. The fact that the genre of spiritual instruction was very popular and widely read among the monastic communities can be seen as an additional argument that, in this case, Dorotheos's work was used as a source.

The rapid development of hagiographical poetry led to the compilation of hagiographical hymns into *menaia*, which may be seen as counterparts of *menologia* and *synaxaria*, liturgical books that appeared at the time when the number of saints' *lives* increased enormously. The *menaia* began to appear from the late ninth century, suggesting that the amount of texts amassed by that time was considerable and that their use in liturgy had become extensive. The earliest preserved example is the above mentioned late ninth-century *menaion* for March and April, Sinait. gr. 607.[11] The activity of composing hymns in the form of *kanons* and their collection into *menaia* seem to have been monastic enterprises, since the emergence of the *kanon* as a hymnographic genre and its use in liturgy are both associated with monasticism. Nancy Patterson-Ševčenko has characterised this whole project as "an ambitious and organised attempt at shaping and sacralising each day and week of the liturgical year, at ordering and codifying the daily round with respect to the heavenly one, and at establishing, through the poetry of the *kanon*, the firmest possible links between them".[12]

The same scholar related the flourishing of hagiographical poetry to the rise, development, and spread of sacred portraiture:

> What the writing of these hundreds of canons to individual saints achieved was to provide the faithful for the first time with a form of access to every holy figure of the Church calendar. In this respect, it is comparable to the contemporary interest in providing visual access to these holy figures through the establishment of portrait types for hundreds of different saints.[13]

The hagiographical hymns attributed to Patriarch Germanos I provide abundant evidence in support of Patterson-Ševčenko's view. These texts articulate compelling discursive portraits of their sacred protagonists comparable to holy icons. In these hymns, moreover, the saints

---

[10] Ἴδωμεν πάλιν τί θέλει διδάξαι ἡμᾶς περὶ τῶν ἁγίων μαρτύρων ὁ ἅγιος Γρηγόριος. Λέγει γὰρ... Ἱερεῖα ἔμψυχα, ὁλοκαυτώματα λογικά... καὶ θύματα τέλεια Θεῷ. Εἶτα τὸ ἑξῆς· Θεὸν γινώσκοντα καὶ Θεῷ γινωσκόμενα πρόβατα... Ὧν ἡ μάνδρα λύκοις ἀνεπίβατος.... *Dorothei Abbatis Doctrina XXIII. Expositio in verba divi Gregorii decantata in sanctos martyres*, PG 88, 1829C.

[11] For a detailed analysis of the content of this manuscript, see A. Nikiforova, *From the History of the Menaion in Byzantium*, 94-138.

[12] For more on this, see N. Patterson-Ševčenko, "Canon and Calendar: The Role of a Ninth-Century Hymnographer in Shaping the Celebration of the Saints", in: L. Brubaker, ed., *Byzantium in the Ninth Century: Dead or Alive?*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998,101-114, here 114.

[13] Patterson-Ševčenko, "Canon and Calendar", 114.

are presented as living icons of key biblical figures, with whom they are connected through shared virtues, as well as moral exemplars for the faithful. The assembled worshippers are repeatedly encouraged to imitate the saints, to look upon their exemplary lives as icons of virtues.

The Purpose of hagiographical hymns

The main purpose of all hagiographical genres is to glorify saints and demonstrate that they were imbued with divine grace. Since grace is also available to those who turn to saints in prayer, hagiographical hymns, with their intercessory and penitential character, could be seen as a complement to saints' biographies and, in particular, as a uniquely suitable vehicle for addressing holy figures. Through hymns, which often feature dialogues or monologues, the congregation is lent a voice to address saints within the liturgical context, which is the most appropriate avenue for seeking saints' intercession with God for the forgiveness of sins and salvation. Furthermore, the liturgical commemoration of saints, with the use of hymns as one of its key elements, bridges the distance between the sacred past and the here and now of liturgical performance and, in the process, renders the celebrated holy person present and accessible to the congregation. The eulogizing of saints in hymns not only serves to keep their memory alive. Rather, its primary function is to provide a setting within which the saints can assume an active role within a Church community and exercise their protective and intercessory roles on behalf of their devotees.

The notion that the liturgical commemoration of a saint renders him or her present within the Church community, even without the actual physical presence of the saint's relics, is attested as early as in the fourth century.[14] John Chrysostom in his homily *On all the saints* expresses this notion when he compares the remembrance of martyrs' tortures with their painting "on the walls of our minds": "For if he [Christ] sees such paintings in our mind, he will come with the Father and, with the Holy Spirit, will make his dwelling-place among us".[15] The paragraph amply demonstrates that martyrs' *praesentia* can be achieved not only through venerating their remains, but also through the rememberance of their lives. Moreover, martyrs' *praesentia* is also able to summon the Holy Trinity into the soul of the faithful. This Chrysostomic concept of the presence through memory is highly significant for understanding the internal logic of Byzantine hymnography in general. To be more specific,

---

[14] For Peter Brown's discussion on *praesentia* see his *Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1981, 86-105.

[15] Ἂν γὰρ ἴδη τοιαύτας ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ τὰς γραφάς, ἥξει μετὰ τοῦ Πατρός, καὶ μονὴν ποιήσει παρ᾽ ἡμῖν σὺν τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ Ἁγίῳ. PG 50, 712. The English translation is taken from: W. Mayer and B. Neil, *St John Chrysostom. The Cult of the Saints*, Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2006, 226.

it allows us to comprehend the poets' address to the saints as if they were present *hic et nunc*. Direct speech and the adverb σήμερον figure prominently in liturgical poetry. To give but one example, these are the opening words of a *troparion* from the nine-ode *kanon* on the martyrs Manuel, Sabel, and Ismael:

Δεῦτε θεάσασθε στάδιον σήμερον ἀξιύμνητον…

Come, behold the stadium worthy to be praised today…[16]

As scholars such as Peter Brown and Claudia Rapp have pointed out, holy figures, whether alive or dead, played multiple roles in the life of Christian communities. In addition to serving as exemplars and *patroni*, two functions eloquently analysed by Brown,[17] holy figures also acted as intercessors.[18] These different roles are highlighted in hagiographical literature. The earliest references to holy men as intercessors are encountered in the surviving correspondence of these revered individuals with their devotees.[19] Rapp, in her analysis of letters exchanged between several great spiritual authorities and their lay followers from the mid-fourth to the seventh centuries, has demonstrated that the earliest attested examples of intercession were practised by spiritual fathers on behalf of the individuals with whom they were in contact through letter exchange. From the examples Rapp provides, one can observe that the correspondents showed an increasing dependence on the holy men as time went on. The authors of the letters discovered at the monastery of Epiphanios at Thebes dated to the turn of the seventh century and addressed to Epiphanios and other spiritual authorities express their firm belief in the intercessory power of the holy men and emphasise their full personal dependence on their intercession: "It is only through the mediation and intercession of these holy men that these letter-writers hope for access to God".[20] I would argue that hagiographical hymns can be compared, to a certain extent, to such letters since hymnographers in their poetic works also address saints as alive and present, while simultaneously occupying a place in front of the divine throne and interceding on behalf of a community. Aside from offering eulogies and presenting the saints as exemplars,

---

[16] *AHG* 10, p. 102.

[17] P. Brown, "The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity," *JRS* 61 (1971) 80–101 and idem, "The Saint as Exemplar in Late Antiquity", *Representations* 1 (1983) 1-25.

[18] See C. Rapp, "For Next to God, You are My Salvation: Reflections on the Rise of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity", in: J. Howard-Johnston and P.A. Hayward, eds., *The Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages. Essays on the Contribution of Peter Brown*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999, 63-81.

[19] C. Rapp, "For Next to God", 67.

[20] Rapp, "For Next to God", 72.

hagiographical hymns also provided the congregation with a means of establishing "communication" with the saints and soliciting their intercession.

This emphasis on the saints's accessibility, presence, and attendance is particularly evident in the ubiquitous use of apostrophies—direct, personal, and often impassioned appeals to the celebrated saint or saints. A characteristic example is the *kanon* for the apostle Andrew, attributed to Germanos:

> Ὦ τῶν ἀρρήτων γραφεύ, μύστα τῆς χάριτος, χριστοκήρυξ Ἀνδρέα, τῷ θείῳ παριστάμενος τοῦ κτίστου σου θρόνῳ, πρέσβευε ἀπαύστως ἵνα λυτρωθῶμεν πυρὸς τοῦ αἰωνίου.

> O Andrew, writer of ineffable things, the one who is initiated into grace, and herald of Christ, you who stand beside the divine throne of the creator, intercede unceasingly for our release from the eternal flame.[21]

Appeals to the saints' intercession are especially common in the concluding ode. Thus, in the unpublished *kanon* for the Birth of John the Baptist, also ascribed to Germanos, the assembled worshippers exclaim:

> Ἐν τῇ σεπτῇ σου γεννήσει, προφῆτα κῆρυξ τοῦ Λόγου, Ἰωάννη Βαπτιστά, σὲ δυσωποῦμεν, ἱκέτευε ἐκτενῶς τοῦ σωθῆναι τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν.

> On the occasion of your birth, O prophet and preacher of [God] the Logos, John the Baptist, we beseech you, pray fervently for the salvation of our souls.[22]

Saints as icons of virtues

During the debate about the possibility and proper way of representing the saints that was sparked in the context of the iconoclastic polemic, both iconophile and iconoclastic parties defended their positions by referring to the saints as inspiring examples for the faithful. Iconophile writers referred to images of the saints as a potent means to promote their virtues; such images thus presented the saints as exemplars for the faithful. As a result, icons came to be regarded as a complement to hagiographic genres, serving a similar purpose. Among the authors who assigned this meaning to sacred images was Patriarch Germanos I. In his letter to Thomas Klaudiopolis he writes the following: "The Christian icons of holy men […] are nothing else but examples of courage, images of their pure and virtuous way of life, an

---

[21] Paris.gr. 259, f. 305.
[22] Sinait.gr. 620, f. 121v.

incitement and prompt to glorify God whom they pleased during their life".[23] Moreover, he explicitly compares icons with homilies in order to underline that both invite the faithful to imitate the saints: "A sermon, by narrating good deeds of good men, benefits the listeners and often incites their zeal for imitation. In all likelihood, the same will happen by observing the icon".[24] The opinion that images were one way to encourage imitation was made explicit by other Byzantine authors as well, including John of Damascus, a staunch defender of icon veneration. One of his arguments in favour of the veneration of icons was that images help those who behold them "to flee what is evil and be zealous for what is good".[25]

In a number of hymns under examination, the saints' lives and their virtues are praised as icons intended for the faithful to stimulate their eagerness to emulate the celebrated heroes. In the *kanon* to Saint Pelagia,[26] for instance, the life of this holy woman is praised as "an icon of repentance":

Ὁ ἀναδείξας Πελαγίας τὸν βίον εἰκόνα μετανοίας τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, εὐλογητὸς εἶ, Κύριε, ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν.

O Lord and God of our fathers, blessed are you who showed the life of Pelagia an icon of repentance to the Church.[27]

In the *kanon* to another female saint, Zenaida,[28] the faithful are invited to honour her as "an icon and model of the pious way of life":

Ὡς εἰκόνα καὶ τύπον ἐνθέου πολιτείας καὶ προτροπὴν εὐλαβείας τὴν μνήμην τῆς ὁσίας ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς εὐσεβῶς τιμήσωμεν.

Let us honour with spiritual odes the memory of the holy one as an icon and model of the pious way of life and exhortation to piety.[29]

---

[23] Αἱ δὲ παρὰ Χριστιανοῖς ἁγίων ἀνδρῶν εἰκόνες […] οὐδὲν ἕτερόν εἰσιν, ἢ ἀνδρείας ὑπογραμμός, πολιτείας τε εὐαγοῦς καὶ ἀρετῶν ὑποτύπωσις, καὶ τοῦ δοξάζειν Θεόν, ᾧ κατὰ τὴν παροῦσαν ζωὴν εὐηρέστησαν, ὑπονυγμὸς καὶ διέγερσις. Mansi 13, 108A-133A, at 113B.

[24] Λόγος μὲν γὰρ τὰς τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν πράξεις διεξιὼν ὠφελεῖ τοὺς ἀκούοντας, καὶ πρὸς ζῆλον μιμήσεως προσκαλεῖται πολλάκις. Τοῦτο δ' ἂν καὶ διὰ τοῦ προσέχειν τῇ εἰκόνι κατὰ τὸν τοῦ εἰκότος λόγον γενήσεται. Mansi 13, 113C.

[25] ὡς τὰ μὲν κακὰ φεύγωμεν, τὰς δὲ ἀρετὰς ζηλώσωμεν. *Oration* 1, 13, in: B. Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, 3, Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1975, 86. For the English translation, see *St John Damascene, Three Treatises on the Divine Images*, trans. and intr. A. Louth, Crestwood, New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003, 27. According to Kotter this oration was probably written in 730 or a bit later. See Kotter, op. cit., 7.

[26] She is celebrated on 8 October. For the edition of this hymn, see *AHG* 2, 73-79.

[27] *AHG* 2, 78.

[28] Her memory is celebrated on 11 October. For the edition of the *kanon*, see *AHG* 2, 88-96.

[29] *AHG* 2, 91.

The same idea is voiced in the *kanon* to Saint Aberkios, bishop of Hierapolis (d. ca. 167):[30]

Ἱερωσύνης κανόνα καὶ ἀρετῶν εἰκόνα σε ἐπέγνωμεν, θεράπον Χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἀπαύστως πρέσβευε σωθῆναι τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν.

We recognised you as a rule of priesthood and an icon of virtues, O servant of Christ; intercede with him ceaselessly that our souls may be saved.[31]

The second *troparion* of the *kanon* to Paul the Confessor, patriarch of Constantinople (d. ca 350), is of particular interest. The *troparion* features terminology related to painting, which is here applied to the saint's ascetic life:

Τῶν ἀρετῶν σε ζωγράφον, πάτερ, ἐπέγνωμεν πάντες, τὸν κατ᾽εἰκόνα τοῦ Θεοῦ τυποῦντα βίον οὐ χρώμασιν ὑλικοῖς, ἀλλὰ δόγμασι τῆς χάριτος.

We all recognised you as a painter of virtues, O father, who modelled your life according to the image of God, not with material colours, but with teachings of grace.[32]

The repeated references to icons and, in particular, the occasional use of the terminology of painting connects these hymns with the iconophile writings on the subject of holy images. Given the problems of authorship, however, it is difficult to determine whether the hymns in question were composed during or after the iconoclastic crisis. If these texts, indeed, date from the period of Iconoclasm, then the parallelism they draw between the saints' virtuous lives and icons acquires an added significance. It invests the hymns with a polemical dimension. As we will see elsewhere, Byzantine liturgical poetry could be mobilised to promote particular ideas, whether political or doctrinal, that were a matter of concern to contemporary audiences. Considering this "instrumental" nature of hymnography, it is conceivable that a certain number of the poetic compositions transmitted under the name of Patriarch Germanos, in which the themes of images and image-making are prominently featured, were written during the iconoclastic era with the aim of promoting, implicitly or explicitly, the iconophile cause.

Modelling the Saints on Biblical Figures and Saints as Models for Imitation

Modelling the saints on biblical figures was a widespread practice in homiletics, hagiographical genres, and hymnography. This practice was one of the ways to demonstrate

---

[30] His annual memory is celebrated on 22 October. For the edition of the *kanon*, see *AHG* 2, 261-265.
[31] *AHG* 2, 261.
[32] His feast falls on 6 November. For the edition, see *AHG* 3, 181.

the unity between the Old and New Testaments and especially to stress the notion of continuity in the history of the chosen people from the "Old" to the "New" Israel, as the Christians frequently characterised themselves. Through the use of typology and allegory, Christian writers of late antiquity and the Byzantine period established associations not only between major events of the two Testaments, but also between individual figures. Some key Old Testament characters, such as Joshua, the son of Nun, Isaac and Joseph, among others, were often seen as types of Christ. Gradually, this perception was extended, and links were also established between biblical personages and Christian saints. Thus it was believed that figures and episodes from the Old Testament not only announced and foreshadowed characters and events from the New Testament, but also served as precursors of extraordinary individuals from the post-New Testament era, mainly martyr-saints and ascetics. As a result, from the fourth century onwards, Christian writers extended the use of typology and allegory and began to employ these hermeneutical methods with regard to great monastic figures, martyrs, and even Byzantine emperors by searching for their biblical, mostly Old Testament, models.[33]

The insertion of the saints into the biblical context can also be seen as a convenient way for Christian authors, including hymnographers, simultaneously to praise the saints and render certain biblical figures and events directly relevant to the audience. This practice must have made a deep impression on the faithful, encouraging the creation of vivid images in their minds and demonstrating to them that the great achievements of prominent biblical heroes could be and actually were repeated in the life of outstanding members of the Church.

The specific time in which this practice appeared may also suggest that it was utilised to facilitate the construction of sanctity and the development of the cult of saints other than martyrs. This would explain why the practice became widespread in the post-persecution period, namely when the Christians sought alternative criteria for making new saints. In the early period, martyrs, as the only category of saints, were modelled on Christ due to their violent demise, which resembled the death of the Saviour. After the persecutions, the emphasis was placed on seeking links between extraordinary Christians and a wide range of biblical heroes in terms of their virtuous way of life. Acquiring their virtues could make a certain person a saint without physical suffering. With its origins in late antiquity, this sacred

---

[33] For more on this topic, see: D. Krueger, "The Old Testament and Monasticism", in: P. Magdalino and R. Nelson, eds., *The Old Testament in Byzantium*, Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 199-221; C. Rapp, "Old Testament Models for Emperors in Early Byzantium", in: Magdalino and Nelson, eds., *The Old Testament in Byzantium*, 175-197.

rhetoric was maintained and further developed over the following centuries, having been gradually adopted by Byzantine hymnographers, especially during the Middle Byzantine period.

Modelling the saints on biblical figures in Byzantine liturgical poetry had three main sources, namely, homilies, *Apophthegmata Patrum* (collections of wise sayings of Egyptian and other monks),[34] and hagiography.

i.   Homilies

A classic example of a homily in which the author is preoccupied with modelling his hero on biblical figures is the hugely influential funeral oration by Gregory of Nazianzos on Basil the Great. In order to convince his audience of Basil's saintly qualities, Gregory systematically compares him with virtually all prominent personalities from both the Old and New Testaments, starting with Adam, and including Enos, Henoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Job, Moses, Aaron, Joshua, the son of Nun, Samuel, David, Solomon, Elijah, Elisha, the Seven Maccabees, John the Baptist, Peter, Paul, John the Theologian, and Stephen. He refers to the most characteristic virtues and achievements of all of these figures, recognising them in Basil who is presented as a sort of living Bible and a compendium of all virtues: "In his progress through all the virtues he excelled all men of our day".[35] As an illustration of how Gregory elaborates on this topic, it is sufficient to cite the comparison he draws between Basil and Moses:

> Truly was Moses great, who inflicted the plague upon Egypt, and delivered the people among many signs and wonders… Basil tortured, not with bodily but with spiritual and mental plagues, the Egyptian race of heretics, and led the chosen people to the land of promise.[36]

Of special interest for the present discussion, as we have seen above, is Gregory's extensive use of a wide range of terms related to painting when he presents Basil as an imitator and

---

[34] For their edition, see J.-C. Guy, ed., *Les Apophtegmes des pères: collection systématique*, 3 vols., SC 387, 474, 498; Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1993–2005.

[35] The entire passage reads as follows: Ἔτι δὲ συντομώτερον εἰπεῖν ἔχω, ἵνα μὴ τοῖς καθ᾽ ἕκαστον ἐπεξίω περὶ τούτων· ἐκεῖνος γὰρ τὸ μὲν ἐξεῦρε τῶν καλῶν, τὸ δὲ ἐζήλωσε, τὸ δὲ ἐνίκησε· τῷ δὲ διὰ πάντων ἐλθεῖν, τῶν νῦν πάντων ἐκράτησεν. (To avoid going into details in each individual case, I shall have to speak more concisely as regards virtues; he discovered some, he emulated others, and others he surpassed. In his progress through all the virtues he excelled all men of our day). Grégoire de Nazianze, *Oratio 43*, ed. J. Bernadi, *Discours 42-43*, SC 384, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1992, 76.2 (p. 294). English Translation: *Funeral Orations by Saint Gregory Nazianzen and Saint Ambrose*, trans. L. P. McCauley, J. J. Sullivan, M. R. P. McGuire and R. J. Deferrari, Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1968, 94.

[36] Καὶ μέγας Μωϋσῆς μὲν Αἴγυπτον βασανίσας, λαὸν διασώσας ἐν σημείοις πολλοῖς καὶ τέρασι… [Τούτου] ζηλωτὴς ἐκεῖνος, βασανίζων μὲν οὐ σωματικαῖς μάστιξι, πνευματικαῖς δὲ καὶ λογικαῖς, ἔθνος αἱρετικὸν καὶ Αἰγύπτιον· ἄγων δὲ λαὸν περιούσιον, ζηλωτὴν καλῶν ἔργων, ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. *Oratio 43*, 72.3 (p. 286) English Translation: *Funeral Orations by Saint Gregory Nazianzen and Saint Ambrose*, 90-91.

emulator of biblical characters. He refers to Basil as the one who depicted the virtues of his biblical counterparts in his life. For example, when Gregory compares Basil with John the Baptist, he asks his audience: "Is it not indeed obvious that Basil was an icon of John's way of life?"[37]

The use of this kind of vocabulary became especially widespread in the literary production of the iconoclastic and post-iconoclastic periods, when it was broadly employed by both opposing parties. Ignatios the Deacon in his patriarchal *Lives*, as well the author of the *Life of George of Amastris*,[38] frequently employ a vocabulary of painting, including words such as ἀρχέτυπον, χαρακτήρ, εἰκών, and τύπος, in reference to biblical prototypes. For example, the biographer of George of Amastris explicitly names two biblical couples, Abraham and Sarah and Hannah and Samuel, as the archetypes (ἀρχέτυπα) to whom George' parents looked with pious thoughts.[39] The term archetype (ἀρχέτυπον), which occurs several times in this *Life* in relation to Old Testament figures, the models for the life of Saint George, fits well within the context of the iconoclastic crisis. Iconophile writers such as John of Damascus use this term frequently in connection to the saints depicted in sacred images.[40] According to the author of the *Life,* the faithful need to look to the just and virtuous men as their archetypes in order to emulate them and thereby depict their good deeds and virtues in their own life. In other words, the faithful are invited to become living icons of the saints in a

---

[37] Ἦ γὰρ οὐκ ἐναργὴς τῆς ἐκείνου φιλοσοφίας εἰκὼν ὁ ἀνήρ; *Oratio 43*, 75.4 (p. 292). English Translation: *Funeral Orations by Saint Gregory Nazianzen and Saint Ambrose*, 93.

[38] *BHG* 668. For its edition, see: V. G. Vasiljevskij, *Trudy* 3, St. Petersburg: Imperatorskaya Akademiya Nauk, 1915, 1-71. Vasilij Vasiljevskij attributes it to Ignatios the Deacon (d. after 845), too, on account of the use of common sources as well as the existence of stylistic resemblance between this *Life* and the patriarchal *Lives*, namely those of Patriarch Tarasios (*BHG* 1698. For its edition, see: S. Efthymiadis, ed. and English tr., *The Life of the Patriarch Tarasios by Ignatios the Deacon*, Byzantine and Ottoman Monographs 4, Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998); Patriarch Nikephoros (*BHG* 1335. Edition: *Vita Nicephori Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani*, in: C. de Boor, ed., *Nicephori Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani Opuscula Historica*, Leipzig: Teubner, 1880 139-217. English translation: E. Fisher, in: A.-M. Talbot, ed., *Byzantine Saints' Lives in Translation*, Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 1998, 41-142; and Gregory the Decapolite (*BHG* 711. Edition: G. Makris, ed., *Ignatios Diakonos und die Vita des Hl. Gregorios Dekapolites*, Byzantinisches Archiv 17, Stuttgart and Leipzig: Teubner, 1997). All three these *Lives* are considered to be Ignatios' genuine works.[38] Vasilevskij, *Trudy*, LXXXVIII-CVIII. Ihor Ševčenko accepts and further elaborates the arguments advanced by Vasilevskij in favour of the *Life*'s attribution to Ignatios, and regards it as a classic example of an iconoclast *Vita*, even though George was an iconodule. Ševčenko especially emphasises the fact that all Ignatian *Lives*, including the one of George of Amastris, draw upon Gregory of Nazianzos' funeral sermon on Basil the Great. I. Ševčenko, "Hagiography of the Iconoclast Period", in: A. Bryer and J. Herrin, eds., *Iconoclasm*, Birmingham: Centre for Byzantine Studies, 1977, 113-131, esp.120-125.

[39] Πρὸς τὰ τοιαῦτα εὐσεβεῖ λογισμῷ ἀποσκοποῦντες ἀρχέτυπα. *The Life of George*, 7. The biographer of Stephen the Younger, draws a similar comparison, but as a fervent iconophile he highlights that Anna also prayed to the icon (χαρακτήρ) of the Virgin of Blachernae: δεήσεις προσφέρουσα εὐκτικὰς καὶ πρὸς ἀντικρὺ ἱσταμένη τοῦ ταύτης ἁγίου χαρακτῆρος, ἐν ᾧ ἐτετύπωτο ἐν ἀγκάλαις τὸν υἱὸν καὶ Θεὸν φέρουσα. M.-F. Auzépy, *La Vie d' Étienne le Jeune par Étienne le Diacre*, Birmingham Byzantine and Ottoman Monographs 3, Aldershot/Brookfield: Variorum, 1997, 87-177.

[40] *Three Treatises on the Divine Images*, passim.

similar way that the saints were images of their biblical models. This idea is expressed in the following excerpt, in which George's biographer emphasizes that his hero obtained the virtues of biblical figures by reading the Holy Scriptures:

> He studied divine scriptures unceasingly, so that the lessons of these deeds and the surviving written accounts of the lives of blessed men might be seen as living images (εἰκόνας ἐμψύχους) of the way of life according to God in their imitation of good deeds.[41]

Elsewhere in the *Life*, the author is specific when he uses the vocabulary of painting to refer to George's emulation of biblical protagonists. George, the author claims, "clearly depicted (ἐξεικόνισεν) Joseph, Moses, and Aaron in himself",[42] and was "a kind of an illustration (εἶδος) of virtue, since he copied (ἀπομαξάμενος) all of their [biblical figures'] merits and reproduced (ἀπηκριβώσατο) them exactly in himself".[43] Furthermore, the author stresses that George, after having become bishop of Amastris, rendered himself a model of piety for his flock:

> Looking to him as if to an archetypical picture (ἀρχέτυπον πίνακα), they impressed (ἀπεμάσσοντο) upon themselves the visible characteristics (χαρακτῆρας) of the virtues, and learned what was necessary in deed rather than in word. They stamped their souls with the indelible images (εἰκόνας) of virtue.[44]

It is obvious, especially in the Greek original, that all of the key expressions in this passage are borrowed from terminology closely related to painting. The presence of such a variety of image-related terms in this *Life* cannot be explained only as a reflection of earlier patristic writings; rather, it points to a broader tendency characteristic of the literary production of the iconoclastic and post-iconoclastic periods. During these periods, the motifs of images and image-making became widespread in liturgical texts, especially Church hymns, and even in liturgical commentaries. For example, in the liturgical commentary attributed to Patriarch Germanos I, the Eucharistic liturgy is presented as a cycle of images of Christ' salvific acts

---

[41] τὴν τῶν θείων γραφῶν μελέτην ποιούμενος ἀκατάπαυστα, ὡς ἐκεῖθεν τὰς τῶν πράξεων ὑποθήκας καὶ τοὺς βίους τῶν μακαρίων ἀνδρῶν ἀναγράπτους παραδεδομένους οἷόν τινας εἰκόνας ἐμψύχους τῆς κατὰ Θεὸν πολιτείας τῷ μιμήματι τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔργων εὑρίσκεσθαι. *The Life of George*, 23.

[42] Ἰωσὴφ καὶ Μωσέα καὶ Ἀαρὼν ἐναργῶς ἐξεικόνισεν. *The Life of George*, 58.

[43] Καὶ οἷόν τι ἓν ἀρετῆς εἶδος τὰς πάντων ἀριστείας ἀπομαξάμενος, εἰς ἑαυτὸν καλῶς ἀπηκριβώσατο. *The Life of George*, 57.

[44] Εἰς αὐτὸν γὰρ ὥσπερ εἰς ἀρχέτυπον ἀφορῶντες πίνακα, τοὺς τῶν ἀρετῶν χαρακτῆρας ἐναργεῖς ἀπεμάσσοντο, καὶ ἔργῳ μᾶλλον ἢ λόγῳ τὰ δέοντα διδασκόμενοι, ἀνεξαλείπτους τὰς τῆς ἀρετῆς εἰκόνας τῇ ψυχῇ ἐναπετυποῦντο. *The Life of George*, 36. For the English translation, slightly modified, see: D. Jenkins, trans., *The Life of Saint George of Amastris*, University of Notre Dame, 2011, 10, available online: https://library.nd.edu/byzantine_studies/documents/Amastris.pdf (accessed 28 June 2015).

and their Old Testament prefigurations.[45] In a similar way, saints' biographies and their deeds in hagiographical literature, including hagiographical hymns, are allegorised with the use of a vocabulary of painting to evoke biblical figures.

ii.   *Apophthegmata Patrum*

Aside from homiletic literature, comparisons between Old Testament personages and Christian saints encountered in Byzantine hymnography can also be seen in relation to another literary genre that was highly influential in the monastic circles, namely, the *Apophthegmata Patrum*. Since Byzantine liturgical poetry, particularly the *kanon*, flourished largely in the monastic milieu, it is not surprising that these sayings of, and brief stories about, Egyptian monks and others, pervade poetic works intended to be sung at monastic liturgical gatherings. In the *Apophthegmata*, links between particular biblical heroes and specific virtues are more or less standardised. The following two passages are characteristic:

> A brother questioned an old man saying, "What good work should I do so that I may live?" The old man said, "God knows what is good. I have heard it said that one of the Fathers asked Abba Nisteros the Great, the friend of Abba Anthony, and said to him, "What good work is there that I could do?" Abba Nisteros answered, "Are not all actions equal? Scripture says that Abraham was hospitable and God was with him. Elijah loved interior peace and God was with him. David was humble, and God was with him. So, do whatever you see your soul desires according to God and guard your heart.[46]

The second passage refers to a considerably larger number of biblical figures:

> Someone said to Abba John the Persian, "We have borne great afflictions for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. Shall we inherit it?" The old man said, "As for me, I am confident I shall obtain the inheritance of Jerusalem on high, which is written in the heavens. Why should I not be confident? I have been hospitable like Abraham, meek like Moses, holy like Aaron, patient like Job, humble like David, a hermit like John, filled with compunction like Jeremiah, a

---

[45] H.-J. Schulz, *The Byzantine Liturgy. Symbolic Structure and Faith Expression*, trans. M. J. O'Connell, New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1986, 62. For example, the rite of the preparation of the bread and wine at the beginning of the Byzantine Eucharistic liturgy (*Proskomide*) includes quotations from Isa. 53 and symbolises the sacrifice of Christ as the *Amnos* or Lamb of God to which Isaiah refers. For the text of the *Proskomide* rite and citations from Byzantine liturgical commentaries containing the interpretation of the rite, see F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895, 539-551.

[46] Ἀδελφὸς ἠρώτησε γέροντα, λέγων· Ποῖον καλὸν πρᾶγμά ἐστιν, ἵνα ποιήσω, καὶ ζήσωμαι ἐν αὐτῷ; Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ γέρων· Ὁ Θεὸς οἶδε τὸ καλόν. Ἀλλ᾽ ἤκουσα ὅτι ἠρώτησέ τις τῶν Πατέρων τὸν ἀββᾶν Νιστερῶον τὸν μέγαν, τὸν φίλον τοῦ ἀββᾶ Ἀντωνίου, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ποῖον καλὸν ἔργον ἐστὶν, ἵνα ποιήσω; Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Οὐκ εἰσὶ πᾶσαι αἱ ἐργασίαι ἴσαι; ἡ Γραφὴ λέγει, ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ φιλόξενος ἦν, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἦν μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ· καὶ Ἠλίας ἠγάπα τὴν ἡσυχίαν, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἦν μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ὁ Δαβὶδ ταπεινὸς ἦν, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἦν μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ. Ὃ οὖν θεωρεῖς τὴν ψυχήν σου θέλουσαν κατὰ Θεὸν, τοῦτο ποίησον καὶ φύλαξον τὴν καρδίαν σου. PG 65: 305D-308A. For the English translation, see: *The Sayings of the Desert Fathers: The Alphabetical Collection*, trans. B. Ward, Oxford: Mowbray, 1975, 154.

master like Paul, full of faith like Peter, wise like Solomon. Like the thief, I trust that he who of his natural goodness has given me all that, will also grant me the kingdom."[47]

Texts such as these would have been known to monastic hymnographers. They offered a form of moral typology, upon which the liturgical celebration of saints and their virtues could easily draw.

iii.   Hagiography

A final source to be considered is hagiographical literature, another genre in which saints are frequently associated with biblical figures. While in the *Apophthegmata Patrum*, holy men are invited to imitate virtues of biblical characters, hagiographers, by contrast, usually present their heroes as those who have succeeded in emulating the virtues of their biblical counterparts. For example, the *Religious History*, one of the earliest collections of biographies of Christian ascetics, written by Theodore of Cyrrhus, includes numerous comparisons between saints and biblical characters, including Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Elijah, David, and others. There are also examples where the entire life of a saint is modelled on one particular biblical figure. This is the case with the *Life of Peter the Iberian*. Peter's biographer portrayed him in such a way that each phase of his life has a counterpart in the life of Moses.[48]

The aforementioned *Life of George of Amastris* represents the most remarkable example in this regard during the iconoclastic period. The author of the *Life*, by elaborating on Gregory's funeral homily on Basil the Great, presents his hero as the one who re-enacted virtues of numerous Old Testament characters. The composer of the *Life* seeks biblical parallels for every stage of George's life starting with the circumstances that preceded his birth. For example, he portrays George's mother Megethos as one initially barren who, similarly to the famous Old Testament infertile women, Sarah and Hannah, the mother of Prophet Samuel, conceived after God answered their fervent prayers.[49] Among the *Lives* composed during the post-iconoclastic period, the *Life* of Saint Basil the Younger is worth

---

[47] Εἶπέ τις τῷ ἀββᾷ Ἰωάννῃ τῷ Πέρσῃ, ὅτι τοσοῦτον κόπον ἐποιήσαμεν διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν· ἆρα κληρονομῆσαι αὐτὴν ἔχομεν; Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ γέρων· Ἐγὼ πιστεύω κληρονομῆσαι τὴν ἄνω Ἰερουσαλὴμ τὴν ἀπογεγραμμένην ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. Πιστὸς γὰρ ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος. Διατί δὲ ἀπιστήσω; Φιλόξενος ὡς ὁ Ἀβραὰμ γέγονα, πραῢς ὡς ὁ Μωϋσῆς ἅγιος ὡς ὁ Ἀαρών, ὑπομονητικὸς ὡς ὁ Ἰὼβ, ταπεινόφρων ὡς ὁ Δαβὶδ, ἐρημίτης ὡς ὁ Ἰωάννης πενθικὸς ὡς ὁ Ἰερεμίας, διδάσκαλος ὡς ὁ Παῦλος πιστὸς ὡς ὁ Πέτρος, σοφὸς ὡς ὁ Σολωμῶν. Καὶ πιστεύω ὡς ὁ λῃστής, ὅτι ὁ ταῦτά μοι χαρισάμενος δι' οἰκείαν ἀγαθότητα, καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν παράσχῃ. PG 65, 239D-240A. For the English translation, see: *The Sayings of the Desert Fathers: The Alphabetical Collection*, 108.

[48] R. Raabe, ed., *Petrus der Iberer. Ein Charakterbild zur Kirchen- und Sittengeschichte des fünften Jahrhunderts*, Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1895. See also J.-E. Steppa, *John Rufus and the World Vision of Anti-Chalcedonian Culture*, Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2002.

[49] See Gen. 21: 1-7 and 1 Sam. 1:20, respectively.

mentioning. Its author describes his protagonist by using comparisons reminiscent of the examples from the *Apophthegmata* quoted above: "He [Basil] was meek like another David, simple like Jacob, he practiced poverty and hospitality even more than Abraham. He made his abode then with John as has been said (for this was the man's name), like another Moses with the priest of Madiam".[50] At another point, he names Basil "the revered Enoch, the second Elijah, the new Abraham".[51] The mentioned examples clearly demonstrate that during the iconoclastic and post-iconoclastic periods, modelling the saints on biblical figures was very common in hagiography, which inevitably found its expression in the hymnographic production of the same period, as we will see below.

Byzantine hymnographers delighted in forging links between the saints they celebrated and various personages from the Scriptures. It would not be exaggeration to say that this is an aspect of liturgical poetry in which hymnographers probably displayed their greatest originality. One should recall in this regard that the *kanon*, the dominant hymnographic form during the period under consideration, was developed by inserting *troparia* between the verses of the biblical odes chanted at the Matins.[52] Hence, it was very natural for liturgical hymns to be profoundly permeated by biblical themes. By elaborating upon the biblical odes, hymnographers borrowed many ideas and motifs contained in these scriptural texts.

Byzantine poets, however, did not confine themselves exclusively to the biblical odes when they sought models for the saints they praised. As was the case with other related literary genres, hymnographers modelled their heroes on various biblical figures. Among the persons most allegorised in their hymns are Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, David, and Elijah. From the New Testament, their favourite paradigms were Paul, Peter, and John the Baptist. The large number of such examples in Byzantine liturgical poetry in general, and in the corpus of hymns attributed to Germanos in particular, suggest that Byzantine hymnographers used liturgical poetry as an additional and highly effective avenue of biblical interpretation.

---

[50] Πρᾶος δὲ ἦν ὡς ἄλλος Δαυίδ, ἄπλαστος ὡς Ἰακώβ, ὥσπερ ὑπὲρ τὸν Ἀβραὰμ τὴν ἀκτημοσύνην καὶ φιλοξενίαν κατωρθωκώς. Κατεσκήνωσεν οὖν παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ ὡς εἴρηται (τοῦτο γὰρ ἦν τὸ ὄνομα τῷ ἀνδρί), ὡς ἄλλος τις Μωϋσῆς παρὰ τῷ ἱερεῖ Μαδιάμ. D. F. Sullivan et al., trans., *The Life of Saint Basil the Younger*, I. 12, 2-5, Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2014, 86. A noteworthy detail regarding this extract is an attribution of meekness to David instead of Moses. David is characterised as meek in Psalm 131 (132):1: "O Lord, remember David and all his meekness (πραΰτητος)".

[51] ὁ τίμιος Ἐνώχ, ὁ δεύτερος Ἠλίας, ὁ νέος Ἀβραάμ. *The Life of Saing Basil the Younger*, I. 58, 15-16, 188.

[52] For *kanon* as a genre of liturgical poetry, see S. Eustratiadis, *Εἱρμολόγιον*, Chennevières-sur-Marne (Paris), 1932; E. Wellesz, *A History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1961, 198-245; J. Grosdidier de Matons, "Liturgie et Hymnographie: Kontakion et Canon", *DOP* 34 (1980–81) 31-43; Detorakis, *Βυζαντινὴ Ὑμνογραφία*, 69-76, and S. Harris, "The 'Kanon' and the Heirmologion", *Music and Letters* 85.2 (2004) 175-197.

This fact alone speaks to the importance of this genre of Byzantine literature, all the more so since liturgical poetry flourished in a period when traditional biblical hermeneutics went into sharp decline.[53]

A well-known example of how Byzantine hymnographers elaborated upon other sources to model a saint after biblical figures is found in a *sticheron* to Basil the Great, attributed to Basil the Monk (?), which is currently in use in the liturgy of the Eastern Church. The *sticheron* seems to echo the quoted passages from the *Apophthegmata* as well as the funeral homily on Basil the Great by Gregory of Nazianzos. It follows a similar pattern, since the author selects several biblical personages and applies one specific virtue exhibited by each of them to the celebrated saint. In this way, the saint, like the ideal holy man, is also presented as a compendium of virtues. The *sticheron* reads as follows:

> Πάντων τῶν ἁγίων ἀνεμάξω τὰς ἀρετάς, Πατὴρ ἡμῶν Βασίλειε, Μωϋσέως τὸ πρᾶον, Ἠλιοὺ τὸν ζῆλον, Πέτρου τὴν ὁμολογίαν, Ἰωάννου τὴν Θεολογίαν, ὡς ὁ Παῦλος ἐκβοῶν οὐκ ἐπαύσω. Τίς ἀσθενεῖ, καὶ οὐκ ἀσθενῶ; τίς σκανδαλίζεται, καὶ οὐκ ἐγὼ πυροῦμαι; Ὅθεν σὺν αὐτοῖς αὐλιζόμενος, ἱκέτευε σωθῆναι τάς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν.

> You obtained the virtues of all saints, O our father Basil: Moses's meekness, Elijah's zeal, Peter's profession, John's theology, and like Paul you did not cease to shout aloud: *Who is weak, and I am not weak? Who is made to stumble, and I am not indignant?*[54] Since you are dwelling with them, supplicate for the salvation of our souls.[55]

However, despite the obvious similarity between this *sticheron* and the relevant passages from the *Apophthegmata Patrum*, two points of difference are notable: first, the number of biblical personages mentioned in the *sticheron* is considerably smaller; and second, the specific virtues attributed to the biblical heroes are not the same as in the *Apophthegmata*. For example, while in the *Apophthegmata* Elijah is praised for his ἡσυχία (interior tranquillity), in the hymn he is an exemplar of religious zeal that he demonstrated by slaughtering four hundred and fifty prophets of Baal (1 Kgs. 18:19, 40; 19:1). Apparently, with the use of the word ζῆλος instead of ἡσυχία the author of the hymn wished to emphasise Basil's role in the

---

[53] Christian Hannick points out the exegetical dimension of Byzantine liturgical poetry in the following way: "In hymnography, from the time of John of Damascus, and to a lesser extent from that of Sophronios of Jerusalem, the distinguishing feature which set patristic homily apart from patristic scriptural commentary – namely, typology and allegory, which are far more than simply rhetorical devices – are developed and lead to an independent method of exegesis". Ch. Hannick, "The Theotokos in Byzantine Hymnography: Typology and Allegory", in M. Vassilaki, ed., *Images of the Mother of God. Perceptions of the Theotokos in Byzantium*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005, 69-76.

[54] 2 Cor. 11:29.

[55] *Greek Menaion*, 1 January.

anti-Arian polemic and his contribution to the defeat of Arianism.[56] Furthermore, this modification also reveals that the hymnographer did not exclusively rely on his sources, but was able to display his creativity and originality.[57]

Kanons *for Saint Basil and Saint Nicholas*

The *kanon* to Saint Basil the Great has been transmitted in two Sinaitic codices: Sinait. gr. 598, ff. 16-18 (11th c.) and Sinait. gr. 646, ff. 119-124v (14th c.). The *kanon* for Saint Nicholas has been preserved in three manuscripts: Sinait. gr. 583, ff. 33-36 (11th c.), Sinait. gr. 590, ff. 55-59v (13th c.), and Athos, Lavrae H 94, ff. 24v-30v (17th c.). The authenticity of these hymns is far from certain. This is especially true of the *kanon* on Saint Nicholas, because it is believed that his cult in Constantinople developed only in the second half of the ninth century, as Nancy Patterson-Ševčenko has demonstrated.[58]

The author or authors of these hymns recall various biblical individuals and events to exalt Basil's and Nicholas's virtues and their contribution to the purity of the faith. As a result, they are presented as anthologies of biblical virtues personalised in several key figures from the biblical history. Like the above-mentioned patriarchal *Lives* by Ignatios the Deacon and the *Life* of George of Amastris, these hymns, and especially the one on Saint Basil, draw upon Gregory of Nazianzos' funeral homily on Basil the Great. As a matter of fact, the hymns frequently elaborate on Gregory's homily in a way that is strikingly close to the *Lives*, suggesting that they may have been inspired by these hagiographical works. The evocation of numerous biblical characters in the hymns, on the other hand, is strongly reminiscent of the *Apophthegmata Patrum*. There is, however, a notable formal difference between the two *kanons*. Whereas comparisons with biblical personages permeate the entire hymn to Saint Basil, in the *kanon* to Saint Nicholas such correlations are present only in the ninth ode. The majority of the biblical figures with whom Basil and Nicholas are compared appear in both *kanons* and include Moses, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, and David. In addition, Basil is compared with Henoch, Noah, Elijah, Peter, Paul, John the Theologian, and John the Baptist, while Saint Nicholas is likened to Aaron, Job, and Joshua, the son of Nun.

---

[56] The author of the *Apophthegmata* used ἡσυχία, since he addressed ascetics and the word fits better in the ascetic context.

[57] The author did not borrow the idea from Gregory's homily either. Gregory refers to Basil's zeal, but relates it to apostle Peter: Ἐμιμήσατο Πέτρου τὸν ζῆλον (He emulated Peter's zeal). *Oratio* 43, 76.1 (p. 294).

[58] Patterson-Ševčenko, "Canon and Calendar", 108-109.

An association between Basil the Great and scriptural personages and events is established at the very beginning of the hymn in his honour. Since the first ode of a *kanon* is generally based on the first biblical ode, which has as its subject the Israelites crossing the Red Sea and the drowning of the pharaoh, the hymn opens with an allegorical interpretation of this biblical event in which Basil is implicitly compared with Moses.[59] Like Moses, who defeated the pharaoh and led the chosen people to the land of promise, Basil triumphed over "the invisible pharaoh", i.e., Satan, the inspiration behind the teachings of heretics, and led the Christians, identified as God's new Israel, to the "land" of the true doctrine of the Church. The second *troparion* of the first ode reads as follows.

> Ἐν τῷ πελάγει τῆς σῆς σοφίας, τοῦ ἀοράτου φαραὼ ὄλεσας τὰ δόγματα ὡς ἅρματα, ὅσιε, τὸν λαὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ καθοδηγήσας εἰς γῆν ὀρθοδοξίας.[60]

> In the sea of your wisdom, you destroyed the invisible pharaoh's teachings as chariots, O holy one, and guided the people of Christ to the land of orthodoxy.

Although this *troparion* is ultimately based on Gregory of Nazianzos's funeral oration, according to which "great indeed was Moses, who afflicted Egypt grievously and saved his people by many signs and prodigies",[61] the poet's treatment of the comparison with Moses is closer to a passage in the *Life of George of Amastris*: "He [George] was proclaimed a spiritual leader of New Israel. Having torn them away from dark sins as if from Egypt, he led them spiritually to the Promised Land".[62]

In the case of the *kanon* to Saint Nicholas, a comparison with Moses is introduced in the sixth *troparion* of the ninth ode:

> Σὺ τὸν Μωϋσῆν ζηλώσας, τὸν νεοθαλῆ λαὸν ἐξήγαγες ἐκ πλάνης Αἰγυπτίων εἰς γῆν ἐπαγγελίας, καὶ ἐπότισας ὕδωρ ἐκ πέτρας ἐπιγνώσεως.

> Having emulated Moses, you led out the new [chosen] people from the deceit of the Egyptians into the land of promise and gave them water from the rock of knowledge.[63]

---

[59] Moses as a model for the saints will be treated separately below, as will be Abraham and Joshua the son of Nun.

[60] Sinait. gr. 598, ff. 16r-v.

[61] Καὶ μέγας Μωϋσῆς μὲν Αἴγυπτον βασανίσας, λαὸν διασώσας ἐν σημείοις πολλοῖς καὶ τέρασι. 72.10-11, 286. For the English translation, see *Funeral Orations by Saint Gregory Nazianzen and Saint Ambrose*, 90.

[62] Καὶ τοῦ νέου δημαγωγὸς ἀναδειχθεὶς πνευματικὸς Ἰσραήλ, ὡς ἐξ Αἰγύπτου, τῆς ζοφερᾶς ἐξαρπάσας ἁμαρτίας, πρὸς γῆν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας νοητῶς διεπέρασεν. *Life of George of Amastris*, 58. For the English translation, see: Jenkins, trans., *The Life of Saint George of Amastris*, 16.

[63] Sinait.gr 583, f. 36.

In the fourth *troparion* of the *kanon* for Basil the Great, the saint is praised as a "new Henoch":[64]

> Μετατεθεὶς τῇ διαθέσει ἐκ τῶν ἐν κόσμῳ πρὸς Θεόν, ἔχων τὸ πολίτευμα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς μυστικῶς νέος ὤφθης Ἐνώχ, εὐαρεστήσας Χριστῷ ἐν εὐσεβείᾳ.

> Having translated yourself with regard to your disposition from worldly matters towards God, and having the mode of life in heavens, you were seen mystically as a new Henoch, since you pleased Christ with piety.[65]

This *troparion* draws upon the following passage from Gregory's homily:

> Henoch was translated, gaining his translation as the reward of a little piety–for the faith was still in shadow–and escaped the danger of a prolonged life. But Basil's whole life was a translation and he was completely tested in a complete life.[66]

In the fourth *troparion* of the same ode, Basil's contribution to the maintenance of the purity of the orthodox faith is related to the achievement of Noah,[67] who saved the world from cataclysm:

> Ὡς κιβωτὸν τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν, κατακλυσμοῦ ἀσεβείας τῇ ἀσφάλτῳ πίστει κεχρισμένην διέσωσας, σπέρματα ἐν αὐτῇ ὀρθοδοξίας τῷ κόσμῳ συντηρήσας.

> You saved the Church like the ark from the deluge of impiety anointed with the pitch of faith, and preserved in it seeds of orthodoxy for the world.[68]

The relevant passage from Gregory's homily that served as a source for this *troparion* reads:

> Noah was entrusted with the ark and the seeds of a new world were committed to a few bits of wood and preserved amid the waters. Basil escaped a deluge of impiety and made his city an ark of safety, sailing buoyantly over the waters of the heretics, and subsequently restored the whole world.[69]

---

[64] In the *kanon* on Saint Nicholas, there is no comparison with Henoch.

[65] Sinait. gr. 598, f. 16v.

[66] Ἐνὼχ μετετέθη, μικρᾶς εὐσεβείας, ἔτι γὰρ ἐν σκιαῖς ἦν ἡ πίστις, ἆθλον εὑράμενος τὴν μετάθεσιν, καὶ τοῦ ἑξῆς βίου τὸν κίνδυνον διαπέφευγε· τοῦ δὲ ὅλος ὁ βίος μετάθεσις ἦν, τελείως ἐν βίῳ τελείῳ δοκιμασθένος. Grégoire de Nazianze, *Oratio 43*, 70.15-18 (p. 282). English translation in *Funeral Orations by Saint Gregory Nazianzen and Saint Ambrose*, 89. This passage is based on Gen. 5: 24.

[67] Noah is not mentioned in the *kanon* to Saint Nicholas.

[68] Sinait. gr. 598, f. 16v.

[69] Νῶε κιβωτὸν ἐπιστεύθη, καὶ κόσμου δευτέρου σπέρματα ξύλῳ μικρῷ πιστευθέντα καὶ καθ᾽ ὑδάτων σωζόμενα· ὁ δὲ κατακλυσμὸν ἀσεβείας διέφυγε καὶ κιβωτὸν σωτηρίας τὴν ἑαυτοῦ πεποίηται πόλιν, κούφως τῶν αἱρετικῶν ὑπερπλέουσαν, ἐξ οὗ κόσμον ὅλον ἀνεκαλέσατο. *Oratio 43*, 70.19-23 (pp. 282-284). English translation: McCauley etc., 89.

Both saints are also compared with the biblical patriarch Jacob by building upon Jacob's vision of the divine ladder (Genesis 28: 10-19). Aside from its Mariological interpretation, this Old Testament narrative was frequently given ascetic and mystical meanings in Byzantine hymnography and other genres. The following *troparion* from the *kanon* for Saint Basil is a good example:

> Κλίμακα θείας ἀναβάσεως θεασάμενος τῇ τῶν ἀρετῶν σου θεωρίᾳ πρακτικῇ, νοῦς ὁρῶν Θεὸν ὡς Ἰσραὴλ ἀνεδείχθης ἡμῖν, ἀπαύστως ἐνατενίζων αὐτῷ, τοῖς τῆς καρδίας ὀφθαλμοῖς παμμακάριστε.

> O wholly blessed, having beheld the ladder of the divine ascent through the practical contemplation of your virtues, you revealed yourself to us as a mind beholding God like Israel, unceasingly contemplating him with the eyes of heart.[70]

The content of this *troparion* reflects the principal ideals of the eastern Christian ascetic tradition, as it was developed especially by Evagrios Pontikos. According to this tradition, the spiritual progress includes *praktike* (πρακτική), that is, personal struggles to subdue the passions and achieve virtues, and contemplation (θεωρία) in which the mind (νοῦς) becomes united with God.[71] Since this progress was frequently likened to climbing a ladder, Jacob's ladder was particularly favoured among ascetic writers as a symbol of this ascent. An additional reason behind the popularity of this narrative was the change of Jacob's name into "Israel," an appellation that was translated as "seeing God" in the Septuagint. This is why the name "Israel" instead of Jacob is mentioned in the cited *troparion*.[72]

In the *kanon* to Saint Nicholas the comparison between the bishop of Myra and Jacob is not as developed as it is in the hymn to Basil. The author, after mentioning Jacob's name, simply refers to Nicholas's virtues as a ladder which lifted him up to the heavenly city:

> Σὺ τὸν Ἰακὼβ ζηλώσας, ἄλλην ἐπὶ γῆς ἐφεῦρες κλίμακα τὰς ἀναβάσεις, πάτερ, τῶν θείων ἀρετῶν σου, διὸ καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἄνω μητρόπολιν μεταβέβηκας.

---

[70] Sinait. gr. 598, f. 16v.

[71] On Evagrios, see A. M. Casiday, *Evagrius Ponticus*, London and New York: Routledge, 2006. For a more general discussion on the Christian mystical tradition, see A. Louth, *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition: From Plato to Denys*, 2nd edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

[72] Similar ideas can even be found in Christian authors other than acclaimed ascetic writers, as, for example, in Eusebios: ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ Ἰακὼβ ὁ Θεὸς αὐτῷ τὸ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ὄνομα δωρεῖται, τὸν ἀσκητὴν καὶ πρακτικὸν ἐπὶ τὸν θεωρητικὸν μεταστησάμενος. Πτερνιστὴς γὰρ ὁ Ἰακὼβ ἑρμηνεύεται ὡς τὸν ἀρετῆς ἐναθλῶν ἀγῶνα. Ἰσραὴλ δὲ ὁρῶν Θεόν, ὁποῖος ἂν εἴη ὁ γνωστικὸς καὶ θεωρητικὸς ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ νοῦς (Instead of 'Jacob' God bestowed upon him the name 'Israel,' transforming the active and practical man into the contemplative. For 'Jacob' is interpreted 'supplanter,' as one who strives in the contest of virtue: but 'Israel' is interpreted 'seeing God,' a description which would suit the mind in man that is capable of knowledge and contemplation). *Praeparatio evangelica*, ed. K. Mras, *Eusebius Werke*, Band 8, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1956, 11.6.29. For the English translation, see *Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae Praeparationis libri 15*, Oxford: Typographeo Academico, 1903, 557.

Having emulated Jacob, you found as another ladder the ascents of divine virtues, through which you passed to the heavenly city.[73]

Both *troparia*, especially the one on Basil the Great, have a parallel in the *Life* of the patriarch Tarasios: "By having been purified with Jacob, he was named Israel according to grace and mind seeing God, and was sanctified in soul and thought".[74] However, Gregory's funeral sermon to Basil the Great could have served as a source of inspiration to both Ignatios and the hymnographer(s), as is apparent from the following extract:

I praise the ladder of Jacob and the pillar which he anointed in honour of God … But I praise also the ladder of Basil, which he not only saw but mounted by his gradual ascents in virtue…[75]

In the third *troparion* of the third ode, Basil is named a "new Joseph":

Νέος Ἰωσὴφ Βασίλειε ἐδείχθης, ἔμψυχος εἰκὼν ὑπάρχων σωφροσύνης, σιτοδοτήσας τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν εὐσεβείᾳ τὴν λογικὴν τροφὴν τῆς πίστεως.

You proved to be a new Joseph, O Basil, and by being a living icon of chastity, you provided the world with the grain of spiritual food of faith in piety.[76]

By elaborating upon the words from Gregory's homily–"Such was our new provider of grain and second Joseph–,[77] in this *troparion* the hymnographer names Basil ἔμψυχος εἰκών of chastity. This phrase recalls expressions from the *Life* of George of Amastris, in which this holy man is portrayed as the one who "clearly depicted (ἐξεικόνισεν) Joseph, Moses, and Aaron in himself".[78] However, the phrase poses some problems, since it is also encountered in the definitions (*horoi*) of the iconoclastic councils of 754 and 815, as well as in other iconoclastic texts.

It is worth recalling at this point that the iconoclasts, in addition to arguing that the Eucharist is the only true icon of Christ,[79] also developed a spiritual or ethical concept of the

---

[73] Sinait. gr. 583, f. 36.

[74] Τῷ Ἰακώβ, ὡς Ἰσραηλίτης τῆς χάριτος καὶ νοῦς ὁρῶν θεὸν χρηματίσας, συγκαθαρθεὶς ἁγιάζεται ψυχὴν καὶ διάνοιαν. S. Efthymiadis, *The Life of the Patriarch Tarasios by Ignatios the Deacon*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998.

[75] Ἐπαινῶ τὴν Ἰακὼβ κλίμακα καὶ τὴν στήλην ἣν ἤλειψε τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν πάλην, ἤ τίς ποτε ἦν ... ἀλλ' ἐπαινῶ καὶ τούτου τὴν οὐχ ὁραθεῖσαν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ διαβαθεῖσαν κλίμακα ταῖς κατὰ μέρος εἰς ἀρετὴν ἀναβάσεσι. *Oratio 43*, 71.14-23 (p. 284). English translation: McCauley etc., 90.

[76] Sinait. gr. 598, f. 17.

[77] Τοιοῦτος ἦν ὁ νέος σιτοδότης ἡμῖν καὶ δεύτερος Ἰωσήφ. *Oratio 43*, 36 (p. 204). English translation: McCauley etc., 58.

[78] Ἰωσὴφ καὶ Μωσέα καὶ Ἀαρὼν ἐναργῶς ἐξεικόνισεν. *The Life of George*, 58. An even closer parallel to these words is found at another point of George of Amastris' *Life*, where, however, the word κανών is used instead of εἰκών: Τοιοῦτος ἦν ὁ νέος Ἰωσὴφ καὶ τῆς σωφροσύνης κανών ("He was the rule of moderation"). *Life of George of Amastris*, 15. English translation: Jenkins, trans., *The Life of Saint George of Amastris*, 4.

[79] Λάβετε, φάγετε εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. Τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα. Ὁμοίως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μεταδοὺς εἶπε: τοῦτό μού ἐστι τὸ αἷμα. Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. Ὡς οὐκ ἄλλου εἴδους ἐπιλεχθέντος παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ

image. According to this theory, the virtues of the saints are living images and the faithful are invited to imitate them. The main points of the theory were included in the *horoi* of the councils held in 754 and 815, as well as in the patristic florilegium attached to the *horos* of 815.[80] The theory is summarised in the sixteenth anathema of the council of 754:

> If anyone ventures to set up profitless figures of all the saints in soul-less, speechless images made of material colours (ἐξ ὑλικῶν χρωμάτων)–for this is a vain invention and the discovery of diabolical craft–and does not, on the contrary, reproduce their virtues in himself as actually living images (ἐμψύχους εἰκόνας), with the aid of what has been recorded about them in books, in order to be stimulated to zeal like theirs, as our inspired fathers have said, let him be anathema.[81]

Even though it is not likely that the author of the *kanon* for Saint Basil was an iconoclast, the vocabulary used in it demands our attention, all the more so considering that both Vasilevskij and Ševčenko, based on the use of a similar vocabulary, regarded the *Life* of George of Amastris as an iconoclastic work.[82] I tend to believe, however, that the vocabulary of this kind should not necessarily be seen as iconoclastic. Rather, in all likelihood, both George's *Life* and our hymn were composed in a period when such expressions did not have any association with the iconoclasts. As we have seen above, numerous hymns feature the notion of saint-as-icon. Instead of associating all such hymns with the iconoclasts, it seems more rational to assume that the iconophiles did not have any objection to presenting saints as icons of virtues.

The author of the *kanon* to Saint Nicholas uses an alternative word τύπος instead of εἰκών in the third *troparion* of the ninth ode when he associates the saint with Joseph:

> Σὺ τὸν Ἰωσὴφ ζηλώσας, τύπος σωφροσύνης ἀνεδείχθης, σιτοδοτῶν τὰς λύσεις ἡμῖν τῶν ἐγκλημάτων δι᾽ ὀνείρων ἐνθέων, Νικόλαε παμμακάριστε.

ὑπ᾽ οὐρανόν, ἢ τύπου εἰκονίσαι τὴν αὐτοῦ σάρκωσιν δυναμένου. Ἰδοὺ οὖν ἡ εἰκὼν τοῦ ζωοποιοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ἡ ἐντίμως καὶ τετιμημένως πραττομένη. J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, vol. 13, Paris and Leipzig: H. Welter, 1902, 261D-264C.

[80] For more on this topic, see: P. Alexander, "The Iconoclastic Council of St. Sophia (815) and Its Definition (Horos), *DOP* 7 (1953) 35-66, and M. Anastos, "The Ethical Theory of Images Formulated by the Iconoclasts in 754 and 815", *DOP* 8 (1954) 151-160.

[81] Εἴ τις τὰς τῶν ἁπάντων ἁγίων ἰδέας ἐν εἰκόσιν ἀψύχοις καὶ ἀναύδοις ἐξ ὑλικῶν χρωμάτων ἀναστηλοῦν ἐπιτηδεύοι, μηδεμίαν ὄνησιν φερούσας· ματαία γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ἐπίνοια, καὶ διαβολικῆς μεθοδείας εὕρεσις· καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον τὰς τούτων ἀρετὰς διὰ τῶν ἐν γραφαῖς περὶ αὐτῶν δηλουμένων οἷόν τινας ἐμψύχους εἰκόνας ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἀναζωγραφεῖ, καὶ πρὸς τὸν ὅμοιον αὐτοῖς ἐκ τούτου διεγείρεται ζῆλον, καθὼς οἱ ἔνθεοι ἡμῶν ἔφησαν πατέρες, ἀνάθεμα. Mansi 13, 345C-D. For the English translation, see: Anastos, "The Ethical Theory of Images", 155.

[82] See above, n. 38.

Having emulated Joseph, you proved to be a type of chastity by providing release from our faults through divine dreams, O wholly blessed Nicholas.[83]

In the third *troparion* of the fifth ode, Basil is implicitly compared with David:

Τῇ γνωστικῇ σφενδόνῃ καὶ τῇ τῶν λόγων στερρότητι ὅσιε, ὤλεσας παραδόξως, Ἀρείου τὸ ἀλλότριον φρύαγμα.

With the spiritual sling and the firmness of words, O holy one, you destroyed miraculously the alien ferocity of Arius.[84]

Although David's name is not explicitly mentioned, it is implied through the reference to the "spiritual sling", which "destroyed" Arius's teaching. This is a clear allusion to David who killed Goliath with a missile from his sling (1 Samuel 17: 48-50). The idea contained in this *troparion* bears a certain resemblance to the following passage from *Life* of George of Amastris in which the biographer interprets allegorically Goliath's death: "As a leader, he armed his mind with purity so that he girded himself for battle and struck the Goliath of his mind with his sling".[85]

The third *troparion* of the seventh ode is permeated with the terminology of painting:

Τῶν ἀρετῶν σε ζωγράφον εὐφημοῦμεν, ἀντὶ χρωμάτων τῇ λάμψει κεχρημένον τῶν διδαγμάτων, τὸν κατ᾽ εἰκόνα ἄνθρωπον ἔργοις καὶ λόγοις ὑπογράφοντα.

We praise you as a painter of virtues, since you, by using the light of teachings instead of colours, painted the man created in God's image with your deeds and words.[86]

The idea of the saint as a "painter of virtues" strongly resembles the passage from the *Life* of George of Amastris cited above and fits well in the context of the iconoclastic and post-iconoclastic periods, when similar motifs, as already pointed out, acquired prominence in both hagiography and hymnography.

Finally, in two *troparia* of the ninth ode, Basil is compared with Paul and John the Baptist, respectively:

---

[83] Sinait. gr. 590, f. 59. Sinait. gr. 583 the word εὐφροσύνης is used instead of σωφροσύνης (f. 36).
[84] Sinait. gr. 598, f. 17.
[85] Τὸν ἡγεμόνα νοῦν καθοπλίσας τῇ καθαρότητι, τὸν νοητὸν Γολιὰθ παραταξάμενος ἐσφενδόνησεν. *Life of George of Amastris*, 59. English translation: Jenkins, trans., *The Life of Saint George of Amastris*, 16.
[86] Sinait. gr. 598, f. 17v.

Πρὸς τὰς θεωρίας ἡρπάγης τὰς οὐρανίους, τὸν παράδεισον, ὅσιε, κατιδὼν τῆς σοφίας, καὶ ἐκλογῆς σκεῦος ἔνθεον ὤφθης, ὡς κήρυξ ἀληθείας καὶ διδάσκαλος.

When you were caught up to the heavenly contemplations, having seen the paradise of wisdom, O holy one, you were revealed as a chosen divine vessel, a preacher and teacher of truth.[87]

The *troparion* clearly alludes to Paul in two ways: first, by mentioning the visions that Paul experienced, as mentioned in 2 Cor. 12: 1-5, when he was "caught up to the third heaven and to paradise"; and second, by characterising Basil as a "chosen vessel" (σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς), as God identified Paul in Acts 9:15.

The last biblical figure that Basil is compared with is John the Baptist:

Μιμητής, Βασίλειε, τοῦ Προδρόμου ἐδείχθης, ὡς νηστείας σύντροφος καὶ μετανοίας κήρυξ, καὶ ἀσεβοῦς βασιλέως ἔλεγξας τῆς κακοδοξίας τὸ ἀθέμιτον.

Basil, you revealed yourself as an imitator of the Forerunner, as a brother in fasting and a preacher of repentance, you condemned the wicked beliefs of the impious emperor.[88]

In this *troparion*, the hymnographer compares Basil with John in two respects, namely in terms of his ascetic way of life and his resistance in the face of the contemporary political authorities. Basil's opposition to the dogmatic teachings favoured by the emperor gave an opportunity to the poet to compare Basil with John. The allusion is obvious since, according to the New Testament account, John was beheaded because of his criticism of the marriage of Herod Antipas, the ruler of Galilee (Matt. 14: 1-12; Mark 6:14-29; Luke 9:7-9).

By invoking so many models for the two saints, the author of these *kanons* simultaneously praises the saints and conveys the content of the Scriptures to the audience. In this way, he actually accommodates biblical narratives to his pastoral and especially ascetic agenda.

New Moses

Moses as the receiver of the Law and the leader of the chosen people in their quest for the Promised Land was highly acclaimed among Christian writers. Byzantine authors frequently invoked Moses as a model for various categories of people, including saints, holy men, and

---

[87] Sinait. gr. 598, f. 18.
[88] Sinait. gr. 598, f. 18.

even emperors. Regarding the latter category, Gilbert Dagron in his influential book "Emperor and Priest", points out:

> No new event was wholly true nor any new emperor wholly authentic until they had been recognized and labelled by reference to an Old Testament model. In Byzantium, the Old Testament had a constitutional value; it had the same normative role in the political sphere as the New Testament in the moral sphere.[89]

Moses was usually presented as a preeminent exemplar of leadership. Eusebios of Caesarea, for example, praised Constantine as a new Moses and modelled his life on that of the Old Testament leader. As Moses was the leader of the Israelites, Constantine was the leader of the Christians as the new Israel. Constantine's chief enemy, Maxentius, drowned in the Tiber, as did the pharaoh in the Red Sea.[90] In the seventh century, George of Pisidia identified Heraklios as a new Moses: "Immediately after the celebration of Easter, you led the troops against the second pharaoh, in the image of Moses (εἰκονίζων Μωσέα)".[91] Not only for people well-educated or well-versed in the Bible, but even for ordinary Christians, such comparisons had a deep significance. When applied to contemporary rulers, they pointed to their specific traits. For example, when Byzantine encomiasts wrote that a particular emperor had defeated his enemies just as Moses had subdued the Amalkites (Ex. 17:8-16), they actually attributed to the emperor the characteristics of a popular leader who relied more on God's help than on the power of weapons.

Moses was also of pivotal importance for Byzantine religious writers, especially hagiographers. On the one hand, Moses provided them with a model of Christian authorship to follow;[92] on the other hand, they referred to Moses as an exemplar for different categories of saints, particularly ascetics. In the hagiographical genre, Moses was usually praised for his prolonged fasting before receiving the divine law on Mount Sinai. For example, the biographer of Symeon the Stylite compares Symeon's fasting to the fasting of Moses.[93] The

---

[89] G. Dagron, *Emperor and Priest. The Imperial Office in Byzantium,* trans. J. Birrell, Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003, 50.

[90] Eusebios, *Life of Constantine*, intr., trans., comm. A. Cameron and S. Hall, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999, 35–39. For further discussion on this topic, see: M. Hollerich, "The Comparison of Moses and Constantine in Eusebios of Caesarea's Life of Constantine," *Studia Patristica* 19 (1989) 80–85; idem, id., "Religion and Politics in the Writings of Eusebios: Reassessing the First 'Court Theologian'," *Church History* 59 (1990): 309–325; Rapp, "Old Testament Models for Emperors in Early Byzantium", in: Magdalino and Nelson, eds., *The Old Testament in Byzantium*, 182.

[91] ἑορτάσας δὲ τὴν μεγίστην ἡμέραν ἐν ᾗ τὸ κοινὸν ἐξανέστη τοῦ γένους εἰς ἔνθεόν τε καὶ νέαν ἀνάπλασιν, εὐθὺς μετ᾿ αὐτὴν εἰκονίζων Μωσέα καταστρατηγεῖς <τοῦ> Φαραὼ τοῦ δευτέρου. *De expeditione Persica* 1.135, in A. Pertusi, ed. *Giorgio di Pisidia. Poemi. I. Panegirici Epici*, Ettal: Buch-Kunstverlag, 1959, 90.

[92] On Moses as a model for Christian writers, see D. Krueger, *Writing and Holiness: The Practice of Authorship in the Early Christian East*, University of Pennsylvania Press: Philadelphia, 2004, passim.

[93] *Religious History* 1. Edition: *Histoire des moines de Syrie*, ed. P. Canivet and A. Leroy-Molinghen, 2 vols., SC 234, 257, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1977–79. Cf. also *Syriac Life of Symeon the Stylite* 108 (trans. in R.

author of the *Life* of George of Amastris writes that his hero, longing "to converse daily with God", looked to Moses who "received the tablets written by the finger of God on Sinai".[94] Furthermore, George's biographer refers to another significant event from Moses' life that was repeatedly subjected to typological interpretation in Byzantine literature and unanimously understood as a prefiguration of the holy Cross: "Long ago with God's aid Moses routed the Amalek by holding up his arms, bearing the image and pattern of a greater mystery".[95] In ascetic literature, Moses is also cited as a model of meekness,[96] which is his biblical characterisation: "And the man Moses was very meek (πραΰς) beyond all the men that were upon the earth" (Num. 12:3). Additionally, hagiographers often identified the rod of Moses with the Cross in the hands of ascetics, a mighty weapon against the devil. Thus, in his *History of Monks*, Theodoret of Cyrrhus states that the monk Jacob performed miracles with the Cross as did Moses with his rod: "This miracle of this New Moses did not happen with a stroke of a rod, but by receiving the force through the sign of the Cross".[97]

Moses, one should recall, was also one of the favourite biblical models for Christian mystical writers of both East and West. As the one who saw only the back of God, while hidden in the cleft of a rock (Ex 33:22-23), Moses was made the preeminent type of every ascetic practicing the apophatic method of knowing God. This gnoseological method emphasised the limitation of what one can positively state about God. It recognised that God is beyond any human knowledge. Among the Greek fathers of the Church, Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, and the author of *Corpus Dionysiacum* showed special interest in Moses and the apophatic theophany on Mount Sinai. Gregory of Nyssa, for instance, presents Moses' life and his ascent to the summit of Mount Sinai as an allegory of the mystical progress of the soul towards God.[98] Pseudo-Dionysios adopts Gregory of Nyssa's mystical interpretation of Moses' Sinaitic ascent. He further develops it by stressing that the soul passes through three stages of mystical life, namely purification (κάθαρσις), illumination (καθαρισμός), and union

---

Doran, *The Lives of Simeon Stylites*, Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1992, 176–177). For other examples from saints' lives and *Apophthegmata Patrum*, see D. Krueger, *The Old Testament and Monasticism*, 206-209.

[94] ἐν τῷ Σιναίῳ δακτύλῳ Θεοῦ γραφείσας πλάκας ἐδέξατο. *Life of St George of Amastris*, 10, p. 18.

[95] Πάλαι μὲν τροποῦται Μωϋσῆς τὸν Ἀμαλὴκ Θεοῦ διατάξει καὶ χειρῶν ἐκτάσει, μυστηρίου μείζονος φέρων εἰκόνα καὶ προχάραγμα. *Life of St George of Amastris*, 26, p. 40.

[96] *Apophthegmata Patrum*: PG 65, 237D. For the English translation, see: *The Sayings of the Desert Fathers: The Alphabetical Collection*, 108.

[97] Τοιοῦτον τοῦ νέου τούτου Μωσέως τὸ θαῦμα, οὐ πληγῇ ῥάβδου γενόμενον, ἀλλὰ τῷ τοῦ σταυροῦ σημείῳ δεξάμενον τὴν ἐνέργειαν. *Théodoret de Cyr. L'histoire des moines de Syrie*, 1.5, P. Canivet and A. Leroy-Molinghen, ed., SC 234, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1977.

[98] J. Daniélou and H. Musurillo, eds., *From Glory to Glory: Texts from Gregory of Nyssa's Mystical Writings*, New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1979, passim.

(ἕνωσις) or perfection (τελείωσις).[99] Moreover, the anonymous author of the *Corpus Dionysiacum* implicitly situates Moses' mystical experience within the liturgical context by drawing parallels between Moses' ascent to Mount Sinai and the hierarch's liturgical role.[100]

Moses was one of the preferred Old Testament figures for Byzantine hymnographers, too. This is especially true of the composers of *kanon*s. In addition to the fact that the first and second odes of this most widespread Byzantine hymnographic genre are directly related to Moses, since they are based on the two odes of Moses, that is, the triumphant song after the crossing of the Red Sea (Ex. 15:1–19) and the song from Deuteronomy (Deut. 32, 1-43), hymnographers also frequently refer to his person as an *exemplum* for the saints by using the technique of *comparatio* or *synkrisis*. A *sticheron* from the Lenten *Triodion* prescribed to be sung on the eve of the Great Lent exemplifies how Byzantine hymnographers elaborated on the idea of Moses' fasting and the benefits such ascetic conduct engendered. In order to encourage the faithful to emulate Moses during the ensuing weeks, the anonymous poet points out that "through fasting Moses became a companion with the creator and invisibly heard his voice".[101]

Returning to the hymns attributed to Germanos, we have already seen in the case of the *kanons* on Saint Basil the Great and Saint Nicholas how their spiritual leadership and orthodox teachings are associated with Moses's role in the salvation of the Israelites from Egypt. In the same corpus of hymns, we also find examples that betray their author's reliance upon the mystical interpretations of Moses's experiences on Mount Sinai. The following *troparion* from the nine-ode *kanon* on John the Faster (2 September) is very characteristic in this regard:

> Προεκαθάρας ἑαυτὸν ἐκ τῆς ἀχλύος τῶν παθῶν, παμμακάριστε, εἰς τὸν γνόφον εἰσῆλθες τὸν θεῖον ὡς δεύτερος Μωσῆς, τῆς ἱερωσύνης τὰς πλάκας δεξάμενος.

---

[99]   A. Louth, *Denys the Areopagite*, London: Continuum, 1989, 40-42; P. Rorem, *Pseudo-Dionysius: A Commentary on the Texts and an Introduction to Their Influence*, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993, 190-191.

[100]   P. Rorem, "Moses as the Paradigm for the Liturgical Spirituality of Pseudo-Dionysius", *Studia Patristica* 18.2 (1989) 275-279.

[101]   δι' αὐτῆς γὰρ Μωϋσῆς, γέγονε τῷ Κτίστῃ συνόμιλος, καὶ φωνὴν ἀοράτως, ἐν ταῖς ἀκοαῖς ὑπεδέξατο. Lenten *Triodion, Vespers on Cheesefare Sunday*. This is an allusion to Exodus 34:28, where it is said that "Moses was there [on the mountain] forty days, and forty nights; he did not eat bread, and he did not drink water; and he wrote upon the tables these words of the covenant, the ten sayings".

Having purified yourself from the mist of passions, O wholly blessed, you entered the divine darkness like a second Moses, and received the tablets of the priesthood.[102]

Evidently, the author refers Moses's ascent on Mount Sinai with the use of several key mystical ideas typical of Gregory of Nyssa and especially of the *Corpus Areopagiticum*. These ideas include the purification from the fog of passions, which refers to the first stage of mystical life, as well as the entry into the divine darkness. As the concluding phrase of the *troparion* clearly shows, the mystical experience is presented as an avenue to the priesthood.

Another example in which a saint's comparison with Moses is situated in a mystical context is found in the nine-ode *kanon* to the hieromartyr Anthimos (3 September), a hymn also attributed to Germanos. Inspired by the theophany on Mount Sinai (Ex. 33:21-23), the second *troparion* of the ninth ode reads as follows:

Ὥσπερ Μωσῆς ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ καλυφθείς, τῶν ὀπισθίων ἐξέμαθες τὴν ἀπόκρυφον γνῶσιν, ἀοίδιμε, τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐνανθρώπησιν προσφωνοῦσαν ἐκτυπώτερον.

O one of blessed memory, having been covered [with God's hand] on the rock like Moses, you learnt the hidden knowledge from having seen the back parts [of God], which [hidden knowledge] announced more clearly Christ's incarnation.[103]

A comparable example comes from the *kanon* to Saint Auxentios, celebrated on 14 February. In this hymn, the author refers to the saint's "divine vision" and compares it to that of Moses. The relevant *troparion* reads:

Τῆς θείας ὀπτασίας πατὴρ ἡμῶν ἠξιώθης, ὡς Μωσῆς ὁ δίκαιος, ὑπὸ τοῦ ὄρους εὐχόμενος.
O our father, you were considered worthy of the divine vision like righteous Moses, praying on the mount.[104]

The example of Moses is also evoked in another *troparion* from the same hymn, in which the author refers to the saint's "passage through darkness".

Ὡς γνόφον διελήλυθας ὅσιε τὰ τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ πρὸς τὰ οὐράνια δι᾽ ἐγκρατείας ἐχώρησας.

O holy one, you passed through darkness of the world and through self-control you dwelled in heaven.[105]

---

[102] Sinait. gr. 552, f. 20.
[103] Sinait. gr. 552, f. 31v and Sinait. gr. 579, f. 13.
[104] Sinait. gr. 602, f. 67.
[105] Sinait. gr. 602, f. 67v.

An ascetic saint whose way of life frequently inspired hymnographers to compare him with Moses is Symeon the Stylite. Symeon's ascetic practice on a pillar, which included the element of ascent, provided hymnographers with an opportunity to draw parallels with Moses. Thus, in the third *troparion* of the third ode of the *kanon* ascribed to Germanos we read:

> Πρὸς τὸ ὄρος ἐπιβὰς τῶν ἀρετῶν, ἱερὸς Συμεών, τῷ γνόφῳ ὑπεισῆλθεν, μὴ καλυφθεῖς ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ τὸν νοῦν.

> Holy Symeon, having ascended the mount of virtues, entered the darkness, but his mind was not covered by the cloud.[106]

Moses's ascent on Sinai and his entry into the darkness are here understood as a counterpart of Symeon's progress in virtue and the mystical experience that he attained when he ascended the pillar.[107]

Symeon, like Moses, is said to have been a man of contemplations (θεωρίαι), as in a *troparion* from the *kanon* ascribed to Joseph the Hymnographer:

> Πάλαι Μωσῆς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἠξίωται εἶδος θεοῦ κατιδεῖν ὄρει ἐν Σινᾷ, σὺ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ στύλου, τὸν νοῦν καθάρας, πάτερ, θείαις θεωρίαις θεὸν ἑώρας καθ᾽ ἑκάστην.

> In the past, Moses was deemed worthy of seeing the form of God on Mount Sinai, but you, O father, having cleansed your mind, saw him in divine contemplations every day on the pillar.[108]

Following other literary genres, hymnographers quite frequently associate Moses with the Cross. This can be observed especially in hymns for the feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross. Hymnographers usually elaborate on several episodes from Moses's life, notably, his activities as the leader of Israel. The most common among these episodes are the following four: first, Moses's parting of the Red Sea by stretching out his hands (Ex. 14:21); second, the defeat of the Amalkites (Ex. 17:8-16); third, his making of a bronze serpent and exhibiting it upon a pole (Numbers 21:9); and, fourth, his bringing water out of the rock by striking it with his rod (Ex. 17:1-6).

---

[106] Sinait. gr. 552, f. 11v; Sinait. gr. 579, f. 5.
[107] A similar comparison is found in the *Syriac Life of Symeon*, 41. See *The Lives of Simeon Stylites*, trans. R. Doran, Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1992, 125-126.
[108] *AHG* 1, 49.

Probably one of the best-known examples of the typological interpretation of the first episode, namely the crossing of the Red Sea, is found in the *kanon* for the Exaltation ascribed to Kosmas the Melode (d. ca. 750), which is still in liturgical use in the Orthodox Church. The author points out that Moses marked a sign of the Cross with his hands in order to divide the sea for the passage of the Israelites and to join it when the passage was completed. The *heirmos* of the first ode reads as follows:

> Σταυρὸν χαράξας Μωσῆς, ἐπ᾽ εὐθείας ῥάβδῳ, τὴν Ἐρυθρὰν διέτεμε, τῷ Ἰσραὴλ πεζεύσαντι, τὴν δὲ ἐπιστρεπτικῶς, Φαραὼ τοῖς ἅρμασι κροτήσας ἥνωσεν· ἐπ᾽ εὔρους διαγράψας, τὸ ἀήττητον ὅπλον, διὸ Χριστῷ ᾄσωμεν· τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν, ὅτι δεδόξασται.

> Inscribing the invincible weapon of the Cross upon the waters, Moses marked a straight line before him with his staff and divided the Red Sea, opening a path for Israel who went over dry-shod. Then he marked a second line across the waters and united them in one, overwhelming the chariots of Pharaoh.[109]

More commonly, however, hymnographers refer to the Israelites' victory over the Amalkites, which was achieved through Moses's raising of his hands. This gesture, according to Christian writers, prefigures the Cross on which Christ was crucified. In the first ode of Kosmas's *kanon*, this biblical event is seen as a prefiguration of Christ's Passion on the cross:

> Τὸν τύπον πάλαι Μωσῆς, τοῦ ἀχράντου πάθους, ἐν ἑαυτῷ προέφηνε, τῶν ἱερῶν μεσούμενος, Σταυρῷ δὲ σχηματισθείς, τεταμέναις τρόπαιον, παλάμαις ἤγειρε, τὸ κράτος διολέσας, Ἀμαλὴκ τοῦ πανώλους· διὸ Χριστῷ ᾄσωμεν, τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν, ὅτι δεδόξασται.

> In times past Moses, standing between the two men of God,[110] prefigured in his person the undefiled Passion. Forming a cross with his outstretched hands, he raised a standard of victory and overthrew the power of all-destroying Amalek.[111]

In the *kanon* for the Exaltation of the Holy Cross attributed to Germanos, the victory over the Amalkites is evoked in three *troparia*. The first among them reads:

> Χείρας πετάσας Μωϋσῆς, καὶ σὲ τυπώσας Ἀμαλὴκ ἐτροπώσατο, ἔγνωρισέ σε τὸν Σωτῆρα τῷ λαῷ ὑμνεῖτε βοῶν· καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

---

[109] *Menaion* for September 14. For the English translation, see: *Festal Menaion*, 144. Among the several other examples, see also the following *troparion* from another *kanon* for the same feast that contains a similar idea: Πατάξας τὰ ὕδατα ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα Μωσῆς διετείχισε τοῦ σταυροῦ τὸ σύμβολον τῇ ῥάβδῳ πάλαι δηλῶν, δι᾽ ἧς ὁ πλάνος Φαραὼ σημεῖα εἶδε πολλά (Long ago Moses, having struck the waters with the staff, divided them, signifying the symbol of the cross, through which Pharaoh the deceiver saw many signs). *AHG* 1, 244.
[110] Aaron and Hur (Ex. 17: 10-14).
[111] *Festal Menaion*, 144.

Having spread out his hands and prefigured you [O holy Cross], Moses put to flight the Amalkites, and recognised you as the saviour of the people, shouting: Praise and magnify him for ever.[112]

The second *troparion* declares:

Προτυπωθεὶς ὁ σταυρός, τὸν Ἀμαλὴκ ποτὲ κατέβαλε, φανεὶς δὲ ἐν οὐρανῷ θράσος συνέτριψεν.

The Cross, having been prefigured once [by the rod of Moses], overthrew the Amalkites, and by appearing in heaven crushed insolence.[113]

The same *kanon* also interprets typologically the bronze serpent, which is seen as a prefiguration of the Cross:

Τὸν ὄφιν ἐστηλίτευσε Μωσῆς, καὶ τῶν δρακόντων τὴν μανίαν κατήργησεν, ἐρρύσατο θανάτου τὸν λαὸν τῷ τύπῳ τοῦ σταυροῦ, ἐν ᾧ ἐθριάμβευσας αὐτὸν Σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου·

Moses exposed the serpent and destroyed the madness of dragons; he saved the people from death with the figure of the cross, by which you triumphed over death, O saviour of the world.[114]

A final episode from Moses's life that attracted the attention of hymnographers due to its exegetical significance concerns his miraculous transformation of bitter waters with his staff:

Πικρογόνους μετέβαλε, ξύλῳ Μωϋσῆς πηγὰς ἐν ἐρήμῳ πάλαι, τῷ Σταυρῷ πρὸς τὴν εὐσέβειαν, τῶν ἐθνῶν προφαίνων τὴν μετάθεσιν.

In times past Moses transformed with wood the bitter wells in the wilderness, prefiguring the bringing of the Gentiles to the true faith through the Cross.[115]

As noted above, such typological interpretations are encountered in other genres of Byzantine literature. Occasionally, however, hymnographers move beyond their sources and offer quite novel exegetical formulations. A good example is found in the *kanon* to Proklos, archbishop

---

[112] Sinait. gr. 552, f. 130.
[113] Sinait. gr. 552, f. 128.
[114] Sinait.gr. 552, f. 130. Compare this *troparion* with the second *troparion* of the first ode of the *kanon* from *menaion*: Ἀνέθηκε Μωϋσῆς, ἐπὶ στήλης ἄκος, φθοροποιοῦ λυτήριον, καὶ ἰοβόλου δήγματος· καὶ ξύλῳ τύπῳ Σταυροῦ, τὸν πρὸς γῆν συρόμενον, ὄφιν προσέδησεν, ἐγκάρσιον ἐν τούτῳ, θριαμβεύσας τὸ πῆμα· διὸ Χριστῷ ᾄσωμεν, τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν, ὅτι δεδόξασται. (Moses set upon a wooden pole a cure against the deadly and poisonous bite of the serpents: for crosswise upon the wood–as a symbol of the Cross–he placed a serpent that creeps about the earth, and thereby he triumphed over calamity). *Festal Menaion*, 144.
[115] *Festal Menaion*, 146.

of Constantinople (434-446) celebrated on 20 November, yet another hymn transmitted under the name of Germanos. Extolling Proklos' teachings, the poet goes so far to compare them with the tablets inscribed with divine commandments, which Moses received on Sinai:

> Σὺ ὥσπερ θείας πλάκας τὰ σὰ διδάγματα, Πρόκλε, παρέθηκας, τῇ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἄλλος Μωϋσῆς χρηματίσας αὐτῇ.

> O Proklos, you provided the Church of Christ with your teachings as though with divine tablets, becoming a second Moses for it [the Church].[116]

The complex figure of Moses provided Byzantine authors with multiple avenues of typological and allegorical elaboration. The great Old Testament hero was simultaneously an ideal ruler and military commander, a paradigmatic ascetic and visionary, and one of the preeminent types of Christ. All of these aspects and roles are variously addressed in the corpus of hymns attributed to Germanos.

New Abrahams

The Old Testament patriarch Abraham figures prominently in the Christian tradition, both visual and literary. In the visual arts, three episodes from Abraham's life in particular, namely, his hosting of the three angelic strangers at the Oaks of Mamre (Gen. 18:1-18), his encounter with Melchisedek (Gen. 14: 18-20), and his sacrifice of Isaac (Gen. 22: 1-13), were hugely popular. They are seen in a variety of contexts, from illuminated manuscripts to monumental church programs, usually invested with Eucharistic connotations. Among the best-known examples are the representations in San Vitale in Ravenna and Saint Mark's Basilica in Venice. The literary record, especially homiletics and hagiography, is equally rich in references to Abraham. The patriarch was usually praised for the lavish hospitality he showed to the three angels and the unshakable faith he demonstrated by his readiness to offer his son as a sacrifice to God. The faithful were, accordingly, invited to emulate Abraham's virtues,[117] while numerous saints were modelled on him. Thus Athanasios the Athonite in his *Life* is said to have possessed the hospitality of Abraham.[118] The patriarch was, moreover, evoked as a model of priesthood. In the funeral homily on Basil the Great, Gregory of

---

[116] Paris. gr. 259, f. 195.
[117] For more on this, see J. Daniélou, "Abraham dans la tradition chrétienne", *Cahiers Sioniens* 5 (1951) 160-179; D. E. Tonias, *Abraham in the Works of John Chrysostom*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2014.
[118] *Life of Athanasios B*, chapter 64. For the edition, see J. Noret, ed. *Vitae duae antiquae sancti Athanasii Athonitae*, CCSG 9, Turnhout: Brepols, 1982.

Nazianzos draws a parallel between Abraham and his deceased friend, referring to their priestly roles:

> Abraham was great and a patriarch and the offerer of a new sacrifice, offering to him who had given it the first fruit of his promise, a ready victim, hastening to the slaughter. But Basil's sacrifice was also great when he offered himself to God, without anything being offered in his place in equal compensation–for where could such be found? And so his auspicious sacrifice was consummated.[119]

John Chrysostom also describes Abraham as the one who, by sacrificing Isaac, became a priest.[120]

The figure of Abraham was especially favoured in monastic literature from its very inception. Monastic writers regularly single out Abraham's hospitality one of the exemplary acts of virtue that monks should seek to imitate. In an often quoted anonymous saying from the *Apophthegmata Patrum*, in which a number of Old Testament personages are identified with key Christian virtues, Abraham is associated with hospitability: "Scripture says that Abraham was hospitable and God was with him".[121]

Abraham plays a no less prominent role in Byzantine hymnography. Romanos the Melode, for example, devoted one of his *kontakia* to the story of Abraham and Isaac. In this composition, the patriarch's offering of Isaac is interpreted typologically as a prefiguration of Christ's crucifixion and resurrection. Romanos, by employing the rhetorical technique of *ethopoiia*, cites God's words to Abraham:

> Just as you did not spare your son because of me,
>
> Just so, I shall not spare my son because of all men;
>
> But I shall give him to be slain for the sake of the world.[122]

---

[119] Μέγας ὁ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ πατριάρχης καὶ θύτης καινῆς θυσίας, τὸν ἐκ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῷ δεδωκότι προσαγαγών, ἱερεῖον ἕτοιμον καὶ πρὸς τὴν σφαγὴν ἐπειγόμενον· ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲ τὸ ἐκείνου μικρόν, ἑαυτὸν προσήγαγε τῷ Θεῷ καὶ οὐδὲν ὡς ἰσότιμον ἀντεδόθη· τί γὰρ καὶ ἦν; ὥστε καὶ τελειωθῆναι τὸ καλλιέρημα. *Oratio 43*, 71.1-6 (p. 284). English translation: McCauley etc., 89.

[120] Ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ μακάριος Ἀβραὰμ τὸ μέγιστον ἆθλον τότε ἤρατο. Ὅτε ταύτην ἦγε τὴν ἡλικίαν, τότε γὰρ τότε τῆς φύσεως τὴν τυραννίδα κατέλυσε, καὶ τὸν παῖδα κατέσφαξεν. Ἔσφαξε γάρ, εἰ καὶ μὴ τῇ πείρᾳ, ἀλλὰ τῇ γνώμῃ, εἰ καὶ μὴ τῷ τέλει, ἀλλὰ τῇ προθέσει, εἰ καὶ μὴ τῷ ἔργῳ, ἀλλὰ διανοίᾳ, τότε τῶν ἰδίων σπλάγχνων γέγονεν ἱερεύς. PG 63, 517. For more, see Tonias, *Abraham in the Works of John Chrysostom*, 121.

[121] Guy, *Les Apophtegmes de Pères: Collection systématique*, 1.18. Cf. also a saying by Abba John the Persian: Φιλόξενος ὡς ὁ Ἀδὰμ γέγονα (PG 65, 237D).

[122] Ὥσπερ οὖν οὐκ ἐφείσω δι᾽ ἐμὲ τοῦ υἱοῦ σου,
Κἀγὼ διὰ πάντας οὐ φείσομαι τοῦ υἱοῦ μου·
ὑπὲρ κόσμου δὲ σφαγῆναι δίδωμι. *On Abraham and Isaac*, 41.22. For the English translation, see: M. Carpenter, trans, *Kontakia of Romanos, Byzantine Melodist*, vol. 2, *On Christian Life*, Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1973, 69.

In the same *kontakion*, Romanos also speaks of Abraham as a model of faith that the congregation should strive to emulate.[123]

Later hymnographers, especially *kanon* writers, who, as already noted, usually came from monastic backgrounds, frequently elaborated on the person of Abraham and the virtues with which he was identified.[124] In liturgical poetry, the patriarch is, for instance, often associated with saints. In the corpus of hymns preserved under the name of Germanos, Abraham figures as a counterpart to both martyrs and ascetics. The *kanon* to Saints Kyrikos and Julitta (15 July) offers a pertinent example. Zooming in on the fact that Julitta was Kyrikos's mother, the poet compares her with Abraham:

> Τὸν Ἀβραὰμ τῇ πίστει μιμησαμένη μάρτυς, τῷ Χριστῷ προσήγαγε τὸν εὐσεβῆ υἱὸν αὐτῆς θυσίαν εὐπρόσδεκτον διὰ τοῦ μαρτυρίου, ἐν διπλῷ γὰρ τῷ σώματι ἠγωνήσατο διὸ αὐτὴν δοξάζομεν.[125]

> The martyr (Julitta), imitating Abraham's faith, offered her pious son to Christ as an acceptable sacrifice through martyrdom, for she fought in the twofold body, for which reason we glorify her.

A similar idea is expressed in another *troparion* from the same *kanon*:

> Τὸν Ἀβραὰμ ἐν τῇ πίστει ζηλώσασα θεόφρον, καὶ τὸν υἱόν σου Κυρίῳ προσήγαγες θυσίαν.[126]

> You emulated Abraham's faith, O one with godly mind, and you offered your son as a sacrifice to the Lord.

The author of the nine-ode *kanon* to Basil the Great, following the funeral homily by Gregory of Nazianzos and employing a similar allegory, identifies Basil as a new Abraham and praises him as a priest who offered his life as a sacrifice to God:

> Νέος ἐφάνης Ἀβραὰμ ἡμῖν, πάτερ ὅσιε, μυστικῆς θυσίας γνωρισθεὶς ἱερουργός, τὸν βίον σου καθὼς μονογενῆ υἱὸν τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαν προσαγαγὼν λογικήν, τῷ τοῦ Πνεύματος, πυρὶ διὰ πίστεως.

> You appeared to us as a new Abraham, O Holy Father, having been known as a priest of the mystical sacrifice, since you offered your life the only son as a spiritual sacrifice to God, with the fire of the Spirit through faith.[127]

---

[123] *On Abraham and Isaac*, 41.1.

[124] This can be easily observed from the incipits of the Byzantine hymns presented by Henrica Follieri. See her *Initia Hymnorum Ecclesiae Graecae*, vol. 1, A-Z, Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1960, 3-4.

[125] Sinait. gr. 625, f. 66; Sinait. gr. 627, f. 52; Meteor. Metamorfoseos 150, f. 146 and Athen. Bibl. Nat. 562, f. 78v.

[126] This *troparion* is preserved in only one manuscript: Athen. Bibl. Nat. 562, f. 79.

As in the previous examples, Abraham's offering of Isaac is allegorised in a *troparion* from the *kanon* on the martyr Theoktistos, celebrated on 3 September. The saint's martyrdom is here understood as a sacrifice through which he offered his blood and his body. The poet compares the former to Isaac and the lamb that was eventually sacrificed in Isaac's stead:

> Τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ἐζήλωσας τὴν θεόδεκτον, πάτερ, θυσίαν ὡς ἄλλον γὰρ Ἰσαὰκ προέθου τὸ αἶμα, καὶ ὡς ἀμνὸν προσενέγκας τῷ σῶμα, ὅλος ὡλοκαρπώθης θυσία δεκτὴ τῷ Θεῷ.

> O father, you emulated Abraham's sacrifice acceptable to God, since you set forth your blood as the other Isaac, and offered the body as a lamb, having offered yourself as a whole (burnt-) offering, a sacrifice acceptable to God.[128]

Another way to allegorise Abraham's offering of his son to God was to stress this episode's ascetic connotations. This approach is encountered in two nearly identical *troparia* in two *kanons* composed for two different saints, namely, Saint John the Faster (2 September) and Saint Nicholas (6 December). In both of these hymns, the saints' hearts, which they offered as living sacrifices to God, are allegorically associated with Isaac. The *troparion* to John the Faster proclaims:

> Σὺ τὸν Ἀβραὰμ ζηλώσας, ἄλλον Ἰσαὰκ τὴν σὴν καρδίαν, θυσίαν ζῶσαν, πάτερ, Θεῷ ἱερουργήσας τῷ πυρὶ τῆς ἀγάπης, μακάριε, ὡλοκαύτωσας.

> You emulated Abraham, having sacrificed your heart – a living sacrifice – to God like another Isaac, O blessed father, since you offered it as a sacrifice totally consumed in the fire of love.[129]

The *troparion* to Saint Nicholas features the same phrasing. The only difference is that the word μακάριε is replaced with Νικόλαε:

> Σὺ τὸν Ἀβραὰμ ζηλώσας, ἄλλον Ἰσαὰκ τὴν σὴν καρδίαν, θυσίαν ζῶσαν, πάτερ, Θεῷ ἱερουργήσας τῷ πυρὶ τῆς ἀγάπης, Νικόλαε, ὡλοκαύτωσας.

> You emulated Abraham, having sacrificed your heart–a living sacrifice–to God like another Isaac, O Nicholas, since you offered it as a sacrifice totally consumed in the fire of love.[130]

---

[127] Sinait. gr. 598, f. 16v.
[128] Sinait.gr. 552, f. 28v.
[129] Sinait. gr. 552, f. 21v; Sinait. gr. 579, f. 10.
[130] Sinait.gr. 583, 35v and Sinait.gr. 590, f. 59. These troparia have a literal parallel in Ignatios the Deacon's *Vita Tarasii*: Τῷ Ἰσαὰκ πίστει συνετύθη καὶ εἰ μὴ παρὰ πατρός, ἀλλ᾽ αὐτὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ καρδίαν ὁλοκαυτώσας

Joshua, the Son of Nun: An Image of the Emperor

Another Old Testament figure that deserves closer examination in the context of the corpus of hymns transmitted under Germanos' name is Joshua, the son of Nun. In comparison to other biblical heroes, Joshua is not as frequently invoked in liturgical poetry. Yet, among the hymns ascribed to Germanos in a Sinai manuscript dated to the eleventh century (Sinait. gr. 552, 10v-15v), a *kanon* on 1 September assigned a prominent place to Joshua.[131] What is particularly noteworthy is that virtually all references to this Old Testament leader in the *kanon* associate him with the emperor. In my opinion, this phenomenon needs to be seen within the broader historical context of the Middle Byzantine period, especially in relation to the Byzantine-Arab wars during the reign of the emperors from the Macedonian dynasty (867-1056) who sought to return Palestine to Byzantine control. Furthermore, the aftermath of the iconoclastic disputes saw a redefinition of the relationship between the Church and the state, personified by the emperor. Addressed to a wide audience, hymnographic texts could be effectively mobilised to reinforce imperial authority among imperial subjects after an extended period of sharp conflicts. Especially so when a good opportunity was provided, as in the present case, namely on the feast day of one of the most prominent leaders of God's chosen people. Since the Byzantines regarded themselves as the New Israel, with the pious emperor as their leader comparable to the Old Testament leaders, the author of the *kanon* exploited this to relate the emperor to Joshua. In this respect, the hymn can be compared to the abovementioned genres of Byzantine literature whose main purpose was to glorify the emperor.

Early Christian writers such as Justin, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, John Chrysostom, and others, usually associated Joshua with Christ. They saw him as one of Christ's principal prefigurations, stressing their shared name and pointing out that, just as Joshua led the Israelites to the Promised Land, Christ led people to the right faith.[132] In our *kanon*, this understanding of Joshua as an Old Testament *typos* of Christ is present in the first reference to him in the *kanon* under examination. The relevant comes to the fore in the following *troparion*:

καὶ ἱερεῖον καὶ θύτης γενόμενος, εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας ἀνήνεγκε Θεῷ καλλιέρημα. Efthymiadis, *The Life of the Patriarch Tarasios.*

[131] In another manuscript of the same collection, Sinait. gr. 579, ff. 5-6v, the *kanon* on this day does not contain *troparia* praising Joshua. Furthermore, the hymn is attributed to Andrew.

[132] J. Daniélou, *From Shadows to Reality. Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers*, trans. W. Hibberd, Westminster: The Newman Press, 1960, 229-286.

Προτύπωσις γέγονας τοῦ Σωτῆρος, τὸν Ἰσραὴλ διασώσας εἰς γῆν ἐπαγγελίας, ἣν ὤμοσε Κύριος Ἰησοῦ τοῖς πατράσιν ποτέ.

O Joshua, you became a prefiguration of the Saviour, having saved the Israelites [and led them] into the land of promise, which the Lord had given by his oath to our fathers in the past.[133]

Interestingly, none of the Church fathers emphasised Joshua as a model warrior. This perception changed from the ninth century onwards. Joshua's accomplishments and military exploits were many. He won a victory over the Amalkites (Ex. 17:13) in a battle during which Moses famously held his arms outstretched in prayer. Joshua also led the Israelites across the river Jordan and into the Promised Land (Joshua 3:1-14). Particularly memorable is his siege of Jericho (Joshua 6:1-27). Before the battle, an angel appeared in front of him with "a drawn sword in his hand" (Joshua 5:13). In the later Byzantine tradition, the angel was identified with the Archangel Michael. As result, the episode was included in the liturgical service of the Archangel Michael during the Middle Byzantine period:

Ἱεριχώ, ὤφθη δυνάμεως ἀρχιστράτηγος, πολεμοῦντι, πάλαι Ἰησοῦ τῷ Ναυῆ, νικοποιῶν καὶ ὑπερμαχῶν, Μιχαὴλ ὁ μέγας, τῶν ἀσωμάτων ὁ ἔξαρχος.

The archistrategos of [celestial] army appeared to Joshua, son of Nun, who was engaged in war at Jericho in the past, bringing victory and fighting for [him], Michael the great, the leader of the bodiless hosts.[134]

Joshua's leadership skills and military prowess, which he demonstrated in warfare against the native population of the Promised Land, became a source of inspiration for Byzantine authors and artists in the same period. Visual representations of Joshua appear with some frequency in monumental painting and on portable objects produced during the so-called Macedonian Renaissance. The most notable example is the famous Joshua Roll. [135] Art historians believe that this richly illustrated parchment scroll, which preserves an extensive cycle of scenes from the life of the Old Testament hero, was probably produced in an imperial workshop with the purpose of glorifying the emperor.[136] It has been proposed that the narrative of Joshua's conquest of the Promised Land acquired particular relevance for the Byzantines in the context

---

[133] Cf. Gen. 50:24.
[134] 8 November. First *troparion* of the fourth ode of the second *kanon*.
[135] On the Joshua Roll, see: L. Lowden, "Illustrated Octateuch Manuscripts: A Byzantine Phenomenon", in Magdalino and Nelson, eds., *The Old Testament in Byzantium*, 107-152.
[136] K. Weitzmann, *The Joshua Roll. A Work of the Macedonian Renaissance*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1948.

of Nikephoros II Phokas' and John I Tzimiskes' military campaigns against the Arabs, which resulted in the reconquest of Syria and large parts of Palestine.[137] For example, Nikephoros is implicitly compared to Joshua in the decoration of the rock-cut church at Çavuşin in Cappadocia.[138] Directly above the emperor's portrait in the north apse of this church is a representation of the appearance of the archangel in front of Joshua before the capture of Jericho. The image seems to evoke the idea of divine assistance, granted in the past to Joshua and now to the emperor in his fight against the infidel. It is worth pointing out, however, that there may have been other reasons for the increasing importance of Joshua under the Macedonians. Scholars have argued that the Israelite leader may have become more prominent due to the influence of an authoritative apocryphal source, the so-called *Palaia* (Τὰ Παλαιά), which was composed in the ninth century.[139] An account of Old Testament events based on both canonical and apocryphal texts, as well as on passages from Josephus Flavius, Gregory of Nazianzos, Andrew of Crete, and Theodore of Stoudios, the *Palaia* was very popular during the Middle Byzantine period.[140] It is hardly surprising, for instance, that the inscriptions accompanying the celebrated tenth-century fresco of Joshua at Hosios Loukas draw from the *Palaia*. Aside from the words that Joshua said to the mysterious person who appeared in front of him and which are taken from the book of Joshua: Ἡμέτερος εἶ ἢ τῶν ὑπεναντίων ("Are you for us or against us?") (Joshua 5:13), the inscription also contains the visitor's response not found in the biblical text: Εἰμὶ Μιχαήλ, ἀρχιστράτηγος τῆς δυνάμεως Κυρίου καὶ ἦλθον τοῦ ἐνισχῦσαι σε ("I am Michael, the chief of the army of Lord, and have come to strengthen you").[141] It has been demonstrated that this inscription as well as several others from Georgia and Russia were taken from *Palaia*, although slightly modified.[142]

In the *kanon* ascribed to Germanos, Joshua's leadership and military exploits are in the foreground, but significantly, the scriptural hero is also directly associated with the emperor. Thus in one of the *troparia*, the poet appeals to God as follows:

---

[137] C. Jolivet-Levy, "*La glorification de l'empereur* à l'*église du Grand Pigeonnier de Cavusin*", *La Cappadoce aux surprenantes richesses. Histoire et Archéologie* 63, May, 73-77; eadem, "L'image du pouvoir dans l'art byzantine à l'époque de la dynastie macédonienne (867-1056)", *Byzantion* 57 (1987) 441-470, esp. 465-466.

[138] L. Rodley, "The Pigeon House Church, Çavuşin", *JÖB* 33 (1983) 301-339. For the representation of John Tzimiskes, see N. Thierry, "Un portrait de Jean Tzimiskès en Cappadoce", *Travaux et Mémoires* 9 (1985) 477-484.

[139] V. Djuric, "Novi Isus Navin", *Zograf* 14 (1983) 5-16.

[140] For the *Palaia*, see briefly *ODB* 3, 1557.

[141] A. Xyngopoulos, "Η τοιχογραφία τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναυῆ εἰς τὴν Μονὴν τοῦ Ὁσίου Λουκᾶ", *Δελτίον τῆς Χριστιανικῆς Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας* 7 (1974) 127-137.

[142] R. Stichel, "L'affresco di Michele arcangelo e Giosuè ad Osios Lukas: La sua interpretazione nel quadro di affreschi simili in Cappadocia e Georgia", *Atti del Primo simposio internazionale sull'arte georgiana*, Milan: Solari, 1977, 289.

Ὁ πάλαι θεράποντι τῷ οἰκείῳ συστρατηγήσας, Ἰησοῦ, κατὰ τῶν ἐναντίων, καὶ νῦν τοῖς βασιλεῦσι κατ᾽ ἐχθρῶν συστρατConήγησον.

You who helped your servant Joshua in waging war against his opponents in the past, now in a similar way also help the emperor against his enemies.[143]

A comparable appeal is expressed in another *troparion*:

Ὡς τοῦ πάλαι Ἰησοῦ ὑπερασπίζων ὤφθης, Κύριε, καὶ νῦν τὸν πιστώτατον ὑπερασπίζου βασιλέα.

In a similar way that you appeared in front of Joshua protecting him in the past, now, too, protect the most pious emperor.[144]

Elsewhere the poet reiterates his prayer by saying:

Ὡς ὑπήκοος τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἐδείχθης ἐν πᾶσι, καὶ τὰ νῦν τοῖς βασιλεύουσι, κλίνον τὸ οὖς σου φιλά[θρωπε].

As you listened to Joshua in all things, so now incline your ear to the emperors.[145]

A final appeal, interestingly, makes an explicit reference to sacred icons venerated by pious emperors:

Ὡς Ἰησοῦ τῷ Ναυῆ συνεστρατήγησας κατ᾽ ἐχθρῶν πολεμίων, οὕτως παράσχου νίκην βασιλεύουσι πιστῶς, τὴν σὴν εἰκόνα τιμῶσι, καὶ τῆς Θεοτόκου, καὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων.

As you helped Joshua the son of Nun against enemies, in a similar way give victory to the emperors, who venerate with faith your image, and those of the Mother of God and of all saints.[146]

The reference to icon veneration indicates that iconoclastic controversy was still fresh in the hymnographer's memory, since only in this context can be understood his association of the imperial success in wars with the veneration of sacred images. However, this topic will be addressed in more detail in Chapter Three.

Conclusion

---

[143] Sinait.gr. 552, f. 11.
[144] Sinait.gr. 552, f. 12.
[145] Sinait.gr. 552, f. 12v.
[146] Sinait.gr. 552, f. 15.

As the analysis of a selected number of the hagiographical hymns attributed to Germanos I showed, in this sub-category of liturgical poetry Byzantine hymnographers exhibited a high level of creativity. They did this to render the celebrated saints present in the Church community, accessible to the congregants and generally relevant to the faithful. Besides their active intercessory role, saints were also presented as images of biblical figures, personified virtues and examplars for emulation. By praising their heroes, the author or authors of the hymns under consideration made it clear that the liturgical commemoration of the saints is inextricably connected with the imitation of their virtues. In this way, Byzantine hymnographers fully adopted the old axiom uttered by John Chrysostom and summarised in the following passage: "Did you imitate (ἐμιμήσω) the martyr? Did you emulate (ἐζήλωσας) his virtue? Did you follow the path of his philosophy? ... The honour to the martyr means the imitation of the martyr".[147]

---

[147] Αἱ τῶν μαρτύρων ἑορταὶ οὐκ ἐν τῇ περιόδῳ τῶν ἡμερῶν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ γνώμη τῶν ἐπιτελούντων κρίνονται. Οἷόν τι λέγω· ἐμιμήσω μάρτυρα; ἐζήλωσας αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀρετήν; κατ' ἴχνος αὐτοῦ τῆς φιλοσοφίας ἔδραμες; καὶ οὐκ οὔσης ἡμέρας μάρτυρος, ἑορτὴν μάρτυρος ἐπετέλεσας. Τιμὴ γὰρ μάρτυρος, μίμησις μάρτυρος. *Joanni Chrisostomi Homilia in Martyres*, PG 50, 663.

Chapter Three

Cult of Relics and Icons

After Chapter One and Chapter Two, which dealt with the Mariological and hagiographical poetry attributed to Germanos, this chapter brings us to another important set of hymnographic writings attached to the patriarch's name, namely, the hymns which extol relics and sacred images. The chapter is divided into two main parts corresponding to its two main topics, relics and icons, and is preceded by an overview of the development of the cult of relics. In my analysis of the relevant hymns, I will primarily focus on their interrelation with other liturgical and hagiographical texts. Wherever possible, I will attempt to situate the hymns within their social context.

On the development of the cult of relics

The development of the cult of the saints in late antiquity was accompanied by that focused on their relics. The practice of venerating the corporeal remains of holy figures has its roots in a generally positive attitude towards the dead body among Christians. Contrary to the pagan and, especially, Jewish traditions, where any contact with the dead body was considered unclean, the Christians treated it with great reverence.[1] Such reverence was expressed, for example, through the gesture of kissing the dead at a funeral. It is not surprising, therefore, that extraordinary Christians, especially martyrs, gradually came to receive veneration by the Christian community to which these individuals belonged. The annual celebration of martyrs' deaths was, along with Sunday as the day of Christ's Resurrection, among the first festal days the Christians observed. Written accounts of martyrdoms circulated within Christian communities as the first saints' Lives, while the martyrs' bodies or body parts became objects of veneration. The famous account of Polycarp's martyrdom, which took place around 155, reports that after his cremation, Polycarp's spiritual flock, having collected his remains, which "were dearer to us than precious stones and finer than gold," buried them in a suitable place. Afterwards, the faithful continued to gather at the burial site "to celebrate the anniversary day of his martyrdom."[2] An obvious conclusion that one can draw from this account is that Polycarp's cult was closely related to his relics.

---

[1] É. Rebillard, *The Care of the Dead in Late Antiquity*, trans. E. T. Rawlings and J. Routier-Pucci, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2009.

[2] H. Musurillo, ed. and trans., *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972, 17.

At the core of the veneration of holy relics was the Christian belief in the spiritual power of the saint's corporeal remains or objects that had been sanctified by coming into contact with the saints.[3] Furthermore, the saints were believed to be omnipresent by simultaneously occupying a place in front of the celestial throne of God and among the congregation. They were also credited with sanctifying the gathering, with healing the faithful from corporeal and spiritual diseases, as well as with interceding on their behalf. This belief was widespread in both East and West, as sources from both traditions confirm. For example, Gaudentius of Brescia (d. 410) expressed a similar idea in regard to the relics of the forty martyrs which he brought from Cappadocia during his pilgrimage to the Holy Land: "pars ipsa, quam meruimus, plenitudo est."[4] The following extract from Theodoret of Cyrrhus (d. 457) encapsulates the early Byzantine understanding of the nature and role of relics:

> The noble souls of the victorious (martyrs) traverse the heavens… their bodies are not obscured by their tombs, but (their relics) are disbursed throughout cities and towns, and they are called doctors and saviours of souls and bodies, and are honoured as protectors and guardians … and though the body has been divided, the grace is not divided, and the smallest of relics is equal in power to the whole martyr.[5]

The notion that the fragmentation of the saints' corpses, with the aim of distributing them to other communities, did not affect the plenitude of the saints' power in even the smallest fragment was apparently developed on analogy with the Christian teaching about the Eucharist. According to this teaching, the body of Christ is present in each particle of the Eucharistic bread. Similarly, the entire saint can be identified with the smallest particles of his or her relics after their division and distribution.[6] The same holds true for fragments of the Holy Cross, the smallest scraps of which retain its entire spiritual force and are sufficient for reminding the faithful about the soteriological events related to Christ's death on the Cross.

---

[3] Bibliography on the development of the cult of the relics is vast. For a brief overview, see *ODB* 3, 1779-1781.

[4] Gaudentius of Brescia, *Tractate* 17, ed. A. Glück, CSEL 68, Vienna: Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1936.

[5] Καὶ αἱ μὲν γενναῖαι τῶν νικηφόρων ψυχαὶ περιπολοῦσι τὸν οὐρανόν… τὰ δὲ σώματα οὐχ εἷς ἑνὸς ἑκάστου κατακρύπτει τάφος, ἀλλὰ πόλεις καὶ κῶμαι ταῦτα διανειμάμεναι σωτῆρας καὶ ψυχῶν καὶ σωμάτων καὶ ἰατροὺς ὀνομάζουσι καὶ ὡς πολιούχους τιμῶσι καὶ φύλακας…Καὶ μερισθέντος τοῦ σώματος, ἀμέριστος ἡ χάρις μεμένηκεν, καὶ ταὸ σμικρὸν ἐκεῖνο καὶ βραχύτατον λείψανον τὴν ἴσην ἔχει δύναμιν τῷ μηδαμῇ μηδαμῶς διανεμηθέντι μάρτυρι. P. Canivet, ed., *Théodoret de Cyr. Thérapeutique des maladies helléniques*, 2, SC 57, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1957, 313-314. Cf. Gregory of Nazianzos's fourth sermon *Against Julian*: Ὧν καὶ τὰ σώματα μόνον ἴσα δύνανται ταῖς ἁγίαις ψυχαῖς, ἢ ἐπαφώμενα, ἢ τιμώμενα. Ὧν καὶ ῥανίδες αἵματος μόνον, καὶ μικρὰ σύμβολα πάθους ἴσα δρῶσι τοῖς σώμασι ("the bodies of the martyrs have the same power as their holy souls, whether one touches them or just venerates them. Just a few drops of their blood, the signs of their sufferings, can effect the same as their bodies"). PG 35, 589D.

[6] On this notion, see D. Krueger, "The Religion of Relics in Late Antiquity and Byzantium", *Treasures of Heaven: Saints, Relics, and Devotion in Medieval Europe,* London: British Museum Press, 2010, 5-17, at 8, and E. D. Hunt, "The Traffic in Relics: Some Roman Evidence", in Hackel, *The Byzantine Saint*, 171-180.

Paulinus of Nola (d. 431) expressed such a conviction in his letter to Sulpicius Severus (d. ca. 425), which accompanied a piece of the Holy Wood intended for the consecration of a new church in Primuliacum in 403 or 404:

> Let not your faith shrink because the eyes of the body behold evidence so small; let it look with the inner eye on the whole power of the Cross in this tiny segment. Once you think that you behold the wood on which our Salvation, the Lord of majesty, was hanged with nails whilst the world trembled, you, too, must tremble, but you must also rejoice.[7]

From the fourth century onwards, along with collecting martyrs' *acta* and building so-called *martyria*—shrines constructed over martyrs' graves—there is evidence that bishops were also engaged in praising, collecting, and translating the relics of martyrs. This new reality influenced many aspects of Christian contemporary culture, primarily Church architecture and ritual.[8] The expansion of the cult of relics was such that already in the fifth century it necessitated canonical regulation. A canon attributed to Bishop Maruta of Maipherqat or "Martyropolis," as the city was also known due to the great number of relics gathered in it, prescribes that the remains of the martyrs should not be kept in private possession, but placed in churches or monasteries, so that "help shall emanate from the treasures of their bones for the needy."[9]

Testimonies about the impact that the saints' remains exerted on the congregants' senses abound in patristic literature. For example, Gregory, bishop of Nyssa, attests that his congregation yearned for physical contact with the relics of Saint Theodore Teron: "For, as if it is the same body, still alive and flourishing, those beholding it embrace it with the eyes, the mouth, the ears. And when they have approached it with all the senses, they pour tears out over it from piety and emotion."[10] Basil the Great states explicitly that "those who touch the bones of the martyrs participate in their sanctity, because of the grace present in the body."[11] The earliest reference to the kissing of sacred objects related to Christian saints can be dated

---

[7] Paulinus of Nola, *Letters* 31, trans. P. G. Walsh, vol. 2, London: The Newman Press, 1967, 126.
[8] For more on this, see L. Larson-Miller, "The Altar and the Martyr: Theological Comparisons in Liturgical Texts and Context", in *Worship Traditions in Armenia and the Neighboring Christian East*, ed. R. R. Ervine, Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press and St. Nersess Armenian Seminary, 2006, 237-260.
[9] Canon 63, in *Canons Ascribed to Maruta of Maipherqat: and Related Sources*, ed. and trans. A. Vööbus, 2 vols, Leuven: Peeters, 1982.
[10] Ὡς σῶμα γὰρ αὐτὸ ζῶν καὶ ἀνθοῦν οἱ βλέποντες κατασπάζονται, τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, τῷ στόματι, ταῖς ἀκοαῖς, πάσαις προσάγοντες ταῖς αἰσθήσεσιν, εἶτα τὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας καὶ τὸ τοῦ πάθους ἐπιχέοντες δάκρυον. Gregory of Nyssa, *De Sancto Theodoro*, ed. J. P. Cavarnos, in: W. Jaeger et al., eds., *Gregorii Nysseni. Sermones*,vol. 10, Leiden: Brill, 1990, 61-71, at 63. For the English translation, see: Gregory of Nyssa, *Homily on St. Theodore*, trans. in J. Leemans et al., *"Let Us Die that We May Live": Greek Homilies on Christian Martyrs from Asia Minor, Palestine and Syria (c. AD 350-AD 450)*, London: Routledge, 2003, 85.
[11] Νυνὶ δὲ ὁ ἀψάμενος ὀστέων μάρτυρος, λαμβάνει τινὰ μετουσίαν ἁγιασμοῦ ἐν τῆς τῷ σώματι παρεδρευούσης χάριτος. *Homily on Psalm 115*, PG 30:112C.

as early as the end of the second century. The *Acts of Paul and Thecla* include a story about Saint Thecla, who bribed a guard to gain access to the prison where the Apostle Paul was held. As she listened to Paul's teaching, she kept "kissing his chains."[12] In this episode it is possible to discern first hints of the idea that material objects could become sacred through their contact with holy individuals.

Relics in Byzantine hymnography

The veneration of relics is a common theme in Byzantine liturgical poetry.[13] Hymnographers showed profound reverence for relics and extolled their miraculous properties such as, for instance, the ability of relics to drive away "evil spirits," "clean the Christians from sins," "cure all sickness," etc. They also praised them as "stronghold against the barbarians," the "protection," "a source of knowledge," and so on. In Byzantine hymnography two types of texts devoted to relics can be distinguished: 1) *akolouthiai*, that is, sets of hymns specially composed for a particular relic, and 2) hymns written in honour of a saint which include references to his or her relics. Special *akolouthiai* are composed for relics directly or indirectly related to Christ and the Virgin Mary, including the Holy Cross, whose exaltation is celebrated on 14 September, the sacred *Mandylion* (16 August), the Virgin's girdle (ζώνη) (31 August), and the Virgin's *maphorion* or Holy Veil (1 October).

For the liturgical remembrance of the invention or translation of the saints' remains separate feasts were also gradually established, demanding an *akolouthia* for the celebrated event. The *akolouthia* was usually comprised of appropriate hymns composed predominantly for that feast. In some cases, however, hymnographic texts written for the main feast of a particular saint were taken by later redactors of liturgical books and incorporated in the *akolouthia* of the invention or translation of the saint's relics, as we shall see below.

Germanos's hymns on relics

The name of Patriarch Germanos I is attached to six hymns included in *akolouthiai* of feast days in honour of relics. Four of these feasts commemorate so-called primary relics, that is,

---

[12] *Acta Pauli et Theclae* 18, in: R. A. Lipsius, ed., *Acta apostolorum apocrypha*, vol. 1. Leipzig: Mendelssohn, 1891 (reprint Hildesheim: Olms, 1972), 235-271.

[13] The relevant bibliography is extremely scant. To the best of my knowledge, the only study that deals with this theme is that of A. Nikiforova, "Relics in Byzantine Hymnography", in A. Lidov, ed., *Relics in Byzantium and Medieval Russia. Written Sources*, Moscow: Progress-Tradition, 2006, 109-176 (in Russian).

holy bodies or body parts: 1) Translation of the relics of John Chrysostom (27 January), 2) First and second Inventions of the Head of John the Baptist (24 February), 3) Translation of the relics of Athanasios the Great (2 May), and 4) Invention of the Relics of Kyros and John, the unmercenary physicians (28 June). The other two have as their subject secondary relics, namely, the Holy Cross and the Holy Lance, both commemorated on the feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross (14 September), and the Veneration of Apostle Peter's precious chains (16 January). Five of these six hymns are nine-ode *kanons*. An exception is the hymn on the translation of the relics of Athanasios the Great, which is a short monostrophic hymn (*sticheron*). The presence of the second ode in these *kanons* allows us to include them in the Constantinopolitan tradition,[14] regardless of whether their author is Germanos or another hymnographer from the Byzantine capital.

On the basis of the content of these hymns it is possible to infer that only three of them, namely, the hymns for the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, the Invention of the Head of John the Baptist, and for the chains of Apostle Peter, were composed specially for the celebrated relics. Unfortunately, the last one, preserved in only one manuscript, Sinait. gr. 598, ff. 111r-v – ?, which is in poor condition, is illegible. For this reason, it will not be considered in the present discussion. The *kanon* on the feast of the Translation of the remains of John Chrysostom was undoubtedly written for his main feast, which commemorates the saint's death (13 November). One of the arguments that can be put forward in support of this claim is that the author does not mention the saint's relics in this hymn. On the contrary, he refers to his death, as for instance in the following two *troparia* from the sixth ode:

> Εἰ καὶ νεκρὸς εἶ ἐν τάφῳ, ἀλλ᾿ ὡς ζῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, Χρυστόστομε, κηρύττεις μετάνοιαν καὶ γράφεις συγχώρησιν...

> O Chrysostom, although you are dead in a grave, you keep preaching repentance and writing forgiveness as if you were alive in the world …[15]

The second *troparion* reads as follows:

> Τὴν παναγίαν σου μνήμην ὁ λαὸς ἑορτάζων, Χρυσόστομε, δοξάζει τὸν κύριον τὸν σὲ ἐκλεξάμενον καὶ καλέσαντα εἰς τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς.

---

[14] Scholars of Byzantine liturgical poetry have pointed out that the use of the second ode was not common among the hymnographers of the Palestinian tradition. See, for example, Rybakov, *Joseph the Hymnographer*, 496-571; Detorakis, *Κοσμᾶς ὁ μελωδός*, 126-128 and idem, *Βυζαντινὴ Ὑμνογραφία*, 71.
[15] *AHG* 5, 425.

O Chrysostom, the people by celebrating your holy remembrance, glorify the Lord, who elected and called you into the eternal dwelling place.[16]

It appears that the same holds true for the hymn on the Invention of the relics of Kyros and John. However, unlike the previous *kanon*, this one, which is preserved in more than fifteen manuscripts, contains a *troparion* in its fourth ode that refers to the remains of the two saints:

Ἄσβεστος αὐγὴ ἐξέλαμψε τῷ κόσμῳ, λείψανα τῶν σῶν μαρτύρων, εὐεργέτα, δι᾽ ἧς ἠλάθη τὸ σκότος τῆς ἀγνωσίας, καὶ ἀντεισήχθη τὸ φῶς τῆς γνώσεως.

Eternal dawn beamed down on the world, the remains of your martyrs, benefactor, through which the darkness of ignorance was driven away and the light of knowledge was introduced.[17]

The *troparion* is encountered in one manuscript only, Sinait. gr. 642, 329v-332, dated to 1523.[18] Accordingly, it should probably be seen as a later interpolation, possibly by the unknown redactor of the manuscript, who wanted to make the *kanon* more suitable for this feast. The hymn with regard to both its form and content differs slightly from one manuscript to another. Hence, it is possible to speak of its multiple versions. The main difference concerns the absence of the second ode from all the manuscripts except for the tenth-century codex Sinait. gr. 620, ff. 137-140.[19]

Apart from the hymns exclusively composed for specific feasts celebrating holy relics, references to the saints' remains as well as to their images are also found in a number of hagiographical hymns attached to the name of Germanos. These references clearly reflect the well-established tradition regarding the holiness and efficacy of saints' relics. A characteristic example is the hymn for the holy physicians Kosmas and Damian (1 July). The hymn features the patristic idea that the bodies of Christian saints are permeated with spiritual power, which enables them to perform healings:

Τὰ τῶν νοσούντων πλήθη, προσερχόμενα πίστει, ὡς ἐκ πηγῆς ἀρύονται τῆς θήκης τῶν λειψάνων τῶν ἀναργύρων σου, Χριστέ, τὰ ἰάματα.

---

[16] *AHG* 5, 425.
[17] Sinait. gr. 642, 330v-331.
[18] V. Gardthausen, *Catalogus codicum graecorom sinaiticorum*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1886, 148.
[19] Gardthausen, *Catalogus codicum graecorom sinaiticorum*, 144.

> Crowds of diseased, approaching with faith, draw remedy from the container of the relics of your unmercenary physicians, O Christ.[20]

Furthermore, a *troparion* from the *kanon* for the annual commemoration of Saint Pionios (15 March), also ascribed to the Constantinopolitan patriarch, singles out three key components of a saint's cult: the invocation of the saint's name and the veneration of his or her relics and images:

> Ἀξιοπρεπῶς σε ὑμνεῖ ἡ σύμπασα κτίσις ὡς προστάτην ὄντα θερμὸν τῶν πιστῶς προσιόντων τῇ εἰκόνι καὶ τῶν λειψάνων τῇ θήκῃ καὶ τῇ ἐπικλήσει σου, Πιόνιε.

> All creation eulogizes you with proper dignity as a fervent protector of those who with faith approach your icon, the container of your relics, and seek your prayer.[21]

It is notable that in the cited stanza the saint's icon and relics are put together, having been given the same importance. They represent two main vehicles through which the faithful have access to a particular saint who intercedes for their salvation. Objects closely associated with a particular saint may be added to these two manifestations and embodiments of sanctity. For example, the author of the *kanon* for the annual commemoration of Saint Symeon the Stylite praises the pillar on which the saint lived and practised his ascetic life. The pillar is mentioned in the second *troparion* of the first ode:

> Τὴν πάνσεπτον μνήμην ἐπιτελοῦντες, καὶ τῶν λειψάνων τὴν σορὸν τιμῶμεν, σοφὲ Συμεών, τὸν στύλον θαυμάζοντες, ἐν ᾧ ὁλοκαυτώθης Θεῷ.

> Celebrating the all-holy commemoration, we honour the chest of your relics, O wise Symeon, and admire the pillar on which you offered yourself as a totally consumed sacrifice to God.[22]

It is noteworthy that the author, having obviously as a point of departure the long tradition of equating asceticism and martyrdom, understands the pillar as a sort of instrument of Symeon's suffering. In this way, the hymnographer offers a rationale for the veneration of the objects associated with the great ascetic.[23]

---

[20] *AHG* 9, 8. A similar idea is found in a *sticheron* for Saint Symeon the Stylite (1 September), also ascribed to Germanos: Θεία χάρις ἀπηώρητο, ἐπὶ τῇ θήκῃ τῶν λειψάνων σου, ἡγιασμένε Συμεών, διὸ καὶ εἰς ὀσμὴν μύρου τῶν θαυμάτων σου δραμούμεθα, τῶν νοσημάτων τὴν ἴασιν ἀρυόμενοι. Ἀλλὰ Πάτερ Ὅσιε, Χριστὸν τὸν Θεὸν ἱκέτευε ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν.

[21] *AHG* 7, 185-186.

[22] Sinait. gr. 579, 5.

[23] A parallel to the cited *troparion* is found in another *kanon* to Saint Symeon the Stylite transmitted in a South Italian manuscript kept in the Monastery of the Holy Saviour at Messina, Mess. gr. 135, ff. 17-19v, at 17 (dated to the thirteenth century): Στύλῳ μίμημα σταυροῦ Συμεών, Σῶτερ, πηξάμενος ἐσταύρωσε τὸ σῶμα καὶ

Martyrdom as analogy to Eucharistic sacrifice

Among other important points concerning the hagiographical hymns attributed to Germanos is the perceived correlation between martyrdom and martyrs' body parts and the Eucharist and the Eucharistic gifts. Based on a well-established tradition widespread in other literary genres and liturgical practice, the author of the hymn in honour of the holy physicians Kyros and John develops such a correlation in several *troparia*. The first instance occurs in the second *troparion* of the seventh ode:

> Ὡς λογικὴν θυσίαν παραδόντες τὸ σῶμα, καὶ ὡς σπονδὴν ἐκχέοντες σοὶ τῷ Θεῷ τὸ αἷμα οἱ ἀθληταί σου Ἰησοῦ ὁλοκαυτώθησαν.

> Having given the body as spiritual sacrifice, and having poured out/shed his blood as a drink-offering to God, your martyrs, Jesus, offered themselves as a totally consumed offering.[24]

The second one is found in the first *troparion* of the eighth ode:

> Εἰδωλικὰς προσοχθίσαντες θυσίας, πνευματικὰς προσηγάγοντο λατρείας, τῇ ἐπουρανίῳ τραπέζῃ οἱ γενναῖοι διὰ τοῦ μαρτυρίου.

> Having been wroth with idolatrous sacrifices, the brave ones offered spiritual worship to the celestial altar through their martyrdom.[25]

Finally, the third example of an interrelation between martyrdom and the Eucharist is found in the second *troparion* of the eighth ode:

> Τὰς μυστικὰς τελετὰς ἱερουργοῦντες, τὰς ἐκτομὰς τῶν μελῶν αὐτῷ προσῆγον, ὡς δεκτὰς θυσίας, τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὸ αἷμα τραπέζῃ καὶ κρατῆρι.

> Celebrating the mystical rites, they offered cut parts of their body to him (God) as acceptable sacrifices, the body and blood on the altar and in the chalice.[26]

In all three cases, the martyrs' bodies are compared to and virtually identified with the Eucharistic gifts offered at the Eucharistic Liturgy. Instead of offering bread and wine, the martyrs are presented as sacrificing their own body and offering it at the celestial altar.

συνανύψωσε τὸν νοῦν ἑαυτῷ (Symeon, having planted a pillar as an icon of the Cross, O Saviour, crucified his body and raised up his mind with it). *AHG* 1, 32, first *troparion* of the third ode.
[24] Sinait. gr. 642, 331v.
[25] Sinait. gr. 642, 331v-332.
[26] Sinait. gr. 642, 332.

In this context one last example from the corpus of hymns under examination needs to be cited, namely, the following *troparion* from the *kanon* for Saint Anthimos (3 September):

> Τὸν σὸν δεσπότην ἐκμιμούμενος, ὡς κριὸς ἤχθης ἐπίσημος πρὸς τὸ τυθῆναι ἀθλητά, οὐκ ἐρίζων οὐ κραυγάζων σοφέ, τῷ πνεύματι δὲ χαίρων, ὡς πρὸς ζωήν, διαπερῶν ἐκ προσκαίρου θανάτου.

> Emulating your master, you were led like a symbolic ram to the slaughter to be sacrificed, O martys, neither arguing nor shouting, O wise one, but rejoicing, as if crossing from temporary death toward life.[27]

Here the author elaborates upon Isa 53 to model the celebrated saint on the "Suffering Servant",[28] unanimously identified with Christ in Christian tradition. In addition to this, in its first part this *troparion* has a Eucharistic character since it is virtually identical with the words, which the priest cites during the rite of *Proskomide* while making incisions in the Eucharistic bread.[29]

The close link between the Eucharist and martyrdom is an old idea, which Enrico Mazza explains in the following way:

> Since martyrdom is an imitation of the passion of Christ and since the Eucharist too is an imitation of the passion, it follows that there should be a special connection between the Eucharist and martyrdom. Both belong to the same order of things, with martyrdom imitating the passion of Christ in a fully real way and the Eucharist imitating it in a rite which in turn is connected with the fulfilment of figures.[30]

The concept is encountered already in the *Letters* of Ignatios of Antioch[31] and the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*.[32] In his letter to the Roman Church, Ignatios insists on the importance of the imitation of Christ's passion through martyrdom in order to be truly Christ's disciple.[33]

---

[27] Sinait. gr. 552, f. 30.
[28] ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγὴν ἤχθη καὶ ὡς ἀμνὸς ἐναντίον τοῦ κείροντος αὐτὸν ἄφωνος οὕτως οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ (he was led like a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before its shearers is silent, so he did not open his mouth), Isa 53:7.
[29] Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, 545.
[30] E. Mazza, *The Celebration of the Eucharist: The Origin of the Rite and the Development of Its Interpretation*, Minnesota MN: Liturgical Press, 1999, 135.
[31] P. T. Camelot, ed., *Ignace d'Antioche*, *Lettres*, SC 10, Paris: Édition du Cerf, 1958.
[32] For an edition and English translation of this early Christian writing, see Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, 1-21. See also B. Dehandschutter, *Martyrium Polycarpi. Een literair-kritische studie*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologicarum Louaniensium 52, Leuven: Universitaire Presse, 1979.
[33] *Letter to the Romans*, 2-7, SC 10, 126-134. For the idea of the imitation of Christ's passion in the saint's martyrdom see C. R. Moss, *The Other Christs: Imitating Jesus in Ancient Christian Ideologies of Martyrdom*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Moreover, he imbues his imminent death in Rome with a clear allusion to the Eucharist by mentioning the "pure bread of Christ" he longs to become: "I am the wheat of God, and am ground by the teeth of the wild beasts, that I may be found the pure bread of Christ."[34] This indirect reference becomes more obvious if we keep in mind that the bread and wine, on the one hand, and martyrdom, on the other, participate in Christ's passion. We should also see the account of Polycarp's martyrdom in this light; he was within the flames "not as burning flesh but rather as bread being baked."[35] What is more, the report that his martyrdom took place on a Saturday possibly reflects the practice of the Christian community in which the *Martyrdom* was composed to celebrate the Eucharist on Saturday.[36] The respect which Polycarp's community showed to his remains can be compared only to the treatment of the Eucharistic bread and wine after their consecration during the Eucharistic Liturgy.

Such ideas remained current following the period of persecution, as can be observed from both written and material sources. To demonstrate how closely interrelated martyrdom, martyrs' relics, and the Eucharist were in the mind of Christian communities of the fourth and fifth centuries, the *vaso* from Belezma (Algeria), discovered beneath the altar of a ruined church, could be taken as an example.[37] The inscriptions engraved on the object can be related to both the Eucharist and saints' relics:

1. Ecce locus inquirendi D(omi)n(u)m ex toto corde. Amen, Chr(ist)e.
2. In isto vaso s(an)c(t)o congregabuntur membra Chr(ist)i.[38]

Based on the content of the inscriptions no less than on the object's shape, earlier scholars identified it as a reliquary that contained the remains of a Christian saint. More recent scholarship, however, recognises it as a Eucharistic chalice.[39] This example indicates that in practice the Christians paid similar respect to Christ's body, which was given to them in the form of the Eucharistic gifts, and to the martyrs' remains, which were an object of utmost veneration. The examples from Germanos's hymns cited above, in which the martyr saints'

---

[34] Σῖτός εἰμι Θεοῦ καὶ δι᾽ ὀδόντων θηρίων ἀλήθομαι, ἵνα καθαρὸς ἄρτος εὑρεθῶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. *Letter to the Romans*, 4, *SC* 10, 130.

[35] καὶ ἦν μέσον οὐχ ὡς σὰρξ καιομένη ἀλλ᾽ ἄρτος ὀπτώμενος. Musurillo, *The Martyrdom of St. Polycarp*, 15, p. 14. For a comprehensive comparative analysis of the account of Polycarp's martyrdom and the Eucharistic prayer of the early Church, see Mazza, *The Celebration of the Eucharist*, 135-136.

[36] Musurillo, *The Martyrdom of St. Polycarp*, 21, p. 18. For the importance of Saturday for some early Christian communities, see D. Boyarin, *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999, 12-13.

[37] Y. Duval and Ch. Pietri, "*Membra Christi*, culte des martyrs ou théologie de l'eucharistie? (Apropos du vase de Belezma, en Algérie)", *Revue des études augustiniennes* 21 (1975) 289-301.

[38] Duval and Pietri, *Membra Christi*, 294.

[39] See Duval and Pietri, *Membra Christi*, 289-301, who identify it as a Eucharistic chalice.

body parts are associated with the Eucharistic gifts, clearly demonstrate the continuation of the intense early Christian devotion to the saints' remains in later Byzantine piety. Perhaps the clearest expression of this link is the practice of burying martyrs under the altar and the later requirement that relics be used for the consecration of churches and altars. I will have more to say about this practice in the discussion of the relic of John the Baptist's head.

In what follows, I will examine two *kanons* dedicated solely to relics. One of these *kanons* is composed for the feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, but interestingly, in addition to the Cross, it also praised the Holy Lance. The other *kanon* was written for the Invention of the Head of John the Baptist.

1. Exaltation of the Holy Cross (14 September)

The *kanon* for the Exaltation of the Holy Cross attributed to Germanos has as its subject both the Holy Cross and Holy Lance, which were regarded as two of the most important instruments of Christ's passion, widely venerated in the Byzantine capital. However, since the Holy Lance did not have its own feast day and *akolouthia*,[40] hymns composed for the feast of the Exaltation sometimes contain references to the Lance too. The Lance and the Cross were transferred to Constantinople in 612[41] and around 634[42], respectively, and both instantly became integrated into the Constantinopolitan liturgy.

The feast of the Exaltation of the Cross, celebrated on 14 September, was established in Constantinople "on the occasion of the arrival of the relic in 630 or 634."[43] The seventh-century *Chronicon Paschale* refers to two liturgical events linked with the Cross—its

---

[40] "The Holy Wood was unique in having a major feast specifically of the relic, not of some event in its history". J. Wortley, "The Wood of the True Cross", in: *Studies on the Cult of Relics in Byzantium up to 1204*, Variorum collected studies series, Farnham and Burlington: Ashgate, 2009, VI, 16.
[41] *ODB* 3, 1480.
[42] J. Wortley, "Relics and the Great Church", *BZ* 99 (2006) 631-647, at 638.
[43] Wortley, "The Wood of the True Cross", 17. There is evidence to suggest, however, that a fragment of the Holy Cross was sent to Constantinople as early as the fourth century. See Wortley, "The Wood of the True Cross", 8-9; *ODB* 3, 2125.

invention, known as σταυροφάνεια, which took place on 17 September,[44] and its exaltation in Hagia Sophia on the 14th of the same month. The second one is mentioned in relation to the translation of the Holy Sponge to Constantinople in 612.[45] The Exaltation was the principal feast of the Holy Cross. The feast was preceded by a four-day public veneration of the relic in the church of Hagia Sophia.[46] Along with the *Typikon* of the Great Church, the *Book of Ceremonies* provides detailed information concerning the involvement of the emperor and his court in the celebration of the feast.[47] Beyond the feast of the Exaltation of the Cross, the Holy Wood was also venerated during the fourth week of Lent, from Tuesday to Friday,[48] as well as on 1 August.[49]

The Holy Lance was brought to Constantinople, along with the Holy Sponge, by Emperor Herakleios's cousin, the general Niketas Patrikios. It was venerated in a ceremony on 28 October in 612.[50] Some sources testify that the Holy Lance was also displayed for veneration on particular days of the liturgical year. For example, the author of the *Chronicon Paschale*, describing the translation of this relic from the Holy Land to Constantinople, specifies that it was venerated in Hagia Sophia for four days:

> On the 28th of *Hyperberetaeos*, the month of October according to the Romans, a Saturday, on the eve before the Lord's Day, the precious spear was brought from the Holy Land, since one of those close to the accursed Salvaras, after it had been captured by them, had given it to the aforementioned Nicetas. And straightway, on the same Lord's Day, it was proclaimed in the most holy Great Church to which it had been brought. And on the Tuesday and Wednesday it was venerated by men, and on Thursday and Friday by women.[51]

---

[44] *Chronicon Paschale*, ed. L. Dindorf, CSHB, Bonn: Weber, 1832, 531. English translation by M. Whitby and M. Whitby, *Chronicon Paschale 284-628 AD*, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1989, 20.

[45] "And on the 14th of Gorpiaeus, the month September according to the Romans, in the third indiction, the precious sponge was fastened on to the life-giving Cross at the third Exaltation and was itself also exalted with it in the most holy Great Church, since it had been dispatched by Nicetas the patrician." *Chronicon Paschale*, 705. English translation by M. Whitby and M. Whitby, *Chronicon Paschale 284-628 AD*, 157.

[46] J. Mateos, ed. *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, OCA 166, Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1962, vol. 1, 24-27.

[47] A. Moffatt and M. Tall, trans., *Constantine Porphyrogennetos. The Book of Ceremonies*, Byzantina Australiensia 18, Canberra: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 2012, 124-128; A. Cameron, "The Construction of Court Ritual: The Byzantine Book of Ceremonies in Rituals of Royalty," in D. Cannadine and S. Price, eds., *Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987, 106-136.

[48] *Le Typicon de la Grande Eglise*, ed. J. Mateos, (OCA 166), Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1963, vol. 2, 40-44.

[49] *The Book of Ceremonies*, 538-541, 549-550.

[50] Briefly on Niketas and the translation of these two relics see *ODB* 3, 1480.

[51] Καὶ τῇ κη΄ τοῦ ὑπερβερεταίου, κατὰ Ῥωμαίους ὀκτωβρίου μηνός, ἡμέρᾳ ζ΄, τῇ ἐπὶ κυριακὴν νυκτί, ἠνέχθη ἡ τιμία λόγχη ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων τόπων, ἑνὸς τῶν ἐγγιζόντων τῷ καταράτῳ Σαλβάρᾳ μετὰ τὸ ληφθῆναι αὐτὴν παρ᾽ αὐτῶν, δεδωκότος αὐτὴν τῷ μνημονευθέντι Νικήτᾳ. Καὶ εὐθέως αὐτῇ τῇ κυριακῇ ἐκηρύχθη ἐν τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ

Furthermore, according to the *Typikon* of the Great Church, the Holy Lance was displayed for veneration during the Holy Week as well. More precisely, the *Typikon* prescribes that the veneration should take place in the church of Hagia Sophia for two days, namely on Holy Thursday and Good Friday.[52] The *Typikon* also provides the *troparion* chanted during its veneration on Holy Friday:

> Προσκυνοῦμεν τὴν λόγχην τὴν νύξασαν τὴν ζωοποιὸν πλευρὰν τῆς σῆς ἀγαθότητος, καὶ τὴν ἀνεξιχνίαστόν σου συγκατάβασιν δοξάζομεν.

> We venerate the lance, which pierced the life-giving side of your goodness, and [we] glorify your unsearchable accommodation.[53]

The fact that both the Holy Cross and the Holy Lance had a very developed cult in Constantinople may serve as an additional proof of the Constantinopolitan origin of the *kanon* and may even point to Germanos's authorship.

It bears emphasising that the Holy Lance was imbued with sacramental, and more specifically, Eucharistic meaning already in the *Chronicon Pascale*. The author of the text, after a quotation from John 19: 33-34: ("But when they came to Jesus and saw that He was already dead, they did not break His legs. But one of the soldiers pierced His side with a spear, and immediately blood and water came out"), adds that the flow of blood and water symbolise "two purifying sacraments: Baptism and Communion."[54] This interpretation deserves particular attention if we consider that the presence of the Holy Lance in Constantinople and the liturgical piety that was developed around this relic probably gave an impetus to the further development of the rite of preparing the bread and wine for the celebration of the Eucharist, called *Proskomide* or *Prothesis*, in the Eastern Church. It is usually argued that the purely functional preparation of the bread and wine received a new, symbolical dimension some decades after the translation of the relic to Constantinople. The first step in this direction was giving the name of λόγχη (lance, spear) to the liturgical implement that was used as a knife in this rite. Not accidentally, the implement even took the shape of a spear. Marco Mandalà in his study on the *Prothesis*, which, although written in the

---

μεγάλη ἐκκλησίᾳ ὡς ἠνέχθη· καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ καὶ τετράδι προσεκυνήθη ὑπὸ ἀνδρῶν, πέμπτῃ δὲ καὶ παρασκευῇ ὑπὸ γυναικῶν. *Chronicon Paschale*, 705. English translation by M. Whitby and M. Whitby, *Chronicon Paschale 284-628 AD*, 157. [52] *Le Typicon de la Grande Eglise*, vol. 2, 72-78.

[52] *Le Typicon de la Grande Eglise*, vol. 2, 72-78.

[53] *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, vol. 2, 72.

[54] Ἐπὶ δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐλθόντες, ὡς εἶδον αὐτὸν ἤδη τεθνηκότα, οὐ κατέαξαν αὐτοῦ τὰ σκέλη, ἀλλ᾽ εἷς τῶν στρατιωτῶν λόγχῃ αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευρὰν ἔνυξεν, καὶ εὐθέως ἐξῆλθεν αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ, τὰ δύο καθάρσια τοῦ τε βαπτίσματος καὶ τῆς μεταλήψεως τῶν ἀχράντων αὐτοῦ μυστηρίων. *Chronicon Paschale*, 413.

mid-1930s, remains a classic, opines that the cutting (*incisione*) of the holy bread with the liturgical sacrificial knife called λόγχη represents the earliest phase in the evolution of the Preparation rite.[55] However, according to some more recent studies, the inclusion of the lance in the *Prothesis* rite marks the second stage of its development, whereas the prayer Ὁ Θεός, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν ὁ τὸν οὐράνιον ἄρτον... was the first ritual element of the preparation of bread and wine. Thomas Pott summarises the results of modern liturgiologists regarding the symbolism developed around the liturgical use of the lance as follows:

> Combined with the citation from Isaiah ("Like a lamb he is led to the slaughter, and like a sheep that before its shearers is dumb" [Is 53:7]), the lance took on the symbolic importance of the prothesis. Indeed, the incision with the lance in "the bread of offering (ὁ ἄρτος τῆς προθέσεως), that is the one who is pierced", makes of the bread the antitype of the immolated Son of God, just as the lance "takes the place of the lance that pierced the side of Christ on the Cross". The mixing of wine and water in the chalice is here entirely integrated into the symbolic representation, for "the wine and water are the blood and the water that poured from his side" (cf. John 19:34).[56]

The liturgical commentary ascribed to Patriarch Germanos I, which is preoccupied with the instruments of the Passion and represents one of the earliest sources to call the liturgical knife λόγχη,[57] highlights that this liturgical implement "corresponds to the lance which pierced Christ on the Cross."[58] Theodore of Studios (d. 826) a generation later also refers to the instruments of Passion in the sacramental context:

> Do you not think that the divine myron [chrism] is to be regarded as a type of Christ, the divine table as his lifegiving tomb, the linen as that in which he was buried, the lance [for the Eucharist] of the priest as that which pierced his side, and the sponge as that in which he

[55] M. Mandalà, *La protesi della liturgia nel rito bizantino-greco*, Grottaferrata: Scuola Tipografica Italo-Orientale "San Nilo", 1935, 98.

[56] T. Pott, *Byzantine Liturgical Reform. A Study of Liturgical Change in the Byzantine Tradition*, (trans. from the French by P. Meyendorff), Crestwood, NY: St.Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2010, 203. For the complete history of the *Prothesis* rite see G. Descoeudres, *Die Pastophorien im syro-byzantinischen Osten. Eine Untersuchung zu architektur- und liturgiegeschichtlichen Problemen*, Schriften zur Geistesgeschichte des östlichen Europa 16, Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1983, 85-126. For the liturgical lance see also R. Taft, *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. The Precommunion Rites*, OCA 261, Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium, 2000, 348-350.

[57] Cf. Taft, *The Precommunion rites*, 348-349. Taft refers to another contemporary explicit mention of the lance encountered in the story of a wonder-working icon from the Island of Lemnos (p. 349, n. 125). For this story, see J. Munitiz, "Wonder-working Icons and the Letters to Theophilos", *Byzantinische Forschungen* 24 (1997) 115-123, cited by Taft.

[58] Ἀντὶ γὰρ τῆς λόγχης τῆς κεντησάσης τὸν Χριστὸν ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ, ἐστὶ καὶ αὕτη ἡ λόγχη. Meyendorff, ed. and trans., *St Germanus of Constantinople on the Divine Liturgy*, 70.

received the drink of vinegar? Set all these aside, and what will be left to render present the divine mysteries?.[59]

Liturgical hymns for the feast under consideration clearly reflect the sacramental interpretation developed around the instruments of the Passion, which were kept in Constantinople. For example, this idea can be observed in an anonymous *kanon* preserved in a single manuscript from Southern Italy (Mess. gr. 52, ff. 2v-3v), dated to the eleventh century. In the second *troparion* of the seventh ode of this hymn we read:

Τὸν σταυρὸν προσκυνοῦντες καὶ τὴν λόγχην σήμερον καὶ τὰ παθήματα τοῦ ζωοδότου, δι᾽ ὧν ἀνεκαίνισε τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ, ὑμνεῖτε, εὐλογεῖτε, λαοί, καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

Today, worshipping the Cross and the lance, as well as the suffering of the Life-giver, through which he renewed [humankind] with his blood, O people, sing, praise and exalt him exceedingly unto the ages.[60]

One should see the *kanon* attributed to Germanos in the same light. The seventh *troparion* of the ninth ode reads as follows:

Προσκυνῶ καὶ δοξάζω τὸν σταυρόν σου καὶ λόγχην, τὴν νύξασαν, Κύριε, πλευράν σου τὴν ἄχραντον, τὴν πηγάζουσαν ἡμῖν ἀθανασίας καὶ ἀφθαρσίας νάματα.[61]

I venerate and glorify the Cross and lance, which pierced, O Lord, your immaculate side that springs to us streams (Eucharistic wine) of immortality and incorruption.

Another reference to the λόγχη in this hymn may also be seen here. In the second *troparion* of the fourth ode the author, referring to Christ's death, singles out the lance, which "pierced his side", without any reference to the Cross:

Ἀγγελικαὶ χοροστασίαι κατεπλήττοντο, καὶ χερουβὶμ καὶ σεραφὶμ κατεκαλύπτοντο, ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ σε βλέπουσαι, λόγχην τὴν πλευρὰν ἐκκεντούμενον.[62]

Choirs of angels admired, and cherubim and seraphim covered themselves, when they saw you on the Cross, having been pierced in your side with a lance.

---

[59] Ἤ οὐ δοκεῖ σοι τὸ θεῖον μύρον εἰς Χριστοῦ τύπον εἰλῆφθαι; Τὴν θείαν τράπεζαν ἀντὶ τοῦ ζωοποιοῦ τάφου; τὴν ἐπ᾽ αὐτῇ σινδόνα ἀνθ᾽ ἧς καὶ ἐν ᾗ εἰληθεὶς ἐτάφη; τὴν ἱερατικὴν λόγχην, ἀνθ᾽ ἧς καὶ ἐν ᾗ τὴν θεόσωμον πλευρὰν ἐνύγη; τὸν σπόγγον, ἀνθ᾽ οὗ καὶ ἐν ᾧ πιὼν ἐχολώθη; τὸ σταυρικὸν ἐκμαγεῖον, ἀντὶ τοῦ ζωοποιοῦ ξύλου; Ἄνελε ταῦτα πάντα, καὶ εἴ τι ἕτερον εἰς ἀντιτυπίαν θείαν. Theodore of Studios, *Adversus Iconomachus* (PG 99: 489B).
[60] *AHG* 1, 248-249.
[61] Ode nine, Sinait. gr. 552, f. 130v.
[62] Ode four, Sinait. gr. 552, f. 128.

Through the mention of the heavenly spiritual powers of cherubim and seraphim, the poet stresses the cosmic dimension of Christ's Crucifixion. Mary Cunningham has pointed out that the increasing interest in angels and in "the encounter between the earthly and heavenly spheres of existence" in reference to events of sotereological importance is a feature commonly found in the works of liturgical writers and hymnographers from the sixth century onwards.[63] Notably, Byzantine liturgical commentaries also refer to the presence of the heavenly powers during the sacramental sacrifice, just as they were present on Golgotha at the time of Christ's historical sacrifice.[64]

Along with comparing the lance to the spear which pierced Christ's side at the time of his Crucifixion on Golgotha, the author of the *kanon* links it with Christ in an opposite way too. Namely, the hymnographer refers to the lance as a weapon used by Christ himself to stab the heart of Hades during his sojourn in the underworld. In the third and last mention of the λόγχη in this hymn, the author addressed Christ with the following words:

> Ὁ τὸν σταυρόν σου, ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τοῦ Ἄδου ὡς λόγχην πήξας ἅγιε Κύριε βοήθησόν με.

> O holy Lord, you who stuck your Cross like a spear into the heart of Hades, help me.[65]

This idea is encountered in earlier patristic sources, and may go back as early as the fourth century. For example, it is found in the homily on "The Precious and Life-giving Cross" ascribed to Ephrem the Syrian (d. 373): "With this precious weapon Christ tore apart the voracious stomach of Hades and blocked the treacherous fully opened jaws of Satan. Seeing this, Death quaked and was terrified, and released all whom he held beginning with the first man."[66] In the sixth century, Romanos the Melode uses the same conceit in his *kontakion On the Victory of the Cross*:

> Τρεῖς σταυροὺς ἐπήξατο ἐν Γολγοθᾷ ὁ Πιλᾶτος· δύο τοῖς ληστεύσασι καὶ ἕνα τῷ Ζωοδότῃ· ὃν εἶδε ὁ Ἄδης καὶ εἶπε τοῖς κάτω· Ὦ λειτουργοί μου καὶ δυνάμεις μου, τίς ὁ ἐμπήξας ἧλον τῇ καρδίᾳ μου; ξυλίνη με λόγχη ἐκέντησεν ἄφνω, καὶ διαρήσσομαι τὰ ἔνδον μου πονῶ, τὴν κοιλίαν μου ἀλγῶ, τὰ αἰσθητήριά μου καὶ μαιμάσσει πνεῦμά μου καὶ ἀναγκάζομαι

---

[63] M. Cunningham, "The Reception of Romanos in Middle Byzantine Homiletics and Hymnography", *DOP* 62 (2008) 251-261, at 258.

[64] Meyendorff, ed. and trans., *St Germanus of Constantinople on the Divine Liturgy*, ch. 37, p. 86.

[65] Ode six, Sinait. gr. 552, f. 129.

[66] Ἐν τούτῳ τῷ ἁγίῳ ὅπλῳ διέρρηξε Χριστὸς τὴν παμφάγον τοῦ Ἄδου γαστέρα καὶ τὸ πολύμηχανον τοῦ Διαβόλου ἐνέφραξε στόμα. Τοῦτον ἰδὼν ὁ θάνατος, τρομάξας καὶ φρίξας, πάντας οὓς εἶχεν ἀπὸ τοῦ πρωτοπλάστου ἀπέλυσε. *Sermo in pretiosam et vivificam crucem*, K. G. Phrantzoles, ed., *Sancti patris nostri Ephraem Syri opera omnia*, vol. 4, Thessaloniki: To Perivoli tis Panagias, 1995, 129-154, at 135.

ἐξερεύξασθαι τὸν Ἀδὰμ καὶ τοὺς ἐξ Ἀδάμ ξύλῳ δοθέντας μοι ξύλον τούτους εἰσάγει πάλιν εἰς τὸν παράδεισον.

> Pilate fixed three crosses on Golgotha, two for the robbers, and one for the giver of life. When Hades saw him, he said to those below: "O my priests and forces, who has fixed the nail in my heart? A wooden spear has pierced me suddenly and I am torn apart. I am in pain–internal pain; I have a bellyache; my senses make my spirit quiver, and I am forced to vomit forth Adam and those descended from Adam, given to me by a tree. The tree leads them back again into Paradise".[67]

The striking similarity between Ephrem's homily and Romanos's *kontakion* leaves little doubt that the hymn of the most famous Byzantine melodist was inspired by Ephrem.[68]

It is significant that the motif of the stabbing of Hades also occurs in the visual arts of the Middle Byzantine period. On a tenth-century ivory panel with the Crucifixion, now kept in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, the Cross on which Christ is crucified is planted in the belly of Hades, carved at the bottom of the scene.[69]

Finally, Christian authors could have borrowed both this idea and the vocabulary from Homer's *Iliad*. The account of the death of Alcathous, one of the Trojan leaders, makes reference to "the spear stuck in his heart."[70] The similarity is notable, although in the Homeric epic the word δόρυ is used instead for λόγχη.

---

[67] 286. For the English translation, see M. Carpenter, tran. and annot., *Kontakia of Romanos, Byzantine Melodist I: On the Person of Christ*, Columbia, Mo.: University of Missouri Press, 1970, 230.

[68] For Romanos the Melode's use of Ephrem the Syrian in general, see W. L. Petersen, "The Dependence of Romanos the Melodist upon the Syriac Ephraem: Its Importance for the Origin of the Kontakion", *Vigiliae Christianae* 39 (1985) 171-187, and more recently M. Papoutsakis, "The Making of a Syriac Fable: From Ephrem to Romanos", *Le Muséon* 120 (2007) 29-75.

[69] For the image on the panel, see H. C. Evans and W. D. Wixom, eds., *The Glory of Byzantium: Art and Culture of the Middle Byzantine Era, A.D. 843-1261*, New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1997, no. 97, 151-152. For more on the panel and the development of the theme, M. E. Frazer, "Hades Stabbed by the Cross of Christ", *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 9 (1974) 153-161. Except for the quoted Romanos' *kontakion* as a possible source of inspiration for the artist, Frazer also refers to a sermon attributed to John Chrysostom, but probably of a later date (between the fifth and seventh centuries).

[70] δόρυ δ᾽ ἐν κραδίῃ ἐπεπήγει. Il. 13, 442. Cf. also George of Pisidia's poem *In restitutionem S. Crucis*, in which he applies this image to Chosroes II, the king of the Sasanian empire, who invaded Byzantium in 604 and took the Holy Cross from Jerusalem in 614, but was defeated in 628: ὁ Χοσρόης μὲν ὡς ξύλον κατερφόνει / εὗρεν δὲ λόγχην τῆς ἑαυτοῦ καρδίας (vv. 67-68). *Giorgio di Pisidia, Poemi. I. Panegirici Epici*, ed. A. Pertusi, Ettal: Buch-Kunstverlag, 1959, 228.

Instruments of the Passion and Iconoclasm

At this juncture, it is worth considering in some detail references to the lance in the context of the iconoclastic debates. The instruments of the Passion emerged as an important point of reference in the course of disputes about the validity of religious images. To begin with, the iconoclasts embraced relics as objects of veneration far superior to icons. For the iconodules, on the other hand, the instruments of the Passion constituted a proof that Christ had assumed a real human body. This fact, in turn, legitimised the practice of depicting Christ in icons. John of Damascus, the most prominent defender of icon veneration during the first phase of Iconoclasm, refers to the instruments of the Passion twice in his *Apologetic Treatises against Those Decrying the Holy Images*.[71] Notably, when he speaks of the lance, he also points out that Christ's side was stabbed by it, evidently to stress the concrete, tangible physicality of his human body: "All these are material: the Cross, the sponge, the reed, the lance that pierced the life-giving side".[72] Furthermore, the attribute "life-giving" intimates sacramental connotations behind these words. The patristic tradition frequently stresses that in the Baptism and Eucharist the faithful partake in the blood and water that flowed from Christ's side.[73]

It bears emphasising that preserved works of visual art from this period, especially images of the Crucifixion dated to the eighth and ninth centuries, as well as miniatures found in several psalters with marginal illustrations dating from the ninth to the eleventh centuries, provide an additional piece of evidence regarding the use of the instruments of the Passion, particularly the lance, in the context of the iconoclastic debates. For example, in the Khludov Psalter[74] (GIM gr. 129D, ca. 843–847), the Barberini psalter (Vatican Barb. Gr. 372, tenth century), and the Theodore Psalter (British Library, Ms Add. 19352) (eleventh century),[75] marginal vignettes showing Christ on the Cross assign a prominent role to the lance. In these

---

[71] *Joannis Damasceni Contra imaginum calumniatores orationes tres*, Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos, vol. 3, ed. B. Kotter, Berlin–New York: W. de Gruyter, 1975, 118, 148.

[72] Ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα ὕλη· ὁ σταυρός, ὁ σπόγγος καὶ ὁ κάλαμος, ἡ τὴν ζωηφόρον πλευρὰν νύξασα λόγχη. Kotter, 3, 147-148.

[73] Cf. the following statement by Chrysostom: "The symbols of baptism and the mysteries [i.e. the Eucharist] come from the side of Christ. It is from his side, therefore, that Christ formed his Church, just as he formed Eve from the side of Adam." John Chrysostom, *Huit Catéchèses Baptismales*, ed. and tran. A. Wenger, SC 50, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1957, 161.

[74] M. V. Schepkina, *Miniatyury Chludovskoj Psaltyri. Grecheskiy Illyustrirovannyj Kodeks IX veka*, Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1977, fol. 67r. For the description and the explanation of this miniature, see K. Corrigan, *Visual Polemics in the Ninth-Century Byzantine Psalters*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992, 30, and 162, notes 20 and 21.

[75] E. Boeck, *Imagining the Byzantine Past: The Perception of History in the Illustrated Manuscripts of Skylitzes and Manases*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015, 149-154.

images, the piercing of Christ's side by the lance is paralleled and virtually equated with the act of whitewashing an icon of Christ performed by iconoclasts. Not accidentally, the pole used to disfigure the divine likeness resembles a lance.

Cross and Emperor

Aside from being a source of spiritual power, the Cross is regularly associated with the empire and the emperor himself. This link is highlighted by both Byzantine and western authors. The belief in the "victory of the Cross," particularly its invincibility in the hands of the emperor, is ultimately part of the legacy of Constantine the Great.[76] According to later tradition, during Constantine's reign his mother Helena discovered the True Cross in Jerusalem and had a part of it dispatched to her son. Still more important for the theme of the victorious Cross is Constantine's celebrated vision of the Cross, as narrated by Church historians. Accounts of this vision, which was first reported by Lactantius ca. 315[77] and subsequently reiterated in a more extensive version by Eusebios towards the end of the 330s, state that Constantine saw the apparition of a Cross in the sky on the eve of the battle of the Milvian Bridge against Maxentius in 312. This event fundamentally changed the emperor's life and played a decisive role in his conversion to Christianity. The story was an important source of inspiration for later Byzantine authors, including hymnographers. Especially relevant for Greek-speaking writers was Eusebios' interpretation of the vision, in which the Cross is called a "trophy" (τρόπαιον) through which Constantine achieved his victory. Here is how Eusebios describes Constantine's vision:

> About the time of the midday sun, when day was just turning, he said he saw with his own eyes, up in the sky and resting over the sun, a cross-shaped trophy formed from light, and a text attached to it which said, 'By this conquer'.[78]

---

[76] On the relation between the cross, and other relics related to Christ's passion, and the emperor, see H. A. Klein, "Sacred Relics and Imperial Ceremonies at the Great Palace of Constantinople", in F. A. Bauer, ed., *Visualisierungen von Herrschaft, BYZAS* 5 (2006) 79-99.

[77] Lactantius, *De mortibus persecutorum*, ed. and trans. J. L. Creed, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984, 33-34.

[78] Ἀμφὶ μεσημβρινὰς ἡλίου ὥρας, ἤδη τῆς ἡμέρας ἀποκλινούσης, αὐτοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἰδεῖν ἔφη ἐν αὐτῷ οὐρανῷ ὑπερκείμενον τοῦ ἡλίου σταυροῦ τρόπαιον ἐκ φωτὸς συνιστάμενον, γραφήν τε αὐτῷ συνῆφθαι λέγουσαν· τούτῳ νίκα. I. A. Heikel, ed., *Eusebius Werke I. Über das Leben Constantins. Constantins Rede an die Heilige Versammlung. Tricennatsrede an Constantin*, GCS 7, Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1902, 1.28 (p. 21). For the English translation, see A. Cameron and S. Hall, *Eusebius: Life of Constantine*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999, 81.

By this vision—a divine revelation to the first Christian emperor—Constantine was instructed to embrace the Cross as a potent instrument that would secure him victory against his enemy. Between the sixth and ninth centuries, this foundational narrative was supplemented by a number of similar legends according to which Constantine experienced analogous visions of the Cross before his other victories.[79] Although the historical reliability of all these stories is far from certain, what is relevant to our purpose is the critical link between Constantine and the sign and relic of the Cross.

The belief in the vital role of the Cross for the emperor and the survival of the empire permeated the official imperial ideology for centuries. Some of the most prominent Church Fathers, including John Chrysostom, elaborated on this belief. For Chrysostom, the Cross was like a trophy, a symbol of victory upon which brave emperors displayed the booty taken from the troops of the defeated enemy.[80]

The significance and authority of the True Cross was further reinforced in the period of Heraklios due to his victorious campaign against the Persians, the recovery of the Holy Wood from Persia, and especially the relic's translation to Constantinople. As pointed out by Paul Magdalino, these events strengthened the faith in the victorious power of the Cross among the Byzantines:

> The end of the seventh century provided a favourable context for the integration of the veneration of Christ's Passion into the court's ritual due to the fact that the Holy Cross, the Holy Lance and the Sponge were already in Constantinople. In 691-692 Justinian II issued a gold coin with the image of Christ on its obverse, and it is about the same year when the eschatological motive of the last emperor who would defeat the Arabs and conquer Jerusalem appeared. The cult of Christ's Passion responds well to the idea of the reintegration of the Holy Land in the earthly kingdom of the King of Kings, announcing his Second Advent.[81]

From the second half of the seventh century there is abundant evidence for the widespread veneration for the relics of Christ's Passion, particularly the True Cross, in the Byzantine capital, a veneration displayed by the populace at large, but also by the imperial family. For

---

[79] On these legends, see Kazhdan, *A History of Byzantine Literature (650-850)*, 132-135.

[80] Καθάπερ γὰρ βασιλεὺς γενναῖος πόλεμον νικήσας χαλεπώτατον, τὸν θώρακα καὶ τὴν ασπίδα καὶ τὰ ὅπλα τοῦ τυράνου καὶ τῶν στρατιωτῶν τῶν ἡττηθέντων ἐφ᾽ ἡψηλοῦ τοῦ τροπαίου τίθησιν· οὕτω καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς τὸν πόλεμον νικήσας τὸν πρὸς τὸν διάβολον, τὰ ὅπλα αὐτοῦ πάντα, τὴν κατάραν ἐκρέμασεν ἐφ᾽ ὑψηλοῦ τοῦ σταυροῦ, καθάπερ ἐπὶ τροπαίου τινός... PG 49, 394-398.

[81] P. Magdalino, "L'Église du Phare et les Reliques de la Passion à Constantinople (VIIe/VIIIe-XIIIe siècles)", in J. Durand and B. Flusin, eds., *Byzance et les Reliques du Christ*, Paris: Association des amis du Centre d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance, 2004, 15-30, at 22.

example, the pilgrim Arculf observed this during his visit to Constantinople around 670.[82] The presence of the figure of the Cross on many of Justinian II's monetary emissions should be seen in this context.[83] Aside from evoking Justinian's dynastic associations with Herakleios, the emperor who had brought the Holy Wood to Constantinople, the figure of the Cross on his coins also proclaimed that the symbol of Christian victory was a supreme palladium, capable of protecting the empire and its ruler. One should also recall in this connection that, from the end of the sixth century onward, the religious aspect of imperial military triumphs was emphasised through liturgical processions and ceremonies. Particularly important in this regard was the liturgical celebration of the great victories of the Byzantine army during the reign of Emperor Maurice in 592/593, when an all-night vigil took place in the church of Hagia Sophia. After the service, the emperor "together with the people, made prayers of supplication that God would deem him worthy of receiving more distinguished signs of victory."[84] Additional steps towards a sort of ritualization of imperial military victories can be detected in both the announcement of Herakleios's final victory against the Persians in an *epinikia* letter that was read from the ambo of Hagia Sophia and in an *adventus* ceremony held on the occasion of his triumphal return to Constantinople. According to the *Chronicle of Theophanes*, the people, going out to meet the Emperor, "sent up to God hymns of thanksgiving."[85] It is not possible to determine what kind of hymns the people sang. However, it cannot be excluded that some of them were in liturgical use, as for example, the famous hymn Σῶσον, Κύριε, τὸν λαόν σου (O Lord, save your people), which came close to being a "national anthem" of the Byzantines. Finally, it is worth recalling that Byzantine emperors frequently sponsored the creation of lavish reliquaries for fragments of the Holy Cross.[86] This practice is a powerful testament to the close association between the emperor and the Cross as one of the main imperial symbols.

---

[82] Arculfus, *De Locis Sanctis* III, 3, in: T. Tobler, ed., *Itinera et Descriptiones Terrae Sanctae* I, Geneva: J. C. Fick, 1877, 193-5. Quoted according to J. Breckenridge, *The Numismatic Iconography of Justinian II (685-695, 705-711 A.D.)*, New York: American Numismatic Society, 1959, 101, n. 40.

[83] Breckenridge, *The Numismatic Iconography of Justinian II*, pl. I-III, V.

[84] *Theophylacti Simocattae historiae*, ed. C. De Boor, Leipzig: Teubner, 1887, 6, 8, 8, 235: εἶτα μετὰ τοῦ λεῶ τὰς ἱκετηρίας εὐχὰς ποιησάμενος ἠξίου τὸ θεῖον ἐπισημότερα δοῦναι τὰ τρόπαια. See also *The Chronicle of Theophanes*, in which it is stated the emperor "offered hymns of thanksgiving to God together with all the people of the city". *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor*, trans. C. Mango and R. Scott, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997, 394.

[85] Mango and Scott, *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor*, 457. For further discussion, see M. McCormick, *Eternal Victory. Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium and the Early Medieval West*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990, 69-70.

[86] For the most recent study on Byzantine reliquaries, see B. Hostetler, *The Function of Text: Byzantine Reliquaries with Epigrams, 843-1204* (PhD dissertation), Florida State University, 2016.

The development of the cult of the Cross from the fourth century onwards, briefly sketched above, had a direct impact on liturgical poetry. Liturgical hymns for the Exaltation of the True Cross repeatedly stress not only the spiritual dimension of the Cross in Christian life, but also its military and triumphant functions. Hymnographers frequently eulogize the Cross as a powerful weapon, which brings victories to the emperors and secures peace in the empire. In the *kontakion* sung annually on the feast of the Exaltation of the True Cross, as well as at weekly offices, namely, on Wednesday and Friday Matins, it is sung:

> Εὔφρανον ἐν τῇ δυνάμει σου τοὺς πιστοὺς βασιλεῖς ἡμῶν, νίκας χορηγῶν αὐτοῖς, κατὰ τῶν πολεμίων, τὴν συμμαχίαν ἔχοιεν τὴν σήν, ὅπλον εἰρήνης, ἀήττητον τρόπαιον.

> Make our faithful emperors glad in your strength, giving them victory over their enemies: may your Cross assist them in battle, weapon of peace and unconquerable sign of victory.[87]

Kosmas the Melode's *kanon* for this feast is preoccupied with the idea of imperial victory to such a degree that Alexander Kazhdan has called it "a political document."[88] Kazhdan explains this feature by the fact that Kosmas was writing in Palestine, which was occupied by the Arabs. The *kanon*, accordingly, expresses the author's hope for liberation by the Byzantine emperor. Characteristic of Kosmas's insistence on the link between the emperors and the True Cross is the following passage:

> Οἱ τῇ θείᾳ ψήφῳ, προκριθέντες ἀγάλλεσθε, Χριστιανῶν πιστοὶ Βασιλεῖς, καυχᾶσθε τῷ τροπαιοφόρῳ ὅπλῳ, λαχόντες θεόθεν, Σταυρὸν τὸν τίμιον, ἐν τούτῳ γὰρ φῦλα πολέμων, θράσος ἐπιζητοῦντα, σκεδάννυνται εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

> You, faithful Christian emperors, forechosen by divine decree, rejoice. Receiving from God the venerable Cross, make this victorious trophy your glory, for by it the tribes of the enemy that rashly seek battle are scattered unto all ages.[89]

The use of such military language to highlight the close connection between the Cross and imperial successes on the battlefield resonates with the testimony of Bishop Arculf from his pilgrimage mentioned above. According to his report, on Great Thursday the emperor and the army entered the church of Hagia Sofia in order to kiss the True Cross.[90] This practice signals the reliance on the military power of the Cross by the emperor and his army, the power that Kosmas's *troparion* invokes by urging the emperors to wield the Cross as a mighty weapon.

---

[87] For the English translation, see *Menaion*, 148, slightly modified.
[88] Kazhdan, *A History of Byzantine Literature (650-680)*, 114.
[89] *Kanon* for the Exaltation of the Holy Cross; Ode 8, *troparion* 3. *Menaion*, 150.
[90] Arculfus, *De Locis Sanctis* III, 3.

One should note, however, that Kosmas's *kanon* is not an exception in this regard, as Kazhdan would seem to imply. For example, an anonymous *kanon* for the same feast contains similar military references. The second *troparion* of the third ode is characteristic:

> Εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀναδειχθεὶς ὁ τοῦ Κυρίου σταυρὸς ἀντιπάλους ἐχθροὺς ἐτροπώσατο καὶ νῖκος ἐμήνυσε τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν ἡμῶν.

> The Cross of the Lord, having been displayed in heaven, put to flight the enemies wrestling against us, and declared victory to our emperors.[91]

Another hymn dedicated to the True Cross, which is sung on the third Sunday of Lent, associates imperial triumphs with the Cross in a comparable fashion:

> ὅπλον ἀκαταγώνιστον, κραταίωμα ἄρρικτον, τῶν βασιλέων τὸ νῖκος, τῶν ἱερέων τὸ καύχημα.

> You are an invincible weapon, an unbroken stronghold; you are the victory of the emperors and the glory of the priests.[92]

References to the emperor in Germanos's kanon

The author of the *kanon* ascribed to Germanos made a major contribution in the theme of the imperial and military significance of the Cross. His poetic work contains more references to the close link between the emperor and the Cross than any other preserved hymn. These references revolve around three main axes. First, the hymnographer expresses his faith in the military power of the Cross, which is based on the assistance provided by the Cross to Constantine the Great against his enemies, who are called "barbarians." This idea is articulated in the third *troparion* of the ninth ode:

> Ὁ ζωοποιὸς σταυρός, ἐν τῇ γῇ κρυπτόμενος, εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἐδείκνυτο, τρόπαιον ἀήττητον, καὶ βασιλεῖ ἐπιφανεῖ, κατὰ βαρβάρων νίκην ἐδωρήσατο.

> The life-giving Cross, being hidden in the earth, was shown in the heavens as an invincible trophy; it granted victory against the barbarians to the glorious emperor.[93]

---

[91] *AHG* 1, 245. Cf. the *kanon* attributed to Andrew of Crete, in which it is said that the emperor and people gather around the Cross: Ἀνυψούμενος σήμερον ὁ ζωηφόρος σταυρὸς ἐν κόσμῳ βασιλέα συνεκάλεσε καὶ λαοὺς συνήγαγε καὶ τὴν κτίσιν πᾶσαν ἐφαίδρυνε. (The life-giving Cross having been lifted up in the world, summoned and brought together emperor and people, and brightened up with joy all creation). The first *troparion* of the fourth ode: *AHG* 1, 255.

[92] Lenten *Triodion*, the second *sticheron* on the Great Vespers.

Second, the author places an emphasis on the emperor's piety, which could be understood as a precondition for receiving that assistance. The following two *troparia* are very characteristic in this regard:

> Σοῦ τὸν σταυρὸν διανοίᾳ καὶ χερσὶν ἐκτυπώσας ὁ θεόφρων βασιλεύς, ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ βοᾷ σοί: εὐλογητὸς εἶ Κύριε.

> The God-minded emperor, having figured your Cross with his mind and hands, shouts with delight to You: You are blessed, O Lord.[94]

> Ὁ καθοπλίσας σταυρῷ, τὸν πιστὸν βασιλέα, καὶ πίστει κραταιώσας, δόξα σοι δόξα σοι, Ἰησοῦ Υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

> You who have armed the pious emperor with the Cross and strengthened him with faith, glory to You, glory to You, O Jesus, Son of God.[95]

Finally, the third *troparion* of the sixth ode represents a prayer to God expressed on behalf of the entire community to strengthen the emperor:

> Χορήγησον βασιλεῖ πιστοτάτῳ, δεόμεθα, τὴν ἰσχύν σου, διὰ τοῦ ζωηφόρου σταυροῦ σου, Χριστέ, ἐν σοὶ γὰρ καυχᾶται καὶ ἐλπίζων εἰς σὲ διασώζεται.

> We pray, grant to the most pious emperor your power, through your life-giving Cross, O Christ; he boasts about You and, placing his hopes in You, will be saved.[96]

As can be observed, the cited examples, which associate the emperor and his army with the victory-bringing power of the Cross, speak of enemies in general terms. However, Byzantine hymnographers did not confine themselves exclusively to general references; rather, some of them, including the author of the hymn attributed to Germanos, are far more specific, as we will see below.

---

[93] Sinait. gr. 552, f. 130.
[94] The fourth *troparion* of the seventh ode. Sinait. gr. 552, f. 129v.
[95] The fourth *troparion* of the fifth ode. Sinait. gr. 552, f. 128v.
[96] Sinait. gr. 552, f. 129.

Anti-Muslim Polemic

In addition to his invocations of the Cross's might phrased in generic terms, the author of the *kanon* for the Exaltation of the True Cross ascribed to Germanos makes specific references to the power of the Cross against the Muslims. The rise and expansion of Islam represented the most acute threat to the Byzantine empire in both military and ideological terms from the seventh century onwards, since the Muslim Arabs laid claims to the same territory and cultural heritage as Byzantium.[97] To counter the new religion, many Byzantine authors engaged in polemics with its proponents by producing separate polemical writings, often in the form of a dialogue between a Christian and a "Saracen."[98] This kind of polemic was also frequently incorporated in more popular literary genres, including saints' lives. For instance, the *Life of Constantine*, the apostle of the Slavs, relates the protagonist's dispute with a Muslim during his mission to the Caliphal court in Baghdad.[99] Echoes of this existential threat to the empire found their way into liturgical texts, especially hymns, through which the faithful prayed for imperial victory.

In the *kanon* under discussion, the author glorifies the emperor and expresses his hope that the offspring of Hagar will be defeated by the power of the True Cross. This idea is articulated in the fourth *troparion* of the third ode:

> Ὥσπερ σταυροτύποις ἔτρεψας ἐν Σινᾷ παλάμαις Ἀμαλὴκ τὸν ἀλλόφυλον, τοὺς τῆς Ἄγαρ τῷ πιστωτάτῳ βασιλεῖ ἡμῶν ὑπόταξον.

> In the same way as you defeated the Amalkites, the foreigners in Sinai, by the hands put in the form of the Cross, subject the <race> of Hagar to the most pious emperor.[100]

In this hymn, the Muslims are denoted as descendants of Hagar: "those of Hagar" or "the offspring of Hagar." Originally, in its biblical usage, the word "Hagarenes" designated the offspring of Abraham's slave Hagar (Gen. 16; Chr. 5:19, and Ps. 82:7). However, after the appearance of Islam, Byzantine authors employed the terms "Hagarenes" or "Hagarites" to

---

[97] P. Speck, "The Origins of the Byzantine Renaissance," in: *Understanding Byzantium. Studies in Byzantine Historical Sources*, Variorum Collected Studies Series, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003, 143-162, at 144.

[98] The earliest one is *Controversy between a Saracen and a Christian*, attributed to John of Damascus, but apparently composed in the second half of the eighth century. For the Greek text and English translation, see D. Sahas, *John of Damascus on Islam*, Leiden: Brill, 1978, 142-155.

[99] F. Dvornik, *Les légendes de Constantin et de Méthode vues de Byzance*, Prague: Orbis, 1933, 354-358.

[100] Sinait. gr. 552, f. 128.

denote the Arabs, who were believed to be the offshoot of Hagar's son Ishmael.[101] Another common term for Arab Muslims was "Saracenes," especially in the earliest Byzantine sources dealing with the Arab conquests. For example, both Sophronios, patriarch of Jerusalem (d. 638), and the author of the *Doctrina Jacobi nuper baptizati*, use this term in 634.[102]

One of the central concerns articulated in this hymn is the hope that the Hagarenes will be subjected to the emperor. The same concern is encountered already in the earliest Byzantine writings that make reference to the Arab Muslims. In his *Synodical Letter*, Sophronios of Jerusalem expressed his wish that the "strong and mighty sceptre" of the Christian emperors would destroy the pride of all barbarians, "but especially of the Saracens" and "cast down their insolent acts."[103] Gradually, this idea found its way into liturgical poetry—one should recall that Sophronios himself was a distinguished hymnographer—, but instead of the "sceptre" Byzantine hymnographers invoke the strength of the Cross.

In the present *troparion*, the author, appealing to God to subject the Muslims to the emperor, refers to the Old Testament battle of the chosen people against the Amalkites (Ex. 17:8-16). He provides a typological interpretation of the biblical event according to which the Israelites won the battle because Moses had his hands raised during the battle: "As long as Moses held up his hands, the Israelites were winning" (Ex. 17:11). The author sees the figure of the Cross in the position of Moses' hands. In this, the author follows a well-established tradition, for ever since Justin Martyr Christian exegetes claimed that Moses kept his hands lifted in a cruciform fashion.[104] By pointing to this interpretation, the author sent a message to the congregation that the power of the Cross, which in its Old Testament type had brought victory to the Old Israel, could now help the emperor, as the leader of the New Israel, to defeat "those of Hagar," that is, the Muslims. It is worth mentioning that, aside from hymnographic texts, other Byzantine sources of liturgical character also refer to the Arab Muslims as Amalkites. For example, in the late seventh century, Anastasios of Sinai (d. after

---

[101] For example, see John of Damascus, *De haeresibus* 100, in B. Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos IV. Opera polemica*, Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1981, 60.

[102] H. Usener, "Weihnachtspredigt des Sophronios", *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 41 (1886) 501-516; V. Déroche, ed., "Doctrina Jacobi nuper baptizati", *Travoux et mémoires* 11 (1991) 47-229. For a more extensive discussion, see W. Kaegi, "Initial Byzantine Reactions to the Arab Conquest", *Church History* 38.2 (1969) 139-149.

[103] P. Allen, *Sophronius of Jerusalem and Seventh-Century Heresy. The Synodical Letter and Other Documents*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009, 154-155.

[104] See also the following *troparion* from the *kanon* for the Exaltation attributed to Andrew of Crete: Τὸν τύπον τοῦ σταυροῦ μηνύων ποτὲ Μωϋσῆς ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους, σταυροτύπως χερσὶ παρέστη ἐν μέσω Ἀαρὼν καὶ τοῦ Ὤρ, καὶ τῷ σημείῳ ἐνίσχυεν ὁ λαὸς κατὰ τῶν ἀντιπάλων. *AHG* 1, 256.

700) in his sermon on the creation of man uses the phrase "the Amalkites of the desert" (ὁ ἐρημικὸς Ἀμαλήκ) referring to the Arabs: "and swiftly arose the Amalkites of the desert, who struck us, the people of Christ (τὸν λαὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ)."[105]

The correlation between the Muslims and the Amalkites contains hints of theological polemics against Islam. More specifically, since Islam also claimed its right to the title of the Chosen People, Byzantine authors, including the composer of the hymn under discussion, were eager to associate their Muslim foes with the Amalkites. Their intention seems to have been to declare that, if the followers of the new religion have any place within the larger framework of the divinely conceived unfolding of human history, it is to be sought among the enemies of the Chosen People.

Another allusion to the Muslims in this *kanon*, which also includes an appeal to God to subject them to the emperor, is found in the fourth *troparion* of the fourth ode:

Τὸ χορηγοῦν ἰσχὺν κατ᾿ ἐναντίων ἐχθρῶν τῷ πιστοτάτῳ βασιλεῖ, καὶ ὑπότασσον αὐτῷ τοὺς ἐκ τῆς Ἄγαρ ἄφρονας, ξύλον τοῦ σταυροῦ προσκυνήσωμεν.

Let us bow before the wood of the Cross, which provides the power to the most pious emperor against enemies, and subjects to him the foolish offspring of Hagar.[106]

Apart from associating the Cross with imperial power, this poetic statement contains elements of a dogmatic polemic against Islam. The explicit reference to the veneration of the "wood of the Cross," which is posited as a source of strength against the Hagarenes, could be seen in the light of Muslim anti-Christian polemical literature. This literature focused, among other things, on the Christian veneration of the Cross, which the Muslims considered mere wood and thus unworthy of reverence.[107] For example, the anonymous middle Byzantine sermon published by Marc de Groote features a phraseology very similar to the one used in our *troparion*: "The Hagarenes allege that you worship mere wood (ξύλον ἁπλῶς λέγοντας

---

[105] K.-H. Uthemann, *Sermones duo in constitutionem hominis secundum imaginem Dei*, CSCG 12, Turnhout: Brepols, 1985, 55-83, at 56. A similar expression is used in the chronicle of Theophanes: ἀνέστη ὁ ἐρημικώτατος Ἀμαλὴκ τύπτων ἡμᾶς τὸν λαὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ("Amalek rose up in the desert, smitting us, the people of Christ"). C. de Boor, *Theophanis chronographia*, vol. 1, Leipzig: Teubner, 1963, 332. For the English translation, see Mango and Scott, *The Chronicle of Theophanes*, 462. Maximos the Confessor denoted the Arabs as ἔθνος ἐρημικόν, that is "nation of the desert", in his dogmatic epistle a century earlier. PG 91, 540A.

[106] Sinait. gr. 552, f. 128v.

[107] For the role of the Cross in the anti-Muslim polemic, see K. Corrigan, *Visual Polemics in the Ninth-Century Byzantine Psalters*, , Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992, 91-94; eadem, "*In the Beginning was the Word*: Art and Orthodoxy at the Councils of Trullo (692) and Nicaea II (787)", in: A. Louth and A. Casiday, eds., *Byzantine Orthodoxies. Papers from the Thirty-sixth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Durham*, 23-25 March 2002, Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies 12, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006, 95-101.

προσκυνεῖν σε).”[108] By using a similar vocabulary, the hymnographer seeks to convey the message to the congregation that this “wood” is a strong weapon in the imperial hands that could be deployed against the Muslims. It is well-documented that members of the Umayyad dynasty worked systematically to remove or destroy crosses and sacred images. The most extreme step in this direction was undertaken by Caliph Yazid II (720-724), who issued a decree prohibiting crosses (and icons) from public display in 721.[109] Byzantine theologians felt it necessary to respond to these attacks against the main Christian symbol. John of Damascus refers to this issue in his treatise *On Heresies*, in which he treats Islam in a separate chapter: “They also defame us as being idolatrous because we venerate the Cross, which they despise.”[110] The *kanon* under consideration shows that Byzantine liturgical hymns could also serve as instruments of religious polemics.[111] Addressed to a wide audience, these texts could be effectively mobilised to communicate messages that delineated dogmatic differences and strengthened the congregation’s sense of identity vis-à-vis a common foe.

2. The First and Second Inventions of the Head of John the Baptist (24 February)

The poetic treatment of the relic of the head of John the Baptist presents a similarly rich body of motifs, images, and allusions that bring together the veneration of this relic with several other areas of religious practice and belief. Before turning to the text itself, however, it is necessary to lay out briefly the complex history of the relic. The story of the discovery of the Baptist’s head is quite complicated, since it is a story involving at least two heads.[112]

---

[108] M. de Groote, “An Anonymous Sermon against the Hagarenes, the Bogomils, and the Jews”, *The Harvard Theological Review*, 97.3 (2004) 329-334 and 336-351, at 336-337.

[109] A. Vasiliev, “The Iconoclastic Edict of the Caliph Yazid II, A.D. 721”, *DOP* 9/10 (1955/56) 23-47. And more recently, R. Schick, *The Christian Communities in Palestine from Byzantine to Islamic Rule: A Historical and Archaeological Study*, Princeton, NJ: The Darwin Press, 1995, 215-217; M. Guidetti, *In the Shadow of the Church: The Building of Mosques in Early Medieval Syria*, Leiden: Brill, 2016, 87-88, with further bibliography.

[110] B. Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, vol. 4, Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1981, 64. D. Sahas, *John of Damascus on Islam: The ‘Heresy of the Ismaelites’*, Leiden: Brill, 1972, 137. See also S. Griffith, “Theodore Abu Qurrah’s Arabic Tract on the Christian Practice of Venerating Images”, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 105 (1985) 53-73, at 65; idem, “Christian, Muslims, and the Image of the One God: Iconophilia and Iconophobia in the World of Islam in Umayyad and Early Abbasid Times”, in: B. Groneberg und H. Spieckermann, ed., *Die Welt der Götterbilder*, Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 2007, 347–380.

[111] The Byzantines response to the Muslim attacks against the veneration of the Cross can also be discerned in the marginal psalters produced in the ninth century. See Corrigan, *Visual Polemics in the Ninth-Century Byzantine Psalters*, 86, 91-92.

[112] A classical monograph on this Baptist’s relic remains that of Ch. du Cange, *Traité historique du chef de S. Jean Baptiste*, Paris 1665. See recently J. Wortley, “Relics of ‘the Friends of Jesus’ at Constantinople”, in: Durand and Flusin, eds., *Byzance et les Reliques du Christ*, 143-157, esp. 145-149, and S. Margutti, “The Power

Sozomen provides an account of the invention and translation of the "first head." As he related in his *Church History*, the head was found in Jerusalem during the reign of the emperor Valens (364-378), who ordered that the relic be taken to Constantinople. However, the order could not be executed, because the mules that carried the chariot with the Baptist's head suddenly stopped at the village of Panteichion near Chalcedon. As "neither the application of the lash, nor the threats of the hostlers," could induce them to advance further, this extraordinary event was considered by all, including the emperor himself, to be a sign given by God. For that reason, the holy head was deposited at the nearby village of Cosilaos.[113]

What Valens could not accomplish became possible to his successor, the emperor Theodosios (379-395). Theodosios, "impelled by an impulse from God, or from the prophet," came to the village, placed the head with the container in which it was encased in a purple robe, and transferred it to a suburb of Constantinople called Hebdomon, where he erected "a spacious and magnificent temple."[114] The relic was deposited at this church on 21 March 392.[115] Strange as it may seem, this head was never mentioned again in the preserved Byzantine sources.[116] As this translation is not recorded by any other contemporary or later authors, including John Chrysostom, who was appointed archbishop of Constantinople several years after the supposed translation had happened, Silvia Margutti argues that the story of the translation of the Baptist's head to Constantinople in 392 is a myth invented by Sozomen in support of Theodosios II and Pulcheria's political ambitions. According to Margutti, as the gathering of relics had a pivotal role in building a political and religious identity of the Byzantine capital, the invention of the translation to Constantinople of such a precious relic served the imperial ambition to give "the capital of the East a prestigious status

---

of the Relics: Theodosius I and the Head of John the Baptist in Constantinople", *Studia Patristica* 62 (2013) 339-352.

[113] Ὑπὸ δὲ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον διεκομίσθη εἰς Κωνσταντινούπολιν ἡ Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ κεφαλή, ἣν Ἡρωδιὰς ᾐτήσατο παρὰ Ἡρῴδου τοῦ τετράρχου. ... προσέταξεν Οὐάλης εἰς Κωνσταντινούπολιν αὐτὴν κομισθῆναι. καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἀποσταλέντες ἐπιθέντες ὀχήματι δημοσίῳ ἦγον· ὡς δὲ εἰς τὸ Παντείχιον ἧκον (χωρίον δὲ τοῦτο Χαλκηδόνος), οὐκέτι προσωτέρω βαδίζειν ἠνείχοντο αἱ τὸ ὄχημα καθέλκουσαι ἡμίονοι, καὶ ταῦτα τῶν ἱπποκόμων ἐπαπειλούντων καὶ τοῦ ἡνιόχου χαλεπῶς τῇ μάστιγι κεντοῦντος. ὡς δὲ οὐδὲν ἤνυον (ἐδόκει δὲ πᾶσι καὶ αὐτῷ τῷ βασιλεῖ παράδοξον εἶναι καὶ θεῖον τὸ πρᾶγμα), ἀπέθεντο ταύτην τὴν ἱερὰν κεφαλὴν ἐν τῇ Κοσιλάου κώμῃ. Sozomen, *HE* 7.21.

[114] Περὶ δὲ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον ἢ τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ αὐτοῦ τοῦ προφήτου κινοῦντος ἧκεν εἰς τήνδε τὴν κώμην Θεοδόσιος ὁ βασιλεύς, βουλομένῳ τε τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ τὸ λείψανον λαβεῖν ... περιλαβὼν τῇ ἁλουργίδι τὴν θήκην ἐν ᾗ ἔκειτο ἔχων ἐπανῆλθε, καὶ πρὸ τοῦ ἄστεως Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἔθετο ἐν τῷ καλουμένῳ Ἑβδόμῳ, μέγιστον καὶ περικαλλέστατον τῷ θεῷ ἐνθάδε ναὸν ἐγείρας. Sozomen, *HE* 7.21.

[115] Wortley, "Relics of 'the Friends of Jesus' at Constantinople", 147. The author of the *Chronicon Paschale* dates its translation from Chalcedon to Constantinople to 391. Ibid, n. 19.

[116] Wortley, "Relics of 'the Friends of Jesus' at Constantinople", 148.

in relation to the other Christian cities," as well as the ideological basis for the "claim to the primacy of Constantinople throughout the Empire, and even in respect to Rome."[117]

The evidence of the "second head" emerges in the discourse on the translation of the right hand of John the Baptist in 956, composed for the Emperor Constantine VII and ascribed to the tenth-century writer Theodore Daphnopates.[118] Daphnopates informs us that, when Justinian sought to celebrate the encaenia of the restored church at Hebdomon, he borrowed John the Baptist's head from Emesa for that occasion. Daphnopates's account reads as follows:

> Some considerable time elapsed and then this is what the Emperor Justinian did, in addition to other pious measures which he took. He transferred to the capital this wonder-working right hand of the Forerunner from Antioch, the tunic of Christ our God ἐν Μαρατσμέρῃ τῇ πόλει [?] and the all-venerable head out of Emesa. Sealing these with the seal of the Emperor-among-the-saints Constantine, he ensured that no fragment could be removed from them. When the seals were removed he sanctified and consecrated the church he had built for the Forerunner in the Hebdomon with the Dominical tunic and the other relics. After that he set his own seals upon them and sent them back where they came from, except that he left the prophet's hand unsealed because it was exuding myrrh and continued to do so until the feast of the Exaltation [of the Holy Cross, 14 Sept.].[119]

After this quotation, Wortley proceeds to describe the history of this head. According to tradition, John's head was found in the time of Constantine the Great. Thereafter, it was stolen and hidden in a cave to be discovered again only on 18 February 453. On October 26 of the same year, the head was deposited at a monastery founded at the site of the cave where it had been hidden before, remaining there until 761. In that year, it was moved to Emesa, "presumably for security reasons."[120] This piece of evidence is given by the chronicler Theophanes, who states that it was still there in ca. 813, when his Chronicle was composed:

> In the same year [759/760] the head of Saint John the Forerunner and Baptist was translated from the monastery of the Cave to his splendid church in the city of Emesa and a crypt was built, wherein to this very day it is worshipped by the faithful and honoured with both

---

[117] Margutti, *The Power of the Relics*, 350, 351.
[118] On Theodore Daphnopates, see Kazhdan, *A History lif Byzantine Literature, II: 850-1000*, 152-157.
[119] *BHG* 849, Θεοδώρου τοῦ Δαφνοπάτου λόγοι δύο, ed. B. Latyshev, *Pravoslavnyj Paleslinkij Sbomik* 59, 1910, 25. Quoted according to Wortley, "Relics of 'the Friends of Jesus' at Constantinople", 148.
[120] Wortley, "Relics of 'the Friends of Jesus' at Constantinople", 148.

material and spiritual incense while it pours cures upon all who come to it in a spirit of faith.[121]

This is the last mention of the head in Emesa. The precious relic turns up again in the ninth century. The sources now speak of its discovery in Comana in Armenia or Cappadocia, and its translation to Constantinople in the time of Patriarch Ignatios (847-858) and Emperor Michael III (842-867). Its final destination in the Byzantine capital was the Studios Monastery, which was dedicated to the Baptist.[122]

Authenticity of the kanon *attributed to Germanos*

The corpus of the hymnographic writings attributed to Patriarch Germanos contains a nine-ode hymn in the honour of the First and Second Inventions of John the Baptist's Head. The hymn was published in the sixth tome of the series *Analecta Hymnica Graeca*.[123] A slightly extended version of the hymn is preserved in a manuscript from the collection of the Historical Museum of Moscow, GIM Sin. grec. 181, ff. 119v-122, dated to the eleventh century, which the editor of *AHG* did not use.

Similar to other *kanons* attached to the name of Germanos, the *heirmoi* used in this hymn do not belong to the same sequence and are not attributed to the same author in Eustratiadis's *Heirmologion*. However, compared to the other *kanons*, the vast majority of the *heirmoi* in this *kanon* are attributed to Germanos, with the exception of the heirmos of the sixth ode (Χιτῶνά μοι παράσχου φωτεινόν), which is transmitted under the name of John the Monk (Ποίημα Ἰωάννου Μοναχοῦ), and the *heirmos* of the eighth ode (Τὸν τοῦ παντὸς Δημιουργόν), which is not included in Eustratiadis's *Heirmologion* under Germanos's name or the names of other hymnographers.[124] Yet the *heirmoi* ascribed to the patriarch belong to three different sequences: the one of the first ode (Τῷ ἐκτινάξαντι ἐν θαλάσσῃ) is found under No. 328;[125] the *heirmoi* of the second (Πρόσεχε, οὐρανέ, καὶ λαλήσω), the third (Ὁ στερεώσας Λόγῳ τοὺς οὐρανούς), and the ninth ode (Τὸν προδηλωθέντα ἐν ὄρει) belong to

---

[121] Mango and Scott, *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor*, 596-597, and n. 2.
[122] Wortley, "Relics of 'the Friends of Jesus' at Constantinople", 149.
[123] *AHG* 6, 375-382.
[124] Eustratiadis, *Heirmologion*, No. 321, p. 224.
[125] Eustratiadis, *Heirmologion*, 220.

sequence No. 324;[126] finally, the heirmoi of the fourth (Μυστικῶς ὁ προφήτης προωρῶν), the fifth (Ὁ ἐκ νυκτὸς ἀγνοίας θεογνωσίας), and the seventh ode (Ὁ ἐν ἀρχῇ τὴν γῆν θεμελιώσας) are borrowed from the sequence under No. 323.[127] The presence of at least one *heirmos* whose author was not Germanos could point to the composition of the hymn at some later date and by another author who used model stanzas of earlier authors to compose his *kanon*. An additional and possibly more convincing argument against Germanos's authorship is the fact that John's head was brought to Constantinople one century after Germanos's death. It is conceivable that the *kanon* was composed on the occasion of this translation or even later.

Content of the kanon

The hymn is of a high quality, written in a solemn tone and with the effective use of rhetorical devices. Building upon the theme of John's vocation as a preacher of repentance, the hymnographer playfully claims that, after the saint's death, his head continues to preach. Resuming the Bapist's mission, the discovered skull urges repentance. This idea is voiced at the very beginning of the hymn:

> Ὁ τὰς ἀβάτους πάλαι καρδίας δείξας βασίμους τῷ Θεῷ, νῦν ἐκ τῶν τῆς γῆς καταχθονίων βοᾷ πρὸς ἡμᾶς· ἀνέωγεν ὁ Χριστὸς τὴν βασιλείαν, λαοί, μετανοεῖτε.

> He, who showed the inaccessible hearts accessible to God in olden times, is crying out to us from beneath the earth now: Christ has opened the kingdom, O people, repent.[128]

The reference to "the inaccessible hearts" which John the Baptist made "accessible to God" with his preaching is inspired by the first biblical ode (Ex. 15: 1-19). Similar to God, who made the Red Sea passable to the Israelites fleeing from Egypt, chased by the pharaoh's cavalry, John the Baptist made accessible people's unrepentant hearts to God's words. In addition, the hymnographer seems to allude to two other biblical verses: "Make straight your *heart* unto the Lord God of Israel"[129] and "Make straight the paths of our God."[130] Both of these verses are taken to refer specifically to John the Baptist in the Gospels (cf. Matt. 3:3; Mark 1:3 and Luke 3:4). In patristic exegesis, the verses, and especially the second one, were

---

[126] Eustratiadis, *Heirmologion*, 226.
[127] Eustratiadis, *Heirmologion*, 226.
[128] *AHG* 6, 375, vers. 1-5.
[129] Εὐθύνατε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν πρὸς Κύριον τὸν Θεὸν Ἰσραήλ (Jos. 24:23).
[130] Εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν (Is. 40:3).

interpreted in the sense that John with his preaching of repentance prepared his listeners for the coming of Jesus Christ. An example of such an interpretation is encountered in John Chrysostom's commentary on Matthew: "Thus the prophet says that he shall come, saying: 'Prepare the way of the Lord, make His paths straight'. Moreover, John the Forerunner himself said: 'Bring forth fruits worthy of repentance', which corresponds with, 'Prepare you the way of the Lord'."[131] Of particular importance for the present discussion is the use of the two verses in early Christian ascetic literature, especially in such an influential writing as the *Vita Antonii*. According to the author, Athanasios of Alexandria (d. 373), Antony cited both verses in a discourse on virtue and the ascetic life: "For this reason Joshua, the son of Nun, exhorting the people, said to them: 'Make straight your heart unto the Lord God of Israel', and John: 'Make your paths straight'."[132] Our hymnographer evidently drew upon this tradition. By interrelating and allegorizing the above-quoted biblical passages, he praises John who, urging people to repentance, made their heart "accessible" to God. His reliance on allegory is obvious in the use of the word καρδία instead of τρίβος or ὁδός, as well as of the adjective βάσιμος, a synonym for the biblical εὐθύς,[133] which Antony the Great also employed in the aforementioned discourse on ascetic life, making a direct reference to John the Baptist.[134] The rare phrase ἄβατος καρδία occurs in another nine-ode hymn attributed to Patriarch Germanos, namely, in the *kanon* on the translation of the relics of John Chrysostom (January 27):

Ὡς τὰς ἀβάτους καρδίας, ὁμαλίσας τοῖς λόγοις, Χρυσόστομε...

O Chrysostom, with your words you rendered smooth the inaccessible hearts…[135]

In this *kanon*, notably, the idea of the "inaccessible heart" that was made smooth by Chrysostom's words does not seem to have been inspired by the first ode of Moses, since it does not occur in the first ode. This suggests that on both occasions the phrase reflects the

---

[131] Ὁ μὲν γὰρ προφήτης φυσίν, ὅτι παρέσται λέγων: 'ἑτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ'. Αὐτὸς δὲ παραγενόμενος ἔλεγε: 'ποιήσατε καρποὺς ἀξίους τῆς μετανοίας'. Ὅπερ ἴσον ἐστὶ τῷ: 'ἑτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου', *Joanni Chrysostomi In Matthaeum*, X, 3, (PG 57, 187).

[132] Διὰ τοῦτο ὁ μὲν τοῦ Ναυῆ Ἰησοῦς παραγγέλλων ἔλεγε τῷ λαῷ: 'Εὐθύνατε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν πρὸς Κύριον τὸν Θεὸν Ἰσραήλ'. Ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης: 'Εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους' ὑμῶν. Athanase d'Alexandrie, *Vie d'Antoine*, ed. G. J. M. Bartelink, SC 400, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1994, 188-192.

[133] The Septuagint uses the alternative form εὐθής.

[134] For the concept of heart in the monastic tradition, see the five essays by J. Raasch, "The Monastic Concept of Purity of Heart I-V," *Studia Monastica* 8.1 (1966) 7-33; 8.2 (1966) 188-213; 10.1 (1968) 7-55; 11 (1969) 269-314; 12.1 (1970) 7-41. See also the proceedings of the conference on the twenty-fifth anniversary of her death: *Purity of Heart in Early Ascetic and Monastic Literature: Essays in Honour of Juana Raasch OSB*, eds. H. Luckman and L. Kulzer, Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999.

[135] *AHG* 5, 424.

ascetic teaching based on the biblical verses cited above, an established tradition in the spirituality of the Christian East.

Along with the theme of repentance, the hymn also foregrounds the widespread notion that the discovery of relics is to be attributed to divine intervention. In the first *troparion* of the third ode, the hymnographer credits Jesus with revealing the location of John's head:

Ὁ ὑψηλὸς βραχίων τοῦ Ἰησοῦ παραδόξως σήμερον τὴν σεπτὴν κεφαλὴν ἀνέδειξε τοῦ Προδρόμου πάλιν ἐκβοῶσαν μετάνοιαν.

The high arm of Jesus miraculously revealed the venerable head of the Forerunner today, which again proclaims repentance.[136]

This *troparion* brings to mind John's testimony about Jesus as Messiah when he pointed at him and said, "Behold the Lamb of God" (John 1: 29). In the present case, however, their roles are reversed, since Jesus is taking the role of a witness by showing John's head, which preaches repentance. The comparison is also reminiscent of the New Testament episode described in Matt. 11:11, where Jesus speaks of John as a prophet and the greatest among those born of women.

The idea is reiterated several more times throughout the hymn, as in the second *troparion* of the seventh ode:

Ὁ κιβωτόν ἐνθέου μυροθήκης τοῦ Βαπτιστοῦ τὴν κάραν ἀναδείξας, εὐλογητὸς εἶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

Blessed are you forever who manifested the Forerunner's skull as a container of divine perfume.[137]

The first *troparion* of the eighth ode reads as follows:

Τὸν ἀναδείξαντα πιστοῖς, τοῦ Προδρόμου τὴν τιμίαν κεφαλήν, ἱερεῖς εὐλογεῖτε.

Priests, bless him who revealed the precious skull of the Forerunner to the faithful people.[138]

Finally, the idea is also expressed in the first *troparion* of the ninth ode:

Τὸν ἀποκαλύψαντα τοῦ Προδρόμου τὴν κάραν, καὶ εὐωδιάσαντα τῇ αὐτῆς ἀναδείξει τὰ ἑῷα καὶ τὰ ἑσπέρια πάντα, ὕμνοις ἀσιγήτοις μεγαλύνωμεν.

---

[136] The first *troparion* of the third ode. *AHG* 6, 377, and GIM Sin. grec. 181, f. 120v.
[137] *AHG* 6, 380, and GIM Sin. grec. 181, f. 121v.
[138] *AHG* 6, 381. In GIM Sin. grec. 181, instead of ἀναδείξαντα the word ἐκκαλύψαντα is used (f. 122).

Let us exalt in ceaseless hymns him who revealed the skull of the Forerunner, and made fragrant all the eastern and western parts of the world with its manifestation.[139]

The notion of the divinely-revealed relic is found in the writing of both western and eastern Church Fathers. In his sermon on Saint Stephen, Augustine declares: "His body lay hidden for so long a time. It came forth when God wished it."[140] The notion is also expressed in the encomium on the third discovery of John the Baptist's head ascribed to Theodore of Stoudios (d. 826): "[John the Baptist's head] has just been revealed thanks to God's gracious will, who is doing everything for the salvation of our species [i.e. humankind]."[141] The following *troparion* from the same ninth ode of our hymn reflects the same concept:

Ὁ θανατῶν καὶ πάλιν ζωογονῶν, ὡς ἐκ τάφου ζῶσαν, καὶ φθεγγομένην δεικνύς, τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ Προδρόμου, δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐκκαλύπτει αὐτήν.

He who puts to death and gives life, having manifested the head of the Forerunner from the grave as alive and uttering a voice, reveals it with glory and honour.[142]

Aside from crediting God with the discovery of John's head, however, these verses introduce another equally important notion, namely, the comparison between the discovery of the head and the resurrection. The idea becomes much clearer if we consider it in light of the opening paragraph of the sermon on the *Invention of the Head of St John the Baptist*, attributed to Theodore of Studios.[143] The author points out that, after two preceding feasts, which commemorated the Forerunner's nativity and death, respectively, this one needs to be seen as his resurrection. The entire paragraph reads as follows:

This day with the third feast and celebration of the divine forerunner and baptist John, invites all of us to celebrate, O friends of feasts. The feast of his nativity[144] somehow resembles a sunrise, which manifests to the world, in a marvellous way, the rise of the spiritual morning star. [145] The feast of his beheading[146] represents the sunset. It manifests that the lantern and

---

[139] *AHG* 6, 381-382, and GIM Sin. grec. 181, f. 122.

[140] For quotation and more on this theme, see: Brown, *The Cult of the Saints*, 91.

[141] [τῆς τοῦ Βαπτιστοῦ σεμνοτάτης κάρας ...] ἄρτι φανερωθείσης, εὐδοκίᾳ τοῦ πάντα πρὸς σωτηρίαν τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν οἰκονομοῦντος Θεοῦ. *Theodori Studitae laudatio in tertiam Inuentionem venerandi Capitis sanctissimi Praecursoris*, in Du Cange, *Traité historique du chef de S. Jean Baptiste*, Paris 1665, 254-264, at 255.

[142] The second *troparion* of the third ode. *AHG* 6, 377-378, and GIM Sin. grec. 181, f. 120v.

[143] Ed. and French trans. by F. Halkin and A.-J. Festugière, "Invention du chef de s. Jean-Baptiste (BHG 842a)," in: idem, *Dix textes inédits tirés du ménologe impérial de Koutloumous*, Geneva: P. Cramer, 1984, 70-79.

[144] The Nativity of John the Baptist is celebrated on 24 June.

[145] It is notable that the characterisation of John as "the spiritual morning star" in the quoted extract has correspondence in the fourth *troparion* of the sixth ode of the present *kanon*:

lamp and precursor of the Sun of Righteousness, Christ, descended into the underground world as if to announce also to those in Hades his salvific advent. As for the present feast,[147] it symbolises, so to speak, his magnificent resurrection. It rose again and as if came to life again by the discovery and revelation of his holy head.[148]

Likened to a resurrection, the discovery of John's head extends further the parallel between the life of Christ and the life of the Baptist. An allusion to this idea is also found in the present *kanon*. For example, in the second *troparion* of the sixth ode, the author interconnects the story of the prophet Jonas, a prefiguration of Christ's Resurrection par excellence, with the discovery of John's head:

> Τὸ κῆτος τὸν προφήτην Ἰωνᾶν διέσωσεν ἄφθορον, ἡ γῆ δὲ τὴν κάραν σου ἄφωνον λαβοῦσα, Βαπτιστά, νῦν ἀπεκάλυψεν.

> The sea-monster preserved the prophet Jonah incorruptible, the earth, which had received your voiceless skull, O Baptist, revealed it now.[149]

It is worth recalling that relics and the belief in the resurrection of the body were intimately connected in patristic thought. The preservation and incorruptibility of the bodily remains of saints were seen as a foretaste of their future glory in new material yet everlasting bodies. Among the most influential Eastern Christian proponents of this understanding was Gregory of Nyssa. In his *Life of Macrina*, Gregory speaks of Macrina's dead body as a relic which has achieved immortality, maintaining connection to its holy soul and demonstrating its spiritual power even in the grave.[150] In the Christian West, Jerome refers to the dead body of Saint Hilarion as "perfect, as if he were still alive, giving off such a fragrance that you would think

---

Ἐξέλαμψεν ὡς ἄστρον νοητὸν καὶ πάλιν βοῶν ἡμῖν, ὁ Πρόδρομος σήμερον, διὰ τῆς κάρας τῆς σεπτῆς, μετανοεῖτε λαοί. (The Forerunner beamed forth through his honourable skull as a spiritual star today, crying out again to us: repent people). GIM Sin. grec. 181, f. 121v.

[146] The Beheading is celebrated on August 29.

[147] The Invention of the head is celebrated on February 24.

[148] Τρίτην ἤδη ἑορτὴν καὶ πανήγυριν τοῦ θείου προδρόμου καὶ βαπτιστοῦ Ἰωάννου ἡ σήμερον ἡμέρα φέρουσα συγκαλεῖται ἡμᾶς πρὸς ἑαυτήν, ὦ φιλέωρτοι. Ἡ μὲν γὰρ τῶν γενεσίων ἀνατολῇ πως ἔοικεν, ἥτις τὸν νοητὸν ἐωσφόρον ἐκ τῶν μητρῴων λαγόνων ἀνίσχοντα θαυμαστῶς τῷ κόσμῳ ἀνέδειξεν. Ἡ δὲ τῆς ἀποτομῆς δύσιν ἐξεικονίζει· τὸν γὰρ αὐτὸν θεοφανῆ λαμπτῆρα καὶ λύχνον καὶ πρόδρομον τοῦ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἡλίου Χριστοῦ ὑπὸ γῆν γενέσθαι παρίστησιν ὡσὰν καὶ τοῖς ἐν ᾅδου τὴν αὐτοῦ κηρύξῃ σωτήριον ἔλευσιν. Ἡ δὲ παροῦσα τὴν ὡς εἰπεῖν αὐτοῦ θαυμαστὴν ἀναβίωσιν· ἀνατέταλκε γὰρ αὖθις καὶ οἱονεὶ ἀνεβίωσε τῇ εὑρέσει καὶ ἀναδείξει τῆς ἱερᾶς αὐτοῦ κεφαλῆς. Halkin and Festugière, *Invention du chef de s. Jean-Baptiste*, 70. This passage, slightly modified, also occurs at the beginning of the aforementioned encomium attributed to Theodore of Stoudios. *Theodori Studitae laudatio*, 254-256.

[149] GIM Sin. grec. 181, f. 121v.

[150] Gregory of Nyssa, *Vie de sainte Macrine*, ed. and trans. P. Maraval, SC 178, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1971, 192, 200, 218-224. For a further discussion, see C. Walker Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200-1336*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1995, 83-86

it had been anointed with perfumed oils."[151] A *troparion* from the eight-ode *kanon* on the martyr saints Floros and Lauros (17 August), also attributed to Germanos I, reflects the patristic understanding of relics as an image of incorruptibility:

> Πίστει τὰ λείψανα ὑμῶν, ὡς ἀφθαρσίας εἰκόνα, ἡ ἐκκλησία Χριστοῦ τιμῶσα, πανένδοξοι, ἑορτάζει τὴν μνήμην ὑμῶν.

> The Church of Christ, venerating with faith your relics, as an image of immortality, O most glorious ones, celebrates your memory.[152]

The ideas about the incorruptibility of holy bodies were shared and propagated across a variety of writing, and hymnography was no exception to this.

Another feature of the hymn for the Invention of John's head that merits closer examination is its liturgical dimension. The hymn points to a direct link between the relic and the altar on which the Eucharist is celebrated.[153] The second *troparion* from the fourth ode, in which the Baptist's head is portrayed as "pouring out streams of blood under the altar," should to be read in this light:

> Ἡ (τῶν) αἱμάτων στάζουσα κρουνούς, κεφαλὴ τοῦ Προδρόμου, θαυμάτων πηγὰς νῦν ὑπὸ τράπεζαν βρύει, καὶ τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν μυρίζει Χριστοῦ.

> The head of the Forerunner, which once poured out streams of blood, now gushes forth streams of miracles under the altar and anoints the Church.[154]

Starting from the early Christian centuries, the martyrs had that privilege to be buried under the altar because of their "privilege" to die in a way similar to that of Christ. This practice attracted the attention of one of the earliest Christian poets, Prudentius, who also related the presence of the martyrs' remains under the altar to the Eucharist celebrated on top of it:

> Sed mox subactis hostibus
> iam pace iustis reddita
> altar quietem debitam
> praestat beatis ossibus;
> subiecta nam sacrario

---

[151] Jerome, *Life of Hilarion*, 46, trans. in C. White, *Early Christian Lives*, London: Penguin Books, 1998, 115.
[152] *AHG* 12, 208.
[153] For a more extensive discussion, see J. Crook, *The Architectural Setting of the Cult of Saints in the Early Christian West c. 300-1200*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, 12-14.
[154] *AHG* 6, 378, and GIM Sin. grec. 181, f. 121.

imamque ad aram condita

caelestis auram muneris

perfusa subter hauriunt. (5.513-520)

But later, when their enemies were subdued and peace given back to the righteous, an altar ensured to the blessed bones the rest that was their due; for laid under the sanctuary, buried at the foot of the altar, they drink in the aura of the heavenly offering, which is shed on them there below.[155]

Michael Roberts in his analysis of the phrase *caelestis auram muneris* comments:

Their position below the altar–whence, according to Prudentius, 'they drink in the breath of heavenly bounty' (*caelestis auram muneris*, 5.519), i.e. at one level, the offerings of the mass–is a visual reminder in the layout of the Church of the privileged access that the saints enjoy to God, access that devotees, in their prayers, hope will be turned to their own or their communities' interests.[156]

Jerome in his writing against Vigilantius, who strongly opposed the veneration of saints and their relics, also associates the Eucharist with the martyrs' remains – in this case those of the apostles Peter and Paul –, by giving them a central position in worship: "So you think, therefore, that the bishop of Rome does wrong when, over the dead men Peter and Paul, venerable bones to us, but to you a heap of common dust, he offers up sacrifices to the Lord, and their graves are held to be altars of Christ".[157]

Saint Ambrose offers what might be the most explicit articulation of the link between the relics and the Eucharist, when he draws a parallel between the presence of Christ *super altare* and bodies of the saints *sub altare*: "Let the triumphant victims take their place where Christ is the victim. Let him be above the altar who suffered for all; let them be beneath the altar who ere redeemed by his suffering".[158]

---

[155] *Prudentius II*, ed. H. J. Thomson, Loeb Classical Library 398, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1953, 198-201.

[156] M. Roberts, *Poetry and the Cult of the Martyrs: The Liber Peristephanon of Prudentius*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press 1993, 17.

[157] PL 23, 346. For the critical edition, see *Contra Vigilantium*, 8, ed. J. L. Feiertag, CCSL 79C. For the dispute between Jerome and Vigilantius, see J. Lössl, "An Early Christian Identity Crisis Triggered by Changes in the Discourse of Martyrdom: The Controversy between Jerome of Strido and Vigilantius of Calagurris", in: J. Leemans, ed., *More than a Memory: The Discourse of Martyrdom and the Construction of Christian Identity in the History of Christianity*, Leuven: Peeters, 2005, 97-117.

[158] Saint Ambrose, *Letter* 61, trans. M. M. Beyenka, Washington: The Catholic University of America, 1967, 380.

Regarding the cult of relics and their relation to the celebration of the Eucharist, one should remember that the seventh canon of the Seventh Ecumenical Synod prescribed that the relics ought to be used in the consecration of churches and altars.[159] In this way, every altar became symbolically a saint's tomb over which the Eucharistic sacrifice was performed.

The liturgical and Eucharistic imagery surrounding the Baptist's head is also found in the second *troparion* of the ninth ode of the present hymn. The *troparion* reads as follows:

Δεῦτε θεασώμεθα, τοῦ Προδρόμου τὴν κάραν, ἐν πίνακι αἵματα ἀποστάζουσα πάλαι, ὑπὸ τράπεζαν πηγάζουσαν ἄρτι, ἀξιομνημόνευτα τεράστια.

Come, gaze at the skull of the Forerunner, which once dripped [his] blood on the plate, and is a source of astonishing miracles under the altar now.[160]

The image of the head on a plate brings to mind the Eucharistic paten. Not accidentally, this kind of association was visualised in Byzantine art from the twelfth century onwards.[161] In portable icons and wall paintings produced during this period, the Baptist's head is depicted on a plate resembling the Eucharist paten and is, moreover, frequently shown displayed on an altar.[162] Such depictions, in which the head occupies the place of the Eucharistic Bread, make the parallelism with the Eucharist obvious.[163] The present *kanon* and other comparable hymns suggest that the view of John as a sacrificial victim was common in liturgical poetry, which may be said to have anticipated the articulation of this idea in the visual arts. The following verse is strikingly explicit on this point:

Ἱερουργήσας τὸ Βάπτισμα, καὶ τελειώσας Πρόδρομε τὰ πρὸς Θεόν, σαφῶς δοθέντα σοι Μυστήρια, ὡς ἀρνίον ἄκακον ἱερουργούμενος, προσηνέχθης θυσία.

---

[159] Mansi 13, 427C-D. In the Western Church, the practice of the inclusion of relics in the altar was officially sanctioned at the synod held at Aachen in 802. Crook, *The Architectural Setting*, 14.
[160] *AHG* 6, 382, and GIM Sin. grec. 181, f. 122.
[161] On this topic, see A. Weyl Carr, "The Face Relics of John the Baptist in Byzantium and the West", *Gesta* 46/2 (2008) 159-190.
[162] For some examples of the representations of John's head with Eucharistic connotations, see Weyl Carr, "The Face Relics of John the Baptist", figs. 4-7, pp. 162-165.
[163] However, there is evidence that the earliest depiction of John's severed head appeared in illuminated manuscripts as early as in the sixth century. See A. Grabar, *Les peintures de l'Évangéliaire de Sinope (Bibliothèque nationale, Suppl. Gr. 1286)*, Paris: Bibliothèque nationale, 1948, pl. 1 and fig. 1. I. A. Shalina, *Relikvii v vostochnochristianskoj ikonografii. Christianskie relikvii v Moskovskom Kremle*, Moscow: Radunica, 2000, 270.

> O Forerunner, having celebrated the rites of baptism and accomplished the mysteries of God that were openly entrusted to you; you yourself, becoming the victim in a rite of sacrifice, were offered as an innocent lamb.[164]

The hymnographer connects John with the two crucial mysteries of Christian faith – baptism and Eucharist. John the Forerunner not only testified about "the lamb of God," but also himself became a sacrificial lamb, prefiguring in this way Christ's death.

The liturgical hymns discussed in this section constitute an important yet largely overlooked body of evidence on the cult of relics in Constantinople and, more broadly, the Byzantine Empire. The manner in which relics were presented, interpreted, and extolled in these texts shows a great deal of ingenuity. Their poetic celebration could serve as an occasion to voice imperial propaganda, forge a sense of group identity, remember the past, promulgate ascetic teachings, reiterate patristic exegesis, and promote particular shrines and pilgrimage centres. The very fact that relics came to be a subject of liturgical verse demonstrates the extent to which these supremely precious objects and corporeal remains were central to the religious identity of the Byzantines.

Cult of sacred images

As already pointed out above, the hagiographical hymns ascribed to Patriarch Germanos I not only celebrate the saints' relics, but also eulogize holy images as one of the key components of the cult of the saint. In the case of the *kanon* to Saint Pionios, one recalls, the bodily remains of the saint and his image are given equal importance, since the faithful approached both to seek Pionios's assistance and mediation.[165] Both the relics and the icon were perceived as being able to render the saint present within the community, so that the gathering of the faithful could seek his intercession. In what follows, I will provide additional examples to illustrate how the development of the cult of icons found its expression in hymnography, especially in the corpus of hymns attached to the name of the Constantinopolitan patriarch. After a brief overview of references to holy images in other

---

[164] *Synaxis* of John the Baptist (7 January), the first *troparion* of the seventh ode. *The Festal Menaion*, 399, slightly modified.
[165] *AHG* 7, 185-186.

relevant literary genres, special attention will be paid to the *kanon* for the annual commemoration of Mary of Egypt, because of this hymn's strong iconophile character.

To begin with, references to sacred icons in liturgical hymns during the Middle Byzantine period fit well in a broader context of their miraculous activity and intercessory role in Byzantine society that can be traced from the second half of the sixth century onwards. According to the preserved sources, the belief in the intercessory power of sacred portraiture was first associated with the so-called *acheiropoietoi* icons. They were regarded as both relics and icons, as Christ's face was believed to have been imprinted on them as a result of physical contact.[166] Moreover, their civic cult and the use in war, during sieges or on the battlefield, as well as in triumphal and liturgical processions, resembled in many respects the practices surrounding the cult of relics. That sacred images and relics were associated already by the early fifth century is attested by Augustine who, in his *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae*, writes: "I know many who worship tombs and paintings".[167] The earliest indisputable evidence of the belief in the intercessory power of an *acheiropoietos* image of Christ dates from the end of the sixth century. It concerns the the Mandylion of Edessa,[168] which, according to an account preserved in Evagrios Scholastikos, rescued this city from a Persian attack in 544.[169]

Gradually, the power to work miracles, secure protection, and ward off evil came to be attributed to man-made—rather than miraculously produced—images of the saints[170] and especially of the Mother of God. One of the earliest and best known examples is found in the *Religious History* by Theodoret of Cyrrhus. According to his testimony, craftsmen in Rome exhibited icons of Symeon the Stylite at the entrance of their workshops to fend off evil: "It is said that the man became so celebrated in the great city of Rome that at the entrance of all the workshops men have set up small representations of him, to provide thereby some protection

---

[166] For further discussion, see Ch. Barber, *Figure and Likeness: On the Limits of Representation in Byzantine Iconoclasm*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002, especially chapter one *Matter and Memory*, 13-38; B. Pentcheva, "The Supernatural Protector of Constantinople: the Virgin and Her Icons in the Tradition of the Avar Siege", *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 26 (2002) 2-41, here 12-15; eadem, *Icons and Power. The Mother of God in Byzantium*, University Park, PA: Penn State University Press 2006, 44.

[167] "Novi multos sepulcrorum et picturarum adoratores". *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae* 1, 34. See Sant' Agostino, *Polemica con i Manichei*, NBA 13/1, Rome: Città Nuova Editrice, 1997, 108.

[168] Brubaker and Haldon, *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era*, 56.

[169] *CPG* 7500. Évagre le Scholastique, *Histoire Ecclésiastique*, books 4-6, SC 566, eds. J. Bidez and L. Parmentier, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2014, 142-148. English translation: *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus*, ed. and trans. M. Whitby, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000, 226-228 and 323-326.

[170] N. Gendle, "The Role of the Byzantine Saint in the Development of the Icon Cult", in: S. Hackel, ed., *The Byzantine Saint*, Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminar Press, 2001, 181-186.

and safety for themselves".[171] Regardless of whether this testimony is authentic or represents a later interpolation, it demonstrates the widespread belief in the apotropaic power of the saints' visual representations.

There are a number of references to miracle-working images of the Virgin Mary in hagiographic and ascetic literature from the period before the outbreak of the iconoclastic crisis. For example, John Moschos's *Spiritual Meadow*, which dates to the beginning of the seventh century, on several occasions speaks of the popularity of Marian icons.[172] Even though these and other similar references are sometimes discounted as later interpolations, nevertheless, they could have served as an important source of inspiration for hymnographers of the Middle Byzantine period, as we shall see below.

Icons in hymns

It was inevitable that the long-standing theological disputes over the holiness of icons and their veneration, as well as over their inclusion in the liturgy, would find expression in liturgical poetry. Probably one of the earliest references to holy images in hymnography is encountered in the *theotokion* of the fifth ode of the *kanon* for archangels Michael and Gabriel (8 November), composed by the hymnographer Clement (b. before 765–d. after 824), a fervent iconophile, whose poetic activity coincided with the second phase of the iconoclastic controversy.[173] The *theotokion* reads:

> Ἐν δυσὶ τελείαις ἕνα σε γινώσκομεν φύσεσι κύριον, ἐνεργείαις ἄμφω καὶ θελήσεσιν ὄντα ἀσύγχυτον, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐκ γυναικὸς λαβόντα σάρκα, ἧς τὴν θέαν τιμῶμεν τοῖς πίναξιν.

---

[171] Φασὶ γὰρ οὕτως ἐν Ῥώμῃ τῇ μεγίστῃ πολυθρύλητον γενέσθαι τὸν ἄνδρα, ὡς ἐν ἅπασι τοῖς τῶν ἐργαστηρίων προπυλαίοις εἰκόνας αὐτῷ βραχείας ἀναστηλῶσαι, φυλακήν τινα σφίσιν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀσφάλειαν ἐντεῦθεν πορίζοντας. P. Canivet and A. Leroy-Molinghen, *Théodoret de Cyr. L'histoire des moines de Syrie*, 26.11, vol. 2, SC 234, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1979, 182. For the English translation, see Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *A History of the Monks of Syria*, trans. R. M. Price, Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1985, 165.

[172] CPG 7376. PG 87c, 2851A-3112B, at 2900B-D; 2940A-B and 3051A-C. For the English translation, see *The Spiritual Meadow of John Moschus*, trans. J. Wortley, Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1992, 35-36; 66 and 149-150.

[173] His authorship of this *theotokion* is beyond doubt: he included his name (Κλήμεντος) in the acrostic composed of the first letters of each *theotokion*, originally nine of them, because the *kanon* had nine odes. For Clement and his poetic production, see Kazhdan, *A History of Byzantine Literature (650-850)*, 261–269.

We acknowledge you, one Lord in two complete natures, both in activities and wills unmingled, the son of God, who received flesh from a woman, whose countenance we honour in icons.[174]

Not only does the *theotokion* clearly reflect the current controversy, but it also raises icon veneration to a dogmatic level and situates it within the context of Christology. This is evident from the hymnographer's reference to—or rather, his confession of—the two complete and unmingled natures and the two activities and wills of Christ. The hymnographer alludes to the doctrinal definitions of the Council of Chalcedon (451), at which one nature theology was condemned, and of the Third Council of Constantinople (680/681), which denounced one activity and one will theology as heresies. Iconoclasm, which iconophiles regarded as a continuation of the previous Christological heresies, is condemned at the end of the stanza through reference to the veneration of icons of the Virgin, who played a vital role in Christ's incarnation by giving him flesh. Packed with succinct yet pointed articulations of Orthodoxy, the stanza was clearly designed to uphold the correct doctrine for the spiritual benefit of the congregation.

Another noteworthy example is the *troparion* from the *kanon* on 1 September, attributed to Patriarch Germanos, which has been cited in the previous chapter. This *troparion* carries political connotations, since it associates imperial success at war with the veneration of the icons of Christ, the Virgin Mary and all other saints:

Ὡς Ἰησοῦ τῷ Ναυῆ συνεστρατήγησας, κατ᾽ ἐχθρῶν πολεμίων, οὕτως παράσχου νίκην βασιλεύουσι πιστῶς, τὴν σὴν εἰκόνα τιμῶσι, καὶ τῆς Θεοτόκου, καὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων.

As you helped Joshua the son of Nun against [his] enemies, in a similar way grant victory to the emperors, who venerate your image with faith, and those of the Mother of God and of all the saints.[175]

By placing emphasis on sacred images rather than the Holy Cross, the hymn reflects a new spiritual and ideological framework created in the aftermath of the triumph for the iconophile party in 843. Instead of highlighting the importance of the Cross as a symbol par excellence of imperial victories, this *troparion* stresses the significance of icon veneration on the part of the emperors as a way to secure victories against their foes.

---

[174] *Theotokion* of the fifth ode.
[175] Sinait.gr. 552, f. 15.

These two examples illustrate how hymnography responded to contemporary concerns by situating the cult of icons against the background of dogmatic teachings and political ideology. Another context within which hymnographers invoked icons was that of asceticism. The nine-ode *kanon* in honour of Mary of Egypt (1 April), attributed to Patriarch Germanos, offers an pertinent example.[176] Since this *kanon* engages with the subject of icon veneration in a sustained fashion, it calls for a more detailed analysis.

Kanon *for Mary of Egypt*

The attribution to Germanos I of the nine-ode *kanon* in honour of the repentant harlot, Mary of Egypt, is attested already in the ninth or the early tenth century. The inscription Ο ΚΑΝΩΝ ΓΕΡΜ[ΑΝΟΥ] is found in the oldest preserved *menaion*,[177] the majuscule codex Sinait. gr. 607, f. 126, while the entire hymn is copied on ff. 126-129.[178]

Mary was declared a saint probably a century before Germanos's lifetime.[179] Cyril of Scythopolis in the *Life of Saint Kyriakos* refers to a certain hermit by the name of Mary who had been a chanter at the church of the Holy Sepulchre before she withdrew to the desert with the basket of legumes that sustained her for eighteen years. According to her own words, she moved to the desert to avoid leading men into sexual temptation. After Mary's death, her grave became a place of pilgrimage.[180] Soon the legend became widespread, but the heroine was presented as a prostitute from Alexandria, who along with pilgrims travelled to Jerusalem for the Feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross (14 September), where she embraced Christianity after an unseen power impeded her from entering the church. Following this event, Mary went into the desert, where she led a life of solitude for forty-seven years. The first human being she met after such a long period of time was Zosimas, an ascetic monk, who administered Holy Communion to her a year later. Zosimas is also said to have buried Mary with the help of a lion. The saint's *Life* is ascribed to Sophronios of

---

[176] Mary is also celebrated on the fifth Sunday of Great Lent. For the English translation of the hymns currently sung on this feast, see Mother Mary and Archimandrite Kallistos, *The Lenten Triodion*, 447-463.

[177] A liturgical book "containing the variable hymns and other texts proper to vespers and orthros of each feast of the fixed cycle, that is, those feasts that fall on a fixed date in the Church calendar". *ODB* 2, 1338. The statement that the first *menaia* appear only in manuscripts of the eleventh-twelfth centuries should be reconsidered. See A. Nikiforova, *From the History of the Menaion in Byzantium*, 94.

[178] For an edition of the hymn based on five manuscripts from western European collections, see *AHG* 8, 26-24.

[179] For Mary's *Life* with an introduction see M. Kouli, intr. and trans., *Life of St. Mary of Egypt*, in: *Holy Women of Byzantium: Ten Saints' Lives in English Translation*, 1, ed. A.-M. Talbot, Washington, D.C: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1996, 65-93

[180] *Kyrillos von Skythopolis*, ed. Schwartz, Leipzig: Hinrichs 1939, 233-234.

Jerusalem. The seventh century is generally accepted as the date of the *Life*'s composition, since it was cited by John of Damascus (d. ca. 750) and translated into Latin in the eighth century.

The story of the repentant prostitute was very popular in both East and West in the Middle Ages. This can be inferred from a plethora of preserved manuscripts of her *Life*. Besides, a significant number of hymns were dedicated to Mary.[181] The *kanon* attributed to Germanos shows affinities with the famous Great *kanon* by Andrew of Crete (d. after 740) insofar as its main theme is repentance. However, unlike the Great *kanon*, this hymn links repentance to the veneration of sacred images.[182]

The *kanon* elaborates upon a momentous episode related in Mary's *Life*, namely, the moment when she was prevented from entering the church of the Holy Sepulchre to venerate the Holy Cross. This event is described as follows:

> When the time came for the divine Exaltation <of the Cross>, I tried to join the crowd and force my way to the entrance, pushing <my way> forward but being pushed back. Eventually, with great trouble and grief—wretched woman <that I am>—I approached the door through which one entered the church where the life-giving Cross was displayed. But as soon as I stepped on the threshold of the door, all the other people entered unhindered, while some kind of divine power held me back, not allowing me to pass through the entrance <of the church>. …Only then did I realise the cause which prevented me from laying eyes on the life-giving Cross, for a salvific word touched the eyes of my heart, showing me that it was the filth of my actions that was barring the entrance to me. Then I began to cry, lamenting and beating my breast, raising sighs from the depths of my heart. As I was crying, I saw the icon of the all-holy Mother of God standing above the place where I stood. I looked straight at Her and said, 'Virgin Lady, Thou Who didst give flesh to God the Word by birth, I know, I know well that it is neither decent, nor reasonable for me who is so filthy and utterly prodigal, to look upon Thy icon...[183]

This story, along with two other Palestinian texts, namely John Moschos's *Spiritual Meadow* and Anthony of Choziba's *Miracles of the Theotokos at the Monastery of Choziba*,[184] both

---

[181] Follieri, *Initia* V/2, 218.

[182] Due to their penitent character, both Andrew's *Great kanon* and Mary's *Life* are incorporated in the liturgy of Great Lent in the Eastern Church. The *Great kanon* is chanted on the first four nights of Lent and at Matins of Thursday of the fifth week of the same period. During the latter service Mary's *Life* is also read in its entirety.

[183] Kouli, intr. and trans. *Life of St. Mary of Egypt*, 82-83.

[184] C. House, ed., Antony of Choziba, *Miracula Beatae Virginis in Choziba*, in: *Analecta Bollandiana* 7 (1888) 360-370. English translation: T. Vivian and A.N. Athanassakis, trans., Antony of Choziba, *The Life of Saint*

dating from the first half of the seventh century, form a group of monastic sources that share a common theme—the role of the Virgin Mary as a guardian of sacred space.[185] However, what makes this story different is the inclusion of an icon of the Virgin to which Mary is said to have prayed. The difference in this detail is especially notable when we compare the story, as recounted in the *Life*, with the one found in *Spiritual Meadow*. In both cases, the protagonist is a sinful woman whom the Virgin Mary prevented from entering the church of the Holy Sepulchre. In Moschos's account, however, the Virgin herself, not her image, appeared in front of the woman.[186] But there is another difference, particularly relevant for the present discussion. While in *Spiritual Meadow* the Mother of God saved the woman from heresy, in the *Life*, she facilitated the repentance of a former harlot.

The episode from Mary's *Life*, if genuine, is one of the earliest testimonies about a devotee's prayer in front of a Marian icon. This is why John of Damascus invokes this event in his *Three Treatises on the Divine Images* to illustrate the place of sacred images in Christian devotion: "In the Life of St Mary of Egypt it is written that she prayed to an icon of Our Lady and besought her to become her guarantor and thus gained entrance to the church".[187]

The enormous popularity of the story in the Middle Byzantine period led to the formation of a tradition according to which this icon was transferred to Constantinople and displayed at the main entrance to the Church of Hagia Sophia. A Latin pilgrim known as the *Mercati Anonymous*, who visited Constantinople in late eleventh century, testifies to its existence:

> In the right part of the church, behind the atrium, at the silver gates, there is an image of Mary on the wall, formerly preserved in Jerusalem; the one to which St Mary of Egypt prayed in

---

George of Choziba and the Miracles of the Most Holy Mother of God at Choziba, San Francisco, CA and London: International Scholars Publications, 1994, 95-105.

[185] For a discussion on this topic, see D. Krueger, "Mary at the Threshold: The Mother of God as Guardian in Seventh-Century Palestinian Miracle Account", in L. Brubaker and M. Cunningham, eds, *The Cult of the Mother of God in Byzantium: Texts and Images*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2001, 31-38.

[186] PG 87c, 2904A-B. For the English translation, see *The Spiritual Meadow of John Moschus*, trans. J. Wortley, 39.

[187] Ἐν τῷ τῆς ὁσίας Μαρίας βίῳ τῆς Αἰγυπτίας γέγραπται τῇ εἰκόνι τῆς δεσποίνης αὐτῆς εὔξασθαι καὶ ταύτην πρὸς ἐγγύην ἐξαιτήσασθαι καὶ οὕτω τυχεῖν τῆς εἰς τὸν ναὸν εἰσόδου. B. Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos III. Contra imaginum calumniatores orationes tres*, Patristische Texte und Studien 17, Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1975, 162. (*CPG* 8045). The entire text of Mary's prayer is cited in Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos III*, 198-199. The English translation is taken from St John of Damascus, *Three Treatises on the Divine Images*, trans. and intr. by A. Louth, Crestwood, New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003, 55. For the text of the prayer, see pp. 156-157. This episode, as well as Mary's prayer, are included in the acts of the Seventh Oecumenical Council. See Mansi, 13, 85D-89A.

her time, when she heard a voice coming from the lips of the Holy Mother of God. This holy image was brought to St Sophia from the holy city by Emperor Leo.[188]

It is significant that the icon was exhibited at the entrance to the church, i.e. at the same place from which it had been taken in Jerusalem. The symbolism is obvious: through this icon Hagia Sophia was associated with the church of the Holy Sepulchre as the holiest shrine of Christendom. Furthermore, the position of the image determined its main function, namely to initiate repentance in those who entered the church, as it did in the case of Mary of Egypt.[189]

Mostly inspired by the account found in Mary's *Life*, the *kanon* under consideration has a strong iconophile character. This aspect is especially evident if we compare this hymn with a number of other published *kanons* for the annual commemoration of Mary of Egypt. In these compositions, the episode with the icon is barely mentioned. Only Theophanes[190] and the anonymous author of another eight-ode *kanon*, also published in the series *AHG*, mention the episode.[191] Even though the *kanon* attributed to Germanos is found in the oldest preserved Greek *menaion*, which is also the earliest manuscript that transmits a hymn under the patriarch's name, its authenticity cannot be proven. For example, the *heirmos* of the seventh ode (Τὴν ἐν καμίνῳ φλόγα) does not belong to any of the sequences of *heirmoi* attributed to Germanos, but is found among Andrew of Crete's *heirmoi*.[192] This can be advanced as an argument—though by no means decisive—against Germanos's authorship of the hymn.

The *kanon*[193] revolves around two main themes, namely, repentance and the veneration of the icon of the Virgin Mary that brought about the harlot's conversion. Mary's life is put forward as an exemplar of repentance for the faithful, who are urged to emulate her:

---

[188] K. Ciggaar, "Une description de Constantinople traduite par un pelerin anglais", *Revue des études Byzantines*, 34 (1976) 211-267, at 249.

[189] For a further discussion on this topic, see A. Lidov, "The Creator of Sacred Space as a Phenomenon of Byzantine Culture", in M. Bacci, ed., *L'artista a Bisanzio e nel mondo cristiano-orientale*, Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2007, 135-176, esp. 146-153.

[190] Theophanes refers to it twice, namely in two *theotokia* of his eight-ode hymn. The first reference is found in the fourth ode: Πρὸς τὴν σὴν εἰκόνα καταφυγοῦσα καὶ τῷ ἐκ σοῦ τεχθέντι, Θεοτόκε Παρθένε, διὰ σοῦ νῦν εὕρατο ζωὴν τὴν ἄθανατον, ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ χορεύσουσα. The second one is found in the fifth ode: Σοῦ, δέσποινα ἁγνή, τῇ εἰκόνι ἤτενιζεν, σοῦ πάντοτε δεομένη, τῶν παθῶν τὰς ἐφόδους, καὶ δαίμονας κατήσχυνεν. *AHG* 8, 55-63, 58.

[191] See the first *troparion* of the fourth ode: Ὑπὸ πολλῶν ὠθουμένη τῶν ἀντωθουμένων ἐκ σοῦ ἐν τῷ ναῷ εἰσιοῦσα, οὗ ὁ σταυρὸς τιμᾶται ὁ θεῖος καὶ ἀποκαμοῦσα ἐν τούτοις τὴν ἰσχύν, πρὸς τὴν εἰκόνα τῆς πανενδόξου δεσποίνης ἀτενίσασα, ἔνδον γέγενησαι. *AHG* 8, 11-25, at 14.

[192] Eustratiadis, *Εἱρμολόγιον*, No. 109, p. 77.

[193] For its brief analysis, see Kazhdan, *A History of Byzantine Literature (650-850)*, 65-66. Cf. D. Casey, "The Spiritual Valency of Gender in Byzantine Society", in *Questions of Gender in Byzantine Society*, eds. B. Neil & L. Garland, eds., *Questions of Gender in Byzantine Society*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2013, 167-181, at 174-175.

> Τῆς μετανοίας ὑπογραμμὸν τὴν ὁσίαν εὑρηκότες, δράμωμεν τῇ ἐκμιμήσει…

> Having found the blessed [Mary] as an exemplar of repentance, let us emulate her…[194]

Her life clearly demonstrates that human mind tends to embrace both sin and virtue, but, having descended into "the abyss of sin," she managed to climb to "the summit of virtue":

> Τὴν ἐφ᾽ ἑκάτερα ῥοπὴν τῆς ἀνθρώπων διανοίας ὁ σὸς διδάσκει βίος, τῆς γὰρ ἁμαρτίας ἔφθασας τὴν ἄβυσσον καὶ πάλιν ἀνέδραμες ἀρετῶν πρὸς κορυφήν...

> Your life teaches that the human mind has an inclination towards both ways: after you reached the abyss of sin, you climbed again to the summit of virtue…[195]

Throughout the hymn, the author underscores that Mary's path from debauchery to redemption was achieved thanks to the intercession of the Mother of God acting through her icon. The idea was introduced in the first ode and permeates the entire *kanon*, since it is mentioned in seven out of nine odes. In all these references to the icon, the hymnographer highlights the power of the Virgin's image, which renders her present and willing to help those who approach her with prayer. The first mention of the icon is found in the fourth *troparion* of the first ode:

> Κωλυομένη τῆς τῶν σεπτῶν ἐποπτείας ὑπερβολῇ φαυλότητος, ἐν συναισθήσει γέγονας καὶ εἰκόνι σεπτῇ τῆς θεομήτορος πιστῶς προστρέχεις.

> Having been prevented from the contemplation of the sacred because of excessive evil, you came to yourself and resorted to the venerable icon of the Mother of God with faith.[196]

In the second reference to the icon, namely, in the *theotokion* of the second ode, Mary the Egyptian's salvation is explicitly linked to her interraction with the image:

> Σέσωσται προσφυγοῦσα, παρθένε, τῇ σῇ εἰκόνι Μαρία ἡ ὁσία.

> Blessed Mary was saved, O Virgin, when she resorted to your icon.[197]

As a convinced iconophile, the author insists on the faculty of vision in his invocations of the icon that initiated Mary's repentance. The sight of the holy image prompted Mary to repent,

---

[194] First *troparion* of the first ode. *AHG* 8, 26.
[195] *AHG* 8, 32-33.
[196] *AHG* 8, 27.
[197] *AHG* 8, 29.

setting her back on the road to salvation. The *theotokia* of the third, fourth, and sixth odes demonstrate this in the clearest fashion.

The *theotokion* of the third ode declares:

> Βδελυξαμένη ἡ ὁσία τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, ἁγνείας εἵλκυσεν εὐωδίαν, τῇ σῇ εἰκόνι, ἄχραντε, ἀτενίσασα.

> When the blessed [Mary] loathed sin, she attracted the fragrance of chastity, after having gazed at your icon, O [Virgin] immaculate.[198]

In the *theotokion* of the fourth ode we read:

> Τὴν σὴν εἰκόνα, δέσποινα, θεωρήσασα ἡ Μαρία, λαμπρότητι τῆς ἁγνείας σου κατηυγάσθη, πρὸς τὸν ἐκ σοῦ σαρκωθέντα δεσπότην σὲ μεσίτην εὑροῦσα καὶ πρέσβυν εὐπρόσδεκτον.[199]

> When Mary contemplated your icon, O Holy Virgin, she was illuminated with the brightness of your purity, having found you as a mediatrix towards the Lord, who received flesh from you, and a favourable intercessor.[200]

The *theotokion* of the sixth ode reiterates the same idea:

> Τῆς θεοτόκου τῇ εἰκόνι ἀπορήσασα ἠτένισας καὶ γλυκυτάτου φωτισμοῦ ἐνεπλήσθη ἡ καρδία σου, πρὸς ἣν καὶ ἀνεβόας· «σῶσον, ἁγνὴ παρθένε, ἡ τὸν Θεὸν συλλαβοῦσα».

> You gazed at the image of the Mother of God after having been perplexed, and your heart was filled with the sweetest illumination, so you cried to her: Save <me>, O pure Virgin, you who conceived God.[201]

Gregory of Nazianzos' poem Περὶ ἀρετῆς (*On virtue*) provides an intriguing parallel for the episode with the icon, as it is presented in our *kanon*. Dealing with different kinds of virtue, Gregory compares Christians and pagans. One of the ancient philosophers, whom he singles out as great exemplars of chastity (σωφροσύνη), was Polemon, head of the Academy between 313 and 270 BC. Gregory relates how, by casting her eyes on a portrait of Polemon, a prostitute felt overwhelmed by shame and repented:

> A libidinous young man called a whore in. When she reached, it is said, the door, a portrait of Polemon looked down at her; she looked at it and immediately went away (for indeed it was

---

[198] *AHG* 8, 28.
[199] *AHG* 8, 29.
[200] *AHG* 8, 29.
[201] *AHG* 8, 31.

venerable), overcome by the sight of it; she felt ashamed in front of Polemon's portrayal as if he were alive.[202]

This story was often quoted by iconophile theologians as an argument in favour of the veneration of holy images. John of Damascus was the first to use it in the dispute. The relevant passage from Gregory is incorporated in the florilegium attached to John's *Third Treatise on the Divine Images*.[203] The excerpt was read aloud at the Seventh Oecumenical Council (787) and was also included in the acts of this synod.[204] From the reaction of two bishops, as well as of Patriarch Tarasios, whose responses to the reading of the passage are quoted in the acts, it is apparent that the portrait of Polemon was perceived as being comparable to an icon of a saint:

> Basil, reverend bishop of Ankyra, said: "Saint Gregory, our theologian Father, also considered the icon of Polemon as respectable (θαυμαστήν)". The most reverend patriarch said: "Indeed, it provoked chastity, for if the whore had not seen Polemon's icon, she would not have refrained from licentiousness". Nikephoros, reverend bishop of Durrhachion, said: "The icon is respectable and venerable (θαυμαστὴ καὶ ἀξιάγαστος): it was able to save the woman from wicked and shameless conduct".[205]

The story was also used in the second stage of iconoclasm (815-843), especially by Theodore of Stoudios, who cited it in two of his letters. The one was addressed to his disciple Naukratios (Ep. 380)[206] and the other to the virgin Thomais (Ep. 551). In the second letter, the abbot of the Stoudios monastery writes the following: "And Gregory the Theologian [says]: 'Polemon looked down at her in an icon' (τῆς δ᾽ ἦν ὑπερκύπτων Πολέμων ἐν εἰκόνι)".[207] Gregory's account of the ancient philosopher and his portrait was thus a common point of reference for iconophile authors in their attempts to justify the practice of making

---

[202] Ἑταῖρον εἰσεκάλει τις ἀκρατὴς νέος,
Ἡ δ᾽ ὡς πυλῶνος ἦλθε, φασί, πλησίον,
Τῆς δ᾽ προκύπτων Πολέμων ἐν εἰκόνι,
Ταύτην ἰδοῦσα, καὶ γὰρ ἦν σεβασμία.
Ἀπῆλθεν εὐθὺς καὶ θέας ἡττημένη,
Ὡς ζῶντ᾽ ἐπαισχυνθεῖσα τὸν γεγραμμένον. *Gregorii Theologi De virtute*, PG 37, 737-738. The English translation is taken from: K. Demoen, "The Philosopher, the Call Girl and the Icon. Theodore the Studite's (ab)use of Gregory Nazianzen in the Iconoclastic Controversy", in K. Demoen & J. Vereecken, eds., *La spiritualité de l'univers byzantin dans le verbe et l'image*: *Hommages offerts à Edmond Voordeckers à l'occasion de son éméritat* (Instrumenta Patristica 30), Steenbrugge – Turnhout: Brepols, 1997, 69-83, at 73.
[203] Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos III*, 189-190. Trans. Louth, 145.
[204] Mansi 13, 13B-C.
[205] Mansi 13, 13C-D. For all discussion and the English translation of the quotation, see Demoen, "The Philosopher, the Call Girl and the Icon", 74ff, and n. 15.
[206] *Theodori Studitae Epistulae*, vol. 2, ed. G. Fatouros, [CFHB, XXXI/2], Berlin-New York: W. de Gruyter, 1992, 518.
[207] *Theodori Studitae Epistulae*, vol. 2, ed. Fatouros, 840.

and veneration of images. As much as these authors may have distorted the account by reading it, anachronistically, as a story involving a Christian saint, not a pagan thinker,[208] the basic premise of the story reflected a widely held belief in the power of sacred portraiture. Icons were capable of profoundly affecting their viewers and venerators to the point of completely changing their way of life. The same belief informed the story of Mary of Egypt's encounter with the image of the Mother of God at the Holy Sepulchre.

Conclusion

The hymnographic texts discussed in this section constitute an important, if hitherto overlooked, body of evidence on the cult of icons in Byzantium. These poetic compositions are notable insofar as they reflect and reinforce common assumptions about the different roles of sacred images in Byzantine society and religious life. Icons operated as sources of protection, guarantors of imperial victory, apotropaic devices, vehicles of intercession, and tangible points of access to the divine. Allowing for the possibility that some of the hymns ascribed to Germanos were composed during or immediately after the iconoclastic crisis, one could also argue that these texts constituted a significant medium of theological polemic. The question of the legitimacy of icons was debated across multiple genres of Byzantine literature, and liturgical poetry was no exception. Indeed, the ritual use and public performance of this kind of poetry ensured that the messages conveyed in hymnographic texts reached broad audiences, which made them a particularly effective tool for the dissemination of iconophile ideas.

---

[208] This holds true even for modern historiography. See, for example, H.G. Thümmel, *Die Frühgeschichte der ostkirchlichen Bilderlehre. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Zeit vor dem Bilderstreit*, [Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 139], Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1992, 58-59, 217.

CONCLUSION

The present study has explored several aspects of the liturgical hymns transmitted under the name of Germanos, a figure frequently identified with Germanos I, patriarch of Constantinople (715-730), in printed liturgical books, editions of hymns, scholarly literature, and manuscripts. The corpus of hymns associated with this name includes about 65 *kanons* (nine-ode hymns) and 52 *stichera* (monostrophic stanzas), mostly composed during the Middle Byzantine period. By focusing on this large body of texts, the purpose of my research was to contribute to the study of Byzantine hymnography, a largely neglected genre of Byzantine literature despite its enormous fertility and importance. Since the majority of the hymns analysed for the purpose of the present thesis are *kanons*, special attention has been paid to the development of this most widespread genre of the liturgical poetry during the period that was crucial for its evolution. Although the focus of my research has been on liturgical poetry ascribed to Patriarch Germanos I, its findings have broader relevance for the study of Byzantine hymnography in general.

It bears emphasising that the results of the present investigation differ to a certain degree from what was initially expected. In the course of my research I have encountered many issues. The question of the authenticity of the hymns, although not a primary concern of this study, proved particularly challenging. Taking into account the attribution attested in the manuscript record, I began to examine this rich material with confidence that it would provide us with new insights into Patriarch Germanos I's literary activity and shed new light on the initial stage of the iconoclastic controversy. However, despite the presence of anti-iconoclastic references and allusions in some of the hymns, Germanos's authorship of any of these texts is difficult to prove.

As far as the question of authenticity is concerned, a number of factors may explain why these hymns came to be attributed to Germanos I. First of all, it is highly likely that in most instances where the ascription is found, either in the margins or in the rubrics of the manuscripts, it refers only to the *heirmoi* or model stanzas of the *kanons*. In the earliest preserved *heirmologion* dated to the tenth century, the majority of the *heirmoi* used as model stanzas for the composition of the *kanons* ascribed to Germanos are attributed to "Germanos" and "Germanos the patriarch." Unfortunately, it is not possible to determine whether the attribution is applied to both the model stanzas and *troparia* or to the model stanzas alone. The example of the *kanon* for Eustathios the Confessor, bishop of Bithynia, proves that the

attribution could refer only to the *heirmoi*. In Sinait. gr. 607, ff. 111v-115v, dated to the end of the ninth century, the *kanon* composed for Eustathios's annual commemoration is ascribed to Germanos although this saint died in the first half of the ninth century, that is, a century after Germanos's death. However, in the oldest preserved *heirmologia*, the *heirmoi* of this *kanon* are attributed to Germanos, which means that the ascription is applied solely to the *heirmoi*.

Another feature of these *kanons*, which indicates that they could belong to the pen of a later author or authors is that the same *heirmoi* of the same mode are frequently combined in different sequences, with a specific *heirmos* usually accompanied by its corresponding *theotokion* in each or most of the sequences. This fact may suggest that later hymnographer or hymnographers used existing model stanzas attributed to Germanos, accompanied by their corresponding *theotokia*, to compose new *kanons*. Pairs of the same *heirmoi* and *theotokia* may have circulated in special collections similar to those found in the Georgian liturgical tradition. Hence, one or several later hymnographers could have used still unidentified collections of *heirmoi* and *theotokia* to write hymns for different feasts. Later editors or copyists or even hymnographers themselves ascribed them to Germanos. This phenomenon, which can be observed in a range of *kanons* composed during the period under discussion, deserves further investigation.

What makes the question of attribution even more difficult to resolve is the fairly frequent presence of *heirmoi* traditionally attached to the names of other authors, usually of Andrew of Crete or John of Damascus, within the sequences of *heirmoi* that bear Germanos's name in *heirmologia*. This phenomenon includes, but is not limited to, *kanons* transmitted in the earliest Greek manuscripts, which contain Germanos's works. For example, in the nine-ode *kanon* for Mary of Egypt, found in the oldest preserved Greek *menaion*, which is also the earliest manuscript with a hymn under Germanos's name, Sinait. gr. 607 (dated to the end of the ninth century), the *heirmos* of the seventh ode does not belong to Germanos, but to Andrew, according to the tenth-century *Heirmologion* edited by Eustratiadis. Several other examples also include the *kanons* for the Nativity of the Virgin Mary (8 September) and her Annunciation (25 March), to mention only these two among the most important feasts containing hymns attributed to Germanos.

As far as the *stichera* or short monostrophic stanzas are concerned, I have not had the opportunity to check how consistent their attributions are in manuscripts. Nonetheless, I find

it possible that Patriarch Germanos did compose a certain number of *stichera*, especially those for two Mariological feasts, the Nativity of the Virgin Mary and the *Hypapante*, since the patriarch delivered a number of Mariological sermons and generally showed a great interest in Mariological themes.

Since the entire corpus of the hymns preserved under the name of Germanos, as well as of the vast majority of the Byzantine hymnographic production in general is, to say the least, of dubious authenticity, during my investigation of this rich material I looked at other, more reliable common denominators that unite these hymns. These denominators include the hymns' common place of origin, the same period of their composition and the existence of common formal features. That said, despite the problems related to the authenticity of the hymns, the Constantinopolitan provenance of the majority of them, especially *kanons*, can be regarded as indisputable. Their formal characteristics, particularly the presence of the second ode, point to this conclusion. Furthermore, the holy events and the saints for which these hymns were composed, correspond to the calendar of the Constantinopolitan Synaxarium developed by the tenth century. Finally, on the basis of the manuscript tradition, a *terminus ante quem* for the hymns under discussion can be determined as the end of the eleventh century, which means that this sizeable hymnographic corpus was produced during the Middle Byzantine period.

Hence, without giving a definite answer to the complex question of authorship, which in the case of liturgical poetry is not of primary importance, the main purpose of the present study is to explore how the hymns preserved under the name of Germanos and composed in Constantinople between the eighth and eleventh centuries, responded to the cults of the Virgin Mary, saints, and relics, respectively. The poetic response to the cult of the Virgin Mary, which was further stimulated by the iconoclastic controversy during the eighth and ninth centuries, includes both dogmatic references and invocations of her intercession. The iconophile writers of the iconoclastic and post-iconoclastic periods strongly emphasised Mary's crucial role in the Incarnation in order to justify Christ's depiction in images. Furthermore, Byzantine authors attributed to Mary the salvation of the Byzantine capital on several occasions. This resulted in a rapid expansion of her cult, which was reflected in the flourishing of Mariological sermons and hymns. In the hymns under discussion, the Virgin Mary appears as a protectress, intercessor, and guide, but also as a model of virtuous living.

Three Mariological *kanons* attributed to Germanos have been analysed in the present thesis. The first is for her Nativity (8 September); it has been preserved in three manuscripts, namely: Sinaiticus gr. 552, ff. 76-78v (11th c.), Sinaiticus gr. 645, ff. 29v-35 (14th c.) and Sinaiticus gr. 671, ff. 24v-29 (14th c.). The second *kanon* is for her Annunciation (25 March), also transmitted in three manuscripts: Sinait. gr. 609, ff. 104v-106 (11th c.), Sinait. gr. 611, ff. 149-151v (14th c.) and Sinait. gr. 645, ff. 200-204 (14th c.). Finally, the third *kanon* is for the *Hypapante* (2 February), which is preserved in a manuscript anthology of *kanons* from the Skete of Kausokalyvia on Mount Athos. Furthermore, a certain number of *stichera* composed for these feasts are also attributed to Germanos. As can be easily noticed, both the Mariological *kanons* and *stichera* are related either to Mary's birth and childhood or to Christ's Incarnation and infancy. This feature of these hymns could point to their composition in the context of the iconoclastic controversy since the iconophile theologians were increasingly concerned with the reality of Jesus's human nature to justify his pictorial representations. In a detailed analysis, I have also demonstrated that the content of all three of these *kanons* show a certain balance between Mariology and Christology.

In the *kanon* for the Birth of the Virgin Mary, she, naturally, occupies the dominant place, but only the first two odes are entirely focused on her. Mary's parents, especially her mother Anna, figure prominently in the *kanon* as well, while great prominence is also given to Christ. This surely relates to and reflects the iconophile urge to promote the dogmatic teachings on the Incarnation and to emphasise Christ's humanity, his earthly origins and thus his physical forebears.

The content of the hymn for the *Hypapante*, the feast that was regarded as Mariological in the Byzantine tradition, here has a strong Christological character with a heavy emphasis placed on the mystery of the Incarnation and its soteriological implications. Among the protagonists involved in the event, Symeon holds a prominent place. He is presented as a witness to Christ's Incarnation and Mary's role in it, while the physical contact between him and the child Jesus is frequently reiterated throughout the hymn. The fact that on several occasions the hymnographer associates the physical contact with the Incarnation indicates that in this way he wished to portray Symeon as a witness par excellence of God's revelation in the flesh. Furthermore, Symeon is also portrayed in the present *kanon* as a precursor of Christ's descent into Hades, which is a notable and an extremely rare idea in Byzantine literature in general.

Apart from a dogmatic dimension, these hymns present the Virgin Mary as a relational figure to whom different groups of people can turn for help. On some occasions, a specific group is singled out, as, for example, in the *kanon* for the Nativity of the Virgin Mary. In this hymn, the hymnographer invites "barren women" to rejoice, because Anna, although "barren and sterile," became a mother. The reason behind this can be seen in the author's intention to present Anna as a source of solace and hope for women who experience a similar problem. Hence, even though the poetry of the *kanon* does not give too much space to poets to dramatise the events by introducing dialogues between the protagonists, to use direct speech, or to address the audience, in the case of Mariological hymns, as the mentioned example demonstrate, this is not uncommon.

Hagiographical hymns are predominant in the corpus of the poetic works attributed to Germanos I, accounting for about ninety percent of the entire poetic production transmitted under this name. However, the large portion of them is of doubtful authenticity. For example, the lack in the Morcelli calendar of entries for more than twenty days of the liturgical year for which hagiographical *kanons* attached to the name of Germanos are composed, casts serious doubt on their authenticity. As we could see from my analysis of the content of these poetic works, regardless of their genuineness, they are not limited exclusively to the exaltation of the commemorated saints. Rather, their author or authors put themselves in dialogue with both the saints and the faithful. On the one hand, the hymnographer or hymnographers lend their voice to the faithful to address the celebrated saints, either to praise them or to ask for their protection and intercession with God; on the other hand, they urge the gathered congregation to imitate the saints' lives. A particular saint is frequently identified with one specific virtue, while the faithful are encouraged to imitate that virtue in their own life. In a number of hymns the saints' lives and their virtues are also praised as icons intended for the faithful to prompt their eagerness to emulate the heroes they celebrate. Furthermore, a widespread use of a vocabulary and motifs from image-making in some of these hymns points to the iconoclastic era as the time of their composition with the aim of promoting, implicitly or explicitly, the iconophile cause.

As far as the hymns for the sacred relics are concerned, I have paid special attention to the *kanon* for the Exaltation of the Holy Cross in which the Holy Lance is also praised. While the Holy Wood was frequently eulogized in liturgical hymns, the Lance is barely mentioned by any other hymnographer. Its praise in this hymn points to its Constantinopolitan provenance,

where this instrument of Christ's Passion was kept from the beginning of the seventh century and was included in the ritual. For example, it was exposed for veneration in the church of Hagia Sophia during the Holy Week. It was also imbued with Eucharistic symbolism reflected in the development of the rite of *Prothesis* or preparation of the bread and wine for the celebration of the Eucharist in the Eastern Church. Furthermore, during the Middle Byzantine period, representations of the Lance, along with other instruments of the Passion, adorned the walls of Byzantine churches. Its presence in the liturgical life and the artistic production of Constantinople may have been a source of inspiration for the author of this hymn. In other words, this *kanon* attributed to Germanos summarises the spiritual experience of the relic, which played a significant role in the religious life of Constantinople.

What is more, the author of the hymn does not refer to the Holy Cross only as a source of holiness for the faithful; he also understands it as an agent of imperial power. Hence, this *kanon* is one of the rare examples of liturgical hymns that reflect the close association between the Byzantine emperor and the Holy Cross established at the time of Constantine the Great. The hymnographer refers to the Cross as a powerful weapon in the emperor's hand that helps him defeat his enemies who are determined either as "the offshoot of Hagar" or "the barbarians." References to Muslims in this and other hymns under investigation render them potent instruments of religious polemics that could reach a wide audience.

References to the emperor are found in one more hymn attributed to Germanos, namely in the *kanon* on 1 September. Here the emperor is associated with Joshua, the son of Nun. Joshua's leadership skills and competence, demonstrated in warfare against the native population of the Promised Land, became a source of inspiration for Byzantine authors and particularly for visual artists who established a link between Joshua and the emperor. It seems that this is the only preserved ecclesiastical hymn in which such a link is shown and dramatised. In addition, in this *kanon* dedicated to Joshua, the emphasis has shifted from the Holy Cross to the holy images. This example illustrates how hymnography, while being mobilised to strengthen loyalty to the emperor, at the same time insists on the emperor's iconophile sentiments as the central constituent of his Orthodoxy.

My thesis contributes to several aspects of the study of Byzantine hymnography. First of all, it brings together, for the first time, all of these specific hymns. I have achieved that through dedicated archival research. This alone is, in my opinion, a significant contribution to scholarship, since the body of texts presented here will facilitate further research not only on

the hymns from this corpus, but on Byzantine liturgical poetry in general. Second, I provide a comprehensive list of sources transmitted under the name of Germanos. This can serve as a starting point for scholars seeking to re-engage with this significant Byzantine author. Third, I bring a substantial number of previously unpublished hymns to light while simultaneously establishing the importance of this corpus for the study of Byzantine Mariology, hagiology, the cult of relics, and even the Byzantine imperial idea.

Perhaps the most important and, potentially, most impactful contribution of this thesis is the methodological approach to the study of, in this case, Germanos I's hymnographic opus, but also to other Byzantine liturgical hymns of dubious authenticity. Based on the analysis of a great number of manuscripts, I argue that instead of focusing only on date and authorship, we should approach them thematically. To achieve this, I have placed the hymns devoted to the Virgin Mary, the saints, and relics in dialogue with other genres and types of discourse, including sermons, the lives of the saints, theological writings on image veneration, biblical hermeneutics, and liturgical commentaries, as well as with the ritual itself. In this way, we can observe the hymns as agents designed to convey certain messages to the congregation.

Finally, but no less importantly, I provide original palaeographic analysis of previously unpublished Greek medieval manuscripts held in various European libraries and archives, among them Mount Sinai, the National Library of France (Paris), the National Library of Greece (Athens), the monastic libraries of Mount Athos, the Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies (Thessaloniki), and the Historical Museum of Russia (Moscow), to name but a few.

To summarise, I have in this thesis compiled, for the first time, a body of evidence that can be used as a springboard for future work, that supplies a new methodological approach, and that adduces original palaeographic analysis of previously unpublished texts.

Catalogue of hymns attributed to Germanos I

No	Month and Date	Feasts and Saints	Genres	Publications and Manuscripts
1	Sep 1	1) Beginning of the Indiction; 2) Symeon the Stylite; 3) Martha, mother of Symeon the Stylite; 4) Forty Holy Women Martyrs; 5) Holy Martyrs Calliste and Siblings: Evodos and Hermogenes; 6) Joshua, the son of Nun	a) **Kanon**, fourth mode: Ἄσωμέν σοι, Κύριε, ὁ Θεός μου can. inc. Δέσποτα καὶ κτίστα τῆς οἰκουμένης acr. – b) **Stichera**: Two *stichera* to Symeon: 1. Ἠγάπησας θεοφόρε, second mode. 2. Θεία χάρις ἀπηώρητο, second plagal mode. A *sticheron* to the Holy Women: Ὅτε τῷ πάθει σου Κύριε, second mode. **Remark**: Only the *stichera* are currently in liturgical use.	Four versions of this *kanon* are published in: *AHG* 1, 1-40. An unpublished version is preserved in three manuscripts: 1) Sinait. gr. 552, 10v-15v (11th c.) 2) Sinait. gr. 579, ff. 5-6v (11th c.) 3) Alexandrinus Patr. 156, ff. 12-19v (14th c.). **Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ in margine cod. Sinait. gr. 552 or Ἀνδρέου in margine cod. Sinait. gr. 579.
2	Sep 2	John the Faster, Patriarch of Constantinople (d. 595)	1) **Kanon**, plagal fourth mode: Τῷ ἐκτινάξαντι can. inc. Τῷ ἀνατείλαντι ἐν τῷ κόσμω acr. – **Remark**: in liturgical use. b) **Kanon**, first mode: Τὸν Φαραὼ σὺν ἅρμασιν can. inc. Τὸν ἀπὸ βρέφους τῷ Θεῷ / δι᾽ ἐγκρατείας acr. –	Sinait. gr. 552, ff. 20-21v. Sinait. gr. 579, ff. 9-10. **Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ in

			Remark: unpublished.	margine codicum.
3	Sep 3	1) Anthimos, Bishop of Nicomedia; 2) Holy martyr Basilissa of Nicomedia; 3) Holy martyr Zotikos; 4) Hosios Theoctistos	**Kanon**, third mode: Ἄσωμεν τῷ Κυρίῳ can. inc. Ἄσωμεν τῷ Κυρίῳ acr. – **Remark**: unpublished.	Athos, Lavrae Γ 16, ff. 10-14 (11th cent.) Sinait. gr. 552, ff. 27-32 (11th cent.) Sinait. gr. 579, ff. 11v-13 (11th cent.) **Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ in rubrica codicum Sinaiticorum.
4	Sep 8	Nativity of the Virgin Mary	a) **Kanon**, fourth plagal mode: Τῷ ἐκτινάξαντι ἐν θαλάσσῃ. Can. inc. Τὴν πρὸ αἰώνων προορισθεῖσαν / Θεοῦ γενέσθαι μητέρα Acr. – b) **Stichera** 1. Ἡ παγκόσμιος χαρά, fourth mode (chanted also on the Forefeast). 2. Δι᾽ Ἀγγέλου προρρήσεως, fourth mode. 3. Στεῖρα ἄγονος ἡ Ἄννα, fourth mode. **Remark**: Only the stichera are currently in liturgical use.	Sinait. gr. 552, ff. 76-78v (11th c.). Sin. gr. 645, 29v-35 (14th cent.) Sin. gr. 671, ff. 24v-29 (14th cent.) **Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ in rubrica codicum.
5	Sep 14	Exaltation of the Holy Cross	a) **Kanon**, fourth mode: Τριστάτας κραταιούς Can. inc. Ἀγάλλου οὐρανὲ καὶ ἡ γῆ εὐφραινέσθω Acr. alphabetical (without the *theotokia*).	Sin. gr. 552, ff. 127v-130v (11th c.). Chalc. Panaghias 61, ff. 39-41 (16th c.). **Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ πατριάρχου in rubrica cod.

			Remark: The kanon is currently in liturgical use (chanted on the forefeast). b) **Kanon**, fourth mode: Ἄισομαί σοι, Κύριε, ὁ Θεός μου Can. inc. Ἄισομαί σοι, Κύριε, ὁ Θεός μου Acr. – **Remark**: unpublished.	Sinaitici.
6	Sep 16	Martyr Euphemia	**Kanon**, third mode: Τῷ ῥυσαμένῳ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ δουλείας can. inc. Ἐν θεοπνεύστοις ᾄσμασι πάντες acr. – **Remark**: unpublished.	Sinait. gr. 552, ff. 140-142v. **Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ in margine codicis.
7	Sep 18	Martyr Bassos	**Kanon**, fourth mode: Ἄσομαί σοι, Κύριε can. inc. Βάσις φερωνύμως acr. – **Remark**: not in liturgical use.	*AHG* 1, *263-268.*
8	Sep 20	Martyr Eustathios	**Sticheron**, second plagal: Τὴν στρατοπεδαρχίαν **Remark**: in liturgical use.	
9	Sep 26	John the Evangelist	**Sticheron**, second plagal: Τὸν υἱὸν τῆς βροντῆς **Remark**: in liturgical use.	
10	Sep 30	Gregory the Illuminator, bishop of Armenia	**Kanon**, barys mode: Τῷ συντρίψαντι πολέμους can. inc. Τῷ φαιδρύναντι arc. –	*AHG* 1, *366-379.*

			Remark: not in liturgical use.	
11	Oct 3	Dionysios the Areopagite	a) **Kanon**, third mode: Τῷ ῥυσαμένῳ can. inc. Ἡ ὑπερκόσμιος arc. – b) **Sticheron**, fourth plagal mode: Ἐν Ἱερεῦσι καὶ Μάρτυσι διαπρέψας Ὅσιε **Remark**: in liturgical use.	*AHG* 2, 1-11.
12	Oct 7	Martyrs Sergios and Bacchos	**Sticheron**, first mode: Δαυϊτικῶς ἀνεβόων **Remark**: in liturgical use.	
13	Oct 8	Saint Pelagia	**Kanon**, fourth mode: Ἄσωμεν τῷ Κυρίῳ can. inc. Ἐξέφυγες, Πελαγία arc. – **Remark**: not in liturgical use.	*AHG* 2, 73-79
14	Oct. 10	Martyrs Eulampios and Eulampia	**Kanon**, first mode: Τῷ βοηθήσαντι Θεῷ can. inc. Σήμερον πάντας συγκαλεῖ acr. – **Remark**: Unpublished.	Dujčev gr. 271, ff. 127-129 (14th cent.) Sinait. gr. 554, ff. 124v-126 (11th cent.) Vatic. gr. 2270, ff. 104-105 (17th cent.) **Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ in margine codicis Sinaitici.
15	Oct 11	Martyr Zenais	**Kanon**, barys mode: Τῷ συνεργήσαντι Θεῷ can. inc. Μνήμην τελοῦντες εὐσεβῶς acr. –	*AHG* 2, 88-96.

			Remark: not in liturgical use.	
16	Oct 18	Luke the Evangelist	**Kanon**, third mode: Βοηθὸς καὶ σκεπαστής can. inc. Τὸν συγγραφέα acr. – **Remark**: not in liturgical use.	*AHG* 2, 207-216
17	Oct. 22	Aberkios of Hierapolis	**Kanon**, fourth plagal mode: Τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ δουλείας can. inc. Ἱεροσύνης κανόνα acr. – **Remark**: not in liturgical use.	*AHG* 2, 261-265.
18	Oct. 25	Martyrs Marcian and Martyrios	a) **Kanon**, fourth plagal mode: Τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ δουλείας can. inc. Τοὺς εὐσεβεῖς ἀθλοφόρους acr. – b) **Sticheron**, first mode: Μαθηταὶ καὶ ὀπαδοὶ γεγονότες **Remark**: in liturgical use.	*AHG* 2, 284-293.
19	Oct 25	Uaros of Egypt	**Kanon**, fourth plagal mode: Τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ δουλείας can. inc. Τὸν ἀριστέα Κυρίου acr. – **Remark**: unpublished.	Athos, Lavrae Δ 14, ff. 2-3v (12th cent.) Dujčev gr. 271, ff. 161-163v (14th cent.) **Remark**: without attribution.
20	Oct 26	Saint Demetrios	**Sticheron**, second mode: Εἰς τὰ ὑπερκόσμια σκηνώματα **Remark**: in liturgical use.	

| 21 | Nov 1 | Unmercenaries Kosmas and Damian | a) **Kanons**

1. Fourth plagal mode: Τῷ ἐκτινάξαντι ἐν θαλάσσῃ

can. inc. Τῷ ἀναδείξαντι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ

acr. –

2. Fourth plagal mode: Τῷ ἐκτινάξαντι ἐν θαλάσσῃ

can. inc. Τῷ ἀναδείξαντι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ

acr. –

Remark: two different versions of the same kanon.

b) **Sticheron**: second mode: Μεγάλων ἀξιωθέντες δωρεῶν

Remark: only the sticheron is in liturgical use. | *AHG* 3, 58-63; 64-71 |
| 22 | Nov 6 | Paul the Confessor | a) **Kanons**:

1. Barys mode: Τῷ συνεργήσαντι Θεῷ

can. inc. Ὡς μαθητὴν καὶ μιμητήν

acr. –

2. Barys mode: Τῷ συνεργήσαντι Θεῷ

can. inc. Ὡς μαθητὴν καὶ μιμητήν

acr. –

Remark: two different versions of the same *kanon*.

b) **Sticheron**: first mode: Ἀρχιερατικὴν στολὴν | *AHG* 3, 175-181; 182-187. |

			ἐνδυσάμενος **Remark**: only the *sticheron* is in liturgical use.	
23	Nov 8	Synaxis of the Archangel Michael and the other Bodiless Powers	**Kanon**, fourth plagal mode: Τῷ ἐκτινάξαντι ἐν θαλάσσῃ can. inc. Τὰς πυριμόρφους ἀγελαρχίας acr. – **Remark**: unpublished.	Athos, Lavrae Δ 14, ff. 42v-44v Athos, Lavrae E 118, ff. 85-93v Athos, Lavrae I 77, ff. 328v-334 Athos, Katholikou Lavrae 19, ff. 21-23 Paris. Suppl. gr. 33, f. 94r-v Sinait. gr. 567, ff. 57-59v **Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ in rubrica aliquot codicum.
24	Nov 13	John Chrysostom	a) **Kanon**, third mode: Ἄσωμεν τῷ Κυρίῳ, τῷ ποιήσαντι can. inc. Ὡς ὑπέρτιμον ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ acr. – b) **Sticheron**, fourth mode: Ἔπρεπε τῇ βασιλίδι τῶν πόλεων **Remark**: only the sticheron is in liturgical use.	Paris. gr. 259, ff. 137v-139v. **Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ in margine codicis.
25	Nov 16	Matthew the Apostle and Evangelist	**Kanon**, fourth plagal mode: Τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ δουλείας can. inc. Ὁ τῇ ἀρρήτῳ σοφίᾳ acr. – **Remark**: unpublished.	Sinait. gr. 570, ff. 47v-48v. **Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ in margine codicis.
26	Nov 17	Gregory, Bishop of Neo-Caesarea	**Kanon**, third mode: Τῷ ῥυσαμένῳ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ	Sinait. gr. 570, ff. 53-55. Paris. gr. 259, ff. 163v-165v.

			δουλείας can. inc. Ἀκαταγνώστως, ὅσιε acr. – **Remark**: unpublished.	**Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ in margine codicis.
27	Nov 20	Proklos, Archbishop of Constantinople	**Kanon**, fourth plagal mode: Τῷ ἐκτινάξαντι can. inc. Πνευματικῆς εὐφροσύνης acr. – **Remark**: unpublished	Paris. gr. 259, ff. 194-195. Athos, Lavrae I 65, ff. 330-335. Athos, Xeropotamou 116, ff. 85-87v. Athen. Bibl. Nat. 842, ff. 97-102. **Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ in margine codicis Atheniensis.
28	Nov 30	Andrew the First-Called Apostle	a) **Kanon**, fourth mode: Ἄσωμεν τῷ Κυρίῳ can. inc. Τὸ στήριγμα τῆς ἀνδρείας acr. – b) **Sticheron**, third mode: Τὸν συναίμονα Πέτρου **Remark**: only the sticheron is in liturgical use.	Paris. gr. 259, ff. 303v-305v. **Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ in margine codicis.
29	Dec 6	Nicholas, Archbishop of Myra	**Kanon**, first mode: Τῷ βοηθήσαντι Θεῷ can. inc. Πνευματικῶς ἡμᾶς, πιστοί, / ὁ διδάσκαλος ἡμῶν acr. – **Remark**: unpublished.	Sinait. gr. 583, ff. 33-36. Sinait. gr. 590, ff. 55-59v. Athos, Lavrae H 94, ff. 24v-30v. **Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ vel Ἰωάννου Μοναχοῦ.
30	Dec 9	Conception of the Theotokos	**Sticheron**, first mode: Τὸ ἀπόρρητον τοῖς Ἀγγέλοις	

			Remark: in liturgical use.	
31		Sunday of Forefathers	**Sticheron**, third mode: Τῶν Προπατόρων τὸ σύστημα	
			Remark: in liturgical use.	
32	Dec 12	Saint Spyridon	**Sticheron**, second mode: Ἱεραρχῶν τὸ θεῖον κειμήλιον	
			Remark: in liturgical use.	
33	Dec 13	Martyr Eustratios and companions	**Sticheron**, third mode: Ῥητορικοῖς ἔπεσιν ὁ Χριστοῦ στρατιώτης	
			Remark: in liturgical use.	
34	Dec 25	Holy Nativity	**Stichera**	
			1. Second mode: Δεῦτε ἀγαλλιασώμεθα τῷ Κυρίῳ	
			2. Second plagal mode: Χορεύουσιν Ἄγγελοι πάντες	
			3. Second mode: Μέγα καὶ παράδοξον θαῦμα	
			4. Third mode: Σήμερον τίκτει ἡ Παρθένος	
			5. Second plagal mode: Ὅτε καιρός	
			Remark: in liturgical use.	
35	Dec 28	After-feast of Holy Nativity	**Kanon**, first mode: Τῷ βοηθήσαντι Θεῷ can. inc. Ὁ δι᾽ ἀστέρος φαεινοῦ acr. – **Remark**: unpublished.	Sinait. gr. 578, ff. 85-86. (10th/11th c.) **Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ in margine codicis.
36	Dec 29	Holy Innocents	**Kanon**, fourth plagal mode: Τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ δουλείας can. inc. Τὸν γεννηθέντα	*AHG* 4, 734-739

			ἀχρόνως arc. – **Remark**: not in liturgical use.	
37	Jan 1	Basil the Great	a) **Kanon**, fourth plagal mode: Τῷ ἐκτινάξαντι can. inc. Τὸν θησαυρὸν τῶν θείων λογίων acr. – **Remark**: unpublished. b) **Sticheron**, third mode: Χριστὸν εἰσοικισάμενος ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ σου **Remark**: in liturgical use.	Sinait. gr. 598, ff. 16-18. (11th c.) Sinait. gr. 646, ff. 119-124v (14th c.) **Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ in margine codicum.
38	Jan 6	Theophany	**Stichera**: first mode 1. Φῶς ἐκ φωτός, ἔλαμψε τῷ κόσμῳ 2. Πῶς σε Χριστέ 3. Σὺ ἐν Ἰορδάνη βαπτισθείς 4. Τὸ ἀληθινὸν φῶς ἐπεφάνη 5. Ὁ περιβάλλων τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐν νεφέλαις **Remark**: in liturgical use.	
39	Jan 10	Gregory of Nyssa	**Kanon**, fourth plagal mode: Τῷ ἐκτινάξαντι ἐν θαλάσσῃ can. inc. Τῷ ἀνατείλαντι ἑωσφόρον acr. – **Remark**: not in liturgical use.	*AHG* 5, 208-220.

40	Jan 14	The Holy Fathers slain at Sinai and Raitho	**Kanon**, fourth plagal mode: Τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ δουλείας can. inc. Τῆς ἐγκρατείας τοῖς ἄθλοις acr. – **Remark**: unpublished.	Sinait. gr. 595, ff. 41v-43 (a. 1049)· Sinait. gr. 598, ff. 98-99v· Sinait. gr. 666, ff. 217-220· Sinait. gr. 668, ff. 117-133· Sinait. gr. 681, ff. 59v- 67. Hierosol. Sab. 207, ff. 75v-76v. Patm. 198, ff. 98-100v. **Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ in margine aliquot codicum Sinaiticorum.
41	Jan 16	Veneration of the Chains of Saint Peter	**Kanon**, second plagal mode: Ὡς ἐν ἠπείρῳ πεζεύσας ὁ Ἰσραὴλ can. inc. Ὁ διὰ Πνεύματος θείου καὶ πατρικῆς acr. – Οἶδας, φιλῶ σε, Πέτρε, τὸν Θεοῦ φίλον. **Remark**: unpublished. The text of the *kanon* is illegible.	Sinait. gr. 598, ff. 111r-v, 121 (11th c.). **Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ in margine codicis.
42	Jan 18	Athanasios and Cyril	a) **Kanon**, third mode: Ἄσωμεν τῷ Κυρίῳ can. inc. Τὸν λογικὸν λαμπτῆρα acr. – b) **Stichera**, third mode: 1. Ἡ μεγάλη τῆς Ἐκκλησίας σάλπιγξ 2. Τὸ μέγα κλέος τῶν Ἱερέων **Remark**: only the *stichera* are in liturgical use.	*AHG* 5, 326-332.
43	Jan 20	Euthymios the Great	**Sticheron**, third mode:	

			Εὐθυμεῖτε ἔλεγε **Remark**: in liturgical use.	
44	Jan 27	John Chrysostom	**Sticheron**, fourth mode: Πάτερ Χρυσόστομε **Remark**: in liturgical use.	
45	Feb 2	Presentation at the Temple	a) **Kanon**, fourth mode: Ἀνοίξω τὸ στόμα μου can. inc. Ἀκτῖσι φιλάνθρωπε, σῆς φωτοδότιδος χάριτος b) **Stichera**, first mode: 1. Λέγε Συμεών 2. Δέχου Συμεών 3. Δεῦτε καὶ ἡμεῖς **Remark**: only the stichera are in liturgical use.	Athos, Kausokalyvion **Attribution**: Ποίημα Γερμανοῦ Πατριάρχου.
46	Feb 14	Auxentios of the Mountain	**Kanon**, fourth plagal mode: Τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ δουλείας can. inc. Ὅτι ἐν ὄρει ἐπῆρας, τὰς ὁσίας χεῖράς σου acr. – **Remark**: unpublished.	Sinait. gr. 602, ff. 66v-68 (11th c.). **Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ in margine codicis.
47	Feb 23	Hieromartyr Polycarp	**Kanon**, third mode: Τῷ ῥυσαμένῳ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ δουλείας can. inc. Ἡ ὑπερκόσμιος τοῦ θεοφόρου ποιμένος acr. – **Remark**: in liturgical use.	*AHG* 6, 364-375.
48	Feb 24	First and Second Invention of the head of John the Baptist	**Kanon**, fourth mode: Τῷ ἐκτινάξαντι ἐν θαλάσσῃ can. inc. Ὁ τὴν Ἡρώδου πρώην	*AHG* 6, 375-382.

			ἐλέγξας acr. – **Remark**: not in liturgical use.	GIM sin. grec. 181, ff. 119v-122 (11th c.).
49	March 3	Martyrs Eutropios, Kleonikos and Basiliskos	**Kanon**, third mode: Ἄσωμεν τῷ Κυρίῳ, τῷ ποιήσαντι can. inc. Ἄσωμεν τῷ Κυρίῳ, τῷ δοξάσαντι acr. – **Remark**: not in liturgical use.	*AHG* 7, 31-41.
50	March 15	Hieromartyr Pionios	**Kanon**, fourth plagal mode: Τῷ ἐκτινάξαντι ἐν θαλάσσῃ can. inc. Τὸν ἀναδείξαντα ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ acr. – **Remark**: not in liturgical use.	*AHG* 7, 178-186. **Attribution**: Ποίημα Γερμανοῦ
51	March 17	Alexios the Man of God	**Kanon**, third mode: Τῷ ἐκτινάξαντι ἐν θαλάσσῃ can. inc. Σήμερον δεῦτε λαοί acr. – **Remark**: unpublished.	Sinait. gr. 609, ff. 66v-68v (11th c.) Sinait. gr. 611, ff. 106-108v (14th c.). **Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ in codicibus.
52	March 25	The Annunciation of the Virgin Mary	**Kanon**, fourth mode: Ἄσομαί σοι, Κύριε, ὁ Θεός μου can. inc. Ἄσωμέν σοι, Κύριε, ὁ Θεός μου acr. – **Remark**: unpublished.	Sinait. gr. 609, ff. 104v-106 (11th c.) Sinait. gr. 611, ff. 149-151v (14th c.) Sinait. gr. 645, ff. 200-204 (14th c.). **Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ in margine codicis Sinait. gr. 609.
53	April 1	Mary of Egypt	**Kanon**, third mode: Τῷ ῥυσαμένῳ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ	*AHG* 8, 26-24.

			δουλείας	Sin. gr. 607, ff. 126-129
			can. inc. Τῆς μετανοίας ὑπογραμμόν acr. – **Remark**: not in liturgical use.	**Attribution**: Ο ΚΑΝΩΝ ΓΕΡΜ[ΑΝΟΥ] in rubrica aliquot codicum.
54	April 23	Great Martyr George	**Kanon**, first mode: Ἀναστάσεως ἡμέρα can. inc. Ἀνατείλαντι τῆς δόξης τῷ ἡλίῳ Χριστῷ acr. – **Remark**: unpublished.	Athos, Pantokratoros 162, ff. 103v-105v (1365). Athen. Bibl. Nat. 557, ff. 105-107v (15th c.). Marc. gr. II 160, ff. 23-48v (16th c.). Vindob. Hist. gr. 66, ff. 141-149 (12th c.). **Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ in theotociis.
55	May 2	Relics of Athanasios of Alexandria	**Sticheron**, second plagal mode: Χριστοῦ τὸν Ἱεράρχην **Remark**: in liturgical use.	
56	May 8	John the Theologian	**Sticheron**, second mode: Τὸν υἱὸν τῆς βροντῆς **Remark**: in liturgical use.	
57	May 24	Martyr Meletios	**Kanon**, fourth plagal mode: Τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ δουλείας can. inc. Εἰ καὶ θνητῷ καὶ ἀνόμῳ acr. – **Remark**: not in liturgical use.	*AHG* 9, 247-255.
58	Jun 12	Onuphrios of Egypt	**Kanon**, fourth mode: Ἅρματα Φαραώ can. inc. Αἴγλῃ τῆς τριφεγγοῦς	*AHG* 10, 36-50.

			acr. – **Remark**: not in liturgical use.	
59	Jun 17	Martyrs Manuel, Sabel and Ismael	**Kanon**, fourth plagal mode: Τῷ ἐκτινάξαντι ἐν θαλάσσῃ can. inc. Ἄσωμεν ᾆσμα πάντες τῷ Κτίστῃ acr. – **Remark**: not in liturgical use.	*AHG* 10, 100-117.
60	Jun 24	Nativity of John the Forerunner	**Kanon**, barys mode: Ἄσωμέν σοι, Κύριε, ὁ Θεός μου can. inc. Ὡς ἑωσφόρον νοητόν· τοῦ ἡλίου τῆς δόξης acr. – **Remark**: unpublished.	Sinait. gr. 620, 119v-121v· Sinait. gr. 696, ff. 265-268. **Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ vel Ἀνδρέου
61	Jun 26	Hieromartyr Olbianos	**Kanon**, fourth plagal mode: Τῷ ἐκτινάξαντι ἐν θαλάσσῃ can. inc. Τῷ ἀναδείξαντι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ acr. – **Remark**: unpublished.	Sinait. gr. 620, ff. 126-128 (10th c.). **Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ in margine codicis.
62	Jun 28	Inventions of the Relics of Unmercenaries Kyros and John	1) **Kanon**, fourth plagal mode: Τῷ ἐκτινάξαντι ἐν θαλάσσῃ can. inc. Ἐκ τῶν τοῦ Πνεύματος χαρισμάτων acr. – 2) **Kanon**, fourth plagal mode: Τῷ ἐκτινάξαντι ἐν θαλάσσῃ can. inc. Τῷ ἀναδείξαντι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ acr. - **Remark**: Two versions of the same *kanon*. Unpublished.	Sinait. gr. 620, ff. 137-140 (10th c.). Sinait. gr. 642, ff. 329v-332. **Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ in margine codicum Sinaiticorum.
		Translation of the Relics of	**Kanon**, third mode:	

63	28 Jun	Unmercenaries Kyros and John	Τῷ ῥυσαμένῳ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ δουλείας inc. Οἱ ἐκ Θεοῦ τοῦ φιλανθρώπου τὴν χάριν acr. -	*AHG* 10, 243–251
64	29 Jun	Apostles Peter and Paul	**Stichera**, second mode: 1. Πέτρε, κορυφαῖε τῶν ἐνδόξων Ἀποστόλων 2. Παῦλε, στόμα Κυρίου **Remark**: in liturgical use.	
65	1 July	Kosmas and Damian	**1) Kanon,** fourth plagal mode: Τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ δουλείας inc. Τοὺς θησαυροὺς τῶν ἰαμάτων 2) **Kanon**, fourth plagal mode: Τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ δουλείας inc. Τοὺς θησαυροὺς τῶν ἰαμάτων Remark: Two versions of the same *kanon*. **Stichera**, second mode: 1. Μεγάλων ἀξιωθέντες δωρεῶν πανεύφημοι 2. Ἀγάλλεται ὁ χορὸς τῶν Ἁγίων εἰς αἰῶνας 3. Ἰατροὶ τῶν ἀσθενούντων **Remark**: in liturgical use.	*AHG* 11, 2–10 and 11–18
66	8 July	Martyr Prokopios	**Sticheron**, third mode: Inc. Νεανικὴν ἄγων τὴν ἡλικίαν, ὥσπερ ὁ θεσπέσιος Παῦλος	

			Remark: in liturgical use.	
67	15 July	Martyrs Kyrikos and Julitta	**Kanon**, third mode: Ἄσωμεν τῷ Κυρίῳ, τῷ ποιήσαντι inc. Τὸν Ἀβραὰμ τῇ πίστει arc. – Remark: Unpublished.	Athen. Bibl. Nat. 562, ff. 78v-79v (14th c.). Meteor. Metamorphoseos 150, 146-148 (12th c.). Sin. gr. 625, ff. 66-69 (11th c.). Sin. gr. 627, ff. 52-54 (11th c.). Attribution: Γερμανοῦ in codicibus.
68	19 July	Dios the Abbot	**Kanon**, fourth plagal mode: Τῷ ἐκτινάξαντι ἐν θαλάσσῃ can. inc. Τὸν ἀσκητὴν τὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας acr. -	*AHG* 11, 347–358
69	20 July	Prophets Elijah and Elisha	**Kanon**, fourth mode: Ἄσομαί σοι, Κύριε, ὁ Θεός μου can. inc. Ἄσομαί σοι, Κύριε, ὁ Θεός μου acr. – **Remark**: Unpublished. **Stichera**, first mode: 1. Ἡλίας ὁ ζηλωτής, καὶ τῶν παθῶν αὐτοκράτωρ 2. Δαυϊτικῶς σήμερον πιστοί 3. Πνευματικοῖς ᾄσμασι τοὺς Προφήτας τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἅπαντες εὐφημήσωμεν **Remark**: in liturgical use.	Sinait. gr. 625, ff. 95-97v (11th c.). Sinait. gr. 626, ff. 169r-v (12th c.). Sinait. gr. 627, ff. 76v-78v (11th c.). Sinait. gr. 662, ff. 221-230v (1292). Galatonensis 3, ff. 213-222v (16th c.). Paris. gr. 1569, ff. 108-109v (12th c.).

70	23 July	Martyrs Trophimos and Theophilos	**Kanon**, fourth mode: Ἄσομαί σοι, Κύριε, ὁ Θεός μου can. inc. Ἄσομαί σοι, Κύριε, ὁ Θεός μου acr. –	*AHG* 11, 390-403
71	25 July	Saints Olympias and Eupraxia	**Kanon**, fourth mode: Ἄσωμεν τῷ Κυρίῳ τῷ πατάξαντι can. inc. Τιμήσωμεν ἐπαξίως τὴν ἀληθῶς καλλιπάρθενον acr. – **Remark**: Unpublished.	Sinait. gr. 625, ff. 124v-126v (11th c.). **Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ in rubrica codicis.
72	27 July	Martyr Panteleimon	1) **Kanon**, third mode: Τῷ ῥυσαμένῳ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ δουλείας can. inc. Τὸν πρὸς πάντας ὁ Χριστοῦ ἀθλοφόρος φερωνύμως ἔλεον acr. – **Remark**: Unpublished. 2) **Sticheron**, first plagal mode: Inc. Ἡ παμφαὴς τοῦ Μάρτυρος μνήμη **Remark**: in liturgical use.	Sinait. gr. 625, ff. 136v-139 (11th c.). Attribution: Γερμανοῦ in rubrica codicis.
73	31 July	Consecration of the Church of Blachernae	**Kanon**, fourth plagal mode: Τῷ ἐκτινάξαντι ἐν θαλάσσῃ can. inc. Μνήμην τελοῦντες τῶν ἐγκαινίων acr. – **Remark**: Unpublished.	Sinait. gr. 626, ff. 152v-155 v. (11th c.). **Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ in rubrica codicis.

74	6 August	Metamorphosis	**Kanon**, fourth plagal mode: Τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ δουλείας can. inc. Τὸν ἐν τῷ ὄρει Θαβωρείῳ, τῇ ἀστραπῇ τοῦ θείου φωτός **Remark**: Unpublished.	Sinait. gr. 631, ff. 21-22v (10th c.). Alexandrinus Patr. 118, ff. 43-46v (1353) **Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ in margine cod. Sinaitici.
75	15 August	Dormition of the Virgin Mary	**Sticheron**, third mode: Inc. Δεῦτε ἄπαντα τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς	
76	18 August	Martyrs Floros and Lauros	**Kanon**, barys mode: Τῷ συνεργήσαντι Θεῷ can. inc. Δυὰς μαρτύρων εὐσεβῶν acr. –	*AHG* 12, 207–216 **Attribution**: Γερμανοῦ
77	29 August	Beheading of John the Baptist	**Stichera**, first mode: 1. Τὶ σε καλέσωμεν Προφῆτα 2. Τῆς ἀποτμηθείσης κεφαλῆς τοῦ Προδρόμου 3. Σήμερον ἡ ἀνοσιουργότροπος μήτηρ τοῦ φόνου **Remark**: in liturgical use.	

LIST OF MANUSCRIPTS

List of manuscripts with unpublished *kanons* ascribed to Germanos I, Patriarch of Constantinople.

Alexandrinus Patr. 118 (AD 1353)

Alexandrinus Patr. 156 (14th cent.)

Atheniensis Bibl. Nat. 557 (15th cent.)

Atheniensis Bibl. Nat. 562 (14th cent.)

Atheniensis Bibl. Nat. 842 (13th cent.)

Athous, Iveron 800 (15th cent.)

Athous, Katholikou Lavrae 19 (AD 1835)

Athous, Kausokalyvion (?) (19th cent.)

Athous, Lavrae E 118 (16th cent.)

Athous, Lavrae H 94 (17th cent.)

Athous, Lavrae I 65 (AD 1462)

Athous, Lavrae I 77 (AD 1345)

Athous, Lavrae Γ 16 (11th cent.)

Athous, Lavrae Δ 14 (12th cent.)

Athous, Lavrae Θ 42 (AD 1631)

Athous, Lavrae Θ 43 (14th cent.)

Athous, Lavrae Ω 147 (AD 1435)

Athous, Panteleimonos 80 (13th cent.)

Athous, Pantokratoros 162 (AD 1365)

Athous, Philotheou 26 (12th cent.)

Athous, Philotheou 30 (12th cent.)

Athous, Philotheou 35 (12th cent.)

Athous, Vatopediou 1108 (15th cent.)

Athous, Vatopediou 1110 (15th cent.)

Athous, Xeropotamou 116 (13th cent.)

Chalcensis, Panaghias 61 (16th cent.)

Dujčev gr. 15 (16th cent.)

Dujčev gr. 25 (AD 1312)

Dujčev gr. 271 (14th cent.)

Dujčev gr. 35 (AD 1410/1411)

Dujčev gr. 373 (AD 1486)

Dujčev gr. 69 (15th cent.)

Galatonensis 3 (16th cent.)

GIM Sin. grec. 181 (State Historical Museum, Moscow) (11th cent.)

Hierosolymitanus Sab. 207 (13th-14th cent.)

Marcianus gr. II 160 (16th cent.)

Meteoriticus, Metamorfoseos 150 (12th cent.)

Parisinus gr. 1569 (12th cent.)

Parisinus gr. 259 (11th cent.)

Parisinus gr. 345 (15th cent.)

Parisinus Suppl. gr. 33 (13th cent.)

Patmiacus 198 (14th cent.)

Patmiacus 738 (? cent.)

Sinaiticus gr. 550 (13th cent.)

Sinaiticus gr. 552 (11th cent.)

Sinaiticus gr. 554 (11th cent.)

Sinaiticus gr. 567 (12th cent.)

Sinaiticus gr. 570 (11th cent.)

Sinaiticus gr. 578 (10th-11th cent.)

Sinaiticus gr. 579 (11th cent.)

Sinaiticus gr. 583 (11th cent.)

Sinaiticus gr. 590 (13th cent.)

Sinaiticus gr. 595 (AD 1049)

Sinaiticus gr. 598 (11th cent.)

Sinaiticus gr. 602 (11th cent.)

Sinaiticus gr. 609 (11th cent.)

Sinaiticus gr. 611 (14th cent.)

Sinaiticus gr. 620 (10th cent.)

Sinaiticus gr. 625 (11th cent.)

Sinaiticus gr. 626 (12th cent.)

Sinaiticus gr. 627 (11th cent.)

Sinaiticus gr. 631 (10th cent.)

Sinaiticus gr. 642 (AD 1474-1477)

Sinaiticus gr. 645 (14th cent.)

Sinaiticus gr. 646 (14th cent.)

Sinaiticus gr. 662 (AD 1292)

Sinaiticus gr. 666 (15th cent.)

Sinaiticus gr. 668 (14th cent.)

Sinaiticus gr. 671 (14th cent.)

Sinaiticus gr. 681 (AD 1764)

Sinaiticus gr. 696 (14th cent.)

Vaticanus gr. 2270 (17th cent.)

Vindobonensis Hist. gr. 66 (12th cent.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Acta apostolorum apocrypha, vol. 1, ed., R. A. Lipsius, Leipzig: Mendelssohn, 1891 (reprint Hildesheim: Olms, 1972), 235-271.

Anastasios of Sinai, *Sermones duo in constitutionem hominis secundum imaginem Dei*, ed. K.-H. Uthemann, CSCG 12, Turnhout: Brepols, 1985, 55-83.

Anthologia Graeca carminum Christianorum, eds. W. Christ, and M. K. Paranikas, Leipzig: Teubner, 1871.

Anthony of Choziba: *Miracula Beatae Virginis Mariae in Choziba eodem Antonio Chozebitae auctore*, ed. C. Houze, *Analecta Bollandiana* 7 (1888) 360-370. English translation: T. Vivian and A.N. Athanassakis, trans., Anthony of Choziba, *The Life of Saint George of Choziba and the Miracles of the Most Holy Mother of God at Choziba*, San Francisco, CA and London: International Scholars Publications, 1994, 95-105.

Athanasios of Alexandria, *Vie d'Antoine*, ed. G. J. M. Bartelink, SC 400, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1994.

Augustine: Sant' Agostino, *Polemica con i Manichei*, NBA 13/1, Rome: Città Nuova Editrice, 1997.

Basil the Great, *Homily on Psalm 115*, PG 30: 104B-116A.

Byzantine Saints' Lives in Translation, ed. A.-M. Talbot, Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 1998.

Chronicon Paschale, vol. 1, ed., L. Dindorf, Bonn: Weber, 1832. English translation: M. Whitby and M. Whitby, *Chronicon Paschale 284-628 AD*, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1989.

Constantine Porphyrogennetos, *The Book of Ceremonies*, 2 vols., trans. A. Moffatt and M. Tall, Byzantina Australiensia 18, Canberra: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 2012.
_____ *Story of the Image of Edessa*, PG 113: 421-454.

Corpus Dionysiacum, 2, eds. G. Heil and A. M. Ritter, Patristische Texte und Studien 36, Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1991. English translation: Pseudo-Dionysius, *The Complete Works*, trans. C. Luibheid, New York: Paulist Press, 1987.

Cunningham, M. *'Wider Than Heaven': Eighth-Century Homilies on the Mother of God*, Crestwood, NY: Saint Vladimir Seminary's Press, 2008.

Cyprian: R. Weber, ed., *Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera*, CCSL 3.1, Turnhout: Brepols, 1972.

Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarius in Isaiam Prophetam*, PG 70, 9A-1449C.

Cyril of Skythopolis: E. Schwartz, ed., *Kyrillos von Skythopolis*, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1939.

De Groote, M. "An Anonymous Sermon against the Hagarenes, the Bogomils, and the Jews", *The Harvard Theological Review*, 97.3 (2004) 329-334+336-351.

Déroche, V. ed., "Doctrina Jacobi nuper baptizati", *Travoux et mémoires* 11 (1991) 47-229.

Dorotheos the Abbot, *Doctrina XXIII. Expositio in verba divi Gregorii decantata in sanctos martyres*, PG 88, 1829B–1836B.

Egeria, *Journal de Voyage (Itinéraire)*, ed. and trans. P. Maraval, SC 296, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1982.

Ephrem, *Hymns on the Church*, CSCO 199, ed. E. Beck, Scriptores Syri 85, Louven: Peeters, 1960.

_____ K. G. Phrantzoles, ed., *Sancti patris nostri Ephraem Syri opera omnia*, vol. 4, Thessaloniki: To Perivoli tis Panagias, 1995, 129-154.

Eusebios, *Eusebius Werke I. Über das Leben Constantins. Constantins Rede an die Heilige Versammlung. Tricennatsrede an Constantin*, GCS 7, ed. I. A. Heikel, Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1902. English translation: *Life of Constantine*, trans. A. Cameron and S. Hall, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

_____ *Evangelicae Praeparationis libri 15*, ed. E. H. Gifford, Oxford: Typographeo Academico, 1903.

_____ *Praeparatio evangelica*, *Eusebius Werke*, ed. K. Mras, Band 8, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1956.

Evagrios Scholastikos, *Histoire Ecclésiastique*, eds. J. Bidez and L. Parmentier, SC 566, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2014. English translation: *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus*, M. Whitby, trans., Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000.

Follieri, E. "Un canone inedito di s. Andrea di Creta", *Collectanea Vaticana in honorem Anselmi M. Card. Albareda*, Studi e Testi 219, Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1962, 345-357.

Gaudentius of Brescia, *Tractate*, ed. A. Glück, CSEL 68, Vienna: Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1936.

George the Monk, *Chronicon breve*, PG 110, 41A-1285D.

Georgios Kedrenos, *Historiarum compendium*, vol. 1, ed. I. Bekker, Bonn: Weber, 1838.

Georgios of Pisidia: A. Pertusi, ed., *Giorgio di Pisidia. Poemi. I. Panegirici Epici*, Ettal: Buch-Kunstverlag, 1959.

Germanos of Constantinople, *On the Entry into the Temple I*, PG 98, 292C-309B.

_____ *On the Entry into the Temple II*, PG 98, 309B-320B.

_____ Λόγος εἰς τὸν Εὐαγγελισμὸν τῆς ὑπεραγίας Θεοτόκου ὡς ἐν σχήματι διαλόγου, ed. D. Fecioru, *Biserica Orthodoxă Română* 64 (1946) 65-91; 180-192; 386-396.

_____ *On the Dormition I*, PG 98, 340A-348C.

_____ *On the Dormition II*, PG 98, 348C-357D.

_____ *On the Dormition III*, PG 98, 360A-372D.

_____ P. Meyendorff, ed. and trans., *St Germanus of Constantinople on the Divine Liturgy*, Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984.

Goar, J. ed. *Εὐχολόγιον, sive rituale Graecorum*, Venice: Simeon Piget, 1730.

Goodspeed, E. J. ed., *Die ältesten Apologeten*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1915.

Gouillard, J. "Le Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie: Édition et commentaire", *Travaux et Mémoires* 2 (1967) 1-316.

Gregory of Nazianzos, *Against Julian*, PG 35, 531-664.

_____ *Discours 32-37*, eds. and trans. C. Moreschini and P. Gallay, SC 318, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1985.

_____ *Discours 42-43*, ed. J. Bernadi, SC 384, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1992.

_____ *Funeral Orations by Saint Gregory Nazianzen and Saint Ambrose*, trans. L. P. McCauley, and al., Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1968.

Gregory of Nyssa, *De Sancto Theodoro*, ed., J. P. Cavarnos, in: W. Jaeger et al., eds., *Gregorii Nysseni. Sermones*, vol. 10, Leiden: Brill, 1990. English translation: *Homily on St. Theodore*, trans. in: J. Leemans et al., eds., *"Let Us Die that We May Live"*: *Greek Homilies on Christian Martyrs from Asia Minor, Palestine and Syria (c. AD 350-AD 450)*, London: Routledge, 2003.

_____ *La vie de Moise*, ed. J. Danielou, SC 1, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1968. English translation: *The Life of Moses*, trans. A. Malherbe and E. Ferguson, New York: Paulist Press, 1978.

_____ *Vie de sainte Macrine*, ed. and trans. P. Maraval, SC 178, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1971.

Halkin F. and A.-J. Festugière, ed., and French trans., "Invention du chef de s. Jean-Baptiste (BHG 842a)," in: F. Halkin, *Dix textes inédits tirés du ménologe impérial de Koutloumous*, Geneva: P. Cramer, 1984, 70-79.

Hesychios of Jerusalem, *Les homélies festales, Vol. 1, Les homélies i-xv*, ed. M. Aubineau, Subsidia hagiographica 59, Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1978, 22-42.

Ignatios of Antioch, *Lettres*, ed. P. T. Camelot, SC 10, Paris: Édition du Cerf, 1958.

Ignatios the Deacon, *The Life of the Patriarch Tarasios*, ed. and trans. S. Efthymiadis, Byzantine and Ottoman Monographs 4, Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998.

_____ *Ignatios Diakonos und die Vita des Hl. Gregorios Dekapolites*, ed. G. Makris, Byzantinisches Archiv 17, Stuttgart and Leipzig: Teubner, 1997.

Irenaeus of Lyons, *Contre les hérésies*, ed. F. Sagnard, SC 34, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1952.

Itinera et Descriptiones Terrae Sanctae I, ed. T. Tobler, Geneva: J. C. Fick, 1877.

Jerome, *Life of Hilarion*, trans. C. White, in: *Early Christian Lives*, London: Penguin Books, 1998.

_____ *Adversus Vigilantium*, ed. J. L. Feiertag, CCSL, vol. 79C, Turnhout: Brepols, 2005.

John Chrysostom: *Joanni Chrysostomi In Matthaeum* (PG 57:12-472).

_____ *Huit Catéhèses Baptismales*, ed. and trans. A. Wenger, SC 50, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1957.

John Moschos: *The Spiritual Meadow of John Moschus*, trans. J. Wortley, Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1992.

John of Damascus, *Homélies sur la nativité et la dormition*, ed. P. S. Voulet, SC 80, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1961.

_____ *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, ed. B. Kotter, Patristische Texte und Studien 7, 12, 17, 22, 29, Berlin and New York: W. de Gruyter, 1969-88.

_____ *St John of Damascus, Three Treatises on the Divine Images*, trans. and intr. A. Louth, Crestwood, New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003.

Kassia: The Legend, the Woman, and Her Work, ed. and trans., A. Tripolitis, New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1992.

Lactantius, *De mortibus persecutorum*, ed. and trans. J. L. Creed, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Le grand lectionnaire de l'Église de Jérusalem Ve-VIIIe siècle, CSCO 188, 189, 204, 205, Sciptores Iberici 9, 10, 13, 14, ed. M. Tarchnisvili, Louven: Peeters,1959-1960.

Le Typicon de la Grande Église, 2 vols, ed. J. Mateos, OCA 165-166, Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1962-1963.

Les Apophtegmes des pères: collection systématique, 3 vols., ed. J.-C. Guy, SC 387, 474, 498, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1993–2005. English translation: *The Sayings of the Desert Fathers: The Alphabetical Collection*, trans. B. Ward, Oxford: Mowbray, 1975.

Life of St. Mary of Egypt, trans. M. Kouli, in: A.-M. Talbot, ed., *Holy Women of Byzantium: Ten Saints' Lives in English Translation*, 1, Washington, D.C: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1996, 65-93.

Mansi, J. D. *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, vols. 1-53, Paris-Leipzig, 1901-1927. Reprint: Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1960-1961.

Maruta of Maipherqat: *Canons Ascribed to Maruta of Maipherqat: and Related Sources*, 2 vols, ed. and trans. A. Vööbus, Leuven: Peeters, 1982.

Morcelli, S. A. ed., *Kalendarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, 2 vols, Rome, 1788.

New Testament Apocrypha. Gospels and Related Writings, vol. 1, ed. W. Schneemelcher, London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003.

Nikephoros of Constantinople, *Refutatio et eversio definitionis synodalis anni 815*, CCSG, vol. 33, ed. J. M. Featherstone, Turnhout: Brepols, 1997.

_____ *Vita Nicephori Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani*, in: *Nicephori Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani Opuscula Historica*, ed. C. de Boor, Leipzig: Teubner, 1880, 139-217.

_____ *Nicephori Patriarchae Constantinopolitani Breviarium Historicum*, CFHB, ed. C. Mango, Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 1990.

Paulinus of Nola, *Letters* 31, vol. 2, trans. P. G. Walsh, London: The Newman Press, 1967.

Prudentius, ed. H. J. Thomson, Loeb Classical Library 398, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1953.

Renoux, C. *Les hymnes de la résurrection, 1. Hymnographie liturgique géorgienne. Textes du Sinai 18*, Sources Liturgiques 3, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2000.

Renoux, C. *Les hymnes de la résurrection*, *Hymnographie liturgique géorgienne, texte des manuscrits Sinaï 40, 41 et 34*, PO 52.1. Turnhout: Brepols, 2010.

Romanos the Melode, *Hymnes*, ed. J. G. de Matons, SC 99, 110, 114, 128, 283, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1964-1981.

_____ *Kontakia*, vol. 1, *On the Person of Christ*, trans., M. Carpenter, Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1970.

_____ *Kontakia*, vol. 2, *On Christian Life*, trans., M. Carpenter, Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1973.

_____ *Sancti Romani Melodi Cantica: Cantica Genuina*, eds. P. Maas, and C. Trypanis, Oxford: Clarendon, 1963.

Saint Ambrose, *Letters*, trans. M. M. Beyenka, Washington: The Catholic University of America, 1967.

Sophronios of Jerusalem: P. Allen, *Sophronius of Jerusalem and Seventh-Century Heresy. The Synodical Letter and Other Documents*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Stephen the Deacon: *La Vie d' Étienne le Jeune*, ed. M.-F. Auzépy, Birmingham Byzantine and Ottoman Monographs 3, Aldershot/Brookfield: Variorum, 1997.

Symeon the Stylite: *The lives of Simeon Stylites*, trans., R. Doran, Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1992.

Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae e Codice Sirmondiano nunc berolinensi, ed. H. Delehaye, Paris: Apud Socios Bollandianos, 1902.

Tertullian, *La Chair du Christ*, ed. J.-P. Mahè, SC 216, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1975.

The Acts of the Christian Martyrs, ed. and trans. H. Musurillo, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.

The Ante-Nicene Fathers. The Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325, vol. 5: Fathers of the Third Century, eds. A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1981.

The Apocryphal New Testament. A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation Based on M.R. James, ed. J. K. Elliott, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

The Festal Menaion, trans. Mother Mary and Archimandrite Kallistos Ware, London: Faber and Faber, 1969.

The Lenten Triodion, trans. Mother Mary and Archimandrite Kallistos Ware, London: Faber and Faber, 1978.

The Life of Saint Basil the Younger, trans. D. F. Sullivan, et al., Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2014.

The Life of Saint George of Amastris, trans. D. Jenkins, University of Notre Dame, 2011. Available online: https://library.nd.edu/byzantine_studies/documents/Amastris.pdf (accessed on 27 March 2017).

Theodore Daphnopates, *Θεοδώρου τοῦ Δαφνοπάτου λόγοι δύο*, ed. B. Latyshev, *Pravoslavnyj Paleslinkij Sbomik* 59, 1910.

Theodore of Studios, *Adversus Iconomachos*, PG 99: 485C-497C.

_____ *Epistulae*, vol. 2 [CFHB, XXXI/2], ed. G. Fatouros, Berlin-New York: W. de Gruyter, 1992.

_____ *Theodori Studitae laudatio in tertiam Inuentionem venerandi Capitis sanctissimi Praecursoris*, in: Du Cange, *Traité historique du chef de S. Jean Baptiste*, Paris 1665.

Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *L'histoire des moines de Syrie*, 2 vols., eds. P. Canivet and A. Leroy-Molinghen, SC 234, 257, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1977-1979. English translation: *A History of the Monks of Syria*, trans. R. M. Price, Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1985.

_____ *Commentary on the Psalms. Psalms 1-71*, trans. R. C. Hill, Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2000.

_____ *Thérapeutique des maladies helléniques*, ed P. Canivet, SC 57, Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1957.

Theophanes the Confessor, *Chronographia*, vol. 1, ed. C. de Boor, Leipzig: Teubner, 1885 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1963). English translation: *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor.*

Byzantine and Near Eastern History, AD 284-813, ed. C. Mango and R. Scott (with the assistance of G. Greatrex), Oxford: Clarendon Press 1997.

Theophylact Simocatta, *Historiae*, ed. C. de Boor, Leipzig: Teubner, 1887.

Vitae duae antiquae sancti Athanasii Athonitae, ed. J. Noret, CCSG 9, Turnhout: Brepols, 1982.

Εἱρμολόγιον, ed. S. Eustratiadis, Paris: Chennevières-sur-Marne, 1932.

S E C O N D A R Y   L I T E R A T U R E

Alexander, P. "The Iconoclastic Council of St. Sophia (815) and Its Definition (Horos), *DOP* 7 (1953) 35-66.

Allatius, L. "De libris et rebus ecclesiasticis graecorum", in: J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, vol. 5, Hamburg: Christian Liebezeit, 1723.

Allen, P. "The Role of Mary in the Early Byzantine Feast of the Hypapante", in: K. Demura and N. Kamimura eds., *Patristica*, Supplementary vol. 2, *Festschrift in Honour of Shinro Kato on His 80th Birthday*, Nagoya 2006.

Anastos, M. "The Ethical Theory of Images Formulated by the Iconoclasts in 754 and 815", *DOP* 8 (1954) 151-160.

Auzépy, M.-F. "La carrière d'André de Crète", *BZ* 88 (1995) 1-12.

Avner, R. "The Initial Tradition of the Theotokos at the Kathisma: Earliest Celebrations and the Calendar", in: L. Brubaker and M. Cunningham, eds., *The Cult of the Mother of God in Byzantium: Texts and Images*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2011, 9-29.

Barber, C. *Figure and Likeness. On the Limits of Representation in Byzantine Iconoclasm*, Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Beck, H.-G. *Kirche und Theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich*, Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959.

Bernard, F. *Writing and Reading Byzantine Secular Poetry 1025-1081*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Bernhard, L. "Der Ausfall der 2. Ode im byzantinischen Neunodenkanon", in: T. Michels, ed., *Heuresis: Festschrift für A. Rohracher*, Salzburg: Otto Müller, 1969, 91–101.

Boeck, E. *Imagining the Byzantine Past: The Perception of History in the Illustrated Manuscripts of Skylitzes and Manases*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015, 149-154.

Bornert, R. *Les commentaires byzantins de la divine liturgie du VIIe au XVe siècle*, Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1966.

Botte, B. *Les origines de la Noël* et de l'*Épiphanie. Étude historique*, Louvain: Mont César, 1932.

Boyarin, D. *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999.

Bradshaw, P. and M. Johnson, *The Origins of Feasts, Fasts and Seasons in Early Christianity*, Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2011.

Breckenridge, J. *The Numismatic Iconography of Justinian II (685-695, 705-711 A.D.)*, New York: American Numismatic Society, 1959.

Brightman, F. E. *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895.

Brown, P. "The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity," *JRS* 61 (1971) 80–101.

_____ "A Dark-Age Crisis: Aspects of the Iconographic Controversy", *English Historical Review* 88/346 (1973) 1-34.

_____ *Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1981.

_____ "The Saint as *Exemplar* in Late Antiquity", *Representations* 1 (1983) 1-25.

Brubaker L. and J. Haldon, *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era, c. 680-850: A History*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Calabuig, I. M. "The Liturgical Cult of Mary in the East and West", in: A. Chupungco, ed., *Handbook of Liturgical Studies* 5, Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2000, 244-255.

Cameron, A. "The Construction of Court Ritual: The Byzantine Book of Ceremonies in Rituals of Royalty," in: D. Cannadine and S. Price, eds., *Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987, 106-136.

Canart, P. *Lezioni di paleografia e di codicologia greca*, Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1980.

Casey, D. "The Spiritual Valency of Gender in Byzantine Society", in: B. Neil and L. Garland, eds., *Questions of Gender in Byzantine Society*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2013, 167-179.

Casiday, A. M. *Evagrius Ponticus*, London and New York: Routledge, 2006.

Ciggaar, K. "Une description de Constantinople traduite par un pelerin anglais", *Revue des études Byzantines*, 34 (1976) 211-267.

Connell, M. J. "The Origins and Evolution of Advent in the West", in M. E. Johnson, ed., *Between Memory and Hope. Readings on the Liturgical Year*, Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2000, 349-371.

Constas, N. *Proclus of Constantinople and the Cult of the Virgin in Late Antiquity. Homilies 1-5, Texts and Translations*, Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2003.

Corrigan, K. *Visual Polemics in the Ninth-Century Byzantine Psalters*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

_____ "*In the Beginning was the Word*: Art and Orthodoxy at the Councils of Trullo (692) and Nicaea II (787)", in: A. Louth and A. Casiday, eds., *Byzantine Orthodoxies. Papers from the Thirty-sixth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Durham*, 23-25 March 2002, [Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies 12], Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006, 95-101.

Crook, J. *The Architectural Setting of the Cult of Saints in the Early Christian West c. 300-1200*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Cunningham M. & L. Brubaker, eds., *The Cult of the Mother of God in Byzantium: Texts and Images*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2011.

Cunningham, M. "Dramatic Device or Didactic Tool? The Function of Dialogue in Byzantine Preaching", in: E. Jeffreys, ed., *Rhetoric in Byzantium: Papers from the Thirty-Fifth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies*, Exeter College, University of Oxford, March 2001. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003, 101-113.

_____ "The Reception of Romanos in Middle Byzantine Homiletics and Hymnography", *DOP* 62 (2008) 251-261.

_____ "The Use of the *Protevangelion of James* in the Eighth-Century Homilies on the Mother of God", in: L. Brubaker and M. Cunningham, eds., *The Cult of the Mother of God in Byzantium: Texts and Images*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2011, 165-178.

_____ "The Impact of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite on Byzantine Theologians of the Eighth Century: The Concept of 'Image'", in J. Mihoc and L. Aldea, eds., *A Celebration of Living Theology: A Festschrift in Honour of Andrew Louth*, London: Bloomsbury, 2014, 41-58.

Dagron, G. *Emperor and Priest. The Imperial Office in Byzantium,* trans. J. Birrell, Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Daley, B. E. trans., *On the Dormation of Mary. Early Patristic Homilies*, Crestwood, NY: Saint Vladimir Seminary's Press, 1998;

Daniélou, J. "Abraham dans la tradition chrétienne", *Cahiers Sioniens* 5 (1951) 160-179.

_____ *From Shadows to Reality. Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers*, trans. W. Hibberd, Westminster: The Newman Press, 1960.

Danielou, J. and H. Musurillo, eds., *From Glory to Glory*: *Texts from Gregory of Nyssa's Mystical Writings*, New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1979.

De Strycker, E. *La forme la plus ancienne du Protévangile de Jacques. Recherches sur le Papyrus Bodmer 5 avec une édition critique du texte grec et une traduction annotée*, Subsidia Hagiographica 33, Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1961, 64-191.

Dehandschutter, B. *Martyrium Polycarpi. Een literair-kritische studie*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologicarum Louaniensium 52, Leuven: Universitaire Presse, 1979.

Demoen, K. "The Philosopher, the Call Girl and the Icon. Theodore the Studite's (ab)use of Gregory Nazianzen in the iconoclastic controversy", in: K. Demoen & J. Vereecken, eds., *La spiritualité de l'univers byzantin dans le verbe et l'image*: *Hommages offerts à Edmond*

Voordeckers à l'occasion de son éméritat (Instrumenta Patristica 30), Steenbrugge – Turnhout: Brepols, 1997, 69-83.

Denysenko, N. "The *Hypapante* Feast in Fourth to Eighth Century Jerusalem", *SL* 37 (2007) 73-97.

Descoeudres, G. *Die Pastophorien im syro-byzantinischen Osten. Eine Untersuchung zu architektur- und liturgiegeschichtlichen Problemen*, Schriften zur Geistesgeschichte des östlichen Europa, Bd. 16, Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1983, 85-126.

Detorakis, T. *Κοσμᾶς ὁ μελῳδός. Βίος καὶ ἔργο, Ἀνάλεκτα Βλατάδων* 28, Thessaloniki: Patriarchikon Idryma Paterikon Meleton, 1979.

_____ "Οἱ ἅγιοι καὶ οἱ μάρτυρες στὴν ὑμνογραφία", in: *Ὁ ἅγιος καὶ μάρτυρας στὴ ζωὴ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, Athens: Ἀποστολικὴ Διακονία τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, 1994, 203-215.

_____ *Βυζαντινὴ Ὑμνογραφία*, Herakleion: University of Crete, 1997.

Dmitrievskij, A. *Opisanie liturgicheskih rukopisej chraniaschichsja v bibliotekah pravoslavnago vostoka*, vol. 1, Kiev: Tipografija G. T. Korchak–Novickago, 1895.

Djuric, V. "Novi Isus Navin", *Zograf* 14 (1983) 5-16.

Dowden, G. *The Church Year and Kalendar*, Cambridge: The University Press, 1910.

Duval, Y. and C. Pietri, "*Membra Christi*, culte des martyrs ou théologie de l'eucharistie? (Apropos du vase de Belezma, en Algérie)", *Revue des études augustiniennes* 21 (1975) 289-301.

Dvornik, F. *Les légendes de Constantin et de Méthode vues de Byzance*, Prague: Orbis, 1933.

Efthymiadis, S. "Hagiography from the 'Dark Age' to the Age of Symeon Metaphrastes (Eighth-Tenth Centuries)", *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography, vol. 1: Periods and Places*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2011, 95-142.

Eustratiadis, S. *Ἡ Θεοτόκος ἐν τῇ Ὑμνογραφίᾳ*, Paris: Éditions Honoré Champion, 1930.

Evans, H. C. and W. D. Wixom, eds., *The Glory of Byzantium: Art and Culture of the Middle Byzantine Era, A.D. 843-1261*, New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1997, No. 97, 151-152.

Fassler, M. "The First Marian Feast in Constantinople and Jerusalem: Chant Texts, Readings, and Homiletic Literature," in: P. Jeffery, ed., *The Study of Medieval Chant: Paths and Bridges, East and West: In Honor of Kenneth Levy*, Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2001, 25-87.

Fletcher, R. A. "Celebrations at Jerusalem on March 25th in the Sixth Century A.D.", in: F. L. Cross, ed., *Papers Presented to the Third International Conference on Patristic Studies, Studia Patristica* 5, Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1962, 30-34.

_____ "Three Early Byzantine Hymns and their Place in the Liturgy of the Church of Constantinople", *BZ* 51 (1958) 53-65.

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

Follieri, E. *Initia Hymnorum Ecclesiae Graecae*, vols. 1-5, Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1960-1966.

Frazer, M. E. "Hades Stabbed by the Cross of Christ", *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 9 (1974) 153-161.

Frøyshov, S. R. "The Georgian Witness to the Jerusalem Liturgy: New Sources and Studies", in: B. Groen, S. Hawkes-Teeples and S. Alexopoulos, eds., *Inquiries into Eastern Christian Worship. Selected Papers of the Second International Congress of the Society of Oriental Liturgy, Rome, 17-21 September 2008*, Leuven: Peeters, 2012, 227-267.

Gador-Whyte, S. *Rhetoric and Ideas in the Kontakia of Romanos the Melodist*, (unpublished PhD dissertation), University of Melbourne, 2011.

Galadza, D. "The Jerusalem Lectionary and the Byzantine Rite", in: B. Groen, D. Galadza, N. Glibetic, and G. Radle, eds., *Rites and Rituals of the Christian East*, Leuven: Peeters, 2014, 181-199.

Gambero, L. *Mary and the Fathers of the Church. The Blessed Virgin Mary in Patristic Thought*, trans. by T. Buffer, San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1999.

Gardthausen, V. *Catalogus codicum graecorom sinaiticorum*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1886.

Géhin, P. and S. Frøyshov, "Nouvelles découvertes sinaïtiques: à propos de la parution de l'inventaire des manuscrits grecs", *RÉB* 58 (2000) 167-184.

Gendle, N. "The Role of the Byzantine Saint in the Development of the Icon Cult", in: S. Hackel, ed., *The Byzantine Saint*, Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminar Press, 2001, 181-186.

Geerard, M. ed., 2nd ed. J. Noret, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, Turnhout: Brepols, 2003, vol. 3.

Giannouli, A. "Byzantine Hagiography and Hymnography: An Interrelationship", in: St. Efthymiadis, ed., *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography, vol. 2: Genres and Contexts*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2014, 285–312.

Grabar, A. *Les peintures de l'Évangéliaire de Sinope (Bibliothèque nationale, Suppl. Gr. 1286)*, Paris: Bibliothèque nationale, 1948.

Grant, R. *Irenaeus of Lyons*, London and New York: Routlege, 1997.

Griffith, S. *Romanos le Mélode et les origines de la poésie religieuse à Byzance*, Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1977.

_____ "Theodore Abu Qurrah's Arabic Tract on the Christian Practice of Venerating Images", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 105 (1985) 53-73.

Grosdidier de Matons, J. "Liturgie et Hymnographie: Kontakion et Canon", *DOP* 34 (1980–81) 31-43.

_____ "Christian, Muslims, and the Image of the One God: Iconophilia and Iconophobia in the World of Islam in Umayyad and Early Abbasid Times", in: B. Groneberg und H. Spieckermann, ed., *Die Welt der Götterbilder*, Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 2007, 347–380.

Grumel, B. "Cassia", *Dictionnaire d' Histoire et Géographie Ecclésiastique* 11 (1949) 1312–1315.

Guidetti, M. *In the Shadow of the Church: The Building of Mosques in Early Medieval Syria*, Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Hannick, C. "The Theotokos in Byzantine Hymnography: Typology and Allegory", in: M. Vassilaki, ed., *Images of the Mother of God. Perceptions of the Theotokos in Byzantium*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005, 69-76.

Harris, S. "The 'Kanon' and the Heirmologion", *Music and Letters* 85.2 (2004) 175-197.

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

Hoegel, C. ed., *Metaphrasis: Redactions and Audiences in Middle Byzantine Hagiography*, Oslo: The Research Council of Norway, 2011.

Hoegel, C. *Symeon Metaphrastes: Rewriting and Canonization*, Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2002.

Hofmann, J. B. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des griechischen*, Munich: Oldenbourg, 1950.

Hollerich, M. "The Comparison of Moses and Constantine in Eusebios of Caesarea's Life of Constantine," *Studia Patristica* 19 (1989) 80–85.

_____ "Religion and Politics in the Writings of Eusebius: Reassessing the First 'Court Theologian'," *Church History* 59 (1990): 309–325.

Honigmann, E. "Juvenal of Jerusalem", *DOP* 5 (1950) 209-279.

Horvath, T. *"*Germanus of Constantinople and the Cult of the Virgin Mary*,* Mother of God*,* Mediatrix of All Human Beings," *De Cultu Mariano Saeculis VI-IX*, vol. 4, Rome: Pontificia Academia Mariana Internationalis, 1972, 285-299.

Hostetler, B. *The Function of Text: Byzantine Reliquaries with Epigrams, 843-1204* (PhD dissertation), Florida State University, 2016.

Howard-Johnston, J. and P. A. Hayward, *The Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages: Essays on the Contribution of Peter Brown*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Huglo, M. "L'ancienne version latine de l'Hymne Acathiste", *Muséon* 64 (1951) 27-61.

Hunt, E. D. "The Traffic in Relics: Some Roman Evidence", in: S. Hackel, ed., *The Byzantine Saint*, Birmingham: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001, 171–180.

Irwin, K. W. *Context and Text: Method in Liturgical Theology*, Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1993.

Janeras, S. "Les lectionnaires de l'ancienne liturgie de Jérusalem", *Collectanea Christiana Orientalia* 2 (2005) 71-92.

_____ "Le temps avant Noël dans l'ancienne liturgie de Jérusalem", *Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata* 4 (2007) 109-117.

Jolivet-Levy C., *"*La glorification de l'empereur à l'*église du Grand Pigeonnier de Cavusin*", *La Cappadoce aux surprenantes richesses. Histoire et Archéologie, Les Dossiers* n° 63, Dijon: CNRS, May 1982, 73-77.

_____ "L'image du pouvoir dans l'art byzantine à l'époque de la dynastie macédonienne (867-1056)", *Byzantion* 57 (1987) 441-470.

Jugie, M. "La première fête mariale en Orient et en Occident, pavent primitif," *Échos d'Orient* 22 (1923) 129-152.

_____ *La Mort et l'Assomption de la Sainte Vierge: Étude historico-doctrinale*, Studi e Testi 114, Rome: Biblioteca Vaticana, 1944.

Kaegi, W. "Initial Byzantine Reactions to the Arab Conquest", *Church History* 38.2 (1969) 139-149.

Karavites, P. "Gregory Nazianzinos and Byzantine Hymnography", *The Journal for Hellenic Studies* 113 (1993) 81-98.

Kazhdan, A. *A History of Byzantine Literature (650-850)*, in collaboration with L. F. Sherry – C. Angelidi [Research Series 2], Athens: The National Hellenic Research Foundation, Institute for Byzantine Research, 1999.

_____ A *History of Byzantine Literature (850-100)*, Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation, 2006.

Kekelidze, K. *Liturgicheskie gruzinskie pamjatniki v otecestvennyh knigohranilischah i ih nauchnoe znachenie (Liturgical Georgian Monuments in Native Libraries and Their Scientific Significance)*, Tbilisi: Tipografija Bratstvo, 1908.

Khevsuriani, L. M. *The Structure of the Most Ancient Tropologion*, Tbilisi: Academy of Sciences, Georgian SSR, 1984 (in Russian).

Klein, H. A. "Sacred Relics and Imperial Ceremonies at the Great Palace of Constantinople", in: F. A. Bauer, ed., *Visualisierungen von Herrschaft, BYZAS* 5 (2006) 79-99.

Kollyropoulou, T. "Ἔκδοση τῶν β΄ ᾠδῶν οἱ ὁποῖες ἐξέπεσαν ἀπὸ τοὺς ἐκδιδομένους κανόνες στὰ λειτουργικὰ βιβλία καὶ τὰ AHG", *Ἐπετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν* 51 (2003) 404-479.

Koschmieder, E. "Die ältesten Novgoroder Hirmologien-Fragmente II", *Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, Neue Folge* 37, Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie *der* Wissenschaften, 1955.

Krausmüller, K. "Making the Most of Mary: The Cult of the Virgin in the Chalkoprateia from Late Antiquity to the Tenth Century", in: L. Brubaker and M. Cunningham, eds., *The Cult of the Mother of God in Byzantium: Texts and Images*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2011, 219-245.

Krivko, R. N. "Синайско-славянские гимнографические параллели", *Вестник Православного Свято-Тихоновского Гуманитарного Университета, Филология,* 1.11 (2008) 56–102.

Krueger, D. "Mary at the Threshold: The Mother of God as Guardian in Seventh-Century Palestinian Miracle Account", in: L. Brubaker and M. Cunningham, eds., *The Cult of the Mother of God in Byzantium: Texts and Images*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2001, 31-38.

_____ *Writing and Holiness: The Practice of Authorship in the Early Christian East*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

_____ "The Religion of Relics in Late Antiquity and Byzantium", *Treasures of Heaven: Saints, Relics, and Devotion in Medieval Europe,* London: British Museum Press, 2010, 5-17.

_____ "The Old Testament and Monasticism", in: P. Magdalino and R. Nelson, eds., *The Old Testament in Byzantium*, Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2010, 199-221.

_____ *Liturgical Subjects. Christian Ritual, Biblical Narrative, and the Formation of the Self in Byzantium*, Philadelphia: University of Pensilvania Press, 2014.

Krumbacher, D. *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur von Justinian biz zum Ende des Oströmischen Reiches (527–1453)*, Munich: Beck, 1897.

La Piana, G. "The Byzantine Theater", *Speculum* 11.2 (1936) 171-211.

Lampe, G. W. H. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.

Lamza, L. *Patriarch Germanos I. von Konstantinopel (715-730): Versuch einer endgültigen chronologischen Fixierung des Lebens und Wirkens des Patriarchen: mit dem griechisch-deutschen Text der Vita Germani am Schluss der Arbeit*, Würzburg: Augustinus-Verlag, 1975.

Larsen-Miller, L. "The Altar and the Martyr: Theological Comparisons in Liturgical Texts and Context", in: R. R. Ervine, ed., *Worship Traditions in Armenia and the Neighboring*

Christian East, Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press and St. Nersess Armenian Seminary, 2006, 237-260.

Lauxtermann, M. D. *Byzantine Poetry from Pisides to Geometres. Texts and Contexts*, vol. 1, Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2003.

Lazarević, S. "Στιχηράριον: An Early Byzantine Hymn Collection with Music", *Byzantinoslavica* 2 (1968) 290–318.

Legrand, E. *Bibliographie Hellénique aux XVe et XVIe siècles*, vol. 1, Paris: Leroux, 1885.

Liddell, H. G. and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Lidov, A. "The Creator of Sacred Space as a Phenomenon of Byzantine Culture", in: M. Bacci, ed., *L'artista a Bisanzio e nel mondo cristiano-orientale*, Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2007, 135-176.

Lilie, R.-J. ed., *Die Patriarchen der ikonoklastischen Zeit: Germanos I. – Methodios I. (715-847)*, Berliner Byzantinistische Studien, Band 5, Frankfurt am Main, etc.: Peter Lang, 1999, 5-21.

Limberis, V. M. *Divine Heiress. The Virgin Mary and the Creation of Christian Constantinople*, London and New York: Routledge 1994

Longo, A. "Il testo integrale della Narrazione degli abati Giovanni e Sofronio attraverso le Hermêneiai di Nicone", *RSBN* 12–13 (1965/66) 230–267.

Lössl, J. "An Early Christian Identity Crisis Triggered by Changes in the Discourse of Martyrdom: The Controversy between Jerome of Strido and Vigilantius of Calagurris", in: J. Leemans, ed., *More than a Memory: The Discourse of Martyrdom and the Construction of Christian Identity in the History of Christianity*, Leuven: Peeters, 2005, 97-117.

Louth, A. *Denys the Areopagite*, London: Continuum, 1989.

_____ *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition: From Plato to Denys*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Luckman, H. and L. Kulzer, eds., *Purity of Heart in Early Ascetic and Monastic Literature: Essays in Honour of Juana Raasch OSB*, Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999.

Lunde, I. "Dialogue and the Rhetoric of Authority in Medieval Preaching", in: I. Lunde, ed., "Dialogue and Rhetoric: Communication Strategies in Russian Text and Theory", Slavica Bergensia 1, Bergen: University of Bergen, 1999, 84-101.

Magdalino, P. "L'Église du Phare et les reliques de la Passion à Constantinople (VIIe/VIIIe-XIIIe siècles)", in: J. Durand and B. Flusin, eds., *Byzance et les Reliques du Christ*, Paris: Association des amis du Centre d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance, 2004, 15-30.

Mandalà, M. *La protesi della liturgia nel rito bizantino-greco*, Grottaferrata: Scuola Tipografica Italo-Orientale "San Nilo", 1935.

Margutti, S. "The Power of the Relics: Theodosius I and the Head of John the Baptist in Constantinople", *Studia Patristica* 62 (2013) 339-352.

Marinis, V. "The Historia Ekklesiastike kai Mystike Theoria: A Symbolic Understanding of the Byzantine Church Building", *BZ* 108 (2015) 753-770.

Mayer, W. "A Life of Their Own: Preaching, Radicalisation, and the Early ps-Chrysostomica in Greek and Latin", forthcoming.

Mayer, W. and B. Neil, *St John Chrysostom. The Cult of the Saints*, Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2006.

Mazza, E. *The Celebration of the Eucharist: The Origin of the Rite and the Development of Its Interpretation*, Minnesota MN: Liturgical Press, 1999.

McCormick, M. *Eternal Victory. Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium and the Early Medieval West*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

McDonnell, K. "The Marian Liturgical Tradition", in: M. Johnson, ed., *Between Memory and Hope. Readings on the Liturgical Year*, Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2000, 385-400.

Merras, M. *The Origins of the Celebration of the Christian Feast of Epiphany. An Ideological, Cultural and Historical Study*, Joensuu: University of Joensuu, 1995.

Métrévéli, H. and B. Outtier, "Anciens Hirmologia Géorgiens", *Muséon* 88.3-4 (1975) 331-359.

Mitsakis, K. *Βυζαντινὴ Ὑμνογραφία. Ἀπὸ τὴν Καινὴ Διαθήκη ὡς τὴν Εἰκονομαχία*, Athens: Γρηγόρης, 1986.

Moss, C. R. *The Other Christs: Imitating Jesus in Ancient Christian Ideologies of Martyrdom*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Mullett, M. "Rhetoric, Theory, and the Imperative of Performance: Byzantium and Now", in: E. Jeffreys, ed., *Rhetoric in Byzantium*, Aldershot: Ashgate 2003, 151-170.

Munitiz, J. "Wonder-working Icons and the Letters to Theophilos", *Byzantinische Forschungen* 24 (1997) 115-123.

Nikiforova, A. "Relics in Byzantine Hymnography", in A. Lidov, ed., *Relics in Byzantium and Medieval Russia. Written Sources*, Moscow: Progress-Tradition, 2006, 109-176 (in Russian).

_____ *From the History of the Menaion in Byzantium. Hymnographic Monuments from the Eighth to the Twelfth Century from the Collection of Saint Catherine's Monastery on Mt. Sinai*, Moscow: Pravoslavnyj Svyato-Tichonovskiy Gumanitarnyj Universitet, 2012, 172-189.

_____ "The Oldest Greek Tropologion Sin.Gr. ΜΓ 56+5: A New Witnes to the Liturgy of Jerusalem from Outside Jerusalem with First Edition of the Text", *Oriens Christianus* 98 (2015) 138-174.

Nikolopoulos, P. G. *Τὰ νέα εὑρήματα τοῦ Σινᾶ*, Athens: Ministry of Culture, 1998.

Olkinuora, J. *Byzantine Hymnography for the Feast of the Entrance of the Theotokos* (PhD dissertation), University of Eastern Finland, 2015.

Panou, E. "Mary's Parents in Homilies Before and After James Kokkinobaphos", in: A. Eastmond and L. James, eds., *Wonderful Things: Byzantium through its Art. Papers from the 42nd Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, London, 20-22 March 2009*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2013, 335-348.

Papailiopoulou-Photopoulou, E. *Ταμεῖον ἀνέκδοτων βυζαντινῶν ἀσματικῶν κανόνων seu Analecta Hymnica Graeca e codicibus eruta Orientis Christiani*, Athens: Σύλλογος πρὸς διάδοσιν ὠφελίμων βιβλίων, 1996.

Papaioannou, S. "Byzantine *historia*", in: K. A. Raaflaub, ed., *Thinking, Recording, and Writing History in the Ancient World*, Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2014, 297-313.

_____ "Voice, Signature, Mask: The Byzantine Author", in: A. Pizzone, ed., *The Author in Middle Byzantine Literature: Modes, Functions, and Identities*, Berlin and Boston: W. De Gruyter, 2014, 21-40.

Papoutsakis, M. "The Making of a Syriac Fable: From Ephrem to Romanos", *Muséon* 120 (2007) 29-75.

Patterson-Ševčenko, N. "Canon and Calendar: The Role of a Ninth-Century Hymnographer in Shaping the Celebration of the Saints", in: L. Brubaker, ed., *Byzantium in the Ninth Century: Dead or Alive?*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998, 101-114.

Peltomaa, L. M. *The Image of the Virgin Mary in the Akathistos Hymn*, The Medieval Mediterranean 35, Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Peltomaa, L. M., P. Allen and A. Külzer, eds, *Presbeia Theotokou. The Intercessory Role of Mary across Times and Places in Byzantium (4th-9th Century)*, Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences, 2015.

Pentcheva, B. "The Supernatural Protector of Constantinople: The Virgin and Her Icons in the Tradition of the Avar Siege", *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 26 (2002) 2-41.

_____ *Icons and Power. The Mother of God in Byzantium*, University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 2006.

Petersen, W. L. "The Dependence of Romanos the Melodist upon the Syriac Ephraem: Its Importance for the Origin of the Kontakion", *Vigiliae Christianae* 39 (1985) 171-187.

Pitra, J. B. *Juris ecclesiastici Graecorum historia et monumenta*, vol. 1, Rome: Typis S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, 1864.

_____ *Hymnographie de l'église grecque*, Rome: La Civiltà Cattolica, 1867.

Pott, T. *Byzantine Liturgical Reform. A Study of Liturgical Change in the Byzantine Tradition*, (trans. from the French by P. Meyendorff), Crestwood, NY: St.Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2010.

Puchner, W. "Τὸ βυζαντινὸ θέατρο", *Κέντρον ἐπιστημονικῶν ἐρευνῶν: Ἐπετηρίς* 11 (1981-1982) 214-217.

Raabe, R. ed., *Petrus der Iberer. Ein Charakterbild zur Kircchen- und Sittengeschichte des fünften Jahrhunderts*, Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1895.

Raasch, J. "The Monastic Concept of Purity of Heart I-V," *Studia Monastica* 8.1 (1966) 7-33; 8.2 (1966) 188-213; 10.1 (1968) 7-55; 11 (1969) 269-314; 12.1 (1970) 7-41.

Raasted, J. "Some Observations of the Structure of the Stichera in the Byzantine Rite", *Byzantion* 28 (1958) 520-541.

_____ ed., *Hirmologium Sabbaiticum*: Pars Suppletoria, Monumenta Musicae. Byzantinae 8.1, Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1968.

_____ "Observations on the Manuscript Tradition of Byzantine Music, II: The Contents of Some Early Heirmologia", *Cahiers de l'Institut du Moyen-Âge Grec et Latin* 8 (1972) 35-47.

_____ "The Princeton Heirmologion Palimpsest", *Cahiers de l'Institut du Moyen-Âge grec et latin* 62 (1992) 219-232.

Rapp, C. "Byzantine Hagiographers as Antiquarians, Seventh to Tenth Centuries", in: S. Efthymiadis, C. Rapp and D. Tsougarakis, eds., *Bosphorus. Essays in Honour of Cyril Mango*, Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1995, 31-44.

_____ "For Next to God, You are My Salvation: Reflections on the Rise of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity", in: J. Howard-Johnston and P.A. Hayward, eds., *The Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages. Essays on the Contribution of Peter Brown*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999, 63-81.

_____ "Old Testament Models for Emperors in Early Byzantium", in: P. Magdalino and R. Nelson, eds., *The Old Testament in Byzantium*, Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collections, 2010, 175-197.

Ray, W. *August 15 and the Development of the Jerusalem Calendar*, (PhD dissertation), University of Notre Dame, 2000.

Rebillard, É. *The Care of the Dead in Late Antiquity*, trans. E. T. Rawlings and J. Routier-Pucci, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2009.

Renoux, A. "Liturgie arménienne et liturgie hiérosolymitaine", *Liturgie de l'Église particulière et liturgie de l'Église universelle*, Bibliotheca Ephemerides Liturgicae Subsidia 7, Rome: Edizioni Liturgiche, 1976.

Roberts, M. *Poetry and the Cult of the Martyrs: The Liber Peristephanon of Prudentius*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993.

Rochow, I. *Studien zu der Person, den Werken und dem Nachleben der Dichterin Kassia*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1967.

Rodley, L. "The Pigeon House Church**,** *Çavuşin"*, *JÖB* 33 (1983) 301-339.

Rogobete, C. C. *Ἡ ἑορτὴ τοῦ Εὐαγγελισμοῦ στὸ χριστιανικὸ ἑορτολόγιο* (PhD dissertation), University of Thessaloniki, 2009.

Rorem, P. "Moses as the Paradigm for the Liturgical Spirituality of Pseudo-Dionysius", *Studia Patristica* 18.2 (1989) 275-279.

_____ *Pseudo-Dionysius: A Commentary on the Texts and an Introduction to Their Influence*, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Roth, G. *Paradox beyond Nature. An Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholic Dialogue on the Marian Homilies of Germanos I, Patriarch of Constantinople (715-730)*, Bloomington: Authorhouse, 2012

Rybakov, V. A., *Saint Joseph the Hymnographer and His Poetic Activity*, Moscow: Russkaya Kniga, 2002 (in Russian, reprint).

Sahas, D. *John of Damascus on Islam: The 'Heresy of the Ismaelites'*, Leiden: Brill, 1972.

Sansterre, J.-M. "La parole, le texte et l'image selon les auteurs byzantins des époques iconoclaste et posticonoclaste", *Testo e immagine nell'alto medioevo* 41, Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1994, 197-240.

Schepkina, M. V. *Miniatyury Chludovskoj Psaltyri. Grecheskiy Illyustrirovannyj Kodeks IX veka*, Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1977.

Schick, R. *The Christian Communities in Palestine from Byzantine to Islamic Rule: A Historical and Archaeological Study*, Princeton, NJ: The Darwin Press, 1995.

Schulz, H.-J. *The Byzantine Liturgy. Symbolic Structure and Faith Expression*, trans. M. J. O'Connell, New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1986.

Ševčenko, I. "Hagiography of the Iconoclast Period", in: A. Bryer and J. Herrin, eds., *Iconoclasm*, Birmingham: Centre for Byzantine Studies, 1977, 113-131.

Shalina, I. A. *Relikvii v vostochnochristianskoj ikonografii. Christianskie relikvii v Moskovskom Kremle*, Moscow: Radunica, 2000.

Shoemaker, S. "The Cult of Fashion: The Earliest *Life of the Virgin* and Constantinople's Marian Relics", *DOP* 62 (2008) 53-74.

Silvas, A. "Kassia the Nun c.810-c.865: An Appreciation", in: L. Garland, ed., *Byzantine Women: Varieties of Experience AD 800-1200,* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006, 17-39.

Simic, K. *The Poetess Kassia: Liturgical Poetry of the Poetess Kassia and its Slavic Translation,* Belgrade-Novi Sad: Akademska knjiga, 2011 (English translation forthcoming).

Sottocornola, F. *L'anno liturgico nei sermoni di Pietro Crisologo: Ricerca storico-critica sulla liturgia di Ravenna antica*, Cesena: Centro Studi e Ricerche, 1973.

Speck, P. "Die Affäre um Konstantin von Nakoleia", *BZ* 88 (1995) 148-154.

Speck, P. *Artabasdos, der rechtgläubige Vorkämpfer der göttlichen Lehren. Untersuchungen zur Revolte des Artabasdos und ihrer Darstellung in der byzantinischen Historiographie*, Poikila Byzantina 2, Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1981.

Speck, P. "The Origins of the Byzantine Renaissance," in: *Understanding Byzantium. Studies in Byzantine Historical Sources*, Variorum Collected Studies Series, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003, 143-162.

Springer, C. P. E. "Sedulius' 'A solus ortus cardine': The Hymn and Its Tradition", *Ephemerides liturgicae* 101 (1987) 69–75.

Starowieyski, M. "Le Titre Θεοτόκος avant le concile d'Ephèse", in E. A. Livingstone, ed., *Studia Patristica* 19, Leuven: Peeters, 1987, 236-242.

Steppa, J.-E. *John Rufus and the World Vision of Anti-Chalcedonian Culture*, Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2002.

Stevenson, K. "The Origins and Development of Candlemas: A Struggle for Identity and Coherence?", *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 102 (1988) 316-346.

Stichel, R. "L'affresco di Michele arcangelo e Giosuè ad Osios Lukas: La sua interpretazione nel quadro di affreschi simili in Cappadocia e Georgia", *Atti del Primo simposio internazionale sull'arte georgiana*, Milano: Solari, 1977, 289.

Strunk, O. "The Antiphons of the Octoechos." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 13 (1960) 50–67.

_____ *Specimina Notationum Antiquorum*, Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1966.

Taft, R. "The Liturgy of the Great Church: An Initial Synthesis of Structure and Interpretation on the Eve of Iconoclasm," *DOP* 34/35 (1982) 45-75.

_____ *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. The Precommunion Rites*, OCA 261, Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium, 2000.

Talley, Th., *The Origins of the Liturgical Year*, Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1991.

Thierry, N. "Un portrait de Jean Tzimiskès en Cappadoce", *Travaux et Mémoires 9 (1985)* 477-484.

Thomas, D. and B. Roggema, eds., *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History (600-900)*, vol. 1, Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Thümmel, H. G. *Die Frühgeschichte der ostkirchlichen Bilderlehre. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Zeit vor dem Bilderstreit*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 139, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1992.

Tomadakis, E. *Ἰωσὴφ ὁ Ὑμνογράφος. Βίος καὶ Ἔργον*, Athens: Ἀδελφοὶ Μυρτίδη, 1971.

Tonias, D. E. *Abraham in the Works of John Chrysostom*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2014.

Treadgold, W. "Stephen's *Life*", *Speculum* 77.2 (2002) 468-470.

Tsironis, N. "The Mother of God in the Iconoclastic Controversy", in: M. Vassilaki, ed., *Mother of God: Representations of the Virgin Mary in Byzantine Art*, Milan and Athens: Museum Benaki, 2000, 27-39.

Usener, H. "Weihnachtspredigt des Sophronios", *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 41 (1886) 501-516.

Van Esbroeck, M. "*La Lettre de l'empereur Justinien sur l'Annonciation et la Noël en 561*", *AB* 86 (1968) 351–371.

_____ "Encore la lettre de Justinien. Sa date: 560 et non 561*", *AB* 87 (1969) 442–444.

Vasiliev, A. "The Iconoclastic Edict of the Caliph Yazid II, A.D. 721", *DOP* 9/10 (1955/56) 23-47.

Vasiljevskij, V. G. *Trudy* 3, St. Petersburg: Imperatorskaya Akademiya Nauk, 1915.

Velimirovic, M. "The Byzantine Heirmos and Heirmologion", in: W. Arlt, E. Lichtenhahn and H. Oesch, eds., *Gattungen der Musik in Einzeldarstellungen: Gedenkschrift Leo Schrade I*, Bern-Munich: Francke Verlag, 1973, 192-244.

Wade, A. "The Oldest Iadgari – The Jerusalem Tropologion – 4th to 8th Centuries, 30 Years after the Publication", in: D. Atanassova and T. Chronz, eds., *Σύναξις Καθολική, Beiträge zu Gottesdienst und Geschichte der fünf altkirchlichen Patriarchate für Heinzgerd Brakmann zum 70. Geburtstag*, Münster: Lit Verlag, 2014, 717-750.

Walker Bynum, C. *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200-1336*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.

Weitzmann, K. *The Joshua Roll. A Work of the Macedonian Renaissance*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1948.

Wellesz, E. "The 'Akathistos'. A Study in Byzantine Hymnography", *DOP* 9 (1956) 142-174.

_____ *A History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.

Wey, W. *Die Akrostichis in der byzantinischen Kanonesdichtung*, Leipzig: Teubner, 1907.

Weyl Carr, A. "The Face Relics of John the Baptist in Byzantium and the West", *Gesta* 46/2 (2008) 159-190.

Wilkinson, J. *Jerusalem Pilgrims before the Crusades*, Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1977.

Winkler, G. "The Appearance of the Light at the Baptism of Jesus and the Origins of the Feast of Epiphany: An Investigation of Greek, Syriac, Armenian, and Latin Sources", in: M. Johnson, ed., *Between Memory and Hope: Readings on the Liturgical Year*, Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2000, 291–347.

Wortley, J. "Relics of 'the Friends of Jesus' at Constantinople", in: J. Durand and B. Flusin, eds., *Byzance et les Reliques du Christ*, Paris: Association des amis du Centre d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance, 2004, 143-157.

_____ "Relics and the Great Church", *BZ* 99 (2006) 631-647.

_____ "The Wood of the True Cross", in: *Studies on the Cult of Relics in Byzantium up to 1204*, Variorum collected studies series, Farnham and Burlington: Ashgate, 2009, VI.

Zervoudaki, A. *Θεοφάνης ὁ Γραπτός. Βίος καὶ ἔργο* (PhD dissertation), University of Crete, 2003.