ASPECTS OF ST ANNA'S CULT IN BYZANTIUM

by

EIRINI PANOU

A thesis submitted to
The University of Birmingham
for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies
Institute of Archaeology and Antiquity
College of Arts and Law
The University of Birmingham
January 2011

Acknowledgments

It is said that a PhD is a lonely work. However, this thesis, like any other one, would not have become reality without the contribution of a number of individuals and institutions.

First of all of my academical mother, Leslie Brubaker, whose constant support, guidance and encouragement accompanied me through all the years of research.

Of the National Scholarship Foundation of Greece (I.K.Y.) with its financial help for the greatest part of my postgraduate studies.

Of my father George, my mother Angeliki and my bother Nick for their psychological and financial support, and of my friends in Greece (Lily Athanatou, Maria Sourlatzi, Kanela Oikonomaki, Maria Lemoni) for being by my side in all my years of absence.

Special thanks should also be addressed to Mary Cunningham for her comments on an early draft of this thesis and for providing me with unpublished material of her work. I would like also to express my gratitude to Marka Tomic Djuric who allowed me to use unpublished photographic material from her doctoral thesis.

Special thanks should also be addressed to Kanela Oikonomaki whose expertise in Medieval Greek smoothened the translation of a number of texts, my brother Nick Panou for polishing my English, and to my colleagues (Polyvios Konis, Frouke Schrijver and Vera Andriopoulou) and my friends in Birmingham (especially Jane Myhre Trejo and Ola Pawlik) for the wonderful time we have had all these years.

A very special 'thank you' goes to my brother Panagiotēs Panou who had been extremely supportive and proud of all my academical goals.

This thesis is dedicated to his memory.

'We must embrace pain and burn it as fuel'.

Kenji Miyazawa

Στο 'γουσουρούι' μου

Abstract

This thesis is the first scholarly attempt to examine the veneration that Mary's parents – and her mother Anna in particular – enjoyed in Byzantium. The four pillars upon which this examination will be based are topography, texts, relics and iconography.

The topography of Constantinople is examined in relation to that of Jerusalem in order to bring to the surface new ideas on the development of Constantinopolitan topography. I also look at the motives behind the construction of the first church dedicated to St Anna in Constantinople and its relation to the topography of the Holy Land.

In terms of textual production, I show that until the eighth century Mary's parents and their story recounted in the second-century apocryphal *Protevangelion of James*, were intentionally 'ignored' because of the non-canonical nature of the text. But from the eighth century onwards the situation dramatically changes with the emergence of Byzantine homilies and I will explore the reasons that triggered this change as well as the way Mary's parents are presented in this genre.

Finally, I discuss the problematic around Anna's relics, her association with iconophilia, demonstration of Orthodoxy, healing and protection of childbirth. Last but not least, the examination of iconographical evidence will uncover the visual impact of Anna's cult and will complete the study of her veneration in Byzantium.

Contents

Part 3. Social approaches

Chapter four: The visual evidence

List of illustrations

Fig. 1 The Probatike (Sheep Pool) before the sixth century, Jerusalem. (After Avi-
        Yonah 1975:10).

Fig. 2 The Probatike (Sheep Pool) before the sixth century, Jerusalem. (After Cleave
        1993:149).

Fig. 3 The church of the Paralytic and the Probatic Pool, fifth century, Jerusalem.
         (After Vincent and Abel 1922: pl.LXXV).

Fig. 4 The church of Mary (upper right) and its arrangement according to the church.
         of the Paralytic and the Probatic Pool (bottom), sixth century, Jerusalem. (After
         Vincent and Abel 1922: pl.LXXV)

Fig. 5 Churches of St Anna in Constantinople: 1. Deuteron 2. Pege
         3. Chalkoprateia 4. Palace 5. Hodegetria. (map after Müller-Wiener 1977:21)

Fig.6 The churches of Anna in the Deuteron and the church of the Blachernai,
        Constantinople (map After Müller-Wiener 1977:21)

Fig. 7 Reconstruction of the rooms of the Great Palace in Constantinople around the
         vestiary of the Augusta by Labarte. (After Labarte 1861:pl. III)

Fig. 8 Reconstruction of the rooms around the vestiary of the Augusta by Paspates.
         (After Paspates 1893)

Fig. 9 Reconstruction of the rooms around the vestiary of the Augusta by Vogt.
         (After Vogt 1935)

Fig. 10 Reconstruction of the rooms around the vestiary of the Augusta by Miranda
          in Guilland's book. (After Guilland 1969)

Fig. 11 Inventory of Saint Angelo in Pescheria, eighth century, Rome. (After Grisar
          1899: 174)

Fig. 12 The three-mother depiction, eighth century, Santa Maria Antiqua, plan. (After
          Lucey 2004:85)

Fig. 13 The Three-Mothers, eighth century, Santa Maria Antiqua, Rome. (After
          Croce 1961 :1271)

Fig. 14 Anna with the Virgin, eighth century, Ekatontapylianē, Paros. (After
          Drossogianne 1998:75 fig. 4)

Thierry 1994: fig. 76b)

2007: fig 135)

List of illustrations

Fig. 1 The Probatike (Sheep Pool) before the sixth century, Jerusalem.

Fig. 2 The Probatike (Sheep Pool) before the sixth century, Jerusalem.

Fig. 3 The church of the Paralytic and the Probatic Pool, fifth century, Jerusalem.

Fig. 4 The church of Mary (upper right) and its arrangement according to the church.
of the Paralytic and the Probatic Pool (bottom), sixth century, Jerusalem.

Fig. 5 Churches of St Anna in Constantinople: 1. Deuteron 2. Pege
3. Chalkoprateia 4. Palace 5. Hodegetria.

Fig. 6 The churches of Anna in the Deuteron and the church of the Blachernai,
Constantinople.

Fig. 7 Reconstruction of the rooms of the Great Palace in Constantinople around the
vestiary of the Augusta by Labarte.

Fig. 8 Reconstruction of the rooms around the vestiary of the Augusta by Paspates.

Fig. 9 Reconstruction of the rooms around the vestiary of the Augusta by Vogt.

Fig. 10 Reconstruction of the rooms around the vestiary of the Augusta by Miranda
in Guilland's book.

Fig. 11 Inventory of Saint Angelo in Pescheria, eighth century, Rome.

Fig. 12 The three-mother depiction, eighth century, Santa Maria Antiqua, plan.

Fig. 13 The Three-Mothers, eighth century, Santa Maria Antiqua, Rome.

Fig. 14 Anna with the Virgin, eighth century, Ekatontapyliane, Paros.

Fig. 15 St Anna, eighth century, Cathedral of Paul, Faras.

Fig. 16 Cathedral of Paul, Faras, plan.

Fig. 17 Psalters, chapel 28 Bawit, seventh century, Egypt.

Fig. 18 Anna and Mary enthroned, tenth century, Cathedral of Faras.

Fig. 19 Anna and Mary, tenth century, Crypt of St. Christina, Carpignano.

Fig. 20 Kizil Tchoukour, Mariological cycle, late ninth or beginning of the tenth
century, Cappadocia.

Fig. 21 (detail of fig. 20)

Fig. 22 Anna denies to wear the royal-band, late ninth or beginning of the tenth
century, Kizil Tchoukour, Cappadocia.

Fig. 23 St Anna, church of Peter and Paul, ninth century, Cappadocia.

List of abbreviations

AB	Analecta Bollandiana
ABull	The Art Bulletin
ABME	Arheion Vyzadinon Mnēmeion Ellados
AD	Arhaiologikon Deltion
AE	Archaiologikē Ephēmeris
AJA	American Journal of Archaeology
AJP	American Journal of Philology
ANRW	Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt
Apocrypha	Apocrypha. Revue internationale des littératures Apocryphes
AπB	Apostolos Varnavas (Απόστολος Βαρνάβας)
Aram	Journal of the Society for Syro-Mesopotamian Studies
AASS	Acta Sanctorum
BMGS	Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies
BMMA	The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin
BNJ	Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbüche
BSOAS	Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies
BurM	Burlington Magazine (for connossieurs)
BS	Bibliotheca Sanctorum
Byz	Byzantion. Revue internationale des études Byzantines
Byzantina	Byzantina annual review of the Byzantine Research centre, Aristotle University of Thessalonikē

ByzF	Byzantinische Forschungen
ByzSlav	Byzantinoslavica
CahArch	Cahiers archéologiques
CCSG	Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca
CHBS	Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae
CIAP	Corpus inscriptionum Arabicarum Palaestinae
CFHB	Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae
CMP	Alvarez Campos (ed.), S. 1970-1985.Corpus Marianum patristicum ,8 vols, Burgos.
CPG	Clavis Patrum Graecorum
CSCO	Corpus scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
CSHB	Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae
DACL	Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie
D.C.A.E	Deltion Christianikēs Archaiologikēs Hetaireias
DHGE	Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques
DSAM	Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique doctrine et histoire
DOP	Dumbarton Oaks Papers
EHR	English Historial Review
EO	Echos d'Orient
EEBS	Ἐπετηρίς Ἑταρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν
E Ph	Ekklesiastikos Pharos
ETL	Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses
GCS	Griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte

GOTR	Greek Orthodox Theological Review
GRBS	Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies
Harv Theolog Rev	Harvard Theological Review
HR	History of Religions
IstMitt	Istanbuler Mitteilungen
JCoptS	Journal of Coptic Studies
JECS	Journal of Early Christian Studies
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JJS	Journal of Jewish Studies
JMEMS	Journal of Medieval and Early modern studies
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
JOAI	Jahreshefte des Osterreichischen Archaologischen Instituts in Wien
JÖB	Jahrbuch der Österreichische Byzantinistik
Jrel	Journal of Religion
JSJ	Journal for the Study of Judaism
JTS	The Journal of Theological Studies
JWI	Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes
KC	Krētika Chronika
LA	Liber Annus
LCI	Aurenhammer, H. 1959. Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie, Wien.
MarbJb	Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft
MARIANUM	Marianum
MonPiot	Monuments et Mémoires de la Fondation Eugène Piot
MS	Mediaeval Studies

MUSJ	Mélanges de l'université Saint-Joseph
NCE	New Catholic encyclopedia
NEA	Near Eastern Archaeology
n.d.	not dated
NRSV	1995, The New Interpreter's Bible : general articles & introduction, commentary, & reflections for each book of the Bible, including the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical books in twelve volumes. v.9, [The Gospel of Luke, The Gospel of John], Nashville.
NT	Novum Testamentum
Numen	Numen: International Review for the History of Religions
ODCC	Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church
Oriens	Oriens Christianus
PBSR	Papers of the British School at Rome
PG	Patrologia cursus completus, Series Graeca
PL	Patrologia cursus completus, Series Latina
PMZ	Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit
PrOC	Proche-Orient Chrétien
QCCCM	Quaderni catanesi di cultura classica e medievale
RB	Revue Biblique
RBK	Reallexikon zur byzantinischen Kunst
REAug	Revue des etudes augustiniennes
REB	Revue des études Byzantines
ROC	Revue de l'Orient Chrétien
RSR	Recherches de science religieuse
RQ	Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte
SCH	Studies in church history

Sobornost	Sobornost incorporating Eastern Churches Review
Speculum	Speculum : a Journal of Medieval Studies
SubsHag	Subsidia hagiographica
SVTQ	St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly
Symmeikta	Byzantina Symmeikta
TAPA	Transactions of the American Philological Association
Thēsaurismata	Thēsaurismata : tou Ellēnikou Institoutou Vyzantinōn kai Metavyzantinōn Spoudōn.
TM	Travaux et Mémoires
Viator	Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies
VC	Vigiliae Christianae
VT	Vetus Testamentum
WJKg	Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte
WS	Wiener Studien
WST	Warszawskie Studia Teologiczne
ZDPV	Zeitschrift des deutschen Palaestina-Vereins
Zograf	Zograf : časopis za srednjovekovnu umetnost
ZRVI	Sbornik Radova Vizantološkog instituta

ASPECTS OF ST ANNA'S CULT IN BYZANTIUM

Introduction

The thirteenth-century court official Theodore Hyrtakenos in his praise of '*The Paradise of St Anna*' wonders 'who does not know the pious Joachim and Anna, full of grace', a 'truly holy couple'.[1] In his fourteenth-century homily on the Presentation of Mary in the temple, Gregory Palamas writes that 'She (= Mary) exalted her ancestors to such glory that through her they are acclaimed God's ancestors'.[2] These two phrases highlight the widespread veneration of Mary's parents and the nature of their veneration in Byzantium.[3] Five centuries earlier than Gregory Palamas, George of Nikomedia, on the feast of St Anna's conception of Mary, tells his congregation the story of Mary's parents in detail, analysing the reasons why they should be honoured.[4] By the fourteenth century, on the same occasion, their story had become so well-known to his congregation that Gregory needs neither to repeat their story nor to mention Anna's and Joachim's names.

This study examines the conditions under which Mary's parents and St Anna in particular were driven from obscurity to veneration, how an apocryphal story was included in the liturgical calendar. It aims to cover a scholarly gap recently acknowledged by Sharon Gerstel, who noted that there has not been a study of St Anna in Byzantium as has

---

[1] Boissonade (ed.) 1962:12. For a translation of Anna's description of her garden, see Dolezal and Mavroudi 2002:105-158.

[2] 'πρὸς τοσοῦτον κλέος ἐξῆρε τοὺς προγόνους, ὡς καὶ θεοπάτορας ἀκούειν δι᾽ αὐτήν.' Christou (ed.) 2009: 268; Veniamin (trans.) 2005:19.

[3] Sinkewicz 2002:131. For Gregory's life and works, see Sinkewicz 2002:131-188.

[4] When related to festal activity, the words Conception, Presentation and Nativity will be capitalized. They will be also capitalized when used in a non-festal context but quoted from another author or when they pertain to a scene from the Marian iconographical cycle. In all other cases, they will appear as conception, presentation and nativity.

2

been the case in the West.[5] Gerstel's article appeared in 1998, six years after the publication of the revised edition of Lafontaine-Dosogne's work in 1992 on the iconography of Mary's first three years of life.[6] In her corpus, Lafontaine-Dosogne provides a good overview of the textual references that refer to Mary's parents, which have mainly to do with the introduction of the feasts related to Mary's childhood, and then discusses the representations of Mary's parents. Although Anna's veneration is defined by that of her daughter's, I do not wish to provide another study on Mary, but look at a rarely considered aspect of it, her parents.[7]

In order to pin down the veneration of Anna in Byzantium I will look in the first chapter at topographical and textual evidence from Jerusalem and Constantinople, which demonstrate the influence of the topography of the Holy City on the Byzantine capital in the sixth century. I will examine the way in which this influence was translated in the churches of St Anna in Constantinople and the importance that lies within this development for the ideology behind church construction in Byzantium. I will argue that the creation of sacred space is an important factor for the first ecclesiastical establishments of the saint in Constantinople, which is far from a simple case of patronage.

In chapter two, this research will revolve around literary works, starting from the *Protevangelion of James*, the only account of the life of Mary's parents. I will explore the genealogy of Mary, the various traditions behind the life of Anna and Joachim, the attitude of early writers toward the *Protevangelion of James*, which I will compare with the way Byzantine preachers use the *Protevangelion* and Mary's early life. By doing so I will demonstrate that from the eighth century onwards Mary's parents were not anymore

---

[5] Gerstel 1998:89-111. Mary has been studied more in the West, see Brubaker and Cunningham 2007: 235. For entries in lexica which refer to Anna's cult in the West, see Murray and Murray 1996 (under Anna); Viller 1937: 672-3; Croce 1961: 1269-1295; Baumer and Scheffczyk 1989: 602; Leclercq (Leclercq 1907:2162-2174) deals more with cult of the saint in the East.
[6] Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992.
[7] For a brief discussion on the similarities between the cult of Anna and of Mary, see pp. 297-8.

'intentionally' disregarded and that the *Protevangelion* reached a certain point when it was considered part of the Holy Scripture despite its apocryphal (non-canonical) nature. I will demonstrate that the lever that agitated this development is the theological implications created by the outbreak of Iconoclasm, when the dogma of the Incarnation of Christ necessitated the promotion of His physical forbearers.

In chapter three I will once more pore over texts but different in nature from the ones used in chapter two. Using mainly hagiography and histories I will explore the ideologies attributed to women named Anna the most common of which was iconophilia (= support of the veneration of icons). St Anna's acknowledgment as the mother of the Virgin resulted in her establishment as a protector of childbirth, a tendency reflected in the life of saints whose mothers are named Anna and in patronage stories of Byzantine empresses. Moreover, I will piece together the traditions around the relics of St Anna in Byzantium using textual evidence from the eighth until the seventeenth century. I will show that despite the fact that the information provided in these sources is often very perplexing, I can safeguard a number of locations as places where the relics of the saint actually appeared. Finally, I will examine the establishment of the feasts that celebrate the early life of Mary and Mary's parents in particular.

The final chapter is dedicated to pictorial evidence. Having set the chronological limit from the eighth until the fifteenth century, I will examine the depictions of St Anna and Joachim outside the Mariological cycle since the Marian cycle does not always denote veneration of Mary's parents. Nevertheless, the non-narrative portraits of Joachim and Anna do, and they allow various associations to be made with them. The depictions are presented chronologically but when the material in one location is extensive, a geographical or thematical categorization is made. This division has two targets: First to highlight the alterations that the saints' depictions experienced over time in both form and

context. Second – in areas where the depictions are numerous and variant in nature, such as in Cappadocia and Greece, – to place the depictions in a theological and social framework.

This study is the first endeavour in Byzantine scholarship at this scale to focus on St Anna in Byzantium. Despite the number of studies on Mary that appeared especially after the publication in 2001 of the *Mother of God* exhibition catalogue at the Benaki Museum (Greece), Mary's parents have not become the subject of detailed treatment by students of Byzantine culture. Until today, the only large-scale attempt has been Kleinschmidt's *Die heilige Anna: ihre Verehrung in Geschichte, Kunst und Volkstum*, which was published in 1930, but this work deals primarily with the saint's cult in the West. The aim of this work is to demonstrate that although Anna's and Joachim's spread of veneration was minor compared to that of their daughter, a thorough study on their cult offers important insight into the culture from which they emerged and in which they were established.

CHAPTER 1

TOPOGRAPHY

Jerusalem: the church of Mary in the Probatic Pool

Markos Eugenikos, the fifteenth-century metropolitan of Ephesos, addressed Mary as the 'new Probatic Pool'.[8] This is because of Mary's association with the Probatic Pool, a church dedicated to her in the sixth century in Jerusalem, the history of which I will explore in the first half of this chapter. The reason I included this monument in a study that examines the cult of St Anna in Byzantium, is that in order for us to understand the nature of the first traces of St Anna's veneration in Constantinople, we should turn to Byzantine-occupied Jerusalem, and in the Probatic Pool in particular, a monument which was associated with the birth of Mary and the house of Anna and Joachim. The church was not initially dedicated to Mary but to the healing of the Paralytic, the miracle that Jesus performed in the Probatic Pool and which we know from the *Gospel of John* (John 5.2).

In the first half of this chapter, I will explain why this monument mentioned in the *Gospel of John* was later associated with the birth of Mary and why this is important for our study. I will argue that the significance of the Probatic Pool lies in the fact that before the construction of this church and from the beginning of its foundation, the pool was used for Jewish purification purposes, to which the *Gospel of John* added Christian baptismal connotations. In turn the dedication of a church first to the healing of the Paralytic and then to Mary, set the ideological background for associating first Mary and then Anna with healing qualities, which in the topography of Constantinople is expressed in the connection

---

[8] Eustratiades 1930:37. Markos Eugenikos has dedicated hymns (stichera) to Joachim and Anna, see Constas 2002: 438 no. 102.

of Mary to holy waters (haghiasmata). In addition, although two monuments are dedicated

to Mary's family in the sixth century, one in Jerusalem and one in the Byzantine capital,

the church of Mary at the Probatic Pool in Jerusalem expresses the ideological evolution

behind the association of Mary and water, which Constantinople crystallised.

Church of the Paralytic- The Probatike

The Probatic Pool or Probatike is situated at the modern Islamic quarter (Figs 1-2).[9]

Although the Gospel of John is not the earliest source to mention the Probatike, it is the

earliest most significant text for this study.[10]

---

[9] The forms we see in the sources and accepted by scholars are: Bezetha (Βηζαθά), Bezatha (Βηζεθά), Bethzatha (Βηθζαθά), Bizetha (in Aramaic), Bethsaida (Βηθσαϊδά), Bethesda (Βηθεσδά), Belzetha (Βελζεθά). For the appropriation of the term 'Bethesda', see Connolly 1913; Vincent and Abel 1922:699-671; Finegan 1969:144; Mare 1987:166,169 (map); Barton and Muddiman 2001: 696-970 (who support the term Beth-Zatha instead of Bethesda). See also Cecchelli 1946:109-112; Robert and Macalister 1977:137-140; Hoppe 1999:71,73; Ovadiah 1999:253; Encyclopedia Judeaica (4) 1971:748 and Encyclopedia Judeaica (9) 1971:1539; NCE 1996: 373; Jeremias 1966:11-12.
The different opinions of modern scholars concernig the correct form of the word Bethesda reflects the differentiation – but not to the same extent – of writers of early Christianity. Josephos, Eusebios, and Origen use the term Bezatha. For Josephos, see Firmin Didot (ed.) 1865: 115,132, 239; Whiston (trans.)1987: Wars 2.15.5, 19.4, 5.4.2, 5.8. For Eusebios, see Klostermann (ed.) 1904:58; Baldi (ed.) 1982:456. For Origen, see GCS (4) 1903:533, 282; On the contrary, Ammonios of Alexandria (third century) uses the word Bethesda instead of Bezatha or Bezetha,see PG 85:1428D; Cramer (ed.) 1844 (2): 228-9.Vincent and Abel argue that the Western fathers used the correct from, Bethsaida, but the Greek texts use 'Bethesda', which Vincent and Abel found surprising based on the popularity of the name in the Gospels, see Vincent and Abel 1922:670. It is true that in the earliest surviving version of the Gospel of John, the Papyrus Bodmer II (middle of the second century), we find the term 'Bethsaida', see Comfort and Barrett (eds)1999: 403. For its date, see ibid: 379. Jeremias sees a unanimous tradition in these names, apart from Bethsaida (Βηθσαϊδά), which he considers erroneous, see Jeremias 1966: 11. St Jerome distinguishes Bethsaida, the hometown of the apostles (ἦν δὲ ὁ Φίλιππος ἀπὸ Βηθσαϊδά, ἐκ τῆς πόλεως Ἀνδρέου καὶ Πέτρου [John 1.44]) from Bethesda (the location where sheep were gathered, without referring to the miracle of the Paralytic), see PL 23: 930D, 931B. The form 'Bethesda' is also used by St Jerome in his book of Hebrew sites *Liber De Situ Et Nominibus Locorum Hebraicorum* who makes the distinction between Bethsaida and Bethesda, see PL 23:930-1. It is also mentioned as 'Kainopolis' (= new city) by Josephos (Firmin Didot (ed.) 1865: 252), and it is attested in a tenth-century Byzantine military treatise, see Sullivan 2003:151, 252, 265.
In the patristic period, the term Bethesda and from the seventh century, the term Probatike (= of sheep) was adopted in texts. These two terms will be used throughout this study.

[10] The first mention of the Probatic Pool is in the book of *Nehemiah* (3.1) where the Probatic Pool appears as a gate under the name 'Probatike': 'καὶ ἀνέστη ελισουβ ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ ᾠκοδόμησαν τὴν πύλην τὴν προβατικήν αὐτοὶ ἡγίασαν αὐτὴν καὶ ἔστησαν θύρας αὐτῆς' (= Then Eliashib the high priest arose with his brothers the priests and built the Sheep Gate; they consecrated it and hung its doors). The Probatic pool appear as 'two pools' in the *Copper Scroll* (3Q15) in Cave III (dated based on paleography between A.D. 35-65), see Baillet and Milik and Vaux 1962:219; Jeremias 1966:36; Finegan 1969:143. The term 'Bethesdathayin' alludes to the existence of two pools in Bethesda, see Baillet and Milik and Vaux 1962: 214 no 54, 297 no 54, 244 no 74, 245 no 74, 271-2; Milik 1959:328 no 57; Jeremias 1966:12, 36; Wilkinson 1978:95.

The *Gospel of John* (5:2) reads: 'In Jerusalem there is, in the Probatike, a pool, the so-called Bethesda in Hebrew, which has five porticoes'.[11] In the description of this miracle, the paralytic tells Jesus that he has nobody to put him inside the pool (κολυμβήθρα) when the troubling of the waters takes place, which will heal him. Gibson describes the troubling of the waters as a phenomenon which attracted the people at the time of Jesus and that it took place when surplus water was drained and was sent away through a covered channel.[12] Excavations have revealed a fresco depicting an angel troubling the waters, most possibly dated to the Byzantine period,[13] which demonstrates acceptance and perpetuation of this narrative by the Byzantines.[14] However, the five porticoes were not found during excavations and they have been reconstructed by Vincent and Abel based on primary sources.[15] The popularity of this miracle account is demonstrated in the construction of a three-aisled Byzantine basilica dedicated to the miracle of the Paralytic, which was attached to the pool (Fig. 3). The chronology of the church is based on the depiction of a cross on the floor mosaic and on the fact that in 427 Theodosios II forbade the decoration of floors with crosses.[16] Nevertheless, as Negev and Gibson have argued, the use of the cross cannot be used for dating purposes,[17] and the depictions with cross on floors appear at least by the end of the fifth century.[18] Canon seventy-three of the sixth Ecumenical Council (691) forbade the depictions on church-floors and shows that at least by the end of the seventh century the law was not necessarily followed.[19] Despite variations in the date of construction, the majority of scholars place the

---

[11] For topographical issues that rise from the text, see Haenchen 1984: 244; Finegan 1969:142-3.

[12] Gibson 2005:287.

[13] Geva 1993: 781.

[14] For an overview of the publication on the excavations during 1865-1967, see Gibson 2005:285 n. 29.

[15] ibid. 746; Pierre and Rousée 1981:34.

[16] Ovadiah 1999:253; Pierre and Rousée 1981:28; Jeremias 1966:19; Rousée 1962:108.

[17] Negev-Gibson 2001:122.

[18] Kitzinger 2002:258. Vincent and Abel argue that the church of the Paralytic was built between 430 and 480, see Vincent and Abel 1922:671 n.6.

[19] 'we command that the figure of the cross, which some have placed on the floor, be entirely removed there from, lest the trophy of the victory won for us be desecrated by the trampling under foot of those who walk over it. Therefore those who from this present represent on the pavement the sign of the cross, we decree are

construction of the church in the fifth century but the earliest textual evidence on the church dates between 512 and 518,[20] when John Rufos writes his *Plerophories*, 'a collection of apophthegmato-like anecdotes which focuses on the controversy over the acceptance (by the Monophysites) of the decisions of the council of Chalkedon'.[21]

In his *Plerophories,* written between 512 and 518, John Rufos describes the sojourn of Peter the Iberian (fifth century), bishop of Maiouma,[22] in the Holy Land.[23] In this text, John provides the earliest testimony to the existence of a church in the Probatic Pool dedicated to the Paralytic.[24] According to Horn, the church of the Paralytic was built in 450 when Peter the Iberian was in Jerusalem.[25]

The church is mentioned in a dream that a cleric in the church of Probatike had in which Christ appears to recall the name of Juvenal, Monophysite bishop of Jerusalem from 422-451 and patriarch from 451-458,[26] who however accepted the decrees of the council of Chalkedon in 451 and was the reason that the Monophysite monks in Palestine rebelled, causing his deposition.[27] According to the account of John Rufos, the cleric did not take care of the church's sanctuary and so Christ appeared in the cleric's dream saying: 'What shall I do with these, with those upon whom I have bestowed such good things, both oil, wine , and the other necessities (of life)? Never are they in want of anything that thus they

---

to be cut off ', see Wace and Schaff and Percival 1991:398.

[20] PO 8:35; Honigmann 1950:263; Steppa 2005:61; Witakowski 1993:62; Vincent and Abel 1922: 92 n. 42; Horn (Horn 2006: 21) dates it to 515.

[21] Horn 2006:10-11; Honigmann 1950:263.

[22] Maiouma or Neapolis was Gaza's port ('κατεπλεύσαμεν εἰς τὸ παράλιον μέρος τῆς Γαζαίων, ὃ καλοῦσιν Μαϊουμᾶν'), see Mark the Deacon 2003:198. The name was associated with the 'feast of waters' of Syriac origin, authorised by Arcadius and Honorius in 396 and was still celebrated at during Justinian I's time, see Mouterde 1959:72-3; Schorch 2003:404-411. It is possible that John Chrysostom refers to this feast in his homily *On Julian the Martyr*, see Leemans 2003:127-8. For the location of Maiouma in the Madaba map, see Avi-Yonah 1954:74. Maiouma or Neapolis is different from the region of Maiouma or Betomarsea, see Avi-Yonah 1954:41.

[23] For bibliography on John Rufos, see Horn 2006:11 n. 4 and n .5. For his life, see Horn 2006:30-44; Kofsky 1997: 209-222.

[24] Horn 2006:250; Finegan 1969:147; Garitte (ed.) 1958:71, 237. The dedication of a church to one of the Gospel miracles is in accordance with what Pullan names as 'relocation of earlier New and Old Testament sites to a somewhat revised Christian configuration', see Pullan 1993:25.

[25] Horn 2006:251, n.11.

[26] Honigmann 1950:211.

[27] Horn 2006:247-9; Norton 2007: 76; Juvenal returned to office in 453, see Horn and Phenix 2008: 1iii.

would have a reason to disregard and to neglect my service. Woe, Juvenal! He made my house a cave of robbers. He has filled it with fornicators, adulterers, and polluted ones'.[28] As Csepregi notes in her discussion of the 'ritual of temple sleep' (sleeping inside the sanctuary and encountering the healer in a dream), the central role of this direct contact with the sacred place resulted […] in the adoption of ancient sites by the Christian healer saints…'.[29] It altered existing connotations until that time around a monument and since the Probatike was already a healing site, I believe I can push the connotational change a bit further, in the debate between Monophysites and Chalkedonians. The healing saints Kyros and John 'lecture' Monophysites in dreams,[30] and it is in a dream where John Rufos credits the Chalkedonians with disregard of sites associated with the life of Christ.[31] Thus the incident with the dream of the cleric in the church of the Probatike and the alleged accusations of Christ against the Chalkedonians, belongs to the fifth-century debate between Monophysites and Chalkedonians in Jerusalem.

Another aspect of the dream to which one should draw attention is the reference to the Patriarch Juvenal. The use of this name in the dream of the cleric is not accidental. Juvenal was well known to the Byzantine court. He took his position back with imperial support and shortly before his deposition in 451, the imperial couple Markianos and Pulcheria asked him to surrender the coffin and winding-sheet of the Theotokos to the capital, which was placed in the church of the Blachernai in Constantinople.[32] Juvenal and

---

[28] PO 8:35; For a translation of this section, see Horn 2006: 324; Honigmann 1950:264. 'This testimony and others of such kind mentioned by Rufos is not evidence that Chalkedonias actually neglected the sites', see Horn 2006: 325. Allen (Allen 2004:4) sees the deposition of Juvenal as a reaction against council decisions which 'was not confined to emperors or patriarchs'. John Rufos calls Juvenal as 'the apostate' and Juvenal's 'betrayal' is compared to that of Judeas, see Horn and Phenix 2008:64-5.

[29] Csepregi (n.d.) 60.

[30] ibid. 69. For dreams in Christianity and Byzantium, see Kelsey 1974; Gnuse 1996; Mavroudi 2002; Oberhelman 2008; Bulkeley 2009; Mullett 2010.

[31] 'Peter the Iberian, transformed Maiuma, Gaza's port, into a stronghold of anti-Chalkedonian resistance', see Stroumsa 1989: 19.

[32] Honigmann 1950:267-8; Mango considers this story as completely unfounded because 'Could the pious Pulcheria have really wished to possess the Virgin Mary *corporaliter*? Was she ignorant of the absence of such a relic?'. See Mango 1998:67. Eudokia was forced to come to terms with Juvenal although initially she supported Romanos, an opponent of Juvenal, see Frend 1972:153; Honigmann 1950:251.

Eudokia, wife of Theodosios II, 'were important propagators of the new cult of saints' in Jerusalem and between 430 and 460 (Eudokia's death) more than twenty churches were built in the Holy City.[33] Junenal's link with Constantinople, his reputation as the Patriarch who surrendered the relics of Mary to the Byzantine emperor and his building activity in Jerusalem is the reason he is included in this study. The dream account is an indication that he may have been associated with the construction of the church of the Paralytic in the Probatike or with its dedication to Mary, which is a reason why Rufos chose this monument. The *Plerophories* were written between 512 and 518 but a few years later the pilgrim Theodosios (530) in his visit to the Probatike writes: 'Next to the Sheep-pool is the church of my Lady Mary'.[34] The information he provides mainly suggests that it was in Juvenal's time that the church of the Paralytic was dedicated to Mary, however it is safer to associate Juvenal only with the church of the Paralytic since the earliest testimony of the church of Mary, which I will discuss below, is the third decade of the sixth century. An additional reason for the connection between Juvenal and the church of the Paralytic is the increasing building activity of the early fifth century, which is placed in the context of the Monophysite - Chalkedonian conflict.[35] Juvenal, in his effort to establish his reputation as a Chalkedonian Patriarch may have initiated the construction of the church in the Probatike after 451 when, having accepted the decrees of the council of Chalkedon, was elevated to the status of Patriarch of Jerusalem.[36] Mango places the debate between Chalkedonians and Monophysites also in fifth-century Constantinople. On the one hand he advocates that 'the early history of the Blachernai shrine was tainted by Monophysite association' since the

---

[33] Verhelst 2006: 453. As Horn notes, the life of Peter the Iberian does not show 'a change of allegiance'. See Horn 2004:213. Peter the Iberian and his anti-Chalkedonian followers benefited from Eudocia's resources and establishments, see Horn 2004: 211 and this why the Anti-Chalkedonias 'upheld her memory as venerable among themselves'. See Horn 2004: 213.

[34] Wilkinson 2002:109.

[35] Brenk 2003:27. For Juvenal in Monophysitic literature, see Honigmann 1950: 262-6.

[36] However he was never officially called as such during his lifetime, see Honigmann 1950:275. A century later, the building activity of Justinian I gave 'tangible expression to the neo-Chalcedonian orthodoxy of his empire', see Frend 1972:296.

maphorion of the Virgin was 'at first in the hands of the Monophysites',[37] which means that its transfer to Constantinople gave the maphorion Chalkedonian connotations.[38] On the other hand, he notes that it is only in the seventh century – in the writings of Theodore Synkellos –,[39] that Pulcheria 'was made the original foundress' (i.e. of the Blachernai) and was associated with bishop Juvenal'.[40] Even if the story is of a later period, one cannot deny that it reflected an older tradition around the building activity of Juvenal since the testimony of John Rufos already places Juvenal in this fifth-century debate between Chalkedonias and Monophysites. As Lourié argues 'the tomb of the Virgin in Gethsémani toward 451 is a very historical place of Marian worship,'[41] and notes that Juvenal's intervention in the ecclesiastical affairs in Gesthémani is a historical fact verified by two sixth-century sources, the Chalkedonian the *History of Euthymios* and the anti-Chalkedonian Pseudo-Dioskoros. The *History of Euthymio*s was written 'fifty years later than the events described',[42] and refers to Juvenal's attack with troops of four hundred soldiers on Jerusalem in 453, which began with the 'shrine of the holy Mary in the valley of Josaphat', which Lourié identifies with the church of the tomb of the Virgin in Gesthémani.[43] This is how Lourié explains the dispatch of Marian relics by Juvenal to Constantinople, which I think shows that the building activity of Juvenal in Jerusalam and his connection to the Palace has historical basis. In addition, Lourié argues that it was between the transfer of the relics in 453 and Pulcheria's death later the same year, that the story linking Pulcheria with the foundation of the Blachernai emerged as part of the Chalkedonian propaganda and both Pulcheria and Juvenal became Chalkedonian saints.[44]

---

[37] Mango 1998:74.
[38] For bibliography on healing shrines and centres, see Talbot 2002: esp. p.154; Pianalto 1999.
[39] Wenger 1955:332 : 'Sed et Pulcheria, Marciani impratoris Augusta, in Blachernis templo Dei Genitrici edificato […] corpus Dei Genitricis trasnferendum in Blachernas fideliter exquisiuit, Iuuenalio patriarcho Hierosolymarum in urbe (i.e. Constantinople) forte regia constituto...'.
[40] Mango 1998:75. See also Cameron 1979a:42-56.
[41] Lourié 2007:203-4.
[42] ibid. 205.
[43] ibid. 204.
[44] ibid. 205.

Consequently, I do not think that the connection between Pulcheria and Juvenal is necessarily a seventh-century figment of an unfounded tradition. Because the Probatike is placed in the fifth-century debate between the Chalcedonians and the Monophysites not only in Rufos' life but in an another story as well. A fifth-century presbyter of the Hagia Sophia, Markianos, appears to have built a church in Constantinople the porticoes of which had similar arrangement to the portioces of the Probatic Pool (four surrounding plus one in the middle creating two rectangulars).[45] Markianos' building activity in Constantinople is also recorded in the tenth-century *Patria*,[46] and even if the link between him and constructions in the Byzantine capital can be debated on the basis of lack of contemporary sources, it could nevertheless be concealing facts perpetuated in later period. As I will show later in this chapter, this is the case of Justinian, whose interest in both healing and St Anna is indicated in twelfth-century manuscripts.

To summarise, the miracle account of the healing of Paralytic mentioned in the Gospel of John gave rise to the construction in the fifth-century of a church dedicated to the Paralytic. As I will show below, at the beginning of the sixth century the same church was dedicated to Mary and was marked as the place where she was born. Following that, I will explain why Mary was associated with the monument and what does this connection show for her mother Anna.

The church of Mary in the Probatike

Pilgrim accounts allude to a new development at the Probatike in the sixth century.[47] The earliest testimony is Theodosios (530): 'Next to the Sheep-pool is the

---

[45] Papadopoulos-Kerameus (ed.) 1963:267.
[46] Preger (ed.) 1989:233-4.
[47] Rapp 2005:222.

church of my Lady Mary'.[48] The Piacenza pilgrim (circa 570), interested in healing sites,[49] describes Bethesda as the 'pool with five porticoes' and writes that 'to one of the porticoes a basilica was attached dedicated to St Mary in which many miracles take place'.[50] Antonios (570) refers to the Probatic pool and the basilica of Mary as well and adds that Mary was born there (Fig. 4).[51]

As Avner has pointed out, Theodosios had not visited the sites he wrote about, but based his account on other sources or on oral information provided to him by other travellers.[52] The fact that Theodosios was not a first-hand witness is of importance here. He records not what he saw but a tradition that affiliates Mary with the Probatike. The fact that Theodosios probably did not visit the monument itself but recorded a tradition around its name shows that by his time the connection between the Probatike and Mary's birth had already been made and that it circulated among the population. This is the reason why although Theodosios is not a first-hand witness one should rely on his account for the establishment of a new tradition, which affiliates Mary's birth to the church in the Probatike. Avner's argument is verified by the testimony of the Piacenza pilgrim since he refers to the porticoes of the pool, although their existence is not yet confirmed by excavations.[53] Consequently, we are not dealing here with actual sightseeing, but with the repetition of an existing tradition about the nativity of Mary in the course of the sixth century in Jerusalem.

---

[48] Wilkinson 2002:109. Elsewhere in his work (Tobler [ed.] 1877:72-3) Theodosios confuses the Probatic pool with Bethsaida, the place where apostles Philip, Peter and Andrew were born. For this text see n. 9.
[49] Limor 2007:322 n.3.
[50] Donner 1979: 288 no 27.
[51] Tobler (ed.) 1877:106, 137. Epiphanios Hagiopolites refers only to the porticoes of Bethesda with no mention of miracles or Marian or other traditions connected to the site, see Wilkinson 2002:208; PG 120: 261B.
[52] Avner 2007:547.
[53] Unless they refer to the porticoes built by the Roman emperor Hadrian, see Jeremias 1966:31. Mulder speaks of colonnades which 'exemplify Herodian style', see Mulder 2003:114 n. 135; Finegan 1969:146.

Whether a reconstruction of the church of the Paralytic or not,[54] the dedication of the Probatike church to Mary could be placed in the fifth century,as mentioned in the previous section. The fifth century marks the beginning of a period when sites designated the places where Mary had lived. For example, the Kathisma church mentioned earlier was built in Jerusalem to 'commemorate the spot where, according to the *Protevangelion of James*, the Virgin rested before giving birth to Christ'.[55] Taylor notes that the tomb of Mary was built in the fifth century in Gesthémani to satisfy the expectations of pilgrims familiar with apocryphal stories about Mary's Dormition.[56] In addition, Pullan attributes the construction of churches dedicated to Mary from the fifth century onwards to the interest in the origins of Christ.[57] Mary's nativity is mentioned in the second-century *Protevangelion of James*, and the event's recitation in a popular textual source, allowed it to gain a place in fifth-century popular belief.[58] This belief was then crystallised in the construction of a monument to commemorate the event. Although the earliest testimony to the celebration of the Nativity of Mary in Jerusalem dates from the eighth century in the Probatike,[59] we cannot deny that the change in religious associations of sites marks an ideological shift. Delehaye for example argues that wells and springs were given new connotations to overcome pagan beliefs, and that those monuments, which were associated with a saint, signify the popularity of saint.[60] Delehaye's view is in agreement with the ideological changes in the Probatic Pool, which are reflected, in its topographical

---

[54] Mare 1987:239; Wilkinson 2002:142 ; Donner 1979:288 no. 27.
[55] Shoemaker 2002:79. For the influence of the *Protevangelion* in the fifth century around Mary's parents are concerned, see chapter two. In his discussion of the Kathisma of Mary, still existing in the time of the pilgrim Theodosios, Shoemaker notes that Theodosios 'fails to indicate explicitly the presence of a church at this site', see Shoemaker 2002:83. Shoemaker notes that not all Dormition stories (which are of apocryphal origin) appeared after 614 and leaves space to argue that they could antedate the 614 invasion, see Shoemaker 2002:70.
[56] Taylor 1993:337; Limor 1998:20.
[57] Pullan 1993:33.
[58] The *Protevangelion* counted around one hundred and forty two copies, see Cothenet 1988:4225.
[59] For the celebration of the Nativity of Mary, see part two of chapter three.
[60] He uses the example of St. Martin's well, see Attwater (trans.) 1998:138.

evolution. It was dedicated to the pagan god Asklepios,[61] then to the miracle of the Paralytic and then to Mary's Nativity.

Limor sees a change in the sacred topography of the monuments connected to Mary in the Holy Land, which denotes a liturgical evolution. This is how she explains the fact that in the fourth century there were no sites associated with Mary in Jerusalem, but only after 530 with pilgrim Theodosios.[62] She does however leaves speace for an earlier date of the 'sacred map' of Mary's churches in the Holy land.[63] I would argue that the Probatic Pool is one of the crucial monuments that allows us to follow the development of Marian sites in the Holy Land. Limor correctly adds that 'in order to study the developments within Christian belief, an instructive case would be the evolution of the traditions of the Virgin Mary and the associated sacred sites'.[64] This is what the Probatike offers to the studies of the the development of Mary's cult in Jerusame, the recognisition of her veneration as early as the fifth but actual development in the sixth century. The church in the Probatike, the Kathisma and the tomb, show that Christians showed profound interest in the events of Mary's life from the fifth century onwards and that the construction of monuments dedicated to her must have responded to popular demand, verified by pilgrims' accounts.

To conclude, altough the church of Mary in the Probatike may already have been standing from the fifth century onwards as a result of Juvenal's activity, which is placed in the framework of a rising Marian piety seen in Mary' Kathisma and her tomb, one can safely argue that it was dedicated to Mary in the sixth century.

Apart from the testimony of the pilgrims, there is no textual information from the sixth century on the basilica of Mary in Bethesda. It is only after the partial destruction of

---

[61] During the expulsion of the Jews from Jerusalem after the suppression of the revolt of their leader Bar Kokhba (132–135) , the site was dedicated to Serapis (Asklepios) and was used for curing diseases. See Mare 1987:239; Murphy-O'Connor 1980:29; Jeremias 1966:34.
[62] Limor 2006:352; For Theodosios, see Limor and Rubin 1998:167-194.
[63] Limor 2006:353.
[64] ibid.352.

the church by the Persians in 614, and its following reconstruction or renovation, that one finds textual references to it again.[65]

Sophronios of Jerusalem and John of Damaskos on the church of Mary in the Probatike

Sophronios,[66] patriarch of Jerusalem (550/560-638/9) in his *Anakreontikon* refers to the Probatike as the place where Anna gave birth to Mary: 'I walk within the holy Probatike, where the most-famous Anna bore Mary'.[67] John of Damaskos (died in 750) in his sermon on Mary's Nativity writes: 'Hail, sheep-pool, most holy precinct of the Mother of God! Hail, sheep-pool, ancestral adobe of the queen! Hail, sheep-pool, which once was the enclosure for Joachim's sheep but now is the heaven-imitating Church of Christ's rational flock! Once a year you received a visit by the angel of God, who troubled the water, strengthening and healing one man from illness that paralysed him, whereas now you contain a multitude of heavenly powers who sing hymns with us to the Mother of God, the source of miracles [and] spring of universal healing.'[68] This is the only direct connection made between the miracle at the Probatike and the Nativity of Mary. In his *Exposition of faith*, John of Damaskos writes on the life of Joachim and Anna: 'Joachim married Anna; but like the old barren Anna who gave birth to Samuel through prayer, she (= Mary's mother) gave birth to Mary through prayer […].[69] Thus grace, because this is what Anna means, gave birth to the Lady, because this is what the name of Mary means'.[70]

---

[65] According to Antiochos Strategos, a monk in St. Sabas (seventh century) the number of people that died in the area of Probatike is two thousand one hundred and seven victims: 'Ex Probatike, sepelivimus homines bis mille septem et centum,'see Peeters 1920:145.

[66] Allen (ed.) 2009:16; Jurgens 1979:306.

[67] 'Προβατικῆς ἁγίης ἔνδοθι βαίνω, ἔνθα τέκεν Μαρίην πάγκλυτος Ἄννα', see Christ and Paranikas (eds) 1871:46; PG 87: 3821C. For a translation of this part, see Wilkinson 2002:160.

[68] PG 96 :669B, 677C. For the translation of this part, see Cunningham (trans.) 2008:68. For the date of John's death, see Louth 2003:9.

[69] This is in contrast to what John of Damaskos will write in his Nativity homily on the way Mary was conceived, see chapter two.

[70] PG 94: 1157B-1160A ' Ἰωακεὶμ τοίνυν τὴν σεμνήν τε καὶ ἀξιέπαινον Ἄνναν πρὸς γάμον ἠγάγετο.Ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἡ πάλαι Ἄννα στειρεύσασα δι' εὐχῆς καὶ ἐπαγγελίας τὸν Σαμουὴλ ἐγέννησεν, οὕτω καὶ αὕτη διὰ λιτῆς καὶ ἐπαγγελίας πρὸς θεοῦ τὴν θεοτόκον κομίζεται […]· τίκτει τοιγαροῦν ἡ χάρις (τοῦτο γὰρ ἡ Ἄννα

Long before John of Damaskos, Philo of Alexandria (first century) is one of the first writers to explain the meaning of the name 'Anna' as 'grace' in his *On the immutability of God* and in his *On ebriety*.[71] John of Damaskos continues that Mary 'is born in the house of Joachim in the Probatike and she is taken to the temple'.[72] And finally, in his treatise *How to venerate buildings* John of Damaskos mentions the church of Mary in the Probatike. He writes that this monument should be worshipped not only because 'of its nature' but because it constitutes a 'holy vessel of holy energy, which God placed for the process of human salvation'.[73] John alludes that the Probatike should be worshipped for the reason that it is the place where Anna and Joachim gave birth to Mary and explains John's interest in the Nativity of Mary about which he composed a homily.[74] The sentence 'of its nature' used by John of Damaskos to describe the Probatike is of importance here and should be understood in connection to the theological associations made with the monument because the miracle of the Paralytic took place there. For the reason that the 'nature' of the monument will be analysed shortly in this chapter, it is sufficient to note for now that the 'nature' of this Marian monument, was also highlighted by the sixth-century historian Prokopios in his description of the church of Pege (= source, fountain) in Constantinople.

The testimonies of Sophronios and John of Damaskos verify the tradition recorded by pilgrim Antonios (570), according to which Mary was born in the Probatike.[75] John of Damaskos is one of the first writers to express deep veneration for Mary's parents.

ἑρμηνεύεται) τὴν κυρίαν (τοῦτο γὰρ τῆς Μαρίας σημαίνει τὸ ὄνομα·'.
[71] Cohn and Wendland (eds) 1962: 57,198.
[72] PG 94:1160A 'Τίκτεται δὲ ἐν τῷ τῆς προβατικῆς τοῦ Ἰωακεὶμ οἴκῳ καὶ τῷ ἱερῷ προσάγεται'.
[73] Kotter (ed.) 1975:139.
[74] Discussed throughout chapter two.
[75] Sophronios' *Anakreontikon* was written while he was in exile (Pullan 1993:27, Allen [ed.] 2009:18 – in contrast to Mimouni 1995: 482 who places it between 603-614 –) and returned to Jerusalem in 634, see Allen (ed.) 2009:20. In the sixth-century lives of Cyril of Skythopolis (Schwartz [ed.] 1939:240) he appears to have built (ἀνήγειρεν δέ ἐκ θεμελίων) a church of Mary but this was located in the monastery of Theodosios in Bethleem destroyed by the Persians in 614, located six kilometres away from St. Sabas monastery, thus it is not the church in the Probatike.

Gambero notes that the 'profound respect' of John of Damaskos to Mary's parents is because 'Anna's sterility is part of the arranged plan for salvation, so that the role of grace would appear fully predominant'.[76] In John's the time Probatike – still standing until the eleventh century since it was not completely destroyed by the Persians in 614 –[77] had become a station for liturgy on the Saturday on the sixth week of Lent, thus it had been established in the liturgy of the church of Jerusalem by the seventh century,[78] and at least from the eighth century the feast of Mary's Nativity was celebrated there.[79]

The final point to look at, is why the Probatike was signalised as the birthplace of Mary and what this choice tells us about the form of veneration that Anna experienced in the first centuries of her cult. As I will demonstrate in the second half of this chapter, the association of Mary with healing waters played a significant role in the topography of Anna's churches in Constantinople. By understanding the nature of the Probatike in Jerusalem, I will able to explain the association of Mary and Anna with water in the churches of Constantinople.

Bethesda's symbolism

The tradition that affiliates Mary's birth with the Probatike appears as an established one in the writings of pilgrim Theodosios. Since no other earlier association had been made between Mary and the Probatike, why was Mary associated to Bethesda and how was this tradition created?

---

[76] Gambero 1999:402.
[77] Pierre and Rousée 1981:28.
[78] Kluge and Baumstark 1915:219 n.6 ; Abel 1914 :455 no. 9.
[79] See chapter three part two.The tenth-century patriarch of Alexandria Euthymios refers to the church, see Cachia (ed.) 1960:139 and the house of Joachim and Anna is mentioned in a twelfth-century Greek description of Jerusalem by Eugesippos, see ibid. 988B.

First the pools constituted a massive purification site. The main characteristic of the pools is their waters and their ability to purify and heal, which formed the background for the story of the miracle of the Paralytic described in the Gospel of John. In turn, the inclusion of the pool in the Gospel of John gave Bethesda baptismal connotations.[80] Bethesda had all the necessary characteristics, the healing waters, a pool (a location, κολυμβήθρα in the Greek, which is a term used in the Baptismal rite) and a miracle (practical manifestation of waters' healing qualities).[81] This miracle gave rise to a sacramental symbolism of the site and it is presented as such by the Church Fathers in both East and West.

Tertullian (160-after 220) writes that it is through the troubling of the waters by the angel in Bethaisda (sic) that 'man's sin will be erased and the new man will be purified and be reborn since he will receive the Holy Spirit once again, which man had lost with the original sin'.[82] Ammonios of Alexandria (third century) believes that the miracle at Bethesda symbolizes Baptism.[83] Ambrose (340-397) writes that the benediction of the Holy Spirit derives from God, as it was signified in the moving of the waters at the pools.[84] He parallels the descending of the angel to the pool and the stirring of waters by him (a

---

[80] Kannengiesser 2004:633; Brock 1974: 204, 210-1. Baert's recent article on the Bethesda pools correctly treats the Pool as a site with many connotations, but overall it is an unfounded attempt to reconstruct the history of the site. First she often does not refer to primary sources (Baert 2005:1 n.2). Second she refers to the pool as a 'well' to make connection with the Latin period where it was called as such (Baert 2005:2). Third she adopts the term 'Bethsaida' without explanation and without referring to the option of using the term 'Bethesda', see Baert 2005:2 n. 5).

[81] 'Εἰσέρχεται ὁ ἱερεὺς […], ἀπέρχεται ἐν τῇ κολυμβήθρα [...]', see Goar (ed.) 1960:287. The Gospel of John is full of Baptismal symbolisms that will later be used in the liturgy either in the Lenten scrutinies or the blessing of the water, see Nocent 2000:11.

[82] Refoulé (ed.) 2002:74; Coxe 1885:642. 'Therefore, when the soul embraces the faith, being renewed in its second birth by water and the power from above, then the veil of its former corruption being taken away, it beholds the light in all its brightness', see Coxe 1885:221; Schiller 1966:178. Dunn argues that Tertullian wrote his homily *On Baptism* because some Canaanite heresy had denied the efficacy of washing with water for the forgiveness of sins, see Dunn 2004:19. Schiller finds an iconographical parallel between the miracle at Bethesda and Moses (Ex 15:22-7, Ex 17:1-7) where God provides water to his people. Especially in Ex. 15:26-7 the provision of sweet water to drink is a contrast between sin and the God of Israel, who is presented as a healer, see Schiller 1966:178.

[83] Cramer 1844 (ed.) (2):228-9.

[84] The name 'Bethesda' is not mentioned by Ambrose, only the pools are: 'De cuius (=Holy Spirit) operatione, quae per piscinae commotionem designabatur', see PL 16:723. For a translation of this part, see Ramsey (trans.) 1997a:150.

sign of the presence of God for the unfaithful) to the descending of the Holy Spirit during baptism (a sign of the presence of God for the faithful).[85] John Cassian (360-435) refers to the miracle but connects it to the demonstration of faith by the paralytic rather than to Baptism.[86] John Chrysostom makes a direct connection between the miracle at Bethesda and Baptism : 'What mystery doth it signify to us? […] A Baptism was about to be given [...] A Baptism purifying all sins […].[87] Ephrem the Syriac (fourth century) in his commentary on the *Diatessaron* of Tatian refers to the healing of the paralytic in the Probatic pool and refers to the negative response of the Jews to the miracle.[88] He writes that 'the leader of the angels comes down and disperses medical power, so that the Jews know that the leading angel cures all diseases of the soul'.[89] In his account, the healing powers of the site are placed in a Christian context: 'one is cured not only by the nature of waters but with the activity of the angel who under the grace of the Holy Spirit cures sins'.[90] These things are then foreshown as in a picture by the pool'.[91]

Chromatius, bishop of Aquileia (fifth century), has made the most straightforward connection of the miracle at Bethesda to Baptism, as it is clear from the title of his sermon

---

[85] 'Sed cum angeli hominibus in adjumentum descendant, intelligendum est quod creatura quidem superior angelorum sit, quae plus recepit gratiae spiritalis', see PL 16:724; Ramsey (trans.) 1997a:150. We remind the reader that a Byzantine fresco depicting the angel troubling the waters has been found at Bethesda. The presence of an angel in a miracle taking place next to water is seen in the tenth-century miracle of Chona: 'He settled at the spring, which gushed forth on account of the guardianship of the Archistrategos, and because of the many miracles, and conversions and Baptisms which occurred at the spring', see Peers 2001:163 and n.44. For the association of angels with natural phenomena and spring waters, see Peers 2001:185 and n.80.

[86] Ramsey (trans.) 1997b:448.

[87] Schaff 1889: 125-6. On Chrysostom's view of the miracle at the Probatike as a healing site for cures, see De Roten 2005:400-401.

[88] 'Let the Jews, who do not believe that Baptism forgives sins, be put to shame', see McCarthy (trans.) 1993:205. See also Cramer (ed.) 1844 (2): 228. Florovsky recognized the part of a gospel text found in Dura-Europos as a part of the Diatessaron, see Palles 2007:111. Today this view has been invalidated, see Parker and Taylor and Goodacre 1999:228. For bibliography on Ephrem's commentary on the Diatessaron, see Horn 2005: 313 n.1.

[89] Cramer (ed.) 1844 (2): 228.

[90] ibid. 228.

[91] Schaff (ed.) 1889: 125-6. For Chrysostom's view of the miracle at the Probatike as a healing site for cures, see De Roten 2005:400-401.

On the healing of the paralytic and Baptism. Similarly to Ambrose, Chromatius connects the angel descending to the pool with the descending of the Holy Spirit during Baptism.[92]

I have demonstrated that as early as the third century Bethesda was associated with one of the most important Christian sacraments, the Baptism, a connection which was facilitated by the fact that John's Gospel played a more important role than the other Gospels in the formation of the Orthodox liturgy.[93] Finegan notes than in the Cyrenian Gospel of John (fifth century) Bethesda is mentioned as a Baptistery, which 'makes it likely that in some period the pools of Bethesda were used for baptism'.[94] The dedication of the church to the healing of the Paralytic by the fifth century and the proximity of the church to the pools, which were also used for purification purposes, made it very likely that the Bethesda was used as a Baptistery at the time when the Cyrenian Gospel of John was written.[95]

The association of the Probatike with Mary's birth derives from the Christian understanding of Baptism as a new birth.[96] This association was first made in the *Gospel of John* (3, 5): 'no one who was not born of water and the Holy Ghost can enter the kingdom of God'. In patristic texts, Christ's Nativity is presented as an antitype for liturgical baptism,[97] and Pseudo-Dionysios (fifth century) in his *Ecclesiastical hierarch*y characterizes Baptism as a 'ceremony of divine generation' (θεογενεσία).[98]

---

[92] Lemarié (ed.) 1969:239.
[93] Verhelst 2006:440.
[94] Finegan 1969:147.
[95] Near the Bethesda pools there were 'healing baths' or 'medicinal pools'. Although its excavators do not associate them directly to Bethesda, this proximity cannot be only accidental, see Jeremias 1966:34.
[96] Meyendorff 1976:193. This view originates in *Genesis* (Gen. 1.20) with the formation of life through water; See also Brock 1979a:81-4. Wolf discusses rebirth through water among Egyptians and Greeks and notes that the first bath came with special qualities, see Wolf 2004:152-5.
[97] Deshman 1989:34.
[98] PG 3:397A. We should note that although the word is not translated as such, it could mean 'reborn again through God', see PG 3:393A. For the meaning of 'θεογενεσία', see Lampe 1961:624. For Pseudo-Dionysios' concept on the divine birth, see Rorem 1993:97-9. The word Pseudo-Dionysios uses for the sacrament of Baptism is not 'Baptism' but 'divine birth' (θεογενεσία), see Rorem 1993:97. For the bath of divine generation in Gregory Palamas see PG 151:12B, 200D where the baptised are reborn in a 'divine way not through the desire of the flesh or the will of a man but through Christ'. For rebirth through Baptism, see Brock 1972: 26, 28, 30.

As far as the connection of Mary with Baptism is concerned, in the ancient and biblical world female deities are associated with water.[99] In the fourth century, the female connotations of Baptism were made in John Chrysostom's *Homily on John*, where John describes the baptismal font as a womb (26.1). In Syria, the female associations of the Holy Spirit derives from the fusion of the spirit hovering over the primeval waters, pictured as a mother dove.[100] Jacob of Serugh (fifth-sixth century) too makes the connection between Bethesda and baptism and second birth in his homily *On the Paralytic*.[101] Ephrem the Syriac refers to Baptism as a second womb,[102] and Anastasios Sinaites (seventh century) blames those who do not have the Lord as father and the Baptismal font as mother.[103] Ephrem's concept is repeated in the *Akathistos* hymn (fifth century),[104] where 'a conceptual connection between Mary's womb and the baptismal font' is attested,[105] associated with Mary as second Eve and her role in the redemption,[106] a connection made for the first time in the fourth century by Didymos of Alexandria.[107] In Ephrem's sermon *On the Nativity*, Mary says to her son: 'Creator of your mother - in a second birth, through water',[108] which reflects the view mentioned in the *Gospel of John* that no one can enter the kingdom of God if he or she is reborn 'through water and spirit' (John 3:4). Bethesda is not the only site connected to Baptism, but it is the first location in

---

[99] Muthmann 1975:339-342. The Greek Goddess Hera, who is associated with springs, is equated with Mary in Arabic infancy Gospels: 'Hera nostra domina Maria' (= Hera our Lady Mary), see Muthmann 1975: 332 n. 264. For the association between Hera and Mary in a fifth-century version of Christ's infancy written by Aphroditianos of Persia, see PG 10:100.

[100] Murray 1982:13.

[101] Brock 1979a:87-8.

[102] Brock and Kiraz (trans.) 2006:191.

[103] Kuehn and Baggarly (eds) 2007:160.

[104] Peltomaa 2001:217-30.

[105] ibid. 199.

[106] ibid. 132.

[107] 'Διτταὶ γὰρ γίνονται κυήσεις ἀνθρώποις, ἡ μὲν ἐκ σώματος ἡμετέρου, ἡ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ θείου Πνεύματος' (Two births occur in human beings, one out of our own body, on through the Holy Spirit). See PG 39:669A. For the life of Didymos of Alexandria, see Bienert 1972:5-8.

[108] CSCO 83:76; Beck 1956:28-9; Kimbrough 2002:270. The same view is later expressed by John of Damaskos, see Murray 1982:13; Lanne 1983: 143-4. Early Syriac Christianity developed a tradition of feminine symbols for aspects of the divine, see Ashbrook Harvey 1983:288-299; Ranft 1998:1-16; Brock 1979a:84-8.

Jerusalem associated with Mary's birth. The connection of female fertility to water had been establishment already in the fourth century in Palestine, when the pilgrim of Bordeaux (333) refers to a spring near Jericho where women washed themselves or drank water to conceive a child.[109]

To sum up, Bethesda is a location where rebirth takes place through its holy waters (Baptism) and a female figure, Mary was the recipient of this tradition, which was not innovative but it is explained by the continuation of the affiliation of women with waters of human or divine birth. The association of water and Baptism created the platform for the connection between Baptism and female deities and since Baptism in Christianity was equated with birth, the birth of female deities came to existence. Mary is the recipient of this evolution in the theological thought. The connection of regeneration to Baptism and Baptism's connection to Bethesda created a platform on which the Nativity of Mary was placed. This concept applies to Byzantine art 'where the bathing of the infant Mary - or, in images of the Nativity of Christ, the bathing of the infant Jesus - appear as anticipations or antitypes of what will be the Christian act of baptism. In many images of the Nativity of the Virgin the water basin takes forms that suggest baptismal fonts'.[110]

Moreover, practical reasons necessiated the identificion of the Probatike as the place of Mary's birth, since there was already a location to commemorate Mary's Dormition, her Tomb Gesthémani but none for her birth. The proximity of the Probatike to the tomb of Mary is verified by John Phokas (eleventh century) in his *Description of Holy Places* 'And toward the gate leading to Gesthémani there is a church dedicted to saints

---

[109] Tobler (ed.) 1877 :19.Taylor argues that this was a curious feature of the countryside that Bordeaux pilgrim likes to record, as it the case of his reference to the Bethesda pool, see Taylor 1993:327-328.

[110] Denny 1973:102; Chamberlain 2007:42. Sometimes the basin takes the shape of chalice when it is depicted with a foot, see Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992:105, 107, and pl. XXII fig.57, pl. XXIII fig. 50 , pl. XXIV fig. 61-2, pl. XXV fig. 64. In this case the connotations made are not Baptismal but Eucharistic, because the bathing fonts are similar in shape to the chalices used in the Eucharist, see Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992: pl. VII fig.21, pl. X fig.29, pl.XXX fig.73, pl. XXXI fig.74-5, pl. XXXII fig.76. A direct connection between the life of Mary and the Eucharist is made in the Aeras of Souzdal (1410-1425), where the Holy Communion is framed by the life of Mary, see Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992: pl.VIII fig.24.

Joachim and Anna, in which the most holy Theotokos' birth took place and close to this, the streams of the Probatic Pool spring up'.[111] Thus the proximity to the Gesthémani together with the theological background analysed above comprise all the ideas behind the association of Mary's birth with the Probatike.

Finally, Mary's role as a healer in connection to the Probatike is shown in a fifth-century manuscript from Oxyrhynchus (P.Oxy.VIII 1151), where a woman named Ioannina asks from 'the God of the probatic pool' to heal from her illness. Ioannina's supplication is then addressed apart from the archangels and saints, to the Virgin.[112]

In the following section, I will show that in Constantinople this association was received, altered, and expanded to accomodate the emerging cult of Mary in the sixth century. The sacramental context was removed and instead the healing qualities of Mary and her mother dominated the churches of St Anna in the Byzantine capital.

Constantinople

The location of St Anna's churches in Constantinople has not attracted the interest of scholarship despite the fact that three chapels are incorporated in well known monuments such as the Pege, the Chalkoprateia, and the Hodegetria. The only church which has attracted some attention as one of the chapels of the Great Palace is St Anna's chapel built by Leo VI (886-912), but it has not been studied in the framework of Anna's veneration.The chapels have not been included even in recent publications on the palace.[113] Five churches were built from the sixth century onwards and at least one of them was still standing in the beginning of the twelfth century (Fig. 5).[114] Apart from the chapel in the Great Palace, the other four are either free-standing or are incorporated as chapels in

---

[111] PG 133:944C.
[112] PO 18:418-9.
[113] Professor Vasileios Marines has worked on palace chapels and kindly informed me that in his work the palace-chapel of Anna has been not included.
[114] Thomas and Constantinides Hero 2000: 710.

churches dedicated to Mary. The common characteristic in the chapels of Anna in Pege, Chalkoprateia and the Hodegetria is that they were built in churches dedicated to Mary which included a healing spring. Nowhere in texts is Anna attributed with healing powers through water; it is only in the Constantinopolitan topography that this association is mainly made.

In this section, I will argue that the incorporation of a chapel dedicated to St Anna in churches dedicated to Mary is a topographical model created by Justinian I who was the recipient of a tradition that was related with the placement of churches next to water constructions. I will demonstrate that his interest in the creation of sacred spaces in the sixth century established a topographical model for Anna's churches by his successors.

Justinian I builds the first church of St Anna in the quarter of Deuteron [115]

The earliest textual reference for the existence of a church dedicated to St Anna in Constantinople is Prokopios, who in his *On Buildings* writes that a 'great church' was built in the quarter of Deuteron and was dedicated to the 'so-called Mother of Mary'.[116] The tenth- century writer/editor of the *Patria* writes that it was a three-aisle church of great size.[117] Mango sees 'a trend of building monasteries' in the fifth and especially in the sixth century in area of the Deuteron where he counts twenty-one monasteries by 536.[118] The location of Anna's church in the Deuteron is verified by the *Typikon of the Kecharitomene monastery* (1110-1116) where the Kecharitomene monastery is connected through a road

---

[115] For the scholarly debate on the location of the quarter of the Deuteron, see Appendix.

[116] Weber (ed.) 1838a:185. Prokopios' reference to St Anna as the one 'who is believed to be the Mother of the Virgin Mary' does not imply ignorance on the part of the writer but should be seen as literary attempt to imitate ancient Greek writers, see Cameron 1985:93;Cameron 1965:161-3. For other works that mention the church of St Anna in the Deuteron, seeWeber (ed.) 1838b:197, 324, 677; Bekker (ed.)1842:168; Scylitzes 1973:107,163. See also Preger (ed.) 1989:244; Delehaye (ed.) 1902:20.2, 90.5, 127.2, 842.1:15; Gedeon 1899:136; Mateos (ed.) 1962:16, 50. Gilles 1561:200-201 who uses Prokopios as his source; Du Cange 1680 (4):143-4.

[117] Preger (ed.) 1989:232 ('τρίκλινος', 'παμμεγεθέστατος')

[118] Mango 1985:49; Mango counts twenty-three monasteries, Mango1986: 125.

with the church of St Anna in the Deuteron.[119] St Anna's church must have been located in the proximity of Chora monastery, between the church of Sts Bassianos and Matronas and near the Aetios and Aspar cisterns (modern Edirne Kapusi) (Fig. 6).[120] It seems that the availability of space facilitated the construction of these churches (the one of St Anna included) in the sixth century. Prokopios provides no description of the church of St Anna in the Deuteron whatsoever,[121] and the building must date between Justinian's rise to the throne in 527 and the publication of Prokopios' work in 554.[122] The church of St Anna was built around eighty years after the first church of Mary in Constantinople, the Theotokos of Kyros (450 or 460),[123] at a time when there were only seven monasteries dedicated to Mary in the capital,[124] and Justinian's patronage of Anna is part of the slow process of the rise of Marian devotion in the capital.[125] It has been suggested that Justinian's building activity was confined to maintaining existing monuments,[126] but there is nothing to show – either in

---

[119] Jordan (trans.) 2000: 710. Ὁ διαιρέτης τοῖχος τῆς γυναικείας μονῆς τῆς Κεχαριτωμένης, ἄρχεται ἀπὸ οὗ εἰσοδικοῦ πυλῶνος τῆς μονῆς τοῦ κατέμπροσθεν κειμένου τῆς δημοσίας ὁδοῦ τῆς ἐρχομένης ἀπὸ τῆς ἁγίας Ἄννης τοῦ Δευτέρου', see PG 127:1117. For the 'δημόσια ὁδός' (= Mese), see Freely and Çakmak 2004:26-7; Guilland 1969:69-79; Mango 1959b:78-81; Schneider 1951:97.

[120] Schwartz (ed.) 1940:69 no 15l; Janin 1953:41; Delehaye (ed.) 1902:127.2. For the cistern of Aetios in the Constantinopolitan Synaxarion, see Delehaye (ed.) 1902:266.5. For St. Bassianos' church, see Janin 1969:60-1; Mateos (ed.) 1962:1:64. For a recent review of Aspar's date of construction, see Bardill 2003:61,109. For both cistern of Aetios and Aspar see Crow 2008:129-132. According to the *Chronicle of Marcellinos* (sixth century), the cistern was built in 421, see Croce 1995: 12-3; For Edirne Kapusi's modern location, see Müller-Wiener 1977:278-9. St Bassianos and St Akepsimas were celebrated in a church of St. Bassianos, which lies next to St Anna church in Deuteron, see Delehaye (ed.) 1902:126-8.

[121] Cameron 1985:100.

[122] ibid. 86; Mango 1976:97. We could probably expand the chronological frame from 518 since according to Prokopios 'Justinian administered the government also during his uncle's reign on his own authority', see Weber (ed.) 1838a:45. But Croke notes that we should be cautious with this statement of Prokopios since 'Justinian's authority during the reign of Justin from July 518 to April 527 was not abrupt and obsolete, but grudging and gradual', see Croke 2007: 56.

That the construction of St Anna's church in the Deuteron initiated the cult of the saint in Constantinople and dates it in 550 (Baumer and Scheffczyk 1988:154,156; Leclercq 1907:2166; Croce 1961:1269) is not supported by any evidence. Leclercq's use of Prokopios does not validate the date of the construction. We think that it is confused by Mauss' belief that a church of Mary in Probatike was built in 550, see Mauss 1888: 24 n .1.

[123] Mango 2000:19.

[124] ibid. Between 518 and 536.

[125] ibid.17.

[126] Gieles 1988:173; Downey 1950: 262-266.

textual or archaeological evidence – that prior to the sixth century other Byzantine emperors took a similar initiative to build a church to St Anna.[127]

Chapels – Churches of Anna in the Byzantine capital

Apart from the church in Deuteron, Middle and Late Byzantine sources inform us about three churches or chapels dedicated to St Anna in Constantinople that were integrated in churches dedicated to Mary at Pege, the Hodegetria and the Chalkoprateia.[128]

For the chapel at Pege we are informed by a tenth-century description of a miracle at the site:[129] Prokopios in the story behind the construction of the church of Pege (Spring) emphasizes the holiness of the location : 'In that place is a dense grove of cypresses and a meadow abounding in flowers in the midst of soft glebe, a park abounding in beautiful shrubs, and a spring bubbling silently forth with a gentle stream of sweet water — all especially suitable to a sanctuary'.[130] This is particularly obvious in the fourteenth-century description by Nikephoros Kallistos (1256-1335) of the miracle of the spring's appearance during the reign of Leo I.[131] Nikephoros' account, however unhistorical, shows that the spring's fame as a healing site never completely subsided despite the fact that it fell into disuse during the Latin domination (1204-1261).[132] The important detail to remember is that by the tenth century, St Anna is associated in written sources with the healing site of

---

[127] For the construction of monasteries between the reigns of Constantine the Great and Justinian I, see Von Falkenhausen 1979:151-5.

[128] Janin 1969: 37; Delehaye (ed.) 1902: 291. For the dating of Chalkoprateia and Hodegetria, see Janin 1969: 199, 237; Mango 1998:65; Berger 1988:411; Mango 1986a: (addenda) 4, who altered his previous opinion expressed in Mango 1986a:125. See also Ebersolt 1921:55; James 2001a:150; Mango 2000:19; Mathews 1971:28-33; Freely and Çakmak 2004:31-2,62-3; Angelidi 1994:141; Talbot 1994b:107; Shoemaker 2008:72.

[129] AASS November 3: 879 C ('εἰς τὸν τῆς πανυμνήτου ναὸν καὶ μὴ συγχωρηθεῖσα εἰς τὸν τῆς ἁγίας Ἄννης σὺν γενεᾷ πάσῃ τέθαπται᾿), 883D ('ποιήσεται ὁρμὴν πρὸς τὸν τὴν ἁγίας Ἄννης οἶκον εὐκτήριον'), 884B ('καὶ κρηπῖδα τοῦ τεμένους τῆς σεβασμίας Ἄννης κατεβάλετο')

[130] Dewing and Downey (trans.) 1940:41; Weber (ed.) 1838a:185. In the fifth-century account of Aphroditianos of Persia on the birth of Christ, Mary ('Myria) is called 'πηγή ὕδατος' (= source/fountain of water), see PG 10:100C. According to Migne's introductory note, this work has wrongly been ascribed to Julius Africanus (third century).

[131] PG 146-7: 72-3.

[132] Talbot 2002:157; Talbot 1994a:135. For miracles performed there see AASS November 3:878A-889D.

Pege and that, similarly to the Probatike, St Anna is placed within a context of a site's fame as a healing site thanks to its waters. Earlier in this thesis, I mentioned the comment of John of Damaskos on the house of Anna and Joachim in the Probatike where he referred to the 'nature' of the location. The same concept is alluded here by Prokopios, who justifies the sanctity of a church dedicated to Mary not only by the fact that it was dedicated to her, but also because the environment, its flora and waters are in harmony with the sanctity of Mary and thus the Pege is located in a natural setting appropriate for the veneration of Mary.

From the *Synaxarion of Constantinople* we are informed about a church or chapel of St Anna in the Chalkoprateia, where the feast of Anna's Conception (of Mary) was celebrated.[133] The Chalkoprateia, apart from the fifth-century baptistery it included, was also next to the Cistern Basilica, built by Justinian in the modern Jere Batan Serai.[134] In the Hodegetria church, which is mentioned no earlier than the ninth century,[135] there used to be a fountain attributed with miraculous qualities, which was – according to the texts – the reason for its construction in the specific location as early as the ninth century and which – according to pilgrims – was venerated at least until the fourteenth century.[136] The miraculous fountain of Hodegetria was compared to the pool in Siloam in Jerusalem,[137] where according to the Gospel of John (9.1-7) a blind man was healed. Similar to Siloam, the Hodegetria was a well-known healing site for curing blind people.[138]

For the church of St Anna in the Hodegetria church we are informed by a twelfth-century epigram of Theodore Balsamon: 'to the tomb near the church of St Anna in the

---

[133] Delehaye (ed.) 1902: 291; Janin 1953:42. One of the Late Byzantine depictions is the murder of Zacharias (Mango 1969-1970:370), which is inspired by the Protevangelion (Wilson [trans.] 1974: 387-8). For the murder of Zacharias in Jewish and Christian sources, see Dubois 1994:23-38.
[134] Mordtmann 1892:78.
[135] Pentcheva 2006:121; Mango 2000:19.
[136] Preger (ed.) 1989: 223, 260; Majeska 1984:96, 325-6; PG 157: 556A; Angelidi 1994:119-120; Janin 1964: 220.
[137] PG 146-7:73.
[138] Angelidi 1994:119. See also Talbot 2002:168; Angelidi and Papamastorakis 2000:380.

Hodegon monastery'.[139] Janin correctly points out that this sentence could signify either a chapel or church,[140] but if it were a chapel then Theodore would have referred to the tomb in relation to the Hodegetria church, and not to one of its chapels.

The brief information provided on these three buildings sets strict limits on any attempt to extract additional information concerning the date of their initial construction. To understand the association of Mary and Anna in the churches of Constantinople and shown in the examples above, means to follow the gradual development of a concept in the religious architecture of Byzantium which relates churches and water.

Churches and water constructions in Byzantium

Bouras sees the phiale in the atrium of the early Christian basilicas as 'survival of the primeval cult of waters, which was carried over into religious as well as secular architecture of the middle Byzantine period'.[141] However they are attested already in the early Byzantine period. Pianalto has shown that the Fountain complex in Gerasa (fourth century) and the church of Hagia Sophia in Thessalonike (fourth to fifth century) shows that from the fourth century onwards water constructions such as fountains formed part of Christian architecture.[142] In the fifth century, water had become an integral part of church architecture due to the association of water to baptism and spiritual cleaning,[143] attested already in the third century in the first preserved Christian building at the Dura - Europos

---

[139] Horna 1903:190 no XXVIII.
[140] Janin 1953: 42 and n.1; Angelidi and Papamastorakis 2000:380-1.
[141] Bouras 1976:85.
[142] Pianalto 1999:65-6.
[143] For the construction of churches next to baths in the fourth century which were turned into baptisteria, see Pietri 1981 :440.

with its baptistery.[144] Sixth-century Byzantine architecture verifies once more this tendency in Sepphoris (Palestine),[145] Gerasa (Jordan),[146] Macedonia and Athens (Greece).[147]

Mary and water constructions in Constantinople

Having established the connection between water constructions and church architecture in the sixth century, we now turn to Constantinople. One of the features of Constantinopolitan topography are springs, which Mango has characterized as 'insignificant' because they played no role in the city's water system.[148] The lack of practical use of springs is of interest in this study because these springs are associated with churches dedicated to Mary such as the Blachernai and Pege, and since these springs had according to Mango little practical use, their construction was triggered by different reasons.[149]

The fifth century marks the 'multiplication of churches and monasteries' in Constantinople, which was intensified in the sixth century and pertains to churches of Mary in particular.[150] Between the fifth century and the sixth century eleven churches were dedicated to Mary in Constantinople: the Theotokos of Kyros (fifth century);[151] the Chalkoprateia built by Pulcheria (according to Theophanes);[152] the basilica of the

---

[144] Bilde 2006:131,133-5, where Bilde explains the difference between Jewish ritual baths (mikweh) and Christian baptisteries at that period.

[145] Weiss and Netzer 1996b:84.

[146] Brenk 2003:11-12.

[147] ibid. 9; Hattersley-Smith 1996:35-6, 198, 204-5, 235.

[148] Mango 1995: 10. Provision of water supply and other water constructions were one of the first public works initiated once a new emperor assumed his task, see Whitby and Whitby (trans.) 1989:45 no 364 (Valens), ibid. p. 56 no 396, p.73 no 443, p. 79 no 261 (Arkadios), ibid. p. 25 no 345 (Konstantios), ibid. p.110 (Justinian I), ibid. p. 148 (Phokas); Weber (ed.) 1838b:384.
The date for the costruction of the 'Dagestheas baths' is debated. Snee and Berger place them in Theodosios' II reign and Janin in Anastasios' reign. Based on the eighth-century historian Theophanes (De Boor [ed.] 1963: 176) Snee, Berger and Janin accept that the finalisation of the baths took place under Justinian I in 528, see Snee 1998:177, n.144; Berger 1982:155; Janin 1964:217.

[149] The importance of water provision is one of the main themes of Prokopios' 'Buildings', see Cameron 1985:85.

[150] Mango 1986a:125.

[151] Mango 2000:18 (map) and p.19 for the date of construction.

[152] De Boor (ed.) 1963:101-2. Later he says that it was built by Justin II, see De Boor (ed.) 1963:248. Mango argues that the monument has been built by Verina the sister of Thedosios II based Nov. 31 of Justinian I (Mango 1998: 65), although Theodore Lector, also in the sixth century, attributes it to Pulcheria. But as

Blachernai (fifth century,[153] renovated by Justinian),[154] Theotokos of Pege (sixth century);[155] Theotokos ta Areovindou (sixth century);[156] Theotokos of Diakonissēs (sixth century);[157] Theotokos of Besson (sixth century);[158] Theotokos close to the Jobs (sixth century);[159] Theotokos of Jerusalem (sixth century);[160] Theotokos close to St Luke (sixth century);[161] Theotokos next to the Great church (sixth century);[162] the Theotokos of Lithostroto (sixth century);[163] and the Theotokos of Boukoleon (sixth century).[164] Of all these buildings only the church of Mary in Pege was built near an existing fountain by Justinian I (the initial construction dates is placed by Talbot in the fifth century).[165] Two other churches were also associated with water: the basilica of Blachernai accommodated a fountain,[166] and the Chalkoprateia included a fifth-century baptistery.[167]

While the majority of churches of Mary in Constantinople did not have aquatic connotations, the churches of St Anna did, with the exception of a palace chapel and the church in the quarter of Deuteron. Despite the small number of churches dedicated to Mary and connected with a source of holy water, modern scholars stress the association of Mary

Mango argues, Theodore's work survives only in the twelfth- and thirteenth century manuscripts. See Mango 1998: 66.

[153] Janin 1969:161. The fifth-century date is based on the account of the life Daniel Stylites, where Verina appears to have been hidden there when her brother wanted to murder her. See Mango 1998:64. Prokopios dates the initial construction to the reign of Justin I (518-527), see Weber (ed.) 1838a: 184.

[154] Weber (ed.) 1838a: 184.

[155] Schwartz (ed.) 1940: 71 no 52. For the church of Mary at Pege, see Janin 1969: 223-228.

[156] According to Theophanes, it was built by the brother of emperor Tiberios, see De Boor (ed.) 1963: 277. Janin 1969:157.

[157] According to Theophanes, it was built by the brother of emperor Tiberios (578-582), see De Boor (ed.) 1963: 277.

[158] Janin 1969:160; Schwartz (ed.) 1940:34 no 29.

[159] Janin 1969:186; Schwartz (ed.) 1940:143 no 30, 172 no 33.

[160] Schwartz (ed.) 1940: 143 no 32.

[161] ibid. 71 no 49, 144 no 42 and 51; Janin 1969:195.

[162] ibid. 27.

[163] ibid. 47 no 64, 70 no 44, 144 no 55.

[164] Janin 1969:171.

[165] That Justinian was involved in the construction of Pege, see Weber (ed.) 1838a:184; PG 157:556; Preger (ed.) 1989:259-260; Gedeon 1899:125; Berger 1988:684.

[166] Weber (ed.) 1838a: 184.

[167] Janin 1969: 166; Kleiss 1965:164-6. This view is contested by Mango, who believes that the octagonal construction is not meant for a baptistery but for the chapel of St James (Mango 1969-70:371), which is based on travellers' accounts, see Mercati 1970:477.

with healing waters in monuments such as the Blachernai.[168] Maguire has suggested that the Virgin Mary was often associated with healing waters and springs and Underwood refers to 'hagiasmata, a series of buildings in Constantinople serving a cult of the Theotokos in which a sacred spring or fountain figures prominently'.[169] How does St Anna fit in all this?

Mary, healing waters and St Anna:
Creation of sacred space in sixth-century Constantinople

According to the *Protevangelion*, Anna built a 'hagiasma' (= sanctuary) in the room where Mary spent her first three years so that Mary would not step on the unclean ground.[170] The purifying role of water in architecture is related to the spiritual cleansing during Baptism but the ability of water to heal is of interest here. In Byzantine architecture, the term 'haghiasmata' refers to water constructions, where water had healing qualities. As mentioned, in Constantinople 'haghiasmata' were particularly connected to the Virgin Mary and before this association was made, Mary was attributed with healing qualities. In Constantinople, the first church dedicated to Mary was built after Mary had cured or benefited someone as Sozomenos (fifth century) tells us.[171] A century later, the same connection is made in Jerusalen, in the Probatike, which had a strong 'healing' tradition: Mary's veneration replaced the commemoration of the healing of the Paralytic. The latter had given an end to the pagan practises taking place on site, which in turn had replaced Jewish practises on purifying baths.

In Constantinople, the pattern manifested in the church of Mary in the Probatike where Mary, Anna and healing waters are amalgamated in one monument, through Mary's

---

[168] Mango 2000:23.
[169] Maguire 2000:284; Underwood 1950:112.
[170] De Strycker (ed.) 1961:90; Smid (ed.) 1965:50; Lampe 1961:9.
[171] Bidez (ed.) 2008: 86.

role as a healer and through her Nativity, took a similar form in the Byzantine capital. This topographical model of Constantinople was not an innovation but was built upon the fact that from the sixth century onwards churches and baths had become 'increasingly inseparable'.[172] This is the result of the freedom of the Constantinopolitan topography to adjust the sacred topography of Jerusalem to fit the conception of the Byzantine capital behind religious architecture. Ousterhout has correctly put it as follows: 'within Constantinople we may witness the construction of a sacred topography in many different ways but it was not the topography of Jerusalem. As a sacred city it could be likened to Jerusalem but it neither replicated nor replaced the prototype'.[173] 'The sanctity of Jerusalem was fixed, but Constantinople did not suffer the restrictions of a memorialized past and could free-associate'.[174] Recent scholars see the sixth century as a period witnessing conscious efforts in Constantinople to create sacred spaces: 'Constantinople, the Second Rome, became the Second Jerusalem in the sixth century. In a process of reduplication and multiplication that is common during Late Antiquity, [...] Constantinople acquired the same religious value as Jerusalem in the Christian faith. This is due to the progressive creation of holy places within the capital and to the symbolic meaning they acquired'.[175] In this context, Byzantine emperors were engaged in creating sacred spaces, but this did not mean that the same concept is applied between model and 'copy', as Alchermes claims for the relationshop between the churches of the Nativity in Bethlehem (Jerusalem) and the Blachernai (Constantinople).[176]

As we saw in the Probatike, the same monument was given different connotations in different periods, based on religious or historical developments. In Constantinople, the

---

[172] Magdalino 1990:173; Magdalino 1988:113. This was not valid only for Constantinople. In Cyrenaica (Libya) the church of Sozusa, which is in all likelihood connected with Justinian's building activities, the main church is attached to Byzantine baths, see Ward-Perkings and Goodchild 2003: 37.
[173] Ousterhout 2006:106.
[174] ibid. 109. For the 'free association' of Jerusalem's topography from the eleventh century onwards in the West, see Ousterhout 1998: 393-404.
[175] Carile 2006:3; See also Krueger 2005:310-11.
[176] Alchermes 2006:358-9.

connection of Mary, Anna and healing waters was an ideological entity expressed in religious architecture but this idea was expressed in other ways as well. The churches or chapels in the Pege, Chalkoprateia and the Hodegetria are three examples of the connection between Mary, Anna and healing waters, which was continued after its appearance in sixth-century Jerusalem as the tenth-century Synaxarion of Constantinople writes under September 6: 'Consecration of (the church of) the Theotokos in the church of Anna in the Deuteron'.[177] Janin, without explaining why, writes that the church of Anna in the Deuteron and the church dedicated to Mary mentioned in the Synaxarion were next to each other, which is not however implied in the text.[178] This reference shows that even when healing association between Mary, Anna and waters cannot be proven, nevertheless these two figures are almost always paired together, namely (apart from the palace chapel discussed shortly) a church of Anna co-exists with one of Mary. However, this connection was not always and strictly a healing one as we can see in the church of Anna in the Deuteron, where the church is built in a location popular for building construction in the sixth century, as mentioned earlier.

The churches and chapels of St Anna in the Byzantine capital offer us a deeper understanding on the way the sixth-century Constantinopolitan church-construction was formed and developed and also to the perceptions attributed by the Byzantines to these two figures which penetrates text and artistic production: Anna is venerated not because of her qualities but gains her sanctity through her motherhood and it is formulated in reason behind the construction of the church dedicated to Anna by Justinian I mentioned by Prokopios.[179]

Justinian and healing

---

[177] Delehaye (ed.) 1902: 20.
[178] Janin 1936:212.
[179] Weber (ed.) 1838a:185.

Justinian's contribution to the sacred topography of Constantinople is the crystallisation of topographical tendencies and healing and of his personal interest inhealing as Prokopios tells us.

Prokopios wrirtes that a great cistern was built under the Nea church in Jerusalem and that Justinian I built two hospices next to the church, one for travellers, and one as an infirmary for poor people or those suffering from disease.[180] He also writes that Justinian I constructed a church dedicated to Sts Kosmas and Damian after Justinian's cure from a serious disease.[181] I do not think that the description by Prokopios of Constantinople as a city full of water reflected the interest of Justinian in waters and healing waters in particular;[182] but I can safely argue that Justinian's interest in healing, demonstrated in the addition of a healing hospice to the Nea church and in the dedication of a church to the medical saints Sts Kosmas and Damian, justify without doubt the emperor's interest in healing. His inclination toward healing saints encompasses his interest in Mary, Anna and water.

Whether Justinian was successful or not in creating sacred spaces in Constantinople and in particular in connection to Mary and Anna, post sixth-century traditions related to him suggest he was. Justinian, healing and Anna constitute the basic elements in a story about the construction of the church of Kyros, which was dedicated to Mary in the fifth century.[183] A twelfth-century text of the Iviron monastery on the construction of this church reads: 'Justinian having been cured in the church of Kyros, he did not construct a new building but he dedicated next to it one church of St Anna, the grandmother of

---

[180] Weber (ed.) 1838a: 323-4. For a brief archaeological overview around the Nea church, see Geva 1993:776-7.
[181] Weber (ed.) 1838a:193-4, 242. However, the interest of Justinian in the healing saints Kosmas and Damian is anticipated by his predecessor, Justin I, who between 512 and 513 dedicated a church to them in Bostra (Syria) where between 527 and 548 Justinian and his wife Theodora built a church dedicated to Prophet Job, see Sartre 1985:109, 112.
[182] Cameron 1985:100.
[183] Mango 2000:18 (map) and p.19 for the date of construction.

Christ'.[184] This information shows first that a tradition had been created around Justinian's interest in healing places; second, that his association with the church of Anna in the Deuteron had given Anna healing connotations; and third it proves once more that churches of Anna were always meant to be in the proximity of Mary's churches.[185] Justinian's acknowledgment of Anna's healing qualities as recorded in the text of the Iviron monastery and his interest in Sts Kosmas and Damian demonstrate a linkage also found in another of his commissions. In the sixth-century basilica in the Sinai monastery, which, as Prokopios tells us, was dedicated to Mary,[186] two chapels were constructed on its southern side, one for Sts Anna and Joachim and one for Sts Kosmas and Damian.[187] Thus once again a chapel of Anna was incorporated in a church of Mary, and healing connotations were given by the proximity of Anna's and Joachim's chapel to the one of the medical saints.

The healing connotations in Jerusalem and the fact that Constantinople was familiar with the Probatic Pool as the building acitivity of Markianos shows, in addition to Justinian's interest in healing and the promotion of Mary's are the reasons why I argue that the Probatike played a significant role in the introduction and further development of the connection between the healing attributes of water, Mary and Anna in the Byzantine capital from the sixth century onwards. This also explains the sudden interest of Justinian I in Anna and the fact that similar initiatives were not taken by later emperors, at least not before the ninth century.

Justinian and Mary

---

[184] Gedeon 1900:134. For its date, see Gedeon 1900:120,122.
[185] Another 'hagiasma' of St Anna was found in the church of Mouchliou and was built in the end of the thirteenth century in the courtyard of the church, see Atzemouglou 1990:30.
[186] Weber (ed.) 1838a:327.
[187] Forsyth 1968: fig 2 no. O.

Justinian I formulated two traditions that started developing from the fifth century onwards. The first is the tendency to associated churches with water constructions and the second is the promotion of Virgin Mary in Constantinople. As stated, in Jerusalem the building activity around the Virgin Mary grew from the beginning of the sixth century as the evidence from pilgrims shows. After the council of Ephesos in 431 where Mary was proclaimed 'Theotokos' the first churches of Mary appeared in the Byzantine capital.[188] The dedication of a church to St Anna should be placed in the framework of Justinian's desire to take active role in the growing establishment of Mary's veneration and it demonstrated by two developments: First the construction of churches dedicated to Mary throughout the empire and second by the liturgical developments around the life of Mary in the capital. Krueger sees Justinian's era as a time of 'rise of a piety focused on the ability of sacred places and material substances to contain and convey divine power'.[189]

Justinian promoted Mary by dedicating churches to her throughout the empire: in Constantinople,[190] Palestine,[191] Egypt,[192] Libya,[193] Antioch,[194] and Theodosioupolis (modern Erzurum).[195] A further indication of his desire is Prokopios' testimony, who before proceeding to the enumeration of the churches of Mary built by Justinian in Constantinople writes: 'We must begin with the churches of Mary the Mother of God. For we know that this is the wish of the Emperor himself, and true reason manifestly demands that from God one must proceed to the Mother of God'.[196] That he included a church to St

---

[188] Mango 2000:21; Daley 2001:72 n. 4. Only in Constantinople, he built or rebuilt thirty-three churches, see Mango 1986a: 126, thirty according to Krueger 2005:306. He also built churches in the name of saints who were already popular in other parts of the Byzantine Empire, such as Sts Sergios and Bachkos and St. Theodore, see Krueger 2005:306; Mango 1975:388. Downey argues that Justinian's interest in churches of local saints was first initiated by Constantine I, see Downey 1960:93-4. The church of Anna is missing from Downey's list, see Downey 1950:264-5.
[189] Krueger 2005: 292.
[190] Weber (ed.) 1838a:184-5.
[191] ibid. 321 (Jerusalem, Nea church); ibid. 325 (Neapolis).
[192] ibid. 327.
[193] ibid. 333.
[194] ibid. 241.
[195] ibid. 253. The city took its name from its founder, Theodosios II, see Sinclair 1989:190.
[196] Dewing and Downey (trans.) 1940:39; Weber (ed.) 1838a:183-4.

Anna as part of his interest on Mary is shown again in Prokopios' *On Buildings*: 'For God, being born a man as was His wish, is subjected to even a third generation, and His ancestry is traced back from His mother even as is that of a man'.[197] Although analysed later, I need to stress now that the recognition of Anna as one of Christ's female forbearers in Byzantium is first attested in this sentence of Prokopios. After the first appearance of the *Protevangelion* in the second century, in no other text until the sixth century is the veneration of St Anna is placed in the framework of imperial patronage.

Before I move on to the rest of the churches dedicated to Anna I need to draw a few conclusions on the ideas behind the constructions of her churches in the Constantinople. In the fifth-century the church of Paralytic was constructed in the Probatic Pool where, by the beginning of the sixth century, it had been replaced by a church dedicated to the Nativity of Mary. Justinian, recognising the rising cult of the Virgin, influenced by his interest in healing saints and the creation of sacred space, introduces into Constantinopolitan topography a model, according to which two churches, one dedicated to Mary and one dedicated to Anna coexist either as two churches or as a church and an adjacent chapel, always in the proximity of water with healing abilities. In the case of the Sinai monastery, the water construction was not easy to realise, but instead Anna's and Joachim's chapel was placed in the proximity of two medical saints. Justinian is the recipient and promoter of Mary's healer quality as Sozomenos tells us, the water constructions in church architecture, the rising interest in Jerusalem on Mary's early (= apocryphal) life which he crystallised in the topographical model discussed. The church in the Probatike is crucial in this development since it is the first monument where this tradition becomes concrete. At the same time Justinian's construction of churches and chapels dedicated to St Anna marks the beginning of imperial patronage of St Anna in

---

[197] ibid. 43;ibid. 185.

Constantinople, which, although are triggered by different motives, underline the emergence of different ideologies centred on the Virgin's mother.

Imperial patronage of Anna's churches after Justinian I:

Basil I

The Justinianic church of St Anna in the Deuteron was rebuilt during the reign of Basil I (867-886).[198] Basil I is also credited with the reconstruction of a church dedicated to St Anna in Trebzond. It is the oldest surviving church in Trebzond and according to an extant inscription it was rebuilt by a provincial governor under the emperors Basil I and his sons Leo VI and Alexander in 884/5.[199] Bryer and Winfield hold the view that the 'restoration of St Anna in Trebzond is somehow connected to the activities in the Byzantine capital'.[200] I cannot know the reasons behind Basil's interest in St Anna which will continued by his son Leo VI; I can only assume that it was associated with him having a daughter named Anna or as we will demonstrate with his desperate need for a male heir to the Byzantine throne; in the case of Leo VI male patronage of St Anna's churches shows a shift in social ideologies and it is related to childbirth. As it will be shown, by the ninth century St Anna was considered protector of childbirth.[201]

The Patria

Apart from the church in the Deuteron, other monuments dedicated to St Anna in Constantinople have been attributed to a number of emperors or empresses.[202] According

---

[198] Weber (ed.) 1838a:324 : 'Καὶ τὸν τῆς ἁγίας Ἄννης ἐν τῷ Δευτέρῳ καὶ τὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ μάρτυρος Δημητρίου καινοὺς ἀντὶ παλαιῶν καὶ εὐρεπεῖς ἀπειργάσατο'.
[199] Bryer and Winfield 1985:218. For its location, see Janin 1975: 254 no 8. For its history, see Janin 1975: 257.
[200] Bryer and Winfield 1985: 218–219; Rosenqvist 2005:34.
[201] PMZ # 463. For this development, see chapter three.
[202] By the ninth century there was a monastery of St Anna on the island of Marmara, see Ruggieri 1991: 205; The eleventh-century metropolitan of Euchaita, John Mauropous refers to a church of Anna in Chiliokomo in Euchaita (modern Beyözü) in North central Turkey in his life of Dorotheos the Younger, see De Lagarde (ed.) 1979:212. By the fourteenth century, a church dedicated to Anna and Joachim is mentioned in

to the tenth-century *Patria,*[203] Theophilos' (829 to 842) wife, Theodora, commissioned a church dedicated to St Anna in the Dagestheas area, and Janin believes – although it is specifically claimed in the *Patria* – that the saint appeared to her in the place where later the narthex was built.[204]

The wife of Leo III (717 to 742) built a monastery in a location named 'ta Annes' (of Anna) and Justinian II is erroneously credited with the church of St Anna in the Deuteron.[205] The Dagestheas area has been located between the Forum of Theodosios and the Forum of Constantine, close to St Anastasia's church.[206] In particular, Berger places the church of St Anna on the Eastern side of the road with St Anastasia's on the western and Janin – like Berger – places both on the Eastern side of the road next to each other.[207] Today the Dagestheas should be looked for between the Atik Ali Paşa Camii and Beyazid Camii.[208]

But although this location is traceable, one cannot be certain whether the church of Anna ever existed, which is also the case for the monastery of 'ta Annes'.[209] Janin argues that even if the story behind Dagestheas is fictional it 'obliges us to admit the existence of a church which the patriographers must have seen or they copied from earlier texts'.[210] As far as the location 'ta Annes' is concerned, I can only guess the origin of that name. In order to justify a certain number of churches in Constantinople, Dagron and Mango argue that members of the aristocracy built on their premises churches which, after

---

Ἀτραμύτιον (Atramytion, modern Edremit), see Hunger and Kresten (eds) 1981:168.
[203] For the date of the Patria in the tenth century, see Magdalino 2007:11.
[204] Janin 1937: 149.
[205] Weber (ed.) 1838a:185.
[206] Janin 1953: 41-2, Janin 1969:22-6 and (enclosed) map: F6-G7; Berger 1988: 440. In the Notitia Dignitatum (fifth century) it is found in the seventh region, together with the churches of St. Eirene and St. Paul, see Seeck (ed.) 1962:235. The church is also mentioned in Theophanes' Chronographia (De Boor [ed.] 1963:249) and in the Book of Ceremonies, the church of St. Anastasia is located in the Dagestheas area, see Vogt (ed.)1935:157:25-7.
[207] Berger 1988: 441.
[208] Müller-Wiener 1977 (enclosed) map: EF/11 (Atik Ali Pasa Camii), E7/1(Beyazid Camii).
[209] Preger (ed.) 1989:251; Berger 1988: 525; Janin 1969:470.
[210] Janin 1937:150.

their owners had been disfavoured, were given to the crown and often the dwelling place was destroyed and the church remained. This explains the names 'ta Kyrou' which takes us back to the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries,[211] and in our case the 'ta Annes' could signify a house with a church built by a woman called Anna, which the patriographers mistakenly associated with a monastery.[212] I cannot however rely on the account of the Patria since it is rife with errors; for example, the church of the Deuteron is wrongly associated with Justinian II. As I will demonstrate, female imperial patronage of St Anna's churches in the *Patria* had more to do with the association of St Anna with childbirth by the tenth century rather than with facts.[213]

The palace-chapel of Leo VI- The account of Theophanes Continuator

The chapel built by Leo VI inside the Great Palace is together with the church in the Deuteron, the only monument about which we have reliable textual information.[214] The Continuator of Theophanes informs us about a palace-chapel dedicated to St Anna by the emperor Leo VI next to his wife's bedroom.[215] Unfortunately, the establishment of its exact location is a hard task, due to scholarly attempts to reconstruct a very complex space, which have resulted in variations in the association between the palace's ecclesiastical buildings. To verify this, one should compare the different representations and locations of various building in and outside the Great Palace provided by Labarte, Krause, Paspates, Ebersolt, Vogt and Guilland (in Miranda's book).[216] The proximity of Anna's chapel to

---

[211] Dagron 1977 :9 and n.29; Mango 1986: 127-8; Magdalino 1996:43-4; Magdalino 2001:69.
[212] In the tenth-century *Patria*, a rich woman names appears to have sold land to Justinian I used to built Hagia Sophia, see Preger (ed.) 1989:77. For a critical edition around the construction of Hagia Sophia and the legend around that Anna, see Vitti (ed.) 1989 :438-9,472-3, 493, 512-3, 544-5, 565-6, 585.
[213] See chapter three, part two.
[214] Weber (ed.) 1838b:146.18-19; Berger 1988: 525; Janin 1969: 35-7. Maguire 2001:159.
[215] Weber (ed.) 1838b:146.18-19.
[216] Guilland 1969; Vogt (ed.) 1939; Paspates 1893: (enclosed maps); Krause 1863; Labarte 1861; Ebesolt 1910. Guilland encloses Miranda's reconstruction of the Palace of 1968 which differs from the one that Miranda published in his book in 1965, see Miranda 1965. Miranda's reconstruction in Guilland's book will be considered here.

the empress's bedroom mentioned by the Continuator of Theophanes is the only secure topographical reference. In order to locate of the empress' chamber, Kostenec has argued that the Pharos and the Chrysotriklinos should be used as points of reference.[217]

Despite the lack of scholarly interest in St Anna's palace chapel, the establishment of its place in the palace contributes to our knowledge of the perplex palace topography. In order to locate of Anna's chapel we need first to look at the arrangements of the rooms in its proximity since the location of the rooms around the chapel of Anna are seriously debated. Once we have established the most possible arrangement of the rooms around the chapel dedicated to St Anna we will have also ascertained the location of Anna's chapel. First the views of scholars on the arrangement of the rooms under discussion will be presented and then by re-visiting the text of Theophanes, I will conclude on the most plausible arrangement of the rooms and consequently of the location of St Anna's chapel according to the text.

Scholarly views on the arrangement of the rooms in the proximity of St Anna's chapel

Labarte arranges the rooms from North to South: Kamilas, Mesopatos, vestiary of the Augusta and Anna's chapel (Fig. 7).[218] He places the chapel of Anna to the South of the Mesopatos and both of them on ground level. The top floor, where the vestiary was, communicated with the room next to the Mousikos via a staircase.[219] Since the Mousikos

---

[217] As they do for the southern part of the palace, see Kostenec 2004:23.
[218] Ebersolt 1910:116-7: 'Après de Camilas venait une deuxième construction…Le troisième bâtiment […]A l'ouest, un quatrième bâtiment […]' Près de ce dernier édifice s' élevait un autre construction […] où Léon VI le Sage construisit plus tard l'oratoire de Sainte-Anna'; Labarte 1861:73 : 'Le Coubouclion que venait à la suite du Camilas […] Le troisième Coubouclion […]A la suite de la chambre à coucher de l' imperatrice […],' and then the description of Anna's chapel follows.
[219] Labarte 1861:73; Krause 1863:581.

was next to the Mesopatos, [220] these buildings were all on the ground level. He and Krause place the chapel of Anna West of the Mousikos.[221]

Paspates wrongly locates the chapel between the vestiary of the empress and Mesopatos. He arranges the buildings similarly to Labarte, from North to South in the following order: Kamilas, Mesopatos, Anna's chapel, Augusta's vestiary (Fig. 8). In his reconstruction Anna's chapel is shown as two rooms side by side, which misinterprets the account of the *Continuator of Theophanes* as I will explain shortly. Finally, the chamber of the Augusta (Mousikos) is wrongly placed further to the East and not in the proximity of Kamilas, Mesopatos, Anna's chapel, and the Augusta's vestiary. Thus his plan should be completely disregarded.

Ebersolt, similarly to Labarte and Paspates, arranged the buildings from North to South: Kamilas, Mesopatos, Vestiary and Anna's chapel and argues that the chapel of Anna was to the West of the Mousikos.[222]

Vogt's reconstruction is opposite to those of Labarte, Paspates and Ebersolt. The arrangement of building is from South to North is in the following order: Kamilas, the vestiary of the eunuchs (Mesopatos), then the Mousikos and next to Mousikos an unidentified building with two columns (Fig. 9). In his view, the Mousikos and Augusta's chamber are two different buildings since the empress's chamber is located on the western side of Kamilas, Mesopatos and Mousikos; this however ignores the account of the *Continuator of Theophanes*.

A second example of Vogt's disregard of the *Continuator of Theophanes* is the exclusion of Anna's chapel, in contrast to Labarte, Krause, Paspates, Ebersolt and (as we will see) Guilland, since the chapel is excluded from his reconstruction. It could however be one of

---

[220] Krause 1863:609; Labarte 1861:73.
[221] Labarte 1861:73; Krause 1863: 581-2; Ebersolt 1910:116-7.
[222] Ebersolt 1910:116-7: Après de Camilas venait une deuxième construction…Le troisième bâtiment […]A l'ouest, un quatrième bâtiment […]' Près de ce dernier édifice s' élevait un autre construction […] où Léon VI le Sage construisit plus tard l'oratoire de Sainte-Anna'.

44

the two buildings either side of the corridor leading to Augusta's chamber. But the one shown having two rooms has no columns and the other single-room has four columns, and thus the account of the *Continuator of Theophanes* is either disregarded or misunderstood.

Similarly to Paspates, in his reconstruction Guilland arranges the space from North to South: Kamilas, (Mesopatos?) and Anna's chapel (Fig. 10).[223] The chapel is located on the southern side of the Mousikos. Like Miranda, Guilland correctly places the chapel of St Anna under the Mousikos.[224] In Guilland's reconstruction, Anna's chapel is not shown as occupying one of two rooms but it is shown as a single room.

To summarise the views of these scholars, the similar points are the following (Vogt exluded): Kamilas is placed South of the Mesopatos,[225] the chapel of St Anna is placed South of the Mesopatos (either exactly next to it or a few buildings away), all include St Anna's chapel in their reconstruction, all regard the Mousikos as the Augusta's bedchamber and, finally, Anna's chapel is considered as taking half of a double building.[226]

They differ on the several points. The Mousikos's location is seriously debated. There are three suggestions for it: First, East of the Kamilas, the Mesopatos, Anna's chapel, and the empress's wardrobe;[227] second, on top of Anna's chapel, Mesopatos (?) and Kamilas;[228] and third, between Mesopatos and Anna's chapel.[229] Notwithstanding this difference, the proximity of the Mousikos to Kamilas and its location North of Anna's chapel (either on the same level as Anna's chapel or above it) appears as the safest

---

[223] The building between Kamilas and Anna's chapel is not named. Although his naming of the chapel is St Agnes it does not designate St Agnes celebrated in the Western church, but St Anna the mother of the Virgin. This is implied by the description of the arrangement of rooms in the palace.
[224] Miranda 1965:112.
[225] Comprare the reconstructions of Paspates 1893, Guilland 1969 (the identity of Mesopatos is questioned in Guilland's reconstruction), Ebesolt 1910, Krause 1863 and Labarte 1861.
[226] Comprare the reconstructions of Ebesolt 1910, Krause 1863, Labarte 1861 and Guilland 1969. Guilland presents it not as part of a double room, however it can be placed in this group.
[227] Paspates 1893.
[228] Guilland 1969.
[229] Ebesolt 1910; Krause 1863;Labarte 1861.

reference. An additional difference concerns the empress's wardrobe: It is either not mentioned,[230] or it is located North of Anna's chapel,[231] or South of it.[232]

The text of Theophanes Continuator once again

By comparing these modern accounts with the original text we will have an idea of how scholarship has interpreted the account of the *Continuator of Theophanes*. The text refers to a number of buildings built by Theophilos on the southern side of the palace. I am interested in four rooms (κουβούκλεια, cubicula): Kamilas, Mesopatos, the empress's vestiary, the empress's chamber (Mousikos) and the arrangement of space between these and the chapel of St Anna.[233]

Before starting his detailed account, the *Continuator of Theophanes* provides an overview of the rooms 'according to order' (κατά τάξιν): Kamilas, was the first room;[234] next to it was a second room, which he does not name followed by a third room, which had been transformed to the vestiary of the Augusta.[235] He refers to the three buildings as existing next to each other.

Then he starts the description of the rooms:[236] Kamilas, which is found on the first floor,[237] had a chapel built within it, which comprised of two sanctuaries, one dedicated to Theotokos and one to Archangel Michael.[238] Mango has wrongly translated 'περιέχον' (= comprised) in this sentence as 'attached', which has been also accepted by Kostenec.[239]

---

[230] Vogt (ed.)1939 ;Guilland 1969.
[231] Paspates 1893.
[232] Ebesolt 1910, Krause 1863, Labarte 1861.
[233] Lampe 1961:772.
[234] 'Πρὸς δὲ τὸν νότον καὶ τοὺς νῦν ὄντας κήπους ποιήσας κουβούκλεια προσεδείματο, τόν τε Καμιλᾶν οὕτω λεγόμενον'. See Theoph. Cont.1838:144:17-20.
[235] Weber (ed.) 1838b: 144: 17-22.
[236] The arrangement of space is important here. We will not refer to internal decoration, only when it helps to forfeit our arguments.
[237] Kostenec 2004:23.
[238] 'συνῳκοδομημένον ἔχει καὶ εὐκτήριον δύο περίεχον βήματα, ἐν μὲν εἰς ὄνομα τῆς [...] θεοτόκου,θάτερον δὲ εἰς ὄνομα τοῦ ἀρχιστρατήγου Μιχαήλ', see Weber (ed.) 1838b: 145:4-6.
[239] Mango 1986c:163; Kostenec 2004:23.

Under the Kamilas there is a 'mesopaton' (μεσόπατον),[240] The word 'mesopaton' should not be confused with the room Mesopatos mentioned shortly after, since there is no capital -μ- in the beginning of the word and no masculine form of the word is used in the text (its second half 'πάτος' is masculine); the 'μεσόπατον' is an adjective that refers to a noun in neutral form which is the 'aristerion' mentioned further in the text,[241] thus the 'mesopaton aristerion' is located under the Kamilas or one of its integrated chapels. After Kamilas there is a second room,[242] which has similar roof to Kamilas and similar floor decoration with stone Prokonesian marble.[243] The name of this room is not given.[244] Then the text refers to the room where the eunuchs lived: (The room) under this (the room next to Kamilas), which is called Mesopatos [...].[245] Mesopatos was not the name of the second room, but the room under the second room after Kamilas. This is probably the reason why in the beginning of his text the author does not include it in the three rooms of the top floor which were presented in order (κατά τάξιν). The third room is the vestiary of the Augusta.[246] The syntax follows that of the other two rooms of the top floor; the roof was similar to the others and the floor was of Proconesian marble.[247] Under the vestiary of the Augusta there was a ground-floor room which formed part of Augusta's vestiary.[248] 'It is named the Mousikos because of the precise cut of its marbles'.[249] 'It is unified with the empress's vestiary on the western side (of the Mousikos)'.[250] Then the author turns to the

---

[240] Lampe 1961:1051; Liddell-Scott 1996:1348.

[241] 'ὑποβεβηκὸς δέ τούτου μεσόπατόν ἐστιν [...] οὗπερ τὸ ἀριστήριον αὖθίς ἐστιν', see Weber (ed.) 1838b: 145:6-7, 10.

[242] Τὸ δέ μετὰ τὸν Καμιλᾶν κουβούκλειον δεύτερον', see ibid. 145:12-3.

[243] ibid. 145:14.

[244] Mesopatos refers to buildings that were in the middle of two others from top to bottom, because in another section the text refers to the mesopaton of the second kouvouklion, the one after Kamilas. See ibid. 145:14-5.

[245] 'τό τούτῳ δέ ὑποβεβηκὸς, ὃ καὶ Μεσόπατος λέγεται', see ibid. 145:18. Labarte correctly places the Mesopatos on the ground-floor, see Labarte 1861:73.

[246] 'Τὸ δέ τρίτον μετὰ τοῦ κουβουκλείου, τὸ καὶ νῦν τῆς Ἀυγούστης βεστιάριον χρηματίζον', see Weber (ed.) 1838b: 145:21-1.

[247] 'ὁμοίαν ἔχει τούτοις τὴν ὀροφὴν καὶ τοῦδαφος ἐκ λευκοῦ λίθου Προικοννησίου κατεστρωμένον', see ibid. 145:21.

[248] 'τὸ τούτῳ δέ ἠνωμένον καὶ συμπεφυκὸς κατώγεον', see ibid. 146:2-3.

[249] 'Μουσικὸς οὗτος κατονομάζεται διὰ τὴν τῶν μαρμάρων ἀκριβῆ συγκοπήν', ibid. 146:7-8.

[250] 'τούτῳ πρὸς μὲν δύσιν κατὰ πλευρὰν κουβούκλειον ἦνωται', see ibid. 146:11.

chapel of St Anna · 'Another (room) lies at the foot of it (empress's vestiary), is divided into two rooms, and approaches the chamber of the Augusta (= the Mousikos). Here, Leo, the Christ-loving emperor, built a chapel of St Anna and this was erected on four Bathynian columns and white Prokonnesian marble on the floor. To the walls, Bathynian slabs. But this, as I said, approaches the chamber of the Augusta.[251] The other one (the other half of the double room), to the West of the Mousikos, leads downhill to the chamber of the Augusta I mentioned via a staircase, and the entrance is formed in the same way (with a staircase)'.[252]

The text of the Continuator of Theophanes orientates its buildings from East to West and from top to bottom. He describes the building not in a row, starting from the upper level (kouvouklia) and moving on to the ones on lower levels, but refers to the ones on top and immediately to the room under them. Thus under Kamilas there is a room transformed into a library, next to Kamilas an unnamed room (= κουβούκλειο) and underneath it the Mesopatos, next to the Mesopatos the vestiary of the Augusta and underneath it the chapel of Anna. The chapel of Anna is not comprised of two rooms but it is one of the two rooms from a double building since the second (the western) room, is connected via a staircase with the bedroom of the Augusta (= the Mousikos).[253] The chapel of Anna is attached to the Mousikos. The name of the other room is not given.

To conclude, the validity of Vogt's plan as far as the area near Anna's chapel is concerned is problematic since the account of the *Continuator of Theophanes* is not examined, otherwise the identification of empress's chamber as the Mousikos would have taken place since it is found in this text. Paspates's account is misleading since he seems to

---

[251] ibid. 146.18-19. 'ἕτερον δέ πρὸς πόδας τούτου ἐστίν, εἰς δύο μὲν δόμους διηρημένον, τῷ Αὐγουστιακῷ δέ πλησιάζον κοιτῶνι·ἔνθα καὶ Λέων[…]εὐκτήριον τῆς ἁγίας Ἄννης ἐδείματο [...]. ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μὲν τῷ τῆς Αὐγούστης πλησιάζει κοιτῶνι, ὡς ἔφαμεν'; Paspates does not translate verse 19. For translation of this part see, Ebersolt 1910:116-7; Mango 1972:205.

[252] 'ἐκεῖνο δέ τὸ πρὸς δύσιν τοῦ Μουσικοῦ τὴν μὲν κάθοδον ἐν τῷ προρρηθέντι ἔχει κοιτῶνι διὰ κλίμακος, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὴν εἴσοδον', see Weber (ed.) 1838b: 146:21-22.

[253] Lambarte 1861: 239 no 88.

have misunderstood the original text. Thus the most reliable reconstructions are those of Labart and Ebersolt who have correctly interpreted the text of the *Continuator of Theophanes*.

The location of the chapel that Leo VI dedicated to St Anna, is not accidental. In Leo's time, St Anna was considered protector of childbirth, as hagiography informs us.[254] The proximity of the empress's room to the chapel of a saint who resolved bareness would augment the chances of begetting a child.

Justinian I, the Macedonian dynasty and St Anna

The interest of Leo VI in St Anna is the outcome of two factors: his father's interest in the saint and Leo's personal struggle to secure a male descendant for the Byzantine throne.

On the one hand Basil I is the first emperor after Justinian I to reconstruct the church of Anna in the Deuteron, as he likewise did with a church dedicated to the saint in Trebzond (mentioned earlier), and he had a daughter named Anna.[255] Leo could be also following practises of his father as he had done repeatedly: Basil constitutes a role model for Leo as far as legislation and veneration of saints is concerned; Leo continued his father's revision of the Justinianic code,[256] a festival dedicated to the Prophet that was initiated by his father and wrote hymns and a homily on Elijah. Finally he built a palace-chapel for St Michael, following his father's building activity around the saint.[257]

On the other hand, difficult personal experiences shifted the interest of Leo VI in St Anna. One could at first think that the palace chapel was built next to his wife's bedroom as an act of thankfulness for the birth of his daughter Anna, the fruit of Leo's

---

[254] See part three of chapter three.
[255] PMZ # 463.
[256] Tougher 1997:115.
[257] See Dagron 2003:197.

second marriage with Zoe Zaoutzaina.[258] The evidence from hagiography shows that by the time Leo VI became emperor, St Anna had been established as a protector of childbirth in Byzantium.[259] It is more probable however, that the dedication of the Palace chapel was the result of his desire for a male heir to the throne, since before the birth of his son Constantine VII Porphyrogennitos, his first son Basil had died and he had only two daughters, Eudokia and Anna.[260] Evidence from the tenth-century reflects Leo's anxiety about a male heir when according to the account of the miracles performed in the church of Pege, his wife Zoe, visited the church since he has problems conceiving and soon after she gave birth to Constantine.[261] Tougher notes that Leo's desire for a male heir 'tends to dominate accounts of his reign, for his quest for an heir led him into conflict with the church and resulted in his excommunication'.[262] The emotional distress after the death of his third wife Eudokia Baiane and shortly after of his son Basil, is reflected in the life of Patriarch Euthymios (907-912), where it is said that Leo experienced 'inconsolable grief.'[263] The same grief is reflected in the homily on Mary's Nativity that Leo wrote, which as I will show took place after the birth of Constantine VII .

The first reason why one should place the composition of the homily after the birth of Constantine VII rather than after the birth of Leo's first son, Basil, is that Basil died shortly after his mother Eudokia and Leo's grief after his wife and son's death, do not match with the images of relief that appear throughout the homily. Second, Leo's homily

---

[258] Tougher 1997: 146.
[259] Discussed in chapter three.
[260] Tougher 1997:136,147.
[261] AASS November 3: 879 C ('Καὶ ἡ Αὔγουστα Ζωὴ φεύγουσα […] καὶ περὶ τέκνων ἀγωνιῶσα ὑπόμνησιν ἔλαβε περὶ τῶν τῆς πανάγνου θαυμάτων καὶ πλέγμα τι ἐκ μετάξης ἰσόμηκες τῆς εἰκόνος τῆς θεομήτορος […] διαμετρήσασα καὶ περιζωσάμενη τοῦτο, τῇ προμηθείᾳ ταύτης Κωνσταντῖνος τὸν ἀοίδιμον βασιλέα συνέλαβεν').
[262] Tougher 1997:37.
[263] Karlin-Hayter 1955-7:68-9: 'ἀπαραμύθητος θλῖψις γενομένη τῷ βασιλεῖ'. See also Tougher 1997: 151. n. 94. Tougher's reference to the life of St. Euthymios on Eudokia's death (VE 63:13-4) is wrong, the correct quote for the translated text is VE 69:13-4.

differs from earlier Nativity homilies, but it closer to those written at the beginning of the tenth century (Constantine was born in 905).[264]

The homily revolves around the sterility of Anna and Joachim, the sadness they experienced, their constant prayers, the reproach they experienced from the people of their tribe and their joy after Mary's birth. Although there are a number of standard features in homilies on Mary's early life,[265] there are a few cases of homilists such as Leo VI who manipulate the story of the *Protevangelion* according to their own perception of the story or theological beliefs. In Leo's case, the different approach shown to the story of the *Protevangelion* is not based on theological but a personal reasons, Leo's struggle for a male child. The homily is not based on the *Protevangelion* since it ignores, for example, Anna's and Joachim's social background, the dialogues between Joachim and the men of his tribe, the angel of annunciation and Anna and Anna's lament. The fact that sections of the apocryphal story of even the whole story is not mentioned is not unknown in homilies on Mary's early life. But the different element in Leo's homily is that the emperor talks only to Joachim, whom he must have used as a model because of their common experiences, and although it is a 'topos' in Marian homilies, the phrase 'although you had a child at a late age it surpassed all children,'[266] is related to Leo's personal experiences, since he had had three children but only Constantine VII made it to the throne. Thus St Anna's promotion as protector of childbirth and Leo's struggle for a male heir resulted in Leo's composition of the homily and the construction of the palace-chapel. Internal evidence of the homily shows that it can be dated after 905 when Constantine was born and although Leo was influenced by his father's choices in his building programme, the construction of the palace chapel was presumably motivated by the same reason as the homily was, and thus should probably be dated at the same time.

---

[264] Tougher 1997:153.
[265] See chapter two.
[266] PG 107:4B, 5C.

Similarly to Justinian, Leo VI was interested in the creation of sacred space and he associated himself with buildings that Justinian I had built or rebuilt. In the proximity of the church of the Hodegetria is the place where the bath of Leo VI was located,[267] which – according to Magdalino – in its 'iconography [...] was influenced by a bath or baptistery attached to one of the many churches that Justinian had rebuilt'.[268] Koder sees Leo's interest in the creation of sacred space in his decorative programme on the Imperial door at Hagia Sophia built by Justinian I, where beside the imperial door there was the image of Mary of Egypt, in similar location to her image in the basilica of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem.[269] Similarities between the two emperors are attested in the way they related to St Anna. Both promoted her cult, Justinian I with the church in the quarter of Deuteron and the first kontakion of Mary's Nativity written by Romanos Melodos,[270] and Leo VI with the dedication of the palace-chapel to Anna and with his composition of sermons on Mary's Nativity and Presentation.[271] Dagron notes that the church of Nea built by Basil I was named New Great Church (in contrast to the Old Great Church of Justinian I) and that Basil's grandson says that this title was chosen by Basil himself.[272] Dagron advocates that the Nea was defined in relation to the Justinian's church which 'continued in use and remained a fixed point in ceremonial'.[273]

The circumstances in the sixth century on the one hand and in the ninth and tenth centuries on the other hand when these developments took place are different and so is the place of Anna in Byzantine society. Although it is discussed later in detail,[274] it should be noted here that by the time Leo VI writes his homilies and dedicates his chapel, the veneration of Anna had been established in Constantinople since she was introduced in the

---

[267] Magdalino 1984; Angelidi 1994:120.
[268] Madgalino 1984:105.
[269] Koder 1994: 137.
[270] Discussed in chapter four.
[271] PG 107:1-12C, 12D-21A; Antonopoulou (ed.) 2008:221-231, 267-276.
[272] Dagron 2003:212.
[273] ibid. 212.
[274] Discussed in chapter three.

church calendar no earlier than the ninth century. In contrast, Justinian's interest in the saint is an isolated phenomenon in the veneration of Anna in the Byzantine capital, and was part of Justinian's interest in both the life of Mary and healing. No other emperor showed the same interest in the saint but it is under Basil I and Leo VI as archaeological evidence and contemporary sources show Anna was again connected to male imperial patronage.

Conclusions

The Probatic Pool in Jerusalem marks the beginning of Anna's veneration in the East which after its introduction to Constantinople by Justinian I was given - similarly to the Virgin from the fifth century onwards - healing connotations. Justinian manipulated existing ideologies on healing and Byzantine church topography, inserted them into Constantinople and resulted in the association of St Anna to healing waters and cure in the Byzantine capital. Anna was transformed to a healing saint, a characteristic which she took from her daughter. The proximity of later monuments of St Anna to healing waters or healing saints and Mary shows that Justinian's model was perpetuated by the Byzantines. For reasons that I will explore in chapter three, Anna's healing qualities in the sixth century were crystallised in the ninth century in the form of curing infertility, as it is implied in the homily of Leo VI and his construction of the palace-chapel. Although Anna's veneration developed rapidly from the sixth to the ninth century, the study of the location of churches dedicated to her shows first that what remained unaltered is first that her veneration revolved around Mary and it was closely bound to it and second that although her healing qualities would target pregnant women from the eighth century onwards, continued without cessation.

The establishment of the location of St Anna chapel in the palace derives from Anna's association with healing sterility and thus it is an aspect, which contributes not only to Palace topography but also to social perceptions interwoven with the saint's cult. As I will show in chapter three, one reaches to this conclusion by also looking at hagiography and histories, where the manipulation of Anna's cult reflects social problems related to childbirth and attests that her veneration expanded in the Byzantine capital from the eighth century onwards.[275] For the period before the eight century, one needs to rely on the topography to attest the ideological attributions made to the saint and that has been the driving theme of this chapter.

CHAPTER 2

MARY'S PARENTS IN TEXTS

Introduction

In this chapter, I examine the 'textual image' of Anna and Joachim in the patristic and Byzantine period. I look at the process from their complete absence in texts between the third and the seventh century until their inclusion in homilies on Mary's early life from

---

[275] Brubaker and Haldon note that the iconophile propaganda was achieved in histories and hagiography. See Brubaker and Haldon 2011:790.

the eighth century onwards. The interest in Mary's early life is reflected in the composition of a second-century apocryphal (= non canonical) text, the *Protevangelion of James*. Writers from the third century onwards started making use of this text in their versions of Mary's early life or when they referred to Mary's life before the birth of Christ. Despite the early interest in Mary's early life, Anna and Joachim will appear consistently in Byzantine texts and homilies in particular from the eighth century onwards.

The current and the following chapter revolve around the information on Mary's parents found in texts postdating the *Protevangelion* and discuss the way this information is manipulated.[276] I should clarify that the value of the *Protevangelion* as a narrative work and as a biographical is out of the scope of this thesis and that I will only discuss the information the *Protevangelion* provides on Mary's parents and its use by later texts.[277] I am not interested in evaluating the historicity of the *Protevangelion* or of other sources in relation to the genealogy of Mary, but how closely writers make use of this apocryphal text and how does this show an evolution in the veneration of the cult of Mary's parents in Byzantium. Overall, the *Protevangelion* is not the main point of this thesis, its use was implied by theological developments discussed in detail later in this chapter.

Part 1. *Biographical notes*

a. *The story of Anna and Joachim according to the Protevangelion*

According to the apocryphal *Protevangelion of James*, the only source for Joachim's and Anna's life,[278] both at an advanced age, offered their gifts to the Jewish priest on the day of the feast of the Tabernacles,[279] – or the Atonement since the two feasts

---

[276] For the reasons why I have divided the textual information in two chapters, see the introduction of the following chapter.
[277] For the *Protevangelion* as a narrative work, see Bauckham 2000:792-6.
[278] For the original Greek text of the *Protevangelion of James*, see Tischendorf (ed.) 1853:1-49; De Strycker (ed.) 1961; CMP 1970:132-153. For an overview of the text and its translated versions from the fourth and until the eighteenth century, see De Strycker 1980: 576-612. For a *Protevangelion*'s translated version and commentary, see James (trans.) 1924; Wilson (trans.) 1974:370-388; Elliott (trans.) 1993: 48-67.
[279] Smid (ed.) 1965:27. The feast is mentioned in the Gospel of John (7.2).

were celebrated the same calendar month (September or October) – but their gifts were rejected since they had no offspring.[280] This rejection made Joachim leave his house and stay for forty days in the desert, and Anna stay in the garden of her house and lament over her sterility and Joachim's departure.[281] During their separation, an angel appeared to each one of them to announce that Anna would give birth to a child. Anna, who had promised her child to God if she ever got pregnant, dedicated Mary to the temple (probaby in Jerusalem) when Mary became three years old. The reference of Anna and Joachim in the *Protevangelion* ends with their dedication of Mary to the temple and their departure for their house.

b. Mary's parents and their home in the Holy Land

The location where Mary was born and spent her life before her Presentation in the temple is a debated issue.[282] Variant textual traditions have resulted in the emergence of four candidates areas as the places where Mary was born, spent her childhood, or where the house of her parents was before their marriage.

The earliest sources on Mary's birthplace are Cyril of Alexandria and John Chrysostom, both in the fourth century, who believed it was Bethleem of Judea, possibly in order to establish a connection with the King of Israel, David, who also originated there.[283] Hippolytos of Thebes (eighth century) writes that Anna's parents gave birth to

---

[280] Sterility was stigmatized in Jewish society, which is shown in the rejections of Joachim's gifts and the reproach of Anna by her servant, see Amann 1910:16.

[281] Cuitting off from society was a common punishment for transgressions in Jewish law, see Num. 15.30-1; Danby 1933:562 n.16.

[282] Wilkinson, Vincent and Abel locate Mary's house in Gethsemane, see Wilkinson 2002: 266 (Bernard); Vincent and Abel 1922:676-7. For testimonies on Anna's house after the Western rule in Jerusalem, see Külzer 1994:221-222.

[283] PG 71:713A (Cyril of Alexandria); PG 49: 354 (John Chrysostom).

three daughters in Bethlehem. The first two were married in Bethlehem, while Anna was married in Nazareth where she gave birth to Mary. Thus in this account Anna was originally from Bethlehem but was married in Nazareth.[284]

In another Judean city, Jericho, is where Epiphanios the Monk (780) locates the house of Joachim.[285] Vincent and Abel believed that in Jericho one should look for the desert, where Joachim spent forty days after the rejection of his gifts. They argue that an echo of the *Protevangelion*'s account is found in the rock-cut church of Mary built in 470 in Jericho although this tradition is first attested in the ninth century.[286] The earliest archaeological evidence on the connection of Mary's parents to Jericho is an inscription in the main church of the monastery of Mary in Choziba (Jericho), which refers to Joachim dates from the Latin period (1099-1291),[287] and an inscription found in the monastery of St Gerasimos in Judea which refers to Mary' parents and it is accompanied by frescoes dates from the thirteenth century.[288] I am inclined to think that the connection between the house of Joachim based on Epiphanios' view, emerged after the Latin rule in Jerusalem when new traditions around Mary's life sprang up.[289]

The majority of sources highlight Bethesda (Jerusalem) as the place, where Mary was born or as the house of Mary's parents: pilgrim Antonios, Sophronios of Jerusalem,

---

[284] Diekamp (ed.) 1898:23: 'Τρεῖς γὰρ ἦσαν ἀδελφαὶ ἀπὸ Βηθλεὲμ θυγατέρες Ματθὰν τοῦ ἱερέως καὶ Μαρίας τῆς αὐτοῦ γυναικός, ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας Κλεοπάτρας καὶ Σώπαρος τοῦ Πέρσου, πρὸ τῆς βασιλείας Ἡρώδου τοῦ υἱοῦ Ἀντιπάτρου. ὄνομα τῇ πρώτῃ Μαριάμ, καὶ ὄνομα τῇ δευτέρᾳ Σοβή, καὶ ὄνομα τῇ τρίτῃ Ἄννα. ἔγημεν δὲ ἡ πρώτη ἐν Βηθλεὲμ καὶ ἔτεκε Σαλώμην τὴν μαίαν. ἔγημεν δὲ καὶ ἡ δευτέρα ἐν Βηθλεὲμ καὶ ἔτεκε τὴν Ἐλισάβετ. ἔγημεν δὲ καὶ ἡ τρίτη εἰς γῆν τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ ἔτεκε Μαρίαν τὴν θεοτόκον.'
[285] PG 120: 269C; Donner 1971:79; Wilkinson 2002:214,294; Schick 1995:481-2; Patrich 1990:212.
[286] Abel 1956:856. For the monastery's history and the 'Laura of St Anna', see Patrich 1990:205-212; CIAP 2004:69-93; Hirschfeld 1992:4-5; Lefort (ed.) 1994:279; Lefort (ed.) 1995: 54,111,133.
[287] CIAP 2004:78. Patrich argues that the tradition according to which the left foot of St Anna reached Mt Athos in the seventeenth century, originated in this church, see Patrich 1990:212.
[288] ibid. 80-1.
[289] Folda has argued that different traditions rose during the Crusader period in the effort of the Latins to associate events of the life of Christ and his mother to the Holy Land, see Folda 1996:104-5; Jeremias 1966:15 n. 27 and ibid. p. 22. The ritual topography of Jerusalem changed in the thirteenth century, when sites were relocated along a portion of the Eastern processional route now know as the Via Dolorosa (Pullan 1993:36 n.7), where the Crusader church of St Anna is still standing. In addition, since they appear under Latin rule, such as Eugessipos (1148) who mentions Sepphoris as Mary's birthplace, see PG 133: 995), have been not included among the candidate cities.

John of Damaskos (eighth century), Kosmas Vestitor (eighth century), Eutychios of Alexandria (tenth century) and John Phokas (eleventh century).[290]

Wilkinson suggested that the traditional place of Mary's birth was the Probatike,[291] that during the ninth century her birthplace was believed to be Gesthémani but during the Western rule in Jerusalem (1099-1291) the location of her nativity returned back to the Probatike, even though he finds no good explanation on this.[292] Bethesda was initially associated with Joachim because according to the *Protevangelion* after the rejection of the gifts he found refuge among shepherds, so the Probatike (= sheep pool) was regarded as the place where this event took place.[293] The strongest supporter of the 'Bethesda tradition', John of Damaskos, locates in the Probatike both Joachim's house and the place where Joachim kept his flock but not where he found refuge.[294] Kosmas Vestitor repeats this tradition and refers to the site's connection to the miracle of the Paralytic.[295]

The last and second most popular candidate location is Galilee and the city of Nazareth in particular. Epiphanios, a monk in the Kallistratou monastery in Constantinople (780),[296] without knowing Anna's place of origin, writes that Anna came to Nazareth to marry Joachim, and after the Presentation of Mary (in Jerusalem I assume) they departed for Nazareth and lived there. After Joachim's death, Anna left Nazareth once more and went to her sister in Jerusalem where she died.[297] The sixth-century Armenian version of

---

[290] Wilkinson 2002:109; Donner 1979: 288 no 27; Tobler (ed.) 1877:106,137; PG 96: 669B, 677C; PG 87: 3821; PG 106: 1008C; Eutychius of Alexandria 1960:139; PG 133: 988. The testimony used by Cecchelli (Cecchelli 1946:109) that Synesios, bishop of Cyrene names the Virgin as Mary of Solyma, does not shed particular light on Mary's origins.

[291] As stated in footnote xxx the two Bethesda and Probatike will be used throughout this study.

[292] Wilkinson 2002:306. As stated, this is how it is found in the Book of Nehemiah, see n. 9. The information about Gesthémane derives from post twelfth-century Western travelers, such as Bernard, see Wilkinson 2002:266.

[293] Mare 1987:239.

[294] PG 96:669B, 677C.

[295] PG 106: 1008C.

[296] Diekamp (ed.) 1898:136; Kazhdan 1999 (2):307. Diekamp dates the composition of Mary's life between 800 και 813, see Diekamp (ed.) 1898:145. Dräseke argues that the Epiphanios Hagiopolites is different from the Epiphanios the Monk (780) who wrote the life of Mary (Dräseke 1895: 353) and places him in the eighth century, Dräseke 1895:359, 362. Diekamp agrees with this view, see Diekamp (ed.) 1898:136. Kurz places the writer of Mary's life in the eleventh century (Kurtz 1897:216) and Caro places him in the late fifth century, see Caro 1972:588.

[297] PG 120: 192.

the *Protevangelion* locates Mary's birth in Nazareth,[298] and according to the tenth-century *Synaxarion of Constantinople*, Mary was born in Galilee where Anna got married.[299] The tenth-century homilist Peter of Argos identifies Nazareth as both Joachim's and Anna's place of origin,[300] a tradition accepted by the church historian Nikephoros Kallistos (1256-1335).[301]

To sum up, although the earliest texts identify Bethleem as Mary's birthplace, the majority of sources incline towards Jerusalem and Nazareth. Church Fathers and pilgrims do not refer to the apocryphal text as their source for the location of Mary's birth, but it is only modern scholars who make this assumption. For example, Ovadiah, Finegan and Murphy-O'Connor argue that the association between Bethesda and St Anna is found in the *Protevangelion* since Mary was born in the proximity of the temple Mount.[302] Mimouni is reluctant to accept this and leaves the topic open to discussion.[303]

The weakness of this connection becomes obvious if one considers that the *Protevangelion* leaves no evidence at all to connect a specific location to any event of Anna's and Joachim's life.[304] As De Strycker has noted, the reference of Joachim as shepherd is not enough to establish a connection with Bethesda.[305] The case of Nazareth is supported by the Armenian version of the *Protevangelion* and raises questions as to the reason why this city made its way to the church calendar of Constantinople and not the Probatike. As we will see later in this chapter, a number of concepts concerning the Virgin Mary attributed to John of Damaskos, appeared in the *Synaxarion of Constantinople*, but I cannot know why the Bethesda tradition, to which John of Damaskos pays deep respect, did not.

---

[298] Terian (ed.) 2008:3.
[299] Delehaye (ed.) 1902:841. For the date of the *Synaxarion* to the tenth century, see Magdalino 2007:11.
[300] Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976:156.
[301] PG 145:652B.
[302] Ovadiah 1999:253; Finegan 1969:145; Murphy-O'Connor 1980:350.
[303] Mimouni 1995:488-9.
[304] Amann 1910:51; Smid (ed.) 1965:43.
[305] De Strycker (ed.) 1961:80.

On the whole, Patrich's comment on the traditions that connect Joachim and Anna to Choziba that there are 'series of monuments which were built in places where events took place according to the tradition, authentic or spurious, a sacred geography was thus revived and expanded, serving the spiritual and physical needs of the local population, and of an ever-growing flow of pilgrims',[306] is valid for the all the cities under discussion.

The Protevangelion

The *Protevangelion* dates either to 150,[307] or 180-200,[308] or 180-204[309] and its place of origin is either Egypt or Syria.[310] Although its origin is outside Palestine, its familiarity with Jewish customs shows that it may have been written in a Judaeo-Christian milieu,[311] although this view is contested.[312]

The reason for its composition is related to Mary: to explain her unique status,[313] to counter contemporary challenges (mainly presented by Jews, according to Justin Martyr) that questioned the legitimacy of Mary's background and the nature of the birth of Christ, to praise her,[314] and in response to popular curiosity on her early life, which the canonical Gospels did not cover.[315] According to Epiphanios the Monk, James the Jew and Aphroditianos of Persia (Epiphanios calls him 'Aphrodisianos') 'and some others' have written about the birth of Mary.[316] However, from the surviving texts we have, the fifth-

---

[306] Patrich 2006:362-3; Gharib 1988:865 n.3.
[307] Wilson (trans.) 1974:372.
[308] De Strycker 1980:579; De Strycker and Louvain 1964:354.
[309] Stempvoort 1964:425.
[310] De Strycker and Louvain 1964:354; Smid (ed.) 1965:22. Rubin argues that 'the author […] was acquainted with Jewish life although he does not seem to be Jewish', Rubin 2009:9-10. Horner also supports that it was written in Jewish environment, see Horner 2004: 313–335. Cothenet argues that although it ignores the Palestinian topography, there are elements that show inspiration from Jewish sources, see Cothenet 1988: 4259-4263, 4267.
[311] Mimouni 1998:103-4; NCE 1993:607.
[312] Gambero 1999:35.
[313] Elliott 2006:ix ; De Strycker and Louvain 1964:354 (to defend the exceptional sanctity of Mary).
[314] Wilson (trans.) 1974:372; Smid (ed.) 1965:14.
[315] Cameron 1991:98; Elliott 2006:ix.12.
[316] PG 120:185.

century writer Aphroditianos has written not on Mary's but on Christ's birth.[317] And a narrative on the early life of Mary the material of which resembles the *Protevangelion* has been attributed to the first-century bishop of Antioch Evodios, to the Patriarch of Alexandria Damian (sixth-seventh century) or to Saint Constantine of Assiut (sixth century).[318]

The Byzantine historian Nikephoros Gregoras (fourteenth century), in his sermon on Mary's early life explains why Mary's early years of life have not been included in the Gospels and in works of Church Fathers: 'even if the Evangelists are silent on her, one should not be surprised about it. It is like when a vine grows a huge bunch of grapes, since it is not easy to carry (it) even with a big wagon, it is natural that it would create long forgetfulness to those who see it (= the bunch) rather than marvel the root, and are surprised by the size of the fruit, so what happened later to the virgin won the mind and the speech, what happened before her was put to silence'.[319] Nikephoros implies that the events of Mary's early life were ignored because the Church was mostly concerned with her giving birth to Christ: 'Her giving birth and remaining virgin after that and the fact that although she was human she gave birth to God, superseded all miracles. This is why one should not wonder if the greatest part of the Apostles and teachers of the Church are silent on this (Mary's life before Christ), although it was of great importance'.[320] Gregoras repeats a notion first attested in the eighth century with Epiphanios the Monk. Epiphanios writes that none of the Holy Fathers has written about Mary's life, her upbringing, her death and that 'others who have written on Mary's birth, fell silent'.[321]

The *Protevangelion* covered the lack of information on Mary's life before Christ, but one should not assume that the popularity of the *Protevangelion* (counting around one hundred

---

[317] For the date of this work, see Gero 1988:3980. For the text, see PG 10:98C-108D. According to Migne's introductory note, this work has been wrongly ascribed to Julius Africanus (third century).
[318] Depuydt 1993:208 no 108, n.1.
[319][318] Leone 1991: 26: 635-642. Translation is not word-to-word.
[320][320] ibid. 27-8.
[321] PG 120:185A-188A.

and forty two copies),[322] made the story of Anna and Joachim (= Mary's early life) popular in early Christianity. As will demonstrate later, Mary's parents were not consistently mentioned in texts until the eighth century.

Variations in the story of the Protevangelion

From the third century onwards, writers showed interest in Mary's lineage. Sometimes they relied on the *Protevangelion* to collect information and other times they incorporated other traditions to complete Mary's genealogy. In the case of Demetrios bishop of Antioch (third century) both occur.

Demetrios seems very familiar with the apocryphal story as he outlines it, despite the confusion of names: He names Anna as Sossana,[323] the *Old Testament* figure whose husband was called Joachim and, similarly to the apocryphal Joachim, was wealthy and mostly appreciated in his society.[324] Sosanna and Joachim were a pious couple and the main setting of Sosanna's story takes place is the garden of her house,[325] where the lament of the apocryphal Anna is also placed. Although Stempvoort has suggested that the writer intentionally made the connection between the two women,[326] later in the text Demetrios of Antioch changes Sosanna's name to Anna. It is less probable that the confusion of the two names is the result of a correction made by a later scriber since Anna is named as such throughout the second half of the text. The most plausible explanation to me is the use of name change of saints in Syriac texts,[327] and Demetrios as a bishop of Antioch must reflect

---

[322] Cothenet 1988:4225; De Strycker and Louvain 1964:348.

[323] Budge (trans.) 1915:653.

[324] Smid (ed.) 1965:26 argues that Joachim's name is taken from the *Old Testament* and the story of Sosanna. Terian (Terian [ed.] 2008:3.n.4) argues that both names – Joachim's and Anna's – are inspired by the same story.

[325] Daniel 1-7; In the tenth-century *Synaxarion of Constantinople*, the alternative name for Anna of Leukate is Sussana.

[326] Stempvoort 1964:415-7. He also showed that there are close similarities between the *Protevangelion* and the story of Judith, at least in the quotation of a few lines, see Stempvoort 1964:417-8 and with Sarah (Tobias 2, 2-3; 3.7) in the story of the head-cover, see Stempvoort 1964:418-9.

[327] Nau 1901:517.

this tradition in his version of Mary's early life. For example, the fifth-century female Syriac martyr Anahid is named Anna in her vita 'probably because that was her Baptismal name'.[328]

A second deviation in Demetrios's version is that the annunciation of Joachim is recorded differently from the version in the *Protevangelion*: In Demetrios's version the angel ('man of light') appeared to Joachim in the dark when Anna was asleep but Joachim was praying, and told him that his wife will conceive and shall bring forth a female child : 'And when the man of light had finished talking with him, Joachim rose up, and awoke Anna his wife, and told her all the words which had been said concerning her'.[329] In the *Protevangelion*, Anna's annunciation takes places first and then Joachim's, but in Demetrios' version, Joachim's annunciation comes first.

Similarly to Demetrios, Cyril of Jerusalem (fourth century) diverges in some details from the *Protevangelion*. Cyril writes that Mary revealed her lineage to him, and in this account, Joachim, interpreted as Kleopas, is Mary's father and Anna 'who was usually called Mariham' is her mother.[330] Kleopas is the child that David had with Sarah and Mariham was the child of Aminadab, David's brother,[331] thus Mary's parents are cousins. Anna and Joachim went to the Temple to make their supplication to God and there is where their annunciation takes place,[332] in contrast to the house (Anna) and desert (Joacim) in the *Protevangelion*.[333]

The *Commentary of the Hexaemeron* written by Pseudo-Eustathios (fifth century),[334] is the earliest surviving source to repeat the story of Anna and Joachim more accurately than both Demetrios of Antioch and Cyril of Jerusalem. However, Pseudo-

---

[328] Brock (trans.) 1987:84 and n.39.
[329] Budge (trans.) 1915:654.
[330] ibid. 630.
[331] ibid. 631.
[332] ibid. 632.
[333] De Strycker (ed.) 1961:68.
[334] De Strycker and Louvain 1964:349.

Eustathios does not provide us with Anna's name, but refers to her as 'Joachim's wife'.[335] And although he repeats the story of the *Protevangelion* accurately enough, he seems to be unfamiliar with the composer of the work: Having explained the differences in the accounts of Matthew and Luke on the genealogy of Joseph, he writes: 'And it is worth coming to the story on saint Mary written by someone named James'.[336]

Diversions or additions to the apocryphal account are also attested in the life of Mary written by Epiphanios the Monk.[337] Epiphanios writes that Matthan had three daughters one of whom was Anna who came to Nazareth, married Joachim, lived with him for fifty years but still did not have a child.[338] Similarly to Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanios places the annunciation of Joachim in the Temple where Joachim went to pray. And similarly to Demetrios of Antioch, Joachim's annunciation takes place earlier than Anna's. In his annunciation, Joachim heard the angel's voice telling him 'There is a child for you, you will be glorified by it' and shortly after Anna gave birth and named the baby after her sister Mary.[339] When Mary became three years old she was taken to the temple where the priests blessed her and her parents. Afterwards, Joachim and Anna departed for Nazareth (i.e. the place where they lived) and dedicated Mary to the temple when she became seven years old, and not three as the *Protevangelion* recounts. Joachim died at the age of eighty (also copied by George Kedrenos in the eleventh century[340]), Anna left Nazareth and went to her sister in Jerusalem and died at the age of seventy-two.[341]

---

[335] PG 18:772-3; Schreckenberg-Schubert 1992:63; Amann (Amann 1910: 116) believes that this is Eustathios, archbishop of Antioch (died in 360), a view rejected by De Strycker 1980: 582; De Strycker and Louvain 1964:345-6, and Zoepfl 1927 :52,55. Gregory of Nyssa (fourth century), Basil the Great (fourth century) and George Pisides (seventh century) do not refer to Mary's parents in their Hexaemera, see PG 44:61- 124, PG 29:3-208, PG 92:1425-1578.

[336] PG 18: 772C : Ἄξιον δὲ καὶ τὴν ἱστορίαν, ἣν διέξεισι περὶ τῆς ἁγίας Μαρίας Ἰάκωβός τις, ἐπελθεῖν'.

[337] For different views on the identity of Epiphanios Hagiopolites and Epiphanios the Monk see n. 296.

[338] As we will see later, St Anna Leukate (see p. 204) lived for fifty years. However, there is no evidence that the number 'fifty' is significant here.

[339] PG 120: 189.

[340] ' Ὅτι Ἰωακεὶμ ἔτει π΄ τελευτᾷ, ἡ δὲ Ἄννα οθ΄', see Bekker (ed.) 1838: 326. He also copies Epiphanios when he writes that Mary learned how to read from Joachim ('τὰ μέντοι Ἑβραϊκὰ γράμματα ἔτι ζῶντος τοῦ Ἰωακεὶμ ἔμαθεν'), see Bekker (ed.) 1838: 326, PG 120:192B.

[341] PG 120: 192.

The four variations (Demetrios of Antioch, Cyril of Jerusalem, Pseudo-Eustathios, Epiphanios the Monk) of Anna and Joachim's story intervene on the *Protevangelion* contributing the personal touch of their writers to the apocryphal story. They enrich the story with information not found in the original text of the *Protevangelion*, such as years of life or time death, cities they lived before or after Mary's presentation to the temple. I think that this information, which diverges from the second-century apocryphal text, is intended to add 'historicity' to their account of Mary's life or to conceal the fact that they were using it. It seems that alterations or additions to the text are attested in a time when the *Protevangelion* started making its first appearance in the writings of Early Christianity. We do not see diversions of such extent made in the account of the *Protevangelion* in Byzantine homilies of Mary's early life that appeared from the eighth century onwards. Byzantine homilists might emphasize different aspects of the story but the story as it is recounted in the *Protevangelion* is not substantially altered.

The lack of historicity credited to the *Protevangelion* in the formative Patristic period is a fact verified by additional writers. The reason I have separated them from the four writers mentioned above is that although the aim of their work is not to produce a piece on Mary's early life, they nevertheless perpetuate the established negativity of Early Christianity towards the *Protevangelion*, by diverging from the story. But similarly to Demetrios of Antioch, Cyril of Jerusalem, Pseudo-Eustathios, and Epiphanios the monk, a few examples of writers indirectly reveal that have consulted the apocryphal text. Although it is out of the scope of this thesis, taking into consideration the number of copies of the *Protevangelion* and the disregard of writers towards it as I will demonstrate now, one wonders how much popular the *Protevangelion* actually might have been before its widespread use from the eighth-century onwards inMarian homilies, which I will develop in the following section.

Mary's parents in the writings of Church Fathers and homilists prior to the eighth century- Disregard of apocryphal works

Apocryphal works were neglected by early writers:[342] Irēneos (second century) considered the apocryphal works as fables written by those who do not know the truth,[343] and Epiphanios of Salamis (fourth century) did not give much credit to apocryphal works although his strong ideological opponent,[344] Origen, did.[345] Pseudo-Athanasios the Great (circa 500)[346] referring to apocryphal and disputed works of the Bible, believes that these works are illegitimate; they should be dismissed, and that none of them is approved or gainful.[347]

Gregory of Nyssa (fourth century) was familiar with the story of Anna and Joachim since in his homily on the *Nativity of Christ* writes that he 'heard an apocryphal story' that the parents of Mary could not conceive.[348] He refers to Joachim's social status, to Anna's sterility and to Mary's (Mariam's) dedication to the temple.[349] Gregory does not name the text but the fact that he refers to the story and that he uses the word 'hear' which in his works often means 'read',[350] suggests that he did not disregard it, but was reluctant to show that he had read it. Gregory's reference to the *Protevangelion* in his homily is the

---

[342] Shoemaker argues that for the *Dormition of Mary* writers did not copy from the apocryphal *Transitus Mariae*, but from newer, revised texts of later periods, see Shoemaker 2002: 323. This might have to do with canon 19 of the synod of Trullo, which required homilists to draw from the writings of Church Fathers rather than to compose their own sermons, see Antonopoulou 1997: 112 and n. 103.

[343] Karavidopoulos 2000:68.

[344] Baur 1960:218.

[345] Dechow 1988:233-7,448. Origen uses the apocryphal work *Prayer of Joseph* in his commentary on Genesis (Trigg 1998:97, 218 n.16), the *Proclamation of Peter* in his commentary on John (Trigg 1998 164, 267.) See also PG 13:876. However, Karavidopoulos writes that in his homilies on Paul (Α´), Origen attacks the apocrypha, see Karavidopoulos 2000:68.

[346] Jurgens 1979:255.

[347] PG 28:432. 'Εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα βιβλία [...] ἑκατέρας Διαθήκης, τῆς Παλαιᾶς δηλαδὴ καὶ Νέας· τὰ μὲν ἀντιλεγόμενα, τὰ δὲ ἀπόκρυφα.[...] Ταῦτα πάντα [...] παραγεγραμμένα δέ εἰσι πάντως καὶ νόθα, καὶ ἀπό-βλητα. Καὶ οὐδὲν τούτων, τῶν ἀποκρύφων μάλιστα, ἔγκριτον ἢ ἐπωφελὲς'.

[348] Mann (ed.) 1975:277:47-50; PG 46 1137D.

[349] ibid. 278.

[350] 'We never heard from any of the fathers that...', see Meredith 1999:56; 'I told him I had heard also from others…', see Meredith 1999:66; 'I have frequently heard the inspired Scripture…', see Meredith 1999:117, 'through not having already heard our exegesis of the text', see Meredith 1999:118.

first inclusion of Anna and Joachim in a liturgical context. The next example will come two centuries later with Romanos Melodos.

Epiphanios the Monk (780) in his account of Mary's early years, mentioned earlier, writes 'even if we take something from the Apocrypha, do not reproach us', apparently because the literary style was considered of low quality.[351] Unlike Gregory's reluctance to name the text, Epiphanios attacks it directly. He includes James the Jew amongst the writers who 'not only did not expound Mary's life correctly (ὠρθοτόμησαν) but became accusators of the parts of Mary's life they wrote about'.[352] This is probably the reason why he wishes to re-write Mary's early life, although he is largely based on the *Protevangelion*.

Writers were aware of the *Protevangelion*,[353] but their reluctance to make use of it or name it in their work in the Patristic period and up to the end of the seventh century, resulted in the lack of sources on Mary's parents and St Anna in particular, who does not appear as often as her *New Testament* namesake (the prophetess Anna) or the biblical Hanna, mother of Samuel.[354] For example, Pseudo-Methodios bishop of Patara (fifth century) dedicated a homily to the first,[355] and John Chrysostom wrote five homilies on the second.[356] Theodotos of Ankyra (fifth century) in his Marian and Christological homilies

---

[351] PG 120: 188B; Antonopoulou 1998:327. However, as Stempvoort notes, its style is not as simple as its language is, see Stempvoort 1964:411.

[352] 'ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ ἐπιχειρήσαντες καὶ μέρη τινὰ εἰπόντες, οὐκ ὠρθοτόμησαν, ἀλλ' ἑαυτοῖς ἐγένοντο κατήγοροι, οἷον, Ἰάκωβος ὁ Ἑβραῖος, καὶ Ἀφροδισιανὸς Πέρσης, καὶ ἄλλοι τινὲς...' See PG 120: 185.

[353] Stempvoort 1964:412-3 (Origen, Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian). See also Amann 1910:109-118.

[354] The abundant references to biblical women is explained by the inclusion of these women in canonical works, while Mary's mother is an apocryphal one. For selective examples that refer to Anna the prophetess or the mother of Samuel, see (Philo of Alexandria) Cohn and Wendland (eds) 1962: 57. Clemens of Alexandria exludes Anna Mary's mother but refers to Anna the prophetess, see PG 8: 872A; Eusebios of Kaisareia, PG 23: 1352D, 1300A; McVey (transl.) 1989:110,113:14; 365, 367: 10; 369; 374:15; Gregory Nanzianzos, PG 35: 928C; 36: 549C; 38:353. CCSG 12; Theodotos of Ancyra, Lo Castro (trans.) 1992:116,120; Anastasios Sinaites, CCSG 59:70; Leontios CCSG 17:74, 243, CCSG 25:8 and CCSG 60:10 Eustratios, CCSG 23: 39; Maximos the Confessor, CCSG 44:125. Pseudo-Kaisarios, Riedinger (ed.) 1969:15. 21, 121, 146-8.

[355] For an English translation of this homily, see Roberts and Donaldson (eds) 1885:383-393.

[356] PG 54:631-676 (John Chrysostom); PG 18: 348-381 (Methodios). For this homily's influences by the *Protevangelion*, see Amann 1910:117. For the date of the homily, see Caro 1972:610-1.

excludes Anna and refers only to the mother of Samuel.[357] Two epigrams of Gregory of Nazianzos (fourth century) refer to his mother Nonna who is compared to the biblical Sarah and Hanna.[358] Gregory then writes 'the other' (= Anna) but the editor notes that it is not clear whether this is the prophetess or the Mother of the Virgin.[359] In another epigram Gregory writes: 'Nonna shines in the circle of the devoted females – of Susanna, of Mariam and of Annas – as a hoard for the women'.[360] The plural 'Annas' may target the two Annas Gregory mentioned in the previous epigram, however we cannot be sure that the mother of Mary is included. Finally, Cyril of Skythopolis (sixth century) in the life of the monk Euthymios uses Hanna's dedication of Samuel as model for the presentation of Euthymios when he became three years old to bishop Otreios, and not the *Protevangelion*.[361]

However, Pseudo-John the Theologian (possibly sixth century) included Anna in his *Dormition of Mary*, where Anna is mentioned as taking part in Mary's Assumption together with Eve and her cousin Elizabeth : 'And on the first day Eve, the mother of the human race, came, and Anna, the mother of Mary, and Elizabeth, the mother of John the Baptist, and they approached Mary and bowed down at her feet and said, Blessed be the Lord, who chose you to be the dwelling place of his glory.'[362]

In Syria, the *Protevangelion* was disregarded between the fourth and the sixth century.[363] This comes as a surprise since the *Protevangelion* was translated into Syriac

---

[357] Lo Castro (trans.) 1992: 116, 120.

[358] Gregory dedicated thirty-five from one-hundrend and twenty-nine epigrams to his mother, see Ksydes 1978: 15. In his work, Gregory's mother is mentioned as Hanna and Gregory as a new Samuel, see Børtnes and Hägg 2006:245.

[359] Beckby (ed.) 1957:462. In his oration *On the Lights* Gregory refers to the prophetess 'With Symeon we have taken him in our arms, with Anna the wise old woman, we have given voice to our thanks', see Daley (trans.) 2006:134. He is however familiar with apocryphal literature, see Laird 2004: 161.

[360] 'Σουσσάνη, Μαριάμ τε καὶ Ἄνναις, ἔρμα γυναικῶν'. See Beckby (ed.) 1957:462 no 28.

[361] Schwartz (ed.) 1939:10.

[362] Shoemaker 2002:390.

[363] John Chrysostom includes Mary's parents in his liturgy ('the holy and righteous ancestors Joachim and Anna'), but it is not sure whether they were included in his time or later, since his liturgy continued to develop. See Taft 1980-1:50 n. 35; ODB 1241.

from the fifth century onwards,[364] the first canon on the Nativity of Mary was written by the Syriac Romanos Melodos,[365] and the first homilies on the same subject were composed by the Syriac Andrew of Crete and the presumably Syriac John of Euboea.[366] Despite the strong tradition of Marian poetry after Ephrem the Syriac (fourth century),[367] and the interest in Mary's early life, homilies from the fifth century onwards on the Virgin do not refer to Anna. For example when it comes to Mary's ability to cure sterile women, as her mother was, Anna is excluded: 'The young maid gave healing medicine to her aged mother, bitten by the serpent, the bitter poison was wrenched from her limbs and the death that had slain her proved no longer effective: daughter had acted as physician to her mother, and healed her'.[368] Similarly: 'the second Eve gave birth to life, among mortals; she wiped clean the bill of debt incurred by Eve her mother. The child (Mary) gave her hand to help her aged mother (Eve) who lay prostrate; she raised her up from the Fall that the serpent had effected. It was the daughter (Mary) who wove the robe of glory and gave it to her father (Adam) who then covered his body that had been naked ever since the affair of the tree'.[369] Although these references strongly brings to mind the sterility of St Anna, for the majority of Syriac writers the mother of Mary is Eve.[370] Jacob of Serug, who flourished in fifth- and sixth-century Syria,[371] in his attempt to show God's manifestation of power over the conception of a sterile woman, uses the example of St Elizabeth and not St Anna.[372]

Moreover, in an anonymous homily on the Virgin we read: 'A virgin is pregnant with God, and a barren woman is pregnant with a virgin, the son of sterility leaps at the

---

[364] Brock 1979b:231-2.
[365] Dieterich argues that Syria plays and influential role for Romanos' poetry, see Dieterich 1909: 32.
[366] Cunningham (trans.) 2008:46.
[367] Cameron 2000: 19.
[368] Brock (trans.) 1994:98.
[369] Hansbury 1998:11.
[370] ibid. 2; Gambero 1999:116-117; Meyendorff 1976: 146-9.
[371] Ignatius Aphram I Barsoum 2003:255-261.
[372] Hansbury 1998:46. For Jacob of Serug and Mary, see Graef 1985:119-123.

pregnancy of virginity'.[373] Although this last sentence could be a reference to St Anna and her conception of the Virgin Mary, it refers to Elisabeth. Thus until the sixth century when the first kontakion on Mary's Nativity was written in Constantinople by a Syriac composer, in Syria, homilists relied on biblical women and not the apocryphal Anna to underline God's power over the laws of nature. This development will begin in the eighth century.

The influence of the *Protevangelion* in Syria is attested after the ninth century in East Syria in Ishodad of Merv, bishop of Hedhatta around 850, and in West Syria, in the *Book of the Bee*.[374] As stated earlier, the *Protevangelion* does not exert any influence on Syriac texts between the fourth and the fifth centuries, and sixth-century homilies shows that this situation had not changed. Taking into consideration that there are no texts from the seventh or eighth century to contradict this, it is safe to argue that the influence of the *Protevangelion* was initiated during the ninth century. As we saw earlier traditions around the names of Mary's parents follow a different tradition in Syria and the translation of the *Protevangelion* did not have an affect on the promotion of Anna and Joachim in the Syriac environment. Although the first works composed on Mary's early life were by writers of Syriac origin in Constantinople and beyond they composed their works outside Syria which shows that at least in the case of Romanos Melodos (and although a reciprocal influence is attested in the ninth century between the two areas),[375] Constantinople was more influential in spreading the cult of Anna and Joachim to Syria than the other way round. This is strengthened by the evidence of artistic production. The Mariological scene of Mary being caressed by her parents, which is taken from the Syriac and Armenian

---

[373] Brock (trans.) 1994:141.
[374] I would like to thank Sebastian Brock for bringing this detail to my attention.
[375] For the influence of Syriac epigrams on ninth-century Byzantine poetry, see Lauxtermann 2003: 133-138.

versions of the *Protevangelion*,[376] does not appear before the tenth century.[377] Thus in Syria, Mary's parents emerged at a time when in Constantinople, as we will see, the veneration of Mary's parents had already been established.

Traditions around the genealogy of Mary

Male – female lineage

Similarly to the treatment of Mary's early life discussed earlier, the disregard of apocryphal texts, the *Protevangelion* included, resulted in the lack of surviving sources on Mary's genealogy. And in those sources that have come down to us, Mary's genealogy is subjected to divergences and differentiations from author to author and from region to region. Nestor the Priest (ninth century) refers to Mary's lineage and concludes: 'Know that I did not ask you about the genealogy of Mary. The genealogy of Mary is mentioned nowhere in the scriptures or in the Gospels'.[378] Nestor believed that Mary's genealogy is not related to Christ's genealogy since it is not mentioned in the Scripture.[379] However as I will show in this section, in order complete Christ's genealogy, writers went back to Mary's genealogical tree. But it is not a straightforward process. The traditions around the lineage of Mary seem to be complicated at first since for example the names of her parents

---

[376] Kalokyres 1972:96; Aspra-Vardavake 1991-2:219. For its Armenian or Syriac influences, see Lafontaine-Dosogne 1975:177.

[377] Aspra-Vardavake 1991-2:220. Lafontaine-Dosogne argues that in the Byzantine capital and the areas artistically influenced by it, the theme of Mary's careness did not appear before the thirteenth century (Lafontaine-Dosogne 1975 :166), and it does not derive from a strictly Byzantine iconographical tradition (Lafontaine-Dosogne 1975:177).

[378] Lasker and Stroumsa (trans.) 1996:19 (for a dating of his writings), 68.

[379] ibid. 153.

vary. For the majority of accounts on Mary's genealogy, authors rely upon Armenian and Syriac versions of the Greek original text of the *Protevangelion*.

When writers draw Christ's lineage they usually refer to the male lineage such as Theodore of Herakleia (fourth century). In his commentary on Matthew's Gospel Theodore writes that the Evangelists draw the lineage from Joseph and that there is no difference between drawing the lineage from Mary and Joseph.[380] In the thirteenth century, James of Voragine writes that Matthew and Luke do not set forth the lineage of Mary but that of Joseph – who had nothing to do with the conception of Christ – because the usage of sacred writers is said to have been to weave the series of generation by males, not females.[381] Eutychios of Alexandria (tenth century) provided Mary's lineage only by her male forefathers,[382] which justifies the comment of Andrew of Crete (eighth century) that genealogy is drawn from the paternal line,[383] although it is contested by the use of female figures in the same case by the fifth-century Patriarch of Constantinople, Proklos.[384] However, in his homily *On the Holy Virgin Theotokos* Proklos also excludes Anna when he refers to Christ's female ancestors: 'Rebeccah is honoured, Leah also […] Elizabeth [...] and Mary'.[385] Proklos reflects the attitude of Early Christian writers, who either avoided to make use or avoided to show that they made use of the *Protevangelion*. Although Proklos is not the last example in the long list of these writers, he is definitely one of the last cases where the *Protevangelion* will be discretely used. It has already been marked by Cunningham that Andrew of Crete stresses the fact that Mary originated from king David

---

[380] CMP 1972 (2):119 no 685.
[381] Ryan (trans.) 1993:149.
[382] Cachia (ed.) 1960:33-4. St Augustine (354-430) does not refer to Anna when he discusses Mary's ancestry, see PL 42:467-472.
[383] PG 97: 852C-D; Supported also by Gregory Palamas, see Veniamin (trans.) 2005:114-5
[384] Proklos refers to (apart from Elizabeth) the wives of biblical men who are also mentioned in the homily on the *Presentation of Christ* composed by Cyril of Jerusalem, see PG 33:1193A.
[385] Constas (ed.) 2003:260: Clemens of Alexandria (c.150 - c. 215) excludes Anna Mary's mother but refers to Anna the prophetess: 'Σάρρα τε καὶ Ῥεβέκκα καὶ Μαριὰμ Δεββώρα τε καὶ Ὀλδά'.[...] μετὰ δὲ τὴν γένεσιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἄννα καὶ Συμεών', see PG 8:872A.

which 'caused him concern'.[386] It seems that since he was one of the first composers of Nativity homilies he overemphasized the assosiation of Mary with biblical figures to add scriptural touch her early life.[387]

Mary's genealogy in Syriac sources and Syriac and Armenian versions of the *Protevangelion*

From the seventh century onwards and in contrast to the *Protevangelion*, writers provide us with the names of Mary's grandparents. Jacob of Edessa (640-708) and Eutychios of Alexandria (tenth century) give us the name of Joachim's father, Panthir in the first case,[388] Binthir in the second,[389] and the tenth-century *Synaxarion of Constantinople* names Anna's father not as Joachim but as Nathan.[390] The name of Mary's father in the *Synaxarion* is in contrast to the constant use of the name 'Joachim', which is based on the *Protevangelion* and which we see being used in Marian homilies from the eighth century.

In several manuscripts on Christ's genealogy written by Hippolytos of Thebes (eighth century), Hippolytos provide his own version on the genealogy of Mary: Joachim had a brother named Kleopas, who died without having any children. Gregory Palamas in his homily *On the through flesh genealogy of Christ and of Ever Virgin Theotokos who gave birth to him but remained a virgin* writes that a child often belonged to two fathers, one by law since one did not have children and one by nature and 'resurrected' his brother's descendants. He also refers to the priest Nathan as one of Mary's ancestors,[391] which is taken from the third homily of the Nativity of Mary composed by Andrew of

---

[386] Cunningham (trans.) 2008:82 n.40.
[387] ibid.76, 84, 85 (title of homily) -7, 90, 96.
[388] Nau 1901:525.
[389] Eutychios of Alexandria 1960:139.
[390] Delehaye (ed.) 1902:26; Eugesippos (1148) writes that Anna had a sister named Hermana, see PG 133: 995.
[391] Christou (ed.) 2009:440.

Crete.[392] Joachim married Anna, the daughter of a priest named Matthan and of a woman named Maria and gave birth to the Theotokos (elsewhere 'Maria').[393] Apart from Maria, Joachim and Anna the couple had two more daughters Sobe and Anna and lived in Bethlehem.[394] Also in the eighth century, Epiphanios the Monk notes that Mary and Joachim did not have another child,[395] which is repeated in the fourteenth century by Isidore, bishop of Thessalonike. Isidore writes that Anna wanted to have a second child, but if this child were born, Mary would take all the glory from it. 'For these reasons', Isidore says, 'Anna did a good thing saying not to have another one'.[396] Hippolytos of Thebes and Epiphanios the Monk are two good examples on the disagreement between writers of the same period on the genealogy of Mary. Interestingly, nowhere in the *Protevangelion* is the genealogy of Anna and Joachim or their decision to have or not a second child mentioned. In spite of the support the view of Epiphanios and Isidore of Thessalonike that Mary was the only child that Joachim and Anna had and need not to have a second one, since Mary herself was exceptional, the tenth-century *Synaxarion of Constantinople* holds the view of Hippolytos of Thebes, which was read on the day of Anna's Dormition on 25 July.[397] The exceptional character of Mary is vehemently defended in Byzantine homilies and nowhere is there another child of Mary's parents mentioned. Consequently, the reason for the introduction of this view in the Church calendar of Constantinople raises questions about the nature of the texts that made it to the calendar, the content of which, in a few cases contradicts with established views on Mary's

---

[392] Cunningham (trans.) 2008:112.
[393] Diekamp (ed.) 1898:25: 'ὅτι ὁ Κλωπας καὶ ὁ δίκαιος Ἰωακείμ ἀδελφοὶ ὑπῆρχον γνήσιοι. τοῦ Κλωπᾶ οὖν γεγαμηκότος καὶ ἀτέκνου τελευτήσαντος ὁ Ἰωακείμ κατὰ τὸ τῶν Ἑβραίων ἔθος συνουσιάσας μετὰ τῆς τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ γυναικὸς ἐγέννησε τὴν Μαρίαν. ἔκτοτε οὖν καταλιπὼν αὐτὴν ἐμνηστεύσατο Ἄνναν τὴν θυγατέρα Ματθὰν τοῦ ἱερέως, ἐξ ἧς ἐγέννησε τήν παναγίαν θεοτόκον'.
[394] ibid. 23, 25: 'Τρεῖς γὰρ ἦσαν ἀδελφαὶ ἀπὸ Βηθλεὲμ θυγατέρες Ματθὰν τοῦ ἱερέως καὶ Μαρίας τῆς αὐτοῦ γυναικός, ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας Κλεοπάτρας καὶ Σώπαρος τοῦ Πέρσου, πρὸ τῆς βασιλείας Ἡρῴδου τοῦ υἱοῦ Ἀντιπάτρου. ὄνομα τῇ πρώτῃ Μαριάμ, καὶ ὄνομα τῇ δευτέρᾳ Σοβή, καὶ ὄνομα τῇ τρίτῃ Ἄννα'.
[395] ibid. 209.
[396] PG 139: 29B-C.
[397] Delehaye (ed.) 1902: 841. For the introduction of this feast into the Church Calendar of Constantinople, see part two of chapter three.

life perpetuated by homilists. St Anna is one of the numerous saints mentioned in the *Synaxarion*, and the way details of her life have been treated by homilists and the *Synaxarion*, shows that homilies were not the standard source to obtain information about Anna's life.

The *Sinai syr. 16* (eighth or early ninth century) is the earliest witness to the tradition that names the parents of Mary not Joachim and Anna but Zadoq or Zadoc and Dina.[398] Nau argues that the explanation for this difference is given by a Syriac writer of the thirteenth century, Salomon de Bassora, who wrote that Anna's real name was Dina but after her annunciation it was changed to Anna.[399] He adds that Joachim's name was changed after an old priest in the temple called Sadoc (a common name for Jewish high priests in the pseudepigrapha),[400] who became like an adopted father to Joachim.[401] This tradition is reflected in the late sixth-century Armenian version of the *Protevangelion* where Mary's parents are named Anna and Joachim and Zadoq appears as a priest.[402] In a fifth-century Syriac version of the *Protevangelion* published by Budge, Mary's father is named Yônâkhîr which later in the text is changed to Zadoq, however Anna's name remains Dina throughout the text: 'And there was born unto Nathan...another son, and he called his name Yônâkhîr, the son of Matthan; and God enriched him exceedingly with flocks and herds, and with possessions, and with great wealth, but he was childless. Now this man was of Bethlehem of Judeah, and his name was Zadok, and the name of his wife was Dînâ'.[403] The fact that in Matthew's Gospel (1.1.13 and 1.14) Eliakim and Zadok

---

[398] Brock 2006:65. A fifth-century Syriac martyr was named Anna: 'Taton, Mama, Mezakhya, and Anna, all "daughters of the covenant" from Karka d-Beth Slokh, were put to death', see Brock (trans.) 1987:77. For their story and date of life, see Brock (trans.) 1987:65-7.
[399] Nau 1901:517.
[400] Terian (ed.) 2008:3. n 3.
[401] Nau 1901:517.
[402] Terian (ed.) 2008:3. For its date, see Terian (ed.) 2008: xix; The Armenian version of *Protevangelion* appeared in the sixth century, see De Strycker and Louvain 1964:349.
[403] Budge (trans.) 1899:4.

appear as ancestors of Mary shows that the name Zadoq is a variant of a common tradition.[404]

Earlier than the *Sinai syr. 16*, in the *Book of Cave Treasures*, written in the fourth and re-edited in the sixth century, Jehoiakim, Eliakim and Zadok appear as Mary's ancestors but her father is called Yônâkhîr.[405] James of Edessa who provided us earlier with the name of Joachim's father, writes that Mary is the 'daughter of David, sperm of Joachim, descendant of Eve, offspring of Anna'.[406]

Amann uses Tischendorf's argument that in the Babylonian *Talmud* (i.e. the *Bavli* which dates to 600),[407] Mary is the daughter of Heli or Jehojakim and that in Luke (Luke 3.23) she is the daughter of Heli, which Tischendorf sees as an ongoing tradition around that name as Mary's father.[408] However, as I have demonstrated there was not a common tradition around the nanes of Mary's parents. Different texts and the different versions of the *Protevangelion* were responsible for variations in the names of Mary's forebears. The Greek version of the *Protevangelion* survived in one hundred and forty-two copies,[409] but despite its popularity, it was not influential in spreading a common tradition around Mary's parents. It seems that writers were interested in providing the genealogy of Mary from the third century onwards (Demetrios of Antioch), but were cautious enough not to show that the *Protevangelion* was among the sources they used. Instead they blended its information with variations of the Greek text, as it seems to be the case in Syria, and formed additional traditions around Mary's parents.

---

[404] Constas (ed.) 2003:260-3.
[405] Budge (trans.) 1927:233 (text) , p. 21-2 (for the date); Ignatius Aphram I Barsoum 2003:50 n.2.
[406] Nau 1901:512; Repeated in Andrew of Crete, see PG 97:816A: 'θυγάτηρ τοῦ Δαβὶδ, σπέρμα τοῦ Ἰωακείμ, ἀπόγονος τῆς Εὔας, γέννημα τῆς Ἄννης'. Also in Epiphanios of Salamis: 'A woman (= Mary) through her mother Anna, through her father Joachim [...] of the house and lineage of David' (ἐκ μητρὸς Ἄννης καὶ ἐκ πατρὸς Ἰωακείμ [...] ἐξ οἴκου καὶ πατρίας τοῦ Δαυίδ), see CMP 1973:188. See also the title of Andrew's second and third homily on the Nativity, see PG 97: 820D, 844 B-C.
[407] Neusner (trans.) 2006: 51,71.
[408] Amann 1910:51. Réau sees the name Joachim as a form of Eliachim, which is the diminutive of Heli. See Réau 1957: 156 n.1
[409] Cothenet 1988:4225.

Before I move on to the homiletic production around Mary's parents from the eighth century onwards and the role of the kontakion written by Romanos Melodos in the sixth century, I will discuss one view expressed by the editor of the oldest surviving copy of the *Protevangelion*, De Strycker, who made a connection between the dogma of the 'Immaculate Conception' an the Annunciation of St Anna and believed that his view is supported by the fourth-century writer Epiphanios, bishop of Salamis in Cyprus.

I need to clarify here that the term 'Immaculate Conception' will be used only when it is mistakenly adopted by modern scholars for Byzantium and since the term applies only to the Western Church, I will instead use the term 'miraculous conception'.[410]

De Strycker: Epiphanios of Salamis, Anna's conception and the dogma of the Immaculate Conception - Epiphanios' comment on Anna's conception

In his *Panarion*, a treatise of the heresies, Epiphanios refers to Anna's conception in the framework of a heresy called Kollyridians or Kollyritai after a group,[411] who worshiped Mary offering bread in her name and receiving Holy Communion from it.[412] Epiphanios commented on a word used by the angel to announce to Joachim that Anna was pregnant and in particular to the past perfect tense used in the word 'conceive' (i.e. has conceived). Epiphanios writes that this word had prophetic meaning, namely the angel fortified what was about to take place, to show that it actually happened.[413] The text reads: 'Because if also the story and the traditions of Mary say that it was said to her father Joachim in the desert that your wife has conceived, < but > not without the husband and

---

[410] I owe this observation to Mary Cunningham. The phrase 'Immaculate Conception' is not found in any Byzantine liturgical book, see Ledit 1976: 107.

[411] CMP 1974:315. For the Kollyridians, Epiphanios and Mary's cult in the fourth century, see Showmaker 2008:371-401. 'A name given by Epiphanius to a group does not imply that it was, necessarily, an organised body', see Taylor 1990:324. 'When discussing the Collyridians, Epiphanius again shows influence from the Protoevangelium of James, even though he is explicitly leery about its trustworthiness', see Limberis 1994: 119.

[412] CMP 1974:315. For Epiphanios' life and writings, see Nautin 1963:618-631.

[413] Holl (ed.) 1933:480.

not without sperm of man, but the angel that was sent institutes what would take place in the future so that there will be no doubt that it actually happened and that what was ordered by God was announced to the righteous'.[414]

De Strycker's explanation of Epiphanios' comment

According to the editor of the *Protevangelion*, De Strycker, Epiphanios commented on the past tense used by the author of the *Protevangelion* to support the argument that Anna had already conceived before Joachim left to the desert, which contradicts Mary's miraculous conception implied in the second-century text; and he argues that in the three earliest versions of the *Protevangelion*, the Papyrus Bodmer V, the Syriac and the Latin version the past perfect is preserved.[415] De Strycker agrees with an already expressed view that 'the form ''she conceived'' would not be accepted because it implies nuptial union and male sowing',[416] and suggests that Epiphanios felt the need to explain the use of the past sense, since the dogma of the Immaculate Conception was challenged. This is the reason De Strycker thinks that this comment had great influence on later Byzantine copies of the *Protevangelion*, because copyists altered the text from past perfect to future tense.[417] The above argument was accepted by literature historians such as Elliott, and art historians such as Lafontaine-Dosogne and Thierry.[418]

Evaluation of De Strycker's comment

---

[414] ibid. 480. Amidon (trans.) 1990:354; Sawyer 1996:89-90.

[415] De Strycker (ed.) 1961:81, n.3; De Strycker1980:582; De Strycker and Louvain 1964:358. De Strycker argues that the Syriac and Ethiopian versions of the *Protevangelion*, which are closer to the original Greek, kept the past tense, see De Strycker (ed.) 1961:81.n.3; Elliott (trans.) 1993:48.

[416] AASS July 6: 234A : 'Non ita accipiendum est, quasi hoc citra nuptialem consociationem ac virilem satum acciderit'.

[417] De Strycker (ed.) 1961:81 n.3. For the changes in later copies of the *Protevangelion*, see De Strycker 1980:582. Most manuscripts used future tense but under the influence of Epiphanios the perfect tense was considered authentic, see Schmaus and Grillmeier and Scheffczyk and Seybold 1971: 25.

[418] Elliott 2008:64-5; Thierry 1994:223; Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992:103 (where she names the Conception of Anna as the 'Immaculate Conception').

The purity of Mary lies in the fact that she was spotless before she was conceived, because the sperm of her father and the foetus of her mother was pure and make Mary pure before and after her conception.[419] Similarly to other fourth-century writers, such as Athanasios of Alexandria and Ephrem the Syriac,[420] Epiphanios does not challenge Mary's purity, since he believed that 'all men apart from Christ have been born through man's sperm.'[421] At the same time he writes that 'it is not possible to worship a woman (Mary) who was born in a natural way,[422] and that (Mary) 'did not gain her body other than by the conception between a man and a woman'.[423] These two phrases show that Anna's conception is not connected to Mary's conception. Similarly to De Strycker, Peretto too recognises in the text of Epiphanios the promotion of the dogma the Immaculate Conception. He claims that the perfect tense used in some manuscripts of the *Protevangelion* does not pertain to the virginal conception of Anna but to the conception, which came before Joachim left for the desert.[424] De Strycker associated the dogma of the Immaculate Conception with Anna's conception, which is wrong since the Immaculate Conception refers to Mary's state of purity at the moment of her conception of Christ and not to Anna's way of begetting Mary. Additionally, the conception of Anna was never an issue of debate among Byzantine writers. As we will see, Byzantine views about Anna's conception was determined by how closely homilists followed the *Protevangelion* which supports conception though prayer.[425] And the future tense in particular did not apparently create any theological issue for Byzantine homilists, since a number of homilists use this

---

[419] Grumel 1937:337.
[420] Brakke 1995:277; Krüger 1952: 59-75.
[421] CMP 1972:146. But even if he did so, a belief in Mary's purity does not equal the dogma of the 'Immaculate Conception'. I owe this observation to Mary Cunningham.
[422] Holl (ed.) 1933:480.
[423] CMP 1971:198.
[424] Peretto 1954:250, 252.
[425] De Strycker (ed.) 1961:68, 74, 78; Tischendorf (ed.) 1853:6-8.

tense : John of Euboea (eighth century),[426] Patriarch Tarasios (730-806),[427] George of Nikomedia (ninth century),[428] James Kokkinobaphos (twelfth century),[429] Neophytos the Recluse (twelfth century),[430] and Nikephoros Kallistos (1256-1335).[431]

To summarise, the dogma of the Immaculate Conception was never formed in the Eastern Church in the way it has been in the Western church and in Epiphanios' case it was never connected to Anna's conception. Epiphanios in his clarification of the use of the past tense with a future meaning, simply wished to highlight that Mary was predestined to give birth to Christ, to fulfil the plan for the salvation of humanity.

The sixth century: Romanos Melodos and the Protevangelion

Before I move on to eighth-century homiletics, and since there is no consistent textual production around Mary's parents during the seventh century, a few comments should be made on the cult of Anna and Joachim in the Byzantine capital in the sixth century. As we saw earlier, the reference to Mary's parents revolves around Mary's lineage and in few exceptional cases, such as Pseudo-Eustathios, writers copied their story from the *Protevangelion*. I have also argued that Gregory of Nyssa plced for the first time Mary's parents in a liturgical context.

The second time this happends is in the sixth century where Romanos Melodos wrote the first hymn for the celebration of Mary's Nativity.[432] This work has been considered by scholars as evidence for the celebration for the feast of Mary's Nativity in Constantinople and for the emergence of Anna's and Joachim's cult in Byzantium.[433]

---

[426] PG 96:1476B-C. Translation in Cunningham 2006:136. Amann sees the homilies of John of Euboea as a testimony for the celebration of Anna's Conception, see Amann 1910: 133.
[427] PG 98:1485; Kazhdan and Talbot 1991-2:95.
[428] PG 100: 1368D.
[429] PG 126:560.
[430] PO 16: [105].
[431] PG 145: 652B.
[432] Pitra (ed.) 1876:198-207.
[433] Discussed in chapter three.

Based on this kontakion where Romanos copies or paraphrases the *Protevangelion*,[434] Vincent and Abel have argued for the great influence of the apocryphal text on the Eastern liturgy.[435] At the same time, Vincent and Abel continue: 'a church was dedicated to St Anna in Constantinople. And I do not know if Byzantium was only imitating the holy city in this homage returned to the ancestress of Christ, but it is possible that Jerusalem did not have had to construct a new edifice to honour the saint there, because the church in the Probatic pool was sufficient'.[436] They namely argue that the popularity of the Protevangelion in the East, shown in the kontakion of Romanos, resulted in the construction of the church of St Anna in Constantinople, a view also supported by Freytag.[437]

The influence of the *Protevangelion* is attested from the last third of the fifth century,[438] and can be proved at least by the number of surviving copies. Vincent's and Abel's argument that St Anna was honoured in Jerusalem in the sixth century should be treated with cautiousness as there are extremely few examples of churches dedicated to Anna in Jerusalem and dated from the Byzantine period (the CIAP records one),[439] and the liturgical evidence (discussed in chapter three) do not show a distinctive from Mary veneration of Anna. The connection they are trying to make between Romanos' kontakion with Anna's church in Constantinople and the Probatike and its use as evidence for Anna's cult is ungrounded since in the kontakion of Romanos, Anna and Joachim are included because of their parental relationship to Mary. Romanos copied from the *Protevangelion* as it was the only source of information for the early years of Mary's life. Consequently, it

---

[434] Amann 1910:133.
[435] Vincent and Abel 1922:674.
[436] ibid. 674.
[437] Freytag 1985:110-111.
[438] Verhelst 2006:443 n.23.
[439] In the early Byzantine period a basilica was built in the memory of St Anna in Bayt Jibrin (Eleutheropolis) and its today ruins are located southwest of Jerusalem in modern Nahal Govrin, see CIAP 1999:109, 114; Pringle 2007: no 223.

was for reasons of necessity rather than of preference that this text was chosen.[440] For these reasons, it is unsafe to propose that a literary work primarily destined to praise the Virgin, and an architectural work destined to praise the Virgin's mother can be used as evidence of a growing cult of St Anna in Constantinople in the sixth century. It may well be an indication but first we should always keep in mind Justinian's role in the promotion of Anna and avoid general application of his actions and if we compare it to happens after the eighth century in text and topography, then the sixth century is not the starting date for the widespread veneration of St Anna.

To summarize, writers from the third until the seventh century were concerned with Mary's genealogy, were aware and made use of the *Protevangelion*. The apocryphal nature of the *Protevangelion* prevented writers from naming their source for Mary's early life but in no way did it prevent them from becoming interested in it and writing about it. The absence of Mary's parents from the patristic period is also the result of the lack of references to Mary,[441] and it is only after Mary started being intensively promoted in Byzantine art and homilies, that Mary's parents start to emerge in Byzantine thought.

Part 2. *St Anna and Joachim in Byzantine homilies*

Introduction

The eighth century marks a change in the way the Byzantines viewed Anna and Joachim. It is the time when homilies on Mary's early life appeared and continued to do so until the fifteenth century, the chronological limit for this study. As De Strycker has correctly put it, in the turn from the seventh- to the eighth century the *Protevanglion* was included in hagiographical and homiletic works in connection with the formation of a concrete Constantinopolitan liturgy and the establishment of Marian feasts.[442]

---

[440] Chevalier 1938: 57.
[441] Cameron 1978: 87 n.5.
[442] De Strycker 1980: 584-5.

Despite the interest in Marian homilies in the recent years Byzantine scholarship has not looked upon the way homilists refer to Anna and Joachim.[443] In this section I will show that the continuous interest in Mary's early life (conception of Anna [i.e. conception of Mary by Anna], Mary's Nativity, Mary's Presentation) from the eighth century onwards marks an ideological shift, which is the theological background for the composition of these homilies: the need of the Iconophiles to support the dogma of Incarnation, to emphasize Christ's humanity, his earthly origins and thus his physical forbearers. I have collected common themes that appear in homilies and other liturgical texts of the middle and late Byzantine period to show how the Byzantines referred to Anna and Joachim. The grouping of themes will show that homilists were more or less revolving around the same topics or that they attributed and exposed the same values to Mary's parents. First I will deal with the themes that appear often in homilies and those that appear less often or *hapax* will be analyzed at the end of the chapter.

The homily on Mary's Nativity composed by John of Damaskos and its importance for the further treatment of the subject

Gregory of Nyssa and Romanos Melodos where the first to place Mary's parents in a liturgical context, but the first homilist to celebrate the Nativity of Mary as part of his deep neveration of Mary, is John of Damaskos whose homily needs to be treated separately by other homilies because the motives and images he uses are used by later homilists on the same occasion.

First the story of Anna and Joachim as recounted in the *Protevangelion* is not mentioned. For example, the apocryphal texts explicitly refers to Anna's breastfeeding,[444] from which John of Damaskos quickly moves away in the sentence 'O most holy little

---

[443] The most recent work is Mary Cunningham's translation of eighth-century Marian homilies. See Cunningham (trans.) 2008.
[444] De Strycker (ed.) 1961:94.

daughter: you were nourished on breast-milk and surroundend by angels!'.[445] Moreover, we saw earlier that John of Damaskos pays respect to the house of Joachim in the Probatike, despite the fact that this location is not mentioned in the story of Anna and Joachim in the *Protevangelion*. Instead John of Damaskos uses biblical prefigurations of Mary's birth to underline the role of Anna and Joachim and their involvement in the salvation of mankind. This is achieved by their giving birth to Mary, an event prophecied in the Holy Scripture: 'But why has the Virgin Mother been born from a sterile woman? For that which alone is new under sun, the culmination of miracles, 'the way had to be prepared by means of miracles, and what was greater had to advance slowly from what was more humble'.[446] Anna's birth of Mary is included in the number of events (miracles) which prepared the birth of Christ , this is why it 'was greater' than the story of the Anna and Joachim, which 'was more humble' and it is why the homilist exludes the story of *Protevangelion*. But, the fact that John of Damaskos does not refer to the story of the *Protevangelion* does not deprive the text of its value. The respect shown by the composer for Anna and Joachim is wedded to biblical quotations making this homily the first example where Mary's parents are connected to the Holy Scripture, which will be developed from the ninth century onwards by Niketas the Paphlagonian.[447]

Another feature is the importance of the event of the nativity, which necessitates its majestic and wide celebration: 'Let us joyfully celebrate the nativity of joy for the whole world!',[448] or elsewhere 'Let the whole of creation make festival ans sing the most holy birth-giving of the holy Anna',[449] supported also by the eighth-century composer Andrew of Crete.[450]

---

[445] ibid. 63;PG 96:672B.
[446] Cunningham (trans.) 2008 :54; PG 96:664A.
[447] Discussed later in this chapter.
[448] Cunningham (trans.) 2008 :53;PG 96:661A.
[449] ibid. 54;PG 96:661C.
[450] ibid. 108.

Moreover, John of Damaskos belongs to the group of homilists that hold that Mary was conceived through sexual intercourse placed under God's grace, a view, supported by and Andrew of Crete and Patriarch Photios (ninth century).[451] He writes: 'Having conducted yourselves piously and blessedly in human nature, you (= Anna and Joachim) have now given birth to a daughter...'.[452] Andrew of Crete and Patriarch Photios embrace the view of John of Damaskos on the difficulty of the mind to understand through a logical process a miracle of such grace, such as the conception of the Mary by her woman: 'Nature has been defeated by grace and stands trembling, no longer ready to take the lead'.[453] However, as I will demonstrate later in this chapter, the marvelousness of the Mary's conception by Anna is based on the vindication of Christ's nativity by Mary in early Christian homilies.

Two additional features are attested in this Nativity homily, the demonstration of tenderness between Anna and Mary and anti- Jewish polemic.

John of Damaskos offers tender however discrete motherly images between Mary and her mother (which will be expanded by George of Nikomedia in the ninth century) : 'Blessed are the arms that carried you and the lips which tasted your pure kisses – the lips only of your parents that you might always be a virgin in every way!'.[454] A combination of tender images with anti-Judaic polemic which will be particularly developed by later homilists is shown in the following sentence : 'O most holy daughter : while still carried in your mother's arms you were a source of fear to all the rebellious powers! O most holy little daughter: you were nourished on breast-milk and surroundend by angels!'.[455] As I will demonstrate later, of all homilies written on Anna's Conception, Mary's nativity and

---

[451] For Photios and the Nativity of Mary, see p.118. For Andrew of Crete, see Cunningham (trans.) 2008: 80; PG 97:816C.

[452] Cunningham (trans.) 2008 :60;PG 96:670A.

[453] ibid. 54;PG 96:664A.

[454] ibid. 61;PG 96:669B. For George of Nikomedia and the tender images he creates between Anna and Mary, see later in this chapter.

[455] ibid. 63.PG 96:672B.

Mary's Presentation to the temple anti-Jewish polemic was used almost exclusively in homilies of Mary's Presentation, a detail which we see here for the first time. Of course the homily under discussion is not dedicated to the Presentation of Mary but to her Nativity. However, the context in which John of Damaskos places the negative response of the Jews towards Mary is during her Presentation which is implied by Mary nourishing by an angel during her sojourn in the temple. A second example of anti-jewish polemic in this homily is the characterisation of the Jews as the Judaic 'thorns' from which Mary rose.[456] This is not a reference to her parents but to the the Jews who challenged her write to enter the temple.

Finally, a brief comment on the authenticity of the work. Kotter has included it in the spurious works of John of Damaskos,[457] Laourdas excludes the possibility that John of Damaskos has written any homily on Mary's Nativity,[458] Antonopoulou refers to 'Pseudo-John of Damaskos' as the composer of a homily on Mary's Nativity.[459] Cunningham however has argued that there is evidence to show that the Nativity homily could be attributed to John of Damaskos although 'we will never be able to prove this attribution conclusively'.[460] To Cunningham's comment one should add a further element to show that the homily may have actually been written in the eighth century, although notr necessarily by John of Damaskos. This is the similar treatment of the story of the *Protevangelion* in this homily to the four Nativity homilies of Andrew of Crete (eighth century). Amann and recently Cunningham have detected Andrew's 'discrete allusion to the Protevangelion' and his 'vagueness on account of its apocryphal nature'.[461] As I showed above, the same occurs in the homily under discussion. The attitude of Andrew of

---

[456] Cunningham (trans.) 2008 :61;PG 96:669B.
[457] Kotter (ed.) 1988:159-182.
[458] Laourdas (ed.) 1959:53* n.1.
[459] Antonopoulou 1997:163 and n. 8.
[460] Cunningham (trans.) 2008 :45. She has included this homily in her latest work on eight-century Marian homilies, see ibid.53-70. Podskalsky considers it as authentic, see Podskalsky 2006: 230.
[461] Amann 1910: 119; Cunningham (trans.) 2008:87-8 n. 9.

Crete towards the *Protevangelion* has been explained by Kazhdan as the result of Andrew's aim to show that the *Old Testament* prefigures the birth of Christ.[462] The same is valid for John of Damaskos but I would push this concept a little further. The reason behind the lack of reference to the story of Anna and Joachim marks the end of a long tradition where the *Protevangelion* was being excluded from the writings of the Orthodox, despite the interest in Mary's lineage from the third century onwards. John of Damaskos and Andrew of Crete are the first and last examples where the story of the *Protevangelion* is elusively used since their presentation of the text denotes their wish to underline the biblical prefigurations of Mary's birth rather than explain the spiritual meaning of Mary's life recounted in the apocryphal text. This 'task' is left up to ninth century preachers to complete. Nevertheless, we need to acknowledge that John of Damaskos and Andrew of Crete in particular who in the latter's mention of 'the untouched flowers of Scripture's spiritual meadowns',[463] gives scriptural notion to the life of Mary before Christ.

Comparison with biblical figures:

 Anna – Hanna – Sarah

In order to justify similarities or the importance of Anna and Joachim over *Old Testament* couples, who could not conceive at an early age either, Byzantine homilists draw parallels with them. The comparison of Anna with biblical mothers is attested for the first time in the *Protevangelion*, where Anna in her lament over her sterility brings to mind Sarah, the mother of Isaac.[464] Peter of Argos in particular writes that 'It was a good choice for these people to become a couple and it is proved in their birth of Mary'.[465] The nucleus around which a parallelism is drawn between the apocryphal couple and biblical

---

[462] Kazhdan 1999 (2) :45.
[463] Cunningham (trans.) 2008:72; PG 97: 808B. See also Cunningham (trans.) 2008:104;PG 97:841D.
[464] De Strycker (ed.) 1961:74.
[465] PO 19 [348]; Boissonade (ed.) 1962:11.

ones is the birth of Mary, which surpasses all the previous births, as we can see in the work of Andrew of Crete, Peter of Argos (tenth century), and Isidore of Thessalonike (fourteenth century).[466]

When it comes to Anna, homilists usually compared her with Hanna, mother of Samuel, possibly because of name conjunction.[467] Byzantine homilists elaborate on this comparison to justify the superiority of apocryphal Anna to the biblical women who had problems conceiving a child. George of Nikomedia sees similarities in the two women in their time of prayer for a child: The biblical Hanna was praying silently without voice, which made Helei mock her thinking she was drunk.[468] The mockery that Hanna experienced by the members of her tribe made the apocryphal Anna think that she would be mocked as well, so she decided to pray in her garden and not in a church.[469] The peacefulness the garden offered Anna and allowed her to pray undistracted appears especially in George of Nikomedia due to his emphasis on prayer.[470] Divergence from the apocryphal account is attested in Andrew of Crete, Leo VI and Nikephoros Gregoras, in the homilies of whom the garden is replaced by a sanctuary or a house.[471] The superiority of Anna to Hanna and other biblical figures who were sterile is demonstrated in panegyric tone in Leo's VI Nativity homily: 'another Anna (= Hanna) gives birth, and (like you) she received child as a gift for her prayer, but (she bore) a servant ('λειτουργός') [...].[472] But you give birth to the queen of heaven and earth. Only you give birth to the mother of God,

---

[466] PG 97: 841B-C; Kyriakopoulos 1976: 24:53-6,32 : 219-237,122-123:108-144; PG 139: 28B.

[467] PG 45 1137D, CSCO 479:3. 'Mary's mother is a replica of Anna, mother of Samuel', see De Strycker and Louvain 1964:357.

[468] Samuel 1,1.12-13. George of Nikomedia quotes the biblical text in PG 100:1364C-1365B-C and Patriarch Tarasios in PG 98: 1485B. The prayer of Hanna and the prayer or lament of Anna have striking iconographical similarities. See for example the prayer of Hanna in Morey 1929: fig.29; Der Nersessian 1965: fig.11, 12

[469] 'δεδοικυῖα μή τι τῶν τοιούτων πάθοι', PG 100: 1365D ; 'Αὐτοὶ (= the Jews) [...] καίτοι μὴ κραυγὴν ἀφιείσης τῆς μακαρίας, μηδὲ φωναῖς ἀτάκτοις τοῖς ἀκροωμένοις ἐνοχλούσης, ταῦτα ἔσκωπτον', see PG 100:1364C. The term 'μακαρία' is first used for the biblical Hanna: 'Ταῦτα δὲ καὶ ἡ μακαρία Ἄννα εἴρηκε, τὸν χαριστήριον ὕμνον προσφέρουσα τῷ Θεῷ·', see (Eusebios) PG 23: 1352D.

[470] PG 100: 1392D-1393A-B.

[471] PG 97: 816C; Antonopoulou (ed.) 2008:225; Leone 1991: 15: 276-7. However, it could be that Nikephoros wrote this because Anna lamented in the garden of her house.

[472] Lampe 1961:796.

only you are the grandmother of God'.[473] Leo VI was Patriarch Euthymios' spiritual child and this phrase has been likewise used by the Patriarch in his enkomion on Anna's Conception,[474] and it is repeated by Peter of Argos in tenth century.[475]

The comparison with biblical women in homilies is likewise made in kontakia on Mary's ealry life. In a kanon of Mary's Nativity Anna is compared to Sarah, where God appears to say: 'I opened the belly of Sarah and now I make the sterile womb, fertile'.[476] And with Hanna, mother of Samuel: 'see that I am God, who gave my mother, an honoured fruit, to Anna like I provided in the past Samuel, the interpreter, fruit of prayer to Anna'.[477]

Joachim – Abraham – Moses

According to the *Protevangelion*, in his lament over his childlessness Joachim compares himself with Abraham, because – contrary to himself – in his last days God gave him a child, Isaac.[478] To George of Nikomedia however, Joachim is superior to Abraham, which George justifies in five key-points: God promised land to Abraham and the childbirth of Sarah so Abraham was hoping and expecting for the fulfilment of both promises. On the contrary, nothing was promised to Joachim which is why he left his wife.[479] Abraham sacrificed his son as he was ordered by God but Joachim offered Mary of

---

[473] Antonopoulou (ed.) 2008:227. Mary's Nativity in the *Protevangelion* was influenced by the Nativity stories of John the Baptist and Samuel, see Amann 1910: 51.

[474] PO 19 (2) [333].

[475] Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976: 120: 76-7. The word 'grandmother' signifies both Anna and Eve, see Toniolo 1971: 64:29, 66: 134 (Homily of Michael Psellos on Mary's Presentation). Peter of Argos compares Anna to Hanna and Sarah, mother of Isaac, see Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976: 166:280-287.

[476] Debiasi Gonzato (ed.) 1966: 147. For the comparison between Anna and biblical women in the work of Peter of Argos, see Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976:26, 32, 122. For the same connection in the work of George the hymnographer and Joseph the Hymnographer, see Pitra (ed.) 1876:279, 397; PG 106: 984-1000.

[477] Debiasi Gonzato (ed.) 1966: 147. For the translation of 'ὑποφήτης' as 'interpreter', see Lampe 1961:1464.

[478] De Strycker (ed.) 1961:66; Tischendorf (ed.) 1853:3.

[479] PG 100: 1389A-B. Abraham: 'Ἐκείνῳ μὲν γὰρ, ἥ τε μετανάστασις, καὶ ἡ ἐν οἷς ἂν παροικήσειεν ἐρρήθη γῆ· ἔτι μὴν, καὶ ἡ τῆς ἀπαιδίας καὶ στειρώσεως τῆς Σάρρας λύσις, ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀψευδοῦς προεπήγγελται· ἅπερ δὴ κατέχων ὑποσχέσει, τὴν μὲν ἐλπίδα ἔτρεφε, τὴν δὲ γνώμην πρὸς τὴν δι'αἰτήσεως ἐψυχαγώγει.[..] Καὶ ὁ μὲν, τεκμήριον τῆς τε κατασχέσεως τῆς γῆς, καὶ τῆς γένους ἐπιδόσεως δεῖται'. Joachim: 'Ὁ δὲ [...] πρὸς ἀφανῆ δὲ τὴν αὐτοῦ προμήθειαν τὰ τῆς ἐλπίδος ἐρείσας, οὕτω καὶ τὴν οἰκείων διάστασιν, καὶ τὴν ἔμμονον πρὸς αὐτὸν δι'ἐντεύξεως ποιεῖται ὁμιλίαν.[…] οὐχ ὡς ἂν ἐκβαίη τὸ εὐαγγελιζόμενον αἰτεῖται, οὐδέ τὰ δηλοῦντα σημεῖα τῆς ἀσθενούσης φύσεως τὴν ἴασιν, ἐπιζητεῖ'.

his own will.[480] Abraham offered his only male son, while Joachim offered the promise of the Logos.[481] Abraham took back his offering (son), while Joachim offered everything (= he never took Mary back).[482] Abraham offered the Patriarch of all tribes, a righteous man, while Joachim offered the mother of God, 'the most righteous Lady of all Patriarchs'.[483] George of Nikomedia proves Joachim's superiority over another model of saintity,[484] Moses,[485] because despite Moses' long stay on Mount Sinai, he was relieved by receiving the Law from God, while Joachim was alone and praying without end, not knowing what would follow.[486] Similarly, in his second homily on the Conception, Patriarch Euthymios writes that Moses received a written Law while Joachim received an unsaid promise.[487] In contrast to George of Nikomedia and Euthymios, Nikephoros Gregoras posits no superiority of Joachim over Abraham and Moses, but similarities with them. He writes that after the rejection of his gifts Joachim left for the mountain because, similarly to Moses, he believed that high mountains would deliver his supplication closer to God.[488] That Joachim's choice of the mountain reminds Moses is also supported by Joseph the Hymnographer (ninth century) in his kontakion on Mary's Conception.[489] Nikephoros

---

[480] ibid. 1389C Abraham: 'ὅπως μὲν ἐκεῖνος προστάξει, αὐτοπροαίρετος δὲ οὗτος ἱερούργησε'.

[481] ibid. 1389C Abraham: 'καὶ μονογενῆ μὲν, κυρίως, οὗτος'. Joachim: ἐκεῖνος δὲ, τῷ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας λόγῳ'.

[482] ibid. 1389C Abraham: 'καὶ ὅτι προσάξας μὲν ἐκεῖνος, τὸ ἱερεῖον ἀντικομίζεται'. Joachim: οὗτος δὲ [...] ὡλοκαύτωσε, καὶ ἀποδοὺς ἀνήνεγκε'.

[483] ibid. 1389C Abraham: 'καὶ πατριάρχην μὲν αὐτὸς φυλῶν, καὶ δίκαιον'.Joachim: 'μητέρα δὲ οὗτος Θεοῦ, καὶ δικαιοτάτην πατριαρχῶν Δέσποιναν'.

[484] Evangelatou 2006: 259.

[485] For the comparison of figures with Moses in Late Antiquity, see Rapp 1998: 277- 298. Shahid associates Justinian with the Madaba mosaic, since Madaba was Moses's place of action. Justinian built the monastery at Sinai, because of its association with Moses and because both of them were law-givers, see Shahid 1999:149-151.

[486] PG 100:1392A Moses: Ὁ μὲν γὰρ τῷ τοῦ προστεταχότος ὅρῳ, καὶ τῇ τῶν πλακῶν διατηρήσει, αὐτῇ τε τῇ ἀπεκδοχῇ τοῦ νομοδότου κατείχετο, ἄπερ σὺν ἐπισχύσει κρείττονι, τόν τε παρατεινόμενον χρόνον, καὶ τὴν ἀνάγκην ἀπεκούφιζε τῆς φύσεως'. Joachim: ὁ δὲ, ὑπ'οὐδενός τῶν ἄλλων ψυχαγωγούμενος, μόνη δὲ τῇ ἀδιαψεύστῳ ῥωννύμενος ἐλπίδι, τήν τε ἐρημίαν καὶ τοὺς ἀγῶνας ὑποδύεται, καί τὴν ἐπιτεταμένην προβάλλεται δέησιν'.

[487] PO 19 [333].

[488] Leone 1991:18: 350-5 and p.11:156-160.

[489] Pitra (ed.) 1876:397. For Joseph the Hymnographer, see Kazhdan and Talbot 1991-2: 57-8; Tomadakes 1971.

Gregoras attributes the same moral values such as generosity, modesty and justice to both Joachim and Abraham.[490]

Coon has correctly argued that 'Biblical prophets, who dwell in caves, hilltops and in the wilderness, validate their affinity with heaven by rejecting such human conventions as family and community'.[491] Joachim's action imitates biblical figures although his preponderance over them is defended by homilists because he is Mary's father. Overall, the message that the homilists conveyed through the comparison between Anna, Joachim and biblical figures is that although other pious sterile couples were granted a child after long supplications, Anna and Joachim superseded them because of the child they brought forth. As we will see, Mary is the point of reference for every aspect of Anna's and Joachim's superioty. Their relationship to Mary justifies their good qualities, decision, thoughts and their precedence over all biblical couples.

Fulfilment of prophecies

Pseudo-John the Theologian (sixth century?) has included Anna among the biblical figures that were present during Mary's Dormition: 'Then the twelve apostles carried her, and ... behold, Eve our mother came before us, and Anna the mother of Mary, and Elizabeth the mother of John the Baptist...'[492] This is the earliest connection of Anna with prophets and was further developed by later homilists.

In relation to their comparison with biblical figures, Mary's birth is the result of the fulfilment of biblical prophecies. Mary's exceptional birth signalled the salvation of humanity from sin and thus it is beyond comparison with any other birth. This motive is attested in kontakia and homilies on the Nativity of Mary throughout the middle and late

---

[490] Leone 1991:19:412-7.
[491] Coon 1977:13.
[492] Shoemaker 2002:392.

Byzantine period.[493] Leo VI writes for example that Mary's birth surpassed all births,[494] and in his kontakion on Mary's Nativity Anna appears to say: 'I am free from the bounds of sterility, Anna mystically shouts hymns toward God, here, I suckle the mother of the creator of all'.[495] The word mystically (μυστικῶς) should be understood as in types and prophesies,[496] since Mary's birth has been long prophesized in the Old Testament: Her birth is considered as the 'fulfilment of prophesies' and 'the end of God's proclamations.[497] In another kontakion on Mary's Nativity, Anna is asked how Mary grew in her womb and Anna replies she conceived although she was barren because of promise (δι' ἐπαγγελίας).[498] This association is perpetuated by George the Hymnographer (ninth century?), who in his kontakion on Mary's Nativity asks Anna to contemplate the prophecies that she completed by giving birth to Mary,[499] and concludes: 'O Anna, the prophets revealed those that pertain to the Virgin with loud voice'.[500] Visual evidence correspond perfectly with homilies and kontakia; in a twelfth-century icon from Mount Athos, St Anna is placed among prophets,[501] and in a fourteenth-century icon (possibly from Serbia) John the Baptist (who foresaw the advent of Christ) is joined with scenes from Mary's infancy.[502]

The prefiguration of Mary in the miracle of the three children in the fiery furnace is associated with Anna in kontakia on Mary's Nativity : 'God shows in [the miracle of] the children [in the furnace that a] bare woman [became] fruitful, and a barren one

---

[493] PG 97: 868B-873B; PG 96: 1480A-B; Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976 :30 :192-4 ; Veniamin (trans.) 2005: 20.
[494] Antonopoulou (ed.) 2008:226.
[495] Debiasi Gonzato (ed.) 1966: 147.
[496] Lampe 1961:894.
[497] Debiasi Gonzato (ed.) 1966: 119 (kontakion on the prefeast of Nativity of Mary).
[498] Pitra (ed.) 1876:277: Lampe 1961:505.
[499] Pitra (ed.) 1876:280-2. The name of George the Hymnographer is mentioned in kontakia for the feast of Mary's Presentation, where in the title we read 'poem of George' or 'hymn of modest George', see Sophronios 1940: 135-6. The identity of George the Hymnographer is not clear. Gonzato (Gonzato 1966: 416) identifies him with George of Nikomedia. Under the title 'poem of George', we find three canons on the prefeast of Mary's Nativity. See Gonzato 1966: 108-138; Sophronios 1937: 16.
[500] Pitra (ed.) 1876:282.
[501] Piatnitskiĭ 2000:110-111, fig. B90.
[502] ibid. 210.

[became a] happy mother ; and the child of the childless preludes the new child of the virgin; because the first marvelous mystery was of course a model for the second.[...] The prophesies of the past now became reality in you, Anna'.[503] The miracle of three children shows that Anna is now attributed with connotations given until then to her daughter and like Mary, she is a prefiguration of the human salvation that was achieved by her birth of Mary.

In relation to Anna's prefigurational role, the following concept was developed in the seventh century by Epiphanios the Younger: Mary's parents are associated with the Holy Trinity. Epiphanios the Younger makes this connection, because Anna, Joachim and Mary 'offered glory to the Holy Trinity'.[504] The same connection is made by three eighth-century preachers Andrew of Crete, Patriarch Tarasios and John of Euboea. For Andrew of Crete the birth of Mary made Andrew aware 'of the culmination of faith in the Trinity. For whilst the Word [...] and Son brought about his own Incarnation, the Father [...] appeared in agreement, and the Holy Spirit [...] sanctified the womb of the one who conceived'.[505] For Tarasios Anna is the 'heirloom of the Trinity',[506] and in his homily on Conception of St Anna, John of Euboea explains the reason for this connection: 'Because Mary was dedicated to the temple on her third year as a gift, [as] a temple and [as] a throne'.[507] The reference to the throne gives eschatological connotations to Mary with which her parents are associated, because the throne refers to the Preparation of the Throne, which prefigures God's second coming to the earth.[508] Epiphanios the Younger

---

[503] Debiasi Gonzato (ed.) 1966: 121. Ἄκαρπον γαστέρα καρποφόρον καί στεῖραν εὐφραινόμενη μητέρα Θεός ἐπὶ τέκνα δείκνυσι, καὶ οἰμιάζεται τό τῆς ἀτέκνου κύημα τόκον παρθένου καινόν, ὑπόδειγμα γάρ ἦν τοῦ δευτέρου [...] Ῥήματα τὰ πρὶν προφητευθέντα εἰς πράγματα νύν, Ἄννα, προέβη ἐν σοί'. John of Damaskos makes also the connection between Mary and the mirracle in his first homily on Mary's Domrition, see PG 96:712C. 'Οὐ σὲ προεμήνυσε κάμινος, πῦρ δροσίζον ἅμα καὶ φλογίζον δεικνύουσα, καὶ τοῦ θείου πυρὸς ἀντίτυπον τοῦ ἐν σοὶ κατοικήσαντος;'. It is also attested in the *Akathistos* hymn, see Peltomaa 2001:165.
[504] PG 43: 488C.
[505] Cunningham (trans.) 2008:81; PG 97:817A-B.
[506] 'κειμήλιον τῆς Τριάδος', see PG 98: 1488.
[507] PG 96:1481A; Cunningham (trans.) 2008: 185; PG 100: 1417B: Ἔδει γὰρ τὸν τρισσὸν ἐν ἑαυτῇ τὴν ἄσπιλον προτιμῆσαι ἀριθμὸν, δι' ἧς τοῖς ἐν κόσμῳ ἡ τῆς Τριάδος ἐφανερώθη δύναμις'.
[508] Gerstel 1999:23.

explains that Joachim is the preparation of God, because the Virgin was prepared by Joachim for the temple of God, which denotes Mary's presentation in the temple.[509] Apart from the connection between the preparation of the Throne and Joachim, which it is established through Joachim's name, since this is what his name means in Hebrew,[510] the concept behind Epiphanios the Younger, Patriarch Tarasios and John of Euboea is that the biblical prophecies around the birth of Mary were fulfilled through Joachim and Anna and especially with their presentation of Mary in the Temple on Mary's third year of life.

Sterility, rebirth, destruction of Eve and Adam

The next theme links sterility, the destruction of sin in the world caused by Adam and Eve, rebirth and creation of a new world.[511] The idea that Mary is the new Eve passed on to Anna as well. In Kosmas Vestitor's (eighth century) homily on the parents of Mary, Anna is compared to Eve: '(Anna lived) not the way Eve lived with Adam […] (but) she was truly a better half […]. Eve became the pain for the world by means of a fruit of a tree, Joachim's Anna represented joy for the Creator by means of the fruit of her womb'.[512] I should note that although Anna is compared to Eve she is never mentioned as the 'new Eve' in contrast to Joachim who is named 'new Adam' by Leo VI.[513] It seems that this title was kept only for the Virgin, or most probably it may have been the result of Leo's emotional attachment to Joachim in whom he saw a personification of his struggle for a heir to the Byzantine throne as I showed in chapter one. It is an *hapax*, and we will see examples of unique characterisations of Anna in other homilies later on. Leo VI calls Joachim and Anna 'treasures through the loins of whom the shame of sterility (they

---

[509] PG 43: 488C.
[510] Herbermann 1910:779.
[511] PG 102B: 556B, Veniamin (trans.) 2005:2 (remaking of old Adam); PO 19 [364] (George Scholarios).
[512] PG 106: 1008A-B, translation in Cunningham (trans.) 2008:140.
[513] Antonopoulou (ed.) 2008:225.

experienced) by their tribesmen now brought the glory of having good children in the world'.[514] A more general association with the recreation of the world by Mary's parents is given by John of Damaskos, Patriarchs Tarasios and Euthymios and by George of Nikomedia, who claim that the Creator chose them to renovate the old world.[515]

As far as rebirth is concerned, the concept develops as follows: Through a sterile woman, a Virgin came forth;[516] through the Virgin, renewal became reality,[517] and Anna was reborn through Mary.[518] Although Anna gave birth to Mary, Mary's coming to the world renewed the whole world, thus she spiritually renewed her mother as well. This concept goes back to the *Gospel of John* where Nikodemos asks Christ whether a man can re-enter his mother's belly and reborn and Christ replied that if one is not baptized through water and Spirit one cannot enter the Kingdom of God (3:4). This statement has been taken up by Christian writers such as Ephrem the Syriac who in his sermon on the Nativity of Christ, has Mary address Christ as follows: 'Creator of your mother – in a second birth, through water'.[519] Anna's rebirth through Mary is also supported by Theodore bishop of Thessalonike in the fourteenth century.[520]

Royal descendance - Social Supremacy

---

[514] ibid. 221.
[515] PG 96:661C, 672B; PG 98:1492; PO 19 [327]; PG 100: 1384C.
[516] PG 100: 1356A.
[517] Veniamin (trans.) 2005:32.
[518] PG 139: 24.
[519] CSCO 83:76; Beck 1956:28-9; Kimbrough 2002:270. For Ephrem's reference to Baptism as a second womb, see Brock and Kiraz (trans.) 2006:191. Early Syriac Christianity developed a tradition of feminine symbols for aspects of the divine, see Ashbrook Harvey 1983:288-299; Ranft 1998:1-16; Brock 1979a:84-8.
[520] PG 139:24A.

George of Nikomedia notes that the composer of the *Protevangelion* sets the wealth of Joachim and Anna as a proof of their supremacy.[521] The financial well-being of Joachim is supported in the *Protevangelion* since he is mentioned as a rich man and owner of a large flock.[522] After his and his wife's annunciation of Mary's birth, Joachim offered part of his flock not only to the church authorities (since his first offerings were rejected because he had no offspring) but also to all his tribesmen.[523]

However, what is usually underlined in Byzantine homilies is Joachim's and Anna's supremacy based on genealogy and social aspects. Anna and Joachim are mentioned as royal plantation,[524] because they are considered descendants of David, king of Judea,[525] whom they imitate during prayer quoting passages from the Psalms.[526] Their genealogical relationship to David entered the *Synaxarion of Constantinople*, where they appear as members of royal tribes; Joachim of the tribe of David and Anna of David and Solomon.[527] The royalty of Anna is defended by the *Protevangelion* where she wears a royal band. According to this story, Anna's maid told Anna to wear a band of 'royal character' which however Anna did not because she was grieving for her sterility and Joachim's departure.[528] Since the *Protevangelion* places Mary in the very centre of the story, I think that Zamberlan places the royalty of Anna in correct context, when she argues that Anna's royal band in the *Protevangelion* shows 'the royal dignity of the woman who will be born by Anna'.[529] From the first appearance of Anna and Joachim in texts, they are highlighted as of exceptional social status. This view is perpetuated until the late Byzantine period when Nikolaos Kavasilas in the fourteenth

---

[521] In PG 100: 1385A: 'Εἶτα καὶ τὸν πλοῦτον, τεκμήριον τι τῆς ὑπεροχῆς ὁ συγγραφέας τεθεικὼς'.
[522] De Strycker (ed.) 1961: 64; Tischendorf (ed.) 1853:1.
[523] ibid. 82; ibid. 9.
[524] PG 100:1352C.
[525] PG 106:1005:B.
[526] PG 96:1472A.
[527] Delehaye (ed.) 1902:26; (Neophytos the Recluse) PO 16: 105, Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976:24:47-50, 26:103 ('ἱερατικοῦ καὶ βασιλικοῦ γένους'); PO 19 (1) [325]; PO 19 (2) [332]; PG 96: 669A.
[528] De Strycker (ed.) 1961:70; Tischendorf (ed.) 1853:4-5.
[529] Zamberlan 2000:100; Thierry 1996:268.

century acknowledges the elevated social status of Anna and Joachim by placing them above all military officers, lawgivers, priests, and leaders.[530]

But it is not only their social, financial well-being or origin that justifies their superiority over their tribesmen but also their spiritual values as John of Damaskos tells us in one of his homilies on the Dormition of Mary.[531] George of Nikomedia too strongly supports Anna's supremacy of origin based on her spiritual values, which are demonstrated in her calm reaction after the rejection of their gifts, an image that is contrasted to the absurdness and audaciousness of her rebukers.[532] In their abundant offering of gifts in the Temple, George of Nikomedia sees not the couple's richness, but their generosity and charity.[533] Joachim's and Anna's reaction with prayer after their rejection is what made them sustain the purity of their royal race and their royal virtues, as George of Nikomedia tells us.[534]

The twelfth-century text of the homilies of James of the Kokkinobaphos monastery is based on the ninth-century homilies of George of Nikomedia. The latter elaborated on the prerogative of Joachim to offer the gifts first (= earlier than the rest of his tribesmen). This word is missing from the *Protevangelion* as George of Nikomedia notes in his third homily on the Conception of Anna,[535] but it was also incorporated in the homily of James Kokkinobaphos who copied him.[536] Interestingly, in the surviving versions of the *Protevangelion* the word 'first' is there,[537] and Nikephoros Gregoras repeats this concept as well.[538] It could be that George of Nikomedia was using a different version

---

[530] PO 19 [348]; Nellas (ed.; trans.) 2010:44.

[531] PG 96:708A-B. This homily formed part of a trilogy of Dormition homilies. For their structure, see Chevalier 1938:65-8.

[532] PG 100: 1357C.

[533] ibid. 1341A, 1348C which appears also in his third homily on the Conception, see PG 100:1385B-C.

[534] ibid. 1337D and 1340A. ('πλουτοῦντες μὲν ἐν τῇ τῶν ἐκτὸς περιουσίᾳ, ὑπερπλουτοῦντες δὲ ἐν τῇ τῆς προαιρέσεως φιλοτομίᾳ').

[535] ibid. 1385D-1388A.

[536] Linardou 2004:25.

[537] De Strycker (ed.) 1961:66; Tischendorf (ed.) 1853:2-3.

[538] Leone 1991:10:102-3 'τὰ δῶρα πρῶτοι προσῆγον αὐτοί'.

of the *Protevangelion* which has not come down to us or that it is an invention to attract the audience's attention.

Models of endurance

The birth of Mary is the result of Anna's and Joachim's selection by God based on virtues they had as individuals.[539] Two of these virtues were their moderate reaction after the rejection of their gifts and their endurance in prayer following that rejection. These two characteristics were used by homilists to prove Anna's and Joachim's royal descendance – as shown above – but they have also been taken up to demonstrate their endurance in pain, which made them disregard feelings of arrogance or hatred towards their reproachers and act with modesty.

Gregory Palamas, following George of Nikomedia, praises Joachim and Anna as models for chastity, prayer and fasting,[540] and Peter of Argos recognises their modesty after the rejection in their quiet return home while crying.[541] However, George of Nicomedia and Nikephoros Gregoras need to be singled out for the way they elaborate on Anna's and Joachim's behaviour after the rejection.

In his homily on Mary's Presentation in the temple George of Nikomedia writes that Anna and Joachim were selected as Mary's parents because of their strong faith as they kept on praying for a child without showing disbelief. George of Nikomedia expresses all the thoughts that Anna did not have during her prayer: 'What if the oracle proves a forgery'? What if the perennial sterility does not meet the prophecy? Here, the age has passed. Here, the blossom of youth is withering. The happiness of childbearing is shown early in signs and the hope for a child comes when old.'[542] Anna did not raise

---

[539] Mai 1905:166 (George of Nikomedia).
[540] Veniamin (trans.) 2005:1-4,7.
[541] Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976 :28.132-3.
[542] Translation is not word-to-word, see PG 100:1431C-D.

doubts saying: 'Why am I concerned with prayer and the promise (of a child)?' but kept on praying.[543] 'Likewise, the prayer of the righteous was completed in works'.[544] George of Nikomedia emphasizes the element of prayer because, as Tsironis has argued, of his personal belief that 'it is through prayer that one relates personally to God'.[545] The words used for Joachim's refuge to pray in the desert recalls the prayer of desert Fathers and the order of words shows a process from 'καρτερία' (endurance) and ἐπιτεταμένη ἀσιτία' (continuous fasting), to ἀσαρκία' (state of no flesh).[546]

In his second homily on the Conception of Anna, George of Nikomedia highlights the endurance and patience of Anna in three cases: in the reproaches for her sterility by her tribesmen, in Joachim's leaving for the desert and in the reproaches of her maid. Her patience surpasses that of Joachim because she had to sustain the three of them.[547] To the first, she endured the reproaches without replying to the rebukers.[548] To the second, she was in pain because she was deprived of all the good of Joachim; for this reason and because of her bereavement she seeks the appearance of Joachim and seeks God, the provider of all good for children.[549] To the third, her maid's reproaches, Anna does not get angry, but took the peaceful space of her paradise (= garden), which is deprived of any kind of noise and in silence she prayed to God.[550] Anna's behaviour is in accordance with the advice that St Isaac the Syriac (seventh century) gives in his homily *On silence*: 'Silence is also an aid to stillness', and that 'if you love stillness [...] then take pleasure in

---

[543] 'Τί πρὸς δέησιν, καὶ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν ἐπασχολοῦμαι;'see PG 100:1413D.
[544] PG 100: 1413B.
[545] Tsironis 1998a:303.
[546] PG 100:1356D. Palamas repeats the same motif, see Veniamin (trans.) 2005:4. For 'the Conception through prayer and asceticism, see ibid. 7; For body purity through self control and prayer, see ibid. 13. The interest of Palamas is the benefits of prayer is shown in his homily *On the benefits of prayer*, see Christou (ed.) 2009:214-235.
[547] PG 100:1357B, 1392C-D. Neophytos the Recluse writes that they were two, the absence of Joachim and Anna's sterility, see PO 16:[106].
[548] PG 100:1357B.
[549] ibid. 1359A. Prayer as reaction to the reproaches is mentioned by Peter of Argos, see Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976: 28: 126-150.
[550] ibid. 1361B-1364A. According to Nikephoros Gregoras, Joachim chose the mountain because of the lack of noise and the quietness, see Leone 1991:11:154-5.

the small physical discomforts, harsh reproaches, and injustices...'.[551] Similarly, Joachim acted calmly and not arrogantly towards Ruben, the priest who reproached Joachim during the offerings of Joachim's gifts. To demonstrate Joachim's calm reaction John of Euboea writes: 'He did not take Rubem (sic) to court, nor curse him, swear at or threatened to hit him'.[552]

Another theme that appears in both George of Nikomedia and Gregory Palamas has to do with the perceptions of the tribesmen on the couple's sterility. George of Nikomedia explains that the negative reaction of the members of their tribe towards their infertility was because 'they (the Jews) were unfamiliar with the gifts that the Holy Spirit provides', 'they were more interested in the body,'[553] targeting in this way their lack of spirituality and thus the inability of the Jews to understand the works of God.[554] Gregory Palamas writes that Joachim and Anna were rejected for their sterility, without examining how blamelessly they lived before God.[555] The same approach is applied to Anna's reproach by her maid by George of Nikomedia 'To the reproach of the maid she considered that wearing the head cover is because of wrongdoing and although it is a royal one, and Anna was of royal origin, Anna did not wear it because although she was rich, she did not drag herself to unnecessary care of her body, even when she was young'.[556]

Similarly to George of Nicomedia, Nikephoros Gregoras uses the words 'struggle' and 'pain' for Anna and Joachim's prayers,[557] but he differs from him in the presentation of the events following the rejection of gifts until the annunciation to Anna and Joachim. This is done in highly dramatic tone, unique in the published corpus of the

---

[551] Holy Transfiguration Monastery 1984: 310, 316.
[552] PG 96: 1468B. The concept of hitting or swearing appears also in John Chrysostom's second homily on Hanna, see PG 54 650. Another function of cursing however was to secure the protection of houses, churches and tombs against violation or to guarantee that texts will not be forged. See Saradi 1994:442-5.
[553] '...σωματικώτερον οἱ τότε διέκειντο...', see PG 100: 1408C.
[554] PG 100:1408C-D.
[555] Chrisou 2008: 588, 590; Veniamin (trans.) 2005:3.
[556] PG 100:1360D.
[557] Leone 1991:11:143 ('athlets of virtue'), Leone 1991:19:381.

Conception, Nativity and Presentation homilies.[558] After the rejection, Anna and Joachim, 'had a tongue, but could not speak, [they had] madness of soul, surging of mind'.[559] After releasing 'smokes of sighs from the bottom of their sorrow, they went home benumbed and dragging their feet like they were dead'.[560] Because of the reproach, they experienced from their tribe 'they thought they would be persecuted by the eyes of God, which to them was worse than ten thousand deaths'.[561] Joachim's 'loneliness in the high mountain' he had chosen is paralleled with his 'cliff of laments',[562] and 'the rising of the sun' is contrasted with the 'darkness in his soul',[563] since he had 'no cure for his childlessness'. [564]Anna says that 'gushes of blood have painted her house' and have made her internal tragedy visible to the ones who could not see her'.[565] 'And if I manage to sleep a little, I am often ruffled in my heart, thinking that I hear reproaches for my sterility and I wake up like I have seen something terrifying'.[566] She is presented as so desolate that she 'cannot live in this shame'.[567]

The integrity and patience with which the couple faced the rejection, demonstrated the royalty of their origin, the endurance of their soul, their distinctiveness from all their tribesmen who were unable to perceive the majesty of Anna's and Joachim' soul. Their behaviour after this event justified a number of characteristics attributed to them by Byzantine homilists, as we will see in the following section.

Anna and Joachim as individuals

---

[558] For a review of the themes that appear in the Presentation homilies, see Anastasiou 1959: 89-103.
[559] Leone 1991:10 :115-6.
[560] ibid. 10-11:123-6. I find the translation of Lampe 1966: 1031 of 'παρέλκω' as 'distract' or 'delay' not suitable in this case. The smoke from intensive thinking appears also in Chrysostom's first homily on Hanna, see PG 54:633.
[561] Leone 1991:11:135-7.
[562] ibid. 12:181-6.
[563] Zamberlan 2000:100; Leone 1991:13: 218-220.
[564] Leone 1991:14: 236.
[565] ibid. 16: 286.
[566] ibid. 16: 301-5.
[567] ibid. 16: 290.

In Byzantine texts, the spiritual qualities that define Anna and Joachim justify their selection by God to become a couple and result in their actions and thoughts throughout the story of the *Protevangelion*. The soteriological plan for the salvation of mankind was completed by people who were loved by God and this is why they were chosen to bring this work to an end:[568] since their qualities were rewarded by Anna's giving birth to Mary. Anna is chaste,[569] Godly-minded,[570] modest,[571] holy,[572] generous,[573] righteous,[574] wise,[575] most brave,[576] most glorious,[577] wholly blessed,[578] named after grace,[579] and with a flaming love for God.[580] Anna is given more attributes that Joachim who is mentioned as admirable,[581] most holy,[582] and having God's grace inside him,[583] chosen by God,[584] and (most) righteous.[585]

Anna and Joachim as a couple

---

[568] Themelis 1931:300 (Menaion of September, eleventh century); 'θεόλεκτον ζεύγος' (God-chosen couple) in PG 139:49; PO 19 [349]; PG 127: 564C (section not copied from George of Nikomedia).

[569]'σώφρων' in Themelis 1931:300 (Menaion of September, eleventh century), Debiasi Gonzato (ed.) 1966:147; Lampsides (ed.) 1975:109.

[570] 'Θεόφρων' in George of Nikomedia PG 100: 1356D, PG 98: 1488; Sophronios 1940:427 (sticheron on Anna's Conception), Debiasi Gonzato (ed.) 1966: 151 (canon on Mary's Nativity); Pitra (ed.) 1876:396 (kontakion on Mary's Conception); Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976: 128: 230, 236.

[571] 'τὸ ταπεινόφρον τῆς Ἄννης' (the modesty of Anna) in PG 100: 1360D.

[572] (James Kokkinobaphos) PG 127: 588D; Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976:116:20 (most holy).

[573] 'μεγαλόψυχος' in PG 100:1369B; PG 127:561B and 588D.

[574] 'δικαία' (Neophytos the Recluse) PO 16; Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976:116:20; PG 100:1356D. 'δικαία' was a invocation for Anna the prophetess, see Munitiz (ed.) 1997:27:13.

[575]Christou (ed.) 2009: 252 (term used for both Anna and Joachim). This word used for Hanna, mother of Samuel: 'Ταῦτα καὶ Ἱερεμίας καὶ ἡ σοφωτάτη Ἄννα διέξεισι·', see (Eusebios) PG 23:1300A.

[576] 'γενναιοτάτη' PG 100:1361B; PG 127:556B.

[577]' Ἄννα ἡ παμφανὴς', see PO 16 [78].

[578] Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976:128:236.

[579] PG 98: 1488; Lampsides (ed.) 1975:109;PG 100:1365D; Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976:24:48-9.

[580] 'φιλοθεΐα διάπυρος' in PG 100:1357A; She also appears as exaggerating in her love for God (ὑπερβολῇ φιλοθεΐας) in PG 100: 1372A.

[581] 'θαυμάσιος' in PG 139: 49. 'Θαυμαστός' in Eustratiades (ed.) 1931:128:205 and Pitra (ed.) 1876:396.

[582] Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976:32:227; Also in kontakia, see Pitra (ed.) 1876:199.

[583] Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976:32:205 ('χάρις ἡ ἔνθεος'); 'ἔνθεος' in Eustratiades (ed.) 1931:128:206.

[584] 'θεόληπτος', in Christ and Paranikas (eds) 1871:7-8.

[585] Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976:32:219 (' ἀπάντων δικαίων σεμνολόγημα'); PG 100:1357B-C.

Since Anna and Joachim share great qualities as individuals, when these individuals become a pair then these qualities are intensified. Thus they were God-minded,[586] loved by God,[587] holy,[588] the first-fruit of new grace.[589] John of Damaskos describes them as 'pair of turtle-doves', a unique image of them as a beloved couple.[590] Their characterisation as couple takes various forms: they are a holy couple,[591] a blessed couple,[592] and a 'holy duality'.[593]

But despite their promotion as a beloved couple generally in homilies, in the first homily on the Nativity written by Andrew of Crete it is Anna who demonstrates love for her husband, while Joachim's portrait as a good husband is missing. Joachim is presented as pious man, who lived in moderation, was faithfull but childless but Anna was all the above plus she 'loved her husband'.[594] Similar treatment of Anna's love for Joachim is demonstrated by George of Nikomedia: Joachim leaves the house without informing Anna of his decision, which is the reason why she laments her husband wondering whether to grieve for him or to consider him lost.[595] Apart from not knowing what happened, due to Joachim's absence Anna was in pain because she was deprived from all the good of Joachim's presence.[596] Her reaction with prayer in the work of George of Nikomedia follows the account of the *Protevangelion*: 'Anna removed her funerary and wedding

---

[586] Neophytos the Recluse PO 16:[106].

[587] PO 16 [80] 'καὶ οὕτως δυνησόμεθα πλησιάσαι ταῖς ἀρεταῖς τοῖς θεαρέστοις ἀνδράσιν Ἰωακείμ τε καὶ Ἄννῃ'.

[588] PG 43: 488C; Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976:32:238 ('προπάτορες ἁγιώτατοι')

[589] 'Τὰ τῆς νέας χάριτος πρωτόλεια (= the first fruit of the new grace), see Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976: 156:81-2 and in PO 19 1 [324].

[590] PG 96: 669A.

[591] Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976:24:74.

[592] Lampsides (ed.) 1975:110.

[593] 'θεία ξυνωρίς' in PO 19 (1) [324]; 'λαμπρὰν ξυνωρίδα' in PG 139: 28A; 'μακαρία συνωρίς' in PG 96 : 664A; 'ἱερά ξυνωρίς' in PG 96: 680B; 'διαφανής καὶ πανεύφημος ξυνωρίς' in PG 96: 685A, 'ξυνωρίς ἀρίστης' in Christou (ed.) 2009: 288, 'ἀκριβεστάτη καὶ περιώνυμος ξυνωρίς' in Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976:156:81 and in PO 19 (1) [324] 'royal plantation' (ἐκ βασιλικῶν φυτουργιῶν) in PG 100:1352C. 'μακαρία δυάς' in PO 19 [348] 'δυάς δικαιοτάτη' in PG 139:25.'ἡ θεοχαρίτωτος καὶ ἁγία ἐκείνη δυάς' (full of divine grace and holy duality), see Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976: 28:126, 156:80; See also PO 19 (1) [324]; 'θεόλεκτον ζεύγος' in PG 139: 49.'πασῶν συζυγιῶν θεσπεσιοτέρα ἁρμονία' PG 96: 685A; 'λελαμπρυσμένη καὶ πανευλαβεῖ συζυγίᾳ',see PO 16 [78]; 'συζυγία ἡ πανθαύμαστος', see Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976:32:204.

[594] Cunningham (trans.) 2008: 79.

[595] PG 96: 1472C-1473A.

[596] PG 100:1359A.

cloths, and put on her spiritual adornment to pray'.[597] Joachim's decision to leave

unexpectedly is not discussed by George of Nikomedia but he praises Joachim because he

left to pray. Anna is exalted because she reacted similarly to Joachim (ὁμόγνωμον),[598]

namely with prayer.[599] Like Joachim Anna did not 'set herself against the foolish

mockeries of the Jews' and she did not 'bridle the impudent loftiness of those who rebuked

her'.[600]

        The 'ὁμόγνωμον' (= consonance) in the Marian homilies of George of

Nikomedia should be understood as Anna's consonance with Joachim' reaction and not

vice versa. Joachim left from the temple after the rejection of the gifts without taking into

account the pain and worries of his wife that would come with his departure. George of

Nikomedia does not go into that but justifies the concord between the couple only by

Anna's reaction. Anna reacted similarly to Joachim although she did not know where her

husband was. Kazhdan's 'dynamic model' of Anna, 'who grieved, was vexed and

depressed while Joachim simply shared her grief',[601] mimics George of Nikomedia's view

on the expressiveness that characterises the female nature, while Joachim is mostly

presented as a hermit rather as a husband who shares his wife's pain. This detail is used by

Patriarch Tarasios as well. After the departure of Joachim, Tarasios writes that 'it is good

to remember the words of Anna', and the sentence that follows is 'Αὗτη γὰρ τῷ ἀνδρὶ

σύμφωνος συμβιοτεύσασα', which can be translated as 'She lived in concord with her

husband...'. [602] But it seems it has a stronger meaning, namely 'she lived in agreement with

---

[597] De Strycker (ed.) 1961:72; Tischendorf (ed.) 1853:5-6. PG 100: 1392D; See also PG 96: 1465A.
[598] 'Ἀγὼν […] τῶν ἐπιπόνων δεήσεων', see PG 100:1349D. For Anna's reaction, see PG 100:1352A. The same is said about Joachim in the second homily *On the Conception of Anna* ('Joachim found relief in God') PG 100:1356D and in his third homily, see PG 100: 1388B-C.
[599] Their common opinion (ὁμογνωμία) is praised along with their prayer and harmony that characterises their relatinoship, see Tsironis 1998a: 302. Joachim and Anna as models of philanthropy, prayer, and endurance have already been highlighted by Tsironis, see Tsironis ibid. 302.
[600] PG 100 1357A. For Joachim's reaction PG 100: 1356D and PG 100:1388B-C.
[601] Kazhdan 1999 (2) :45.
[602] PG 98:1481D.

the husband', namely that she accepted her husband's actions and feelings without questioning them.

The examples of Patriarch Tarasios, George of Nikomedia and Andrew of Crete shows that Byzantine homilists did not question such behaviour on the part of husbands and elaborated more on the way wives reacted towards their husbands. This is why Joachim's unexpected disappearance is not questioned by George of Nikomedia and Tarasios, while Anna is praised because of her thoughtfulness towards her husband. Thus the 'ὁμόγνωμον' refers more to Anna's similar reaction to Joachim although she did not know what Joachim was doing after the rejection of the gifts, while Joachim's demonstration of consideration of his wife at that moment is missing from homilies on Mary's early life. It seems that in this detail of the *Protevangelion*, homilists express contemporary views on social structure and the role of women in the family. Anna's emotional strenght to sustain the disappearance of her husband and the social reproaches for her sterility, elevate Anna to the status of a powerful woman who shows compasion for her husband's decision and endurance towards the social mockery. In contrast to Joachim, Anna does not abandon their house, since the role of Byzantine women was defined by their presense inside the house.

Anna and Joachim as parents

The elaboration of Joachim's and Anna's parenthood is a favourite theme of Byzantine homilists since they are given the chance to emphasize on the spirituality of the figures involved by contrasting it with 'earthly' feelings of affection between Mary and her parents. I should note however, that homilists are not detailed in their description of the theme, but – with the exception of George of Nikomedia and James Kokkinobaphos – limit themselves to praising Anna and Joachim as parents who have been given Mary for a

child. This is why Anna 'surpasses all mothers',[603] Joachim 'surpasses all fathers',[604] both of them were 'holy parents',[605] and 'a child like Mary who is the mother of God, makes Joachim and Anna *fathers* of all who give birth', a theme repeated by George of Nikomedia (ninth century), Peter of Argos (tenth century), Gregory Palamas (fourteenth century) and Andrew Levadenos (fourteenth century).[606] Leo VI wonders 'why they seek reasons how the sterile womb became fertile and they do not consider as capable of giving birth those who would surpass all in birth'. And he concludes: 'but this is what I say, that Anna was capable of giving birth'.[607]

In contrast to the modesty of Anna's character mentioned earlier, when it comes to her giving birth to the Virgin, Anna demonstrates pride: 'Now Anna rejoices and shouts with the boast: 'Even though I was barren, I gave birth to the mother of God'.[608] This is why she is mentioned as μεγαλόφρων (= proud) by George of Nikomedia.[609] Anna's pride of Mary pierces through the texts: 'I increased (= conceived) to give birth to the mother of God.'[610] In his Presentation of Mary, Tarasios puts in the mouth of Anna the following words: 'Who would say that from me, you would come forth, daughter, (you) who proved blessed in generations of generations? Thinking that you grew in me, who cannot glorify the one who gave you to me as a gift, a sterile and childless [woman]? [...] I am blessed

---

[603] Antonopoulou (ed.) 2008:227; Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976:32:211 ('πασῶν ὑπερανεστηκυῖα μητέρων'), 216 ('μητέρων ἁπασῶν το σεμνολόγημα'); PG 127:608A.
[604] Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976:219, 224.
[605] Antonopoulou (ed.) 2008:223.
[606] PG 100:1352C; Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976: 28:152-3,124:145 ('γεννητόρων ἁπάντων'); Veniamin (trans.) 2005:4: 'The Daughter of with all virtues might be born of highly virtuous parents'; Lampsides (ed.) 1975:110.
[607] Antonopoulou (ed.) 2008:223; PG 107: 4C-D.
[608] Debiasi Gonzato (ed.) 1966: 153; Similarly in Pitra (ed.) 1876:200.
[609] PG 100: 1361B.
[610] Debiasi Gonzato (ed.) 1966: 155.

because I am called the mother of such a daughter.[611] Anna, a sanctified [612] mother of a good child,[613] is blessed because she became 'the mother of the mother of life.'[614]

The image of Anna as a happy mother suckling her child, which is based on the *Protevangelion* ('Who will announce to the sons of Rubel (sic) that Anna is breastfeeding?'),[615] appears in kontakia on Mary's Nativity ('I suckle the mother of the creator of all'),[616] and in the homilies of Andrew of Crete, John of Damaskos, Neophytos the Recluse, and indirectly in Gregory Palamas ('she was presented to the temple having been taken from her mother's breast only a day or two before').[617]

Images of affection between Anna and her daughter are used by George of Nikomedia and Gregory Palamas. The affection of Anna towards her daughter is initially acknowledged by Mary who responses to it, but in the end Mary has to disregard it because she is aware of her role and understands that she has to be separated from her parents. In these scene, in order for George of Nikomedia to show Mary's clearness of human passion, which is 'higher than the need (i.e. of the child for its mother) that nature creates', he contrasts it with a touching image of a child being separated from its mother crying and extending its hands toward her.[618] In the feast that Mary's parents prepared for her so that the priests would see her, Mary is brought in her mother's arms,[619] and James Kokkinobaphos creates a tender image where Anna lifts Mary up and kisses her repeatedly

---

[611] See also the words of Anna before Presentation of Mary in Germanos' first homily on the Presentation of Mary in PG 98: 297; For 'μακαρία' see also PO 16:[105]; PG 100: 1369B; PG 127: 561B; Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976 :30 :172.
[612] 'ἡγιασμένης μητρός' in PO 19 [324].
[613] 'καλλίπαιδος μήτηρ' in PG 139: 49.
[614] Debiasi Gonzato (ed.) 1966: 157; Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976:120:76-8 ('Τίς γὰρ ἄλλη Μητρός Θεοῦ μήτηρ τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος ἁγίως τὸν βίον ἀνυσασῶν καὶ τούτου προσεχεστάτη προμήτωρ γεγένηται; Τίς ἄλλη τὸ τοιοῦτο μυστήριον διακονήσασθαι κατηξίωται;'= who else became the mother of the mother of God among those who lived in the past their life in piety?
[615] De Strycker (ed.) 1961:94.
[616] Debiasi Gonzato (ed.) 1966: 147.
[617] PO 16 [111]; PG 97: 820A; PG 96: 664B-C; Veniamin (trans.) 2005:28.
[618] PG 100: 1448D-1449B.
[619] PG 127: 589A.

(κατεφίλει).[620] The word 'περιεπλέκετο' (= folded around)[621] used by James Kokkinobaphos should be understood as a scene of Mary hugging Anna and at the same time as she moves around her mother's body (literally Anna is enfolded by Mary).[622]

But Mary disdained her mother's warm and loving embrace and appropriate care and chose God instead of her mother and father's embrace,[623] despite her young age since 'she was presented to the temple having been taken from her mother's breast only a day or two earlier' as Gregory Palamas writes.[624] In artistic depictions of the Presentation scene Mary is often depicted as a robust miniature of an adult woman to reflect both her early age and her emotional maturity.[625] Mary is included in the number of saints who were *puer senex*, an elderly child, 'exceptional from birth, exhibiting mature behaviours and acute spiritual sensibility long before adulthood'.[626] Palamas verifies her maturity by the fact that she entered the Holy of Holies before 'she reached the age of children, although she showed that she was wiser than those who have reached the age of prudence'.[627]

Mary's exceptional nature and its acknowledgement by her parents is unfolded by James Kokkinobaphos in two ways. First, by Anna's and Joachim's similar reaction to Mary: 'the parental entrails were not touched when they left Mary to the temple, they did not turn back to her'.[628] Second, by the fact that Mary at the age of six months made her first seven steps,[629] a reference based on the *Protevangelion* where after she had made

---

[620] ibid. 592A. Linardou argues that the 'unique scene of motherly love and affection between Anna and Mary in the sermon commemorating the latter's birth seems to have been included to capture the attention of a devoted mother and flatter her (the female donor's) familiar sentiment'. See Linardou 2004:284.

[621] Lampe 1961:1069.

[622] PG 127: 592A.

[623] 'καὶ προκρίνει τὸν Θεὸν τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μητρὸς ἀγκαλῶν καὶ τῶν κατ᾽ οἶκον σαινόντων τὸν Θεοῦ νεὼν, see Christou (ed.) 2009:292; Veniamin (trans.) 2005:29.

[624] Christou (ed.) 2009:290; Veniamin (trans.) 2005:28.

[625] Croce 1961:1288.

[626] Hatlie 2006:189. This should not be confused with the tendency in Byzantine texts to make children 'behave like adults'. See Kalogeras 2001:8.

[627] 'μήπω μηδ᾽ εἰς ἡλικίαν παραγγείλασα παίδων, εἰ καὶ τῶν εἰς φρονοῦσαν ἀφιγμένων ἐμφρονεστέρα οὖσα ἔδειξαν', see Christou (ed.) 2009:288.

[628] PG 127:624D. Samuel and Hanna reacted in the same way in John Chrysostom's homily *On Hanna*, mother of Samuel, see PG 54:655.

[629] PG 127:588B.

seven steps, she reached her mother's lap.[630] Although George of Nikomedia and James Kokkinobaphos contrast the love among the family members with Mary's final disdain of it, this theme goes back to the third century. Demetrios of Antioch in his version of Mary's childhood writes : 'and when she had gone into [the temple] she did not turn back to come out again, neither did one thought of her parents rise up in her heart, nor any thought of any earthly thing'.[631]

The emotional burden of the parents who had to be separated from their beloved daughter demonstrates the awareness on their and their daughter's behalf of the soteriological plan of God, which had long been prophesised and Mary had to complete. From all the examples cited it is George of Nikomedia and James Kokkinobaphos (who largely copies George of Nikomedia), who elaborate in most detail the sentimental aspect of the relationship between Mary and her parents shortly before the Presentation. George of Nikomedia explains in the most detail the story of Anna and Joachim; he expands and elaborated on their significance of the story so that the audience will gasp the meaning of the celebration of these two figures in relation to Christ's Incarnation that will follow.

To sum up, similar themes recur in Byzantine homilies since the message preachers needed to convey was specific: Anna and Joachim had all the spiritual qualities to become the parents of Mary, justifying in this way their selection by God. All their actions and thoughts lead to this conclusion, drawn from the story of the *Protevangelion*, the only anchor to base their homilies on Mary's life as a child. The grouping of these features shows that in general homilists were not innovative in their views but moved around similar themes even though in the case of George of Nikomedia (ninth century) and Gregory Palamas (fourteenth century) five centuries separate them. There are also unique themes, and in additional to the ones mentioned earlier, I should add the presentation of

---

[630] De Strycker (ed.) 1961: 90; Tischendorf (ed.) 1853:11.
[631] Budge (trans.) 1915:655.

Anna as a defender of Constantinople,[632] or other motives that are used for Mary, such as Peter of Argos who doubts on his ability to deal with a figure like St Anna.[633] Overall, the main theme shared by all homilies of Mary's early life – always in relation to her parents – is the explanation of Anna and Joachim's role in the soteriological work of God, based on the *Protevangelion*.

George of Nikomedia needs to be singled out for the time he spents to explain to his congregation the significance of Anna's and Joachim's story, to explain in every detail their thoughts and actions and to demonstrate their spiritual virtues. His difference from other homilists is that he refers to the story of the *Protevangelion* in extreme detail which will never be repeated ever after (apart from James Kokkinibaphos of course who copies him). I would argue that George of Nikomedia is the first homilist to give scriptural authority to the *Protevangelion.* The story is repeated almost word-to-word explaining to his congregation the rich theological content of the *Protevangelion* and its importance for the Christian faith. Thus the way George of Nikomedia presents the spiritual validity of the *Protevangelion*, he made the text value as if it were part of the Holy Scripture. But the clear reference of the *Protevangelion* as a scriptural text will be made by other homilists, as I will discuss later.

Moreover, there is another reason why George emphasizes in such detail on the early life of Mary. It is George of Nikomedia's veneration of Mary, which is shown in the fact that his 'homilies in honour of Mary form the greater part of his published corpus'.[634] The rising interest in Mary's parents from the eighth century allows George of Nikomedia to use Anna's and Joachim's story in his work, but his devotion to Mary is the reason why an apocryphal work is treated with 'scriptural' respect. Thus although the theological

---

[632] Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976: 128:233-6.
[633] ibid. 116: 3-5, 22: 4-6 ; PG 127:568C; PG 100:1405C; PG 96: 664C; PG 96:1461A; PG 97: 821A ; Leone 1991:7:24.
[634] Tsironis 1998b:165.

developments of the period allow the promotion of Mary's parents it is his deep veneration of Mary that urges George of Nikomedia to underline the exceptional life of Mary in every detail.

In the following section and in contrast to what we have seen so far, the themes selected reveal differences in the way homilists approach a topic and the topic that I will discuss first is the conception of Mary by Anna.

In our earlier discussion on Epiphanios' of Salamis and De Strycker's comments on the use of the future and past tense in Anna's annunciation, I argued that Byzantine homilists use both tenses and that there are different views on the conception of Anna. In this section, I will unfold these views and I will also uncover a polemic around the *Protevangelion* in the eighth and ninth centuries. In a time when the *Protevangelion* started its process towards its acceptance and establishment in Byzantine thought, its support by homilists received various forms, which will be the topic of the final section of this chapter.

The conception of Anna in Byzantine texts

There are three approaches in Byzantine homilies to how Anna begot Mary: through sexual intercourse, through prayer and through a combination of both. The division between these three groups I have made is arbitrary since, as John Chrysostom writes on divine births, they start 'neither from female nature, nor intercourse' and that 'if divine grace and the providence of God is missing then conception is not sufficient'.[635] However, this division enables us to show that Byzantine homilists believed that a distinction *should* be made between conception through prayer, and through intercourse. This distinction was not made clear until the ninth century when the majority of writers

---

[635] PG 54:639 : 'Μὴ τοίνυν θεὸς ἀπὸ γάμου καὶ φθορᾶς συλλαμβάνεται, καὶ ἐξ ἀνδρὸς καὶ κοίτης τεχθῆναι ἢ σαρκωθῆναι δύναται; Οὐδαμῶς, ἀλλ' ἐξ ἐνεργείας θεοῦ, ἐξ ἐπιφοιτήσεως ὑψίστου, ἐκ παρουσίας Πνεύματος'. See also PG 93:1449-50 (Hesychios of Jerusalem, *On the Nativity of Christ*).

begin to defend the conception through prayer, which verifies the gradual acceptance of the account of the *Protevangelion*.

Natural conception

The first approach supports conception through physical intercourse, defended already from the fourth century onwards: Cyril of Alexandria (fourth century) wrote 'And after a few days Joachim visited Anna, and she conceived'),[636] Theophilos, patriarch of Alexandria (345-373),[637] claimed that 'We do not revile the supplication of blessed Anna who prayed to receive sperm from her husband. Because, although she desired to have a child, she did not pray for her soul to sin [...], [but she prayed] to see the power of her personal desire fulfilled',[638] and Pseudo-Eustathios (500) says that 'after Joachim returned to his house, he 'acquainted' his wife and had a daughter through her'.[639] Similarly to Epiphanios of Salamis, John of Damaskos writes that it is only Christ who was born only of a mother,[640] a view repeated in the tenth-century Synaxaria of Constantinople and of Basil II under the 'Conception of Anna' on December 9.[641] The text, which is very similar in both calendars reads: 'Mary was not born, as some claim, on the seventh month or without a man, but was born [when she had] completed nine months [of pregnancy] and through Annunciation, through the union with a man. Only the Lord was born without man and without union and [sowing of] seed'.[642] Finally, in the Nativity homily of Neophytos

---

[636] Budge (trans.) 1915:632.
[637] Russell (trans.) 2007:3-4.
[638] 'Οὐδέ τῆς μακαρίας Ἄννης τὴν αἴτησιν κακίζομεν σπέρμα λαβεῖν ἱκετευούσης ἀνδρός. οὐ γὰρ παιδοποιΐας ἐρῶσα ψυχὴν ἐν οὐρανῷ διαιτωμένην προσαμαρτεῖν ηὔχετο, ἵνα τῆς οἰκείας ἐπιθυμίας πληρουμένην ἴδη τὴν δύναμιν'. See Diekamp (ed.) 1907:182-3.
[639] 'Καὶ [...] ἀφικνεῖται εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ· καὶ γνοὺς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, ποιεῖ ἐξ αὐτῆς θυγατέρα', see PG 18:773.
[640] Kotter (ed.) 1988: 180. Translated in Cunningham 2006:142.
[641] Delehaye (ed.) 1902:291; Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992:31 and n .31 For the date of the synaxarion of Basil II in the time of emperor Leo VI, see Der Nersessian 1940-1:128.
[642] Delehaye (ed.) 1902:291; PG 117: 196B-C.

the Recluse (1134-1220) we read: 'Anna, who was released by the bonds of sterility by the creator of nature, conceives Mary by her husband'.[643]

But the most vehement defender of the natural conception is Theodore Studites. In one of his letters written between 809 and 811/2,[644] to hermit Theoktistos, Theodore responds to the hermit's previously expressed wish to have some issues clarified by Theodore for him. Theoktistos believed that Virgin Mary existed through the centuries and that she was not conceived through physical intercourse.[645] According to Theodore this was an issue that needed clarification and in his response to the hermit Theoktistos he states that this view was not in accordance with the Orthodox dogma and that from now on the hermit should accept that Mary was conceived according to the natural law.

Conception through intercourse and prayer

The second approach, to the means of Anna's conception is the combination of human intercourse and prayer. Andrew of Crete, who is credited with the first homilies on Mary's Nativity,[646] and kontakia on Anna's Conception and Mary's Nativity [647] writes that Mary 'was born [...] as a result of a man's union and seed,'[648] 'enriching his homily with vivid images from the reproductive process' as Cunningham notes,[649] without however denying the role of prayer.[650] At the end of the eighth century John of Euboea in his homily on the Conception of Mary refers to Anna's and Joachim's prayers and writes of 'a woman [Mary] who came from the loins of Joachim and was carried in the womb of Anna'.[651]

---

[643] PO 16 [106], Halkin 1957: 1083. Jugie surprisingly accepts this phrase as a reference to the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, see PO 16: 527.

[644] Miller (trans.) 2000:68.

[645] Fatouros (ed.) 1992: no 490:16-20. For a German translation, see Fatouros (ed.) 1992:446. See also Cholij 2002:73-4.

[646] For the life of Andrew of Crete, see Cunningham 1983:9-18.

[647]618 PG 97:1305-1329. Szövérffy 1979:196.

[648] Cunningham 2006:141; PG 97:1313A-B.

[649] PG 97: 816C; PG 97: 860C-D; Cunningham (trans.) 2008:80,121.

[650] PG 97: 816C, 876C.

[651] PG 96: 1496B. Dvornik relates this statement to the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, see Dvornik 1958:96-7.

Patriarch Germanos (eighth century) in his second Presentation homily writes that Anna had sexual relations with her husband but was still sterile for a long time and after endless prayer, the annunciation for the conception came.[652] Patriarch Tarasios (730-806) sees the conception of Anna as the result of both prayer and the desire of the flesh of man,[653] anticipating the ninth-century Patriarch Photios who understands Anna's conception as a work of both divine power and intercourse.[654]

Conception through prayer

The third approach is supported by the *Protevangelion* and strictly treats the conception of Anna as a result of prayer.[655] The number of texts in this group outnumbers the other two by far. Epiphanios the Younger,[656] in contrast to the view of his earlier namesake who argued that Mary was conceived through prayer and intercourse, Sophronios of Jerusalem (550/560-638/9),[657] Kosmas Vestitor (eighth century),[658] George of Nikomedia (ninth century),[659] Niketas David Paphlagon (ninth century),[660] Patriarch Euthymios (907-912),[661] Leo VI (tenth century),[662] Peter of Argos (tenth century),[663] Theophylaktos of Ochrid (eleventh century),[664] James Kokkinobaphos (twelfth century),[665]

---

[652] PG 98: 313.
[653] ibid. 1485.
[654] [652] PG 102: 552C.
[655] De Strycker (ed.) 1961:68, 74, 78; Tischendorf (ed.) 1853:6-8. George of Nikomedia quotes this text in his third homily on the Conception, see PG 100:1389D-1392B.
[656] PG 43: 488.
[657] PG 87: 3265D-3267A-B (homily on the Annunciation of Mary).
[658] PG 106: 1005B.
[659] PG 100 1369 ἐπίμονοι δεήσεις'; PG 100: 1372C : 'ἐπιτεταμένης δεήσεως'. The same words are also used for Joachim. Between PG 100: 1372C and 1373D the word 'pain' is repeated fourteen times and the word 'struggle' seven times.
[660] PG 106: 20B, 'she conceived in her womb because of the Word of God rather than because of nature', see PG 106:24C.
[661] PO 19 [325],[333].
[662] Antonopoulou (ed.) 2008: 224.
[663] Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976:28 :145-7, 32 : 225.
[664] PG 126: 133B-C.
[665] PG 127: 560A-B, 569C-D, 572A; Halkin 1957: 1126.

Nikephoros Kallistos (1256-1335),[666] Gregory Palamas (fourteenth century),[667] Isidore of Thessalonike (fourteenth century),[668] Nikolaos Kavasilas (fourteenth century),[669] and George Scholarios (fifteenth century) are in favour of it.[670] Emperor Leo VI on his homily on Mary's Nativity refers to the couple's fasting, prayer and strong shoutings,[671] which resulted in the conception of Mary and shows that he believed that Mary was begotten through prayer and not through intercourse. Niketas Paphlagon is the only homilist who stresses Anna's conception through prayer and explicitly denies the physical conception: 'Anna conceived by praying rather than in the natural way'.[672]

Theophylaktos of Ochrid, who refers to sterile couples that often turned to astrology,[673] praises Anna because she did not seek any medical cure for her sterility, did not wear an amulet, did not consume drink (πόμα), and did not resort to magic but prayed.[674] In Palestine and in Jericho in particular sterile women would drink water from fountains to help them conceive, as the Pilgrim from Bordeaux (333) informs us.[675] In the fourteenth century, through the association of the Probatike in Jerusalem with Mary's Nativity and the spread of the story of Anna's conception in her garden as it is recounted in the *Protevangelion*, sterile women venerated a tree in the narthex of the church of Mary in the Probatike, a custom mentioned by protonotarios Perdikos.[676] Despite the contrast between unsuccesful medical cure and succesful prayer (i.e.when conception is achieved) supported

---

[666] PG 145: 652B.

[667] Christou (ed.) 2009:269 : 'Θεοῦ πρὸς Ἰωακεὶμ καὶ τὴν Ἄνναν τελεσφόρος ἐπαγγελία τεκεῖν ἐν γήρᾳ παῖδα τοὺς ἀγόνους ἐκ νέου, εὐχὴ πρὸς Θεὸν τῆς θαυμασίας ταυτησὶ συζυγίας ἀντιδώσειν τῷ δόντι τὴν δεδομένην, καθ᾽ ἣν ὡς ἀληθῶς ἀξιόχρεως καὶ δικαιοτάτην εὐχὴν ' Veniamin (trans.) 2005:3, 27.

[668] PG 139: 24A, 28B, 52.

[669] PO 19 [348], [350-351].

[670] ibid. [400]: 22-3.

[671] Antonopoulou (ed.) 2008: 224.

[672] PG 106:20B.

[673] Hatlie 2006: 184.

[674] PG 126: 133B-C.

[675] Tobler (ed.) 1877 :19.

[676] Baseu-Barabas 1997:166.

by John Chrysostom,[677] women apparently needed more apt solutions in their everyday life than prayer to resolve their sterility.

Looking at the conception of Anna in Byzantine homilies ones comes to the conclusion that as time progressed, the view in favour of the conception through prayer become predominant, as we deduce from the number of homilists who are in favour of it. In contrast to what it has been suggested, the conception through prayer was not 'heretical' for Byzantine homilists,[678] but writers who supported the *Protevangelion* inclined towards this 'method' of conception. This change reflects a shift in the mentality of the Byzantines in favour of the *Protevangelion* after its continuous use in homilies from the eighth century onwards. The word 'acceptance' however does not reflect the reality. A century after its appearance in homilies which celebrated feast days of Mary's early life it was even included among the Holy Scriptures. Its wide acceptance after the ninth century made Niketas David the Paphlagonian (ninth century) write that 'only someone who has not studied (literally 'visited') the Holy Scriptures does not know Joachim and Anna'.[679] In the tenth century in his homily in the Conception of Anna, Peter of Argos writes that Anna is the 'boast of the Evangelical teaching',[680] and in the twelfth century, James Kokkinobaphos writes that his third Presentation homily has been '…chosen from the Holy Scriptures'.[681] In the writings of John of Damaskos and Andrew of Crete an event from Mary's early life becomes part of the Holy Scripture and the development of this process is attested in the work of Niketas the Paphlagonian in the ninth century.

It took six centuries for the wide acknowledgment of the *Protevangelion* by Orthodox Christianity. Familiarity with the text did not guarantee its acceptance in early Christianity since I have shown that although writers were aware of it and used it, they

---

[677] PG 54: 653-4.
[678] Cunningham (trans.) 2008:121 n.37.
[679] ' Τίς οὐκ οἶδεν Ἰωακεὶμ καὶ Ἄνναν [...], τίς οὕτω τῶν θείων Γραφῶν ἀνεπίσκεπτος […];' PG 105: 20A-B.
[680] Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976: 24:75 : ' Ἄννα […] τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς φιλοσοφίας τὸ καύχημα'.
[681] ' Ἐκλεγεὶς ἀπὸ τῶν θείων Γραφῶν', see PG 127: 600A.

were reluctant to name it in fear that they might be misjudged of their use of an apocryphal text. Yet seven centuries later the *Protevangelion* is considered as part of the Holy Scripture. What triggered this change? This question will be answered in the following section where I will argue that Iconoclasm was the main lever that manipulated the interest and promotion of the *Protevangelion* in Byzantium. I will also argue that the *Protevangelion* was promoted as part of a polemic 'package' in the eighth and ninth centuries.

'Attack' and defence of the Protevangelion

The promotion of the *Protevangelion* in Byzantium owes a lot to Byzantine homilists who espoused the themes discussed above or defended the text as we will see below. In their effort to support the veracity of the *Protevangelion* homilists defend it against iconic enemies: Jews, pagans or unnamed people as opponents of the apocryphal text. The defence of the *Protevangelion* revolves around four themes: Anna's conception, Anna's seven-month labour, Mary's Presentation in the temple, and the text itself.

Anna's conception in Photios' homily on Mary's Nativity

The ninth-century Patriarch of Constantinople, Photios, in his Nativity homily writes that Anna's conception is not accepted by 'some' who accepted 'without reasoning births by monsters' of ancient Greek mythology.[682] He expresses his surprise that 'some'

---

[682] ibid. 168; Laourdas (ed.) 1959:91-2. Having referred to Greeks (= pagans) Photios uses a phrase which has been translated by Mango as: 'you who imaginest men to the children of putrefaction,' on which Mango and Laourdas noted that there is no such a myth in Greek mythology, see Laourdas (ed.) 1959:220; Mango (trans.) 1958:168 n 14. Although the homily on Mary's Nativity refers to a number of ancient Greek myths and shows Photios' great familiarity with Greek mythology, I think that this particular sentence does not to refer to a myth but it is a play of words. In the sentence 'ὁ σήψεως τέκνα πλάττων τοὺς ἀνθρώπους' Photios does not write 'πλάσσων' but 'πλάττων' (attic dialect) (Laourdas (ed.) 1959:92), which to the Greek audience would sound as 'Plato', the Greek philosopher. However, references to pagan beliefs was not

do not accept the fact that St Anna conceived in a miraculous way and gave birth at an advanced age: 'the birth without a man is a marvellous thing […] but a barren woman […] surpasses the laws of nature'.[683] Photios continues: 'If I said that the birth had happened by a natural concatenation […] nature itself would rightly have aroused difficulty in reasoning'.[684] Apart from Photios, the marvellousness of Anna's conception is also attested in kontakia of Mary's Nativity,[685] and in the homilies of Andrew of Crete, John of Damaskos and George of Nikomedia.[686] But the different point that only Photios makes in his homily is that although the pregnancy of Sarah is accepted, Anna's conception of Mary is not; that those who do not accept it cannot understand God's will, which surpasses the laws of nature: 'If Anna confuses and disturbs thy mind, Sarah should rather do so since she came first. If the former be the case of thy hesitation, dost thou not perceive that thou art rejecting the latter from thy kinship, and cutting the sound whereof thou art the branch, and art proved to have departed from Jewish laws?'[687] The reference to Sarah to defend another nativity, was made in the fourth century by Gregory of Nyssa in his homily *On the Nativity of Christ*,[688] and by Andrew of Crete in his second Nativity homily.[689] Five centuries later than Gregory of Nyssa, Photios uses Sarah to defend the mother of Mary since as it appears that there were people who did not understand and accept Mary's

---

uncommon in Marian homilies, see for example the Nativity homily of Pseudo-John of Damaskos (PG 96: 661B) and Patriarch Euthymios (PO 19 2 [335]). For another reference to Plato in a Byzantine homiliy, **see** also p. 135 and the discussion that follows.

[683] PG 102: 552D .

[684] Mango (trans.) 1958:167. It has been translated by Laourdas : 'If I claimed that Mary was born according to the law of nature then I would create perturbation , see Laourdas (ed.) 1959 :52*; For the original text, see Laourdas 1959:91:26-8.

[685] Debiasi Gonzato (ed.) 1966: 155. In kontakia, the virginal conception is a mystery greater than the labour of a barren woman, see Debiasi Gonzato (ed.) 1966:119.

[686] Cunningham (trans.) 2008: 133-4; PG 100: 1353C 'through the strange things that have appeared in the life of people, eternal glory of the invisible is revealed' and in PG 100: 1356A: 'Because of our exsiccated nature from evilness, the mortified sterile is rekindled'. For John of Damaskos, see PG 96: 664A. Apart from Proklos, the defence of Mary' birth or virginity is atteated in earlier works, such as the apocryphal *Acta Pilati*, see Tischendorf (ed.) 1853: 224-228.

[687] Mango (trans.) 1958:167.

[688] 'οὐ δουλεύει φύσεως νόμοις ὁ δεσπότης τῆς φύσεως' (= the ruler of nature does not abide to the laws of nature), see Mann (ed.) 1996:246.10-1.

[689] Cunningham (trans.) 2008:103.

conception by a sterile woman. Apart from Sarah and Anna's pregnancy, in his Annunciation homily Photios defends the late pregnancy of Elisabeth in the same way, as a work that superseded human logic and nature since for God nothing is impossible.[690]

Anti-Judaic and anti-pagan polemic in Photios' homily

Mango has placed this homily in the framework of anti-idolatry polemic.[691] As Laourdas notes 'Photios' literary background gave him the opportunity to contrast the Greek tradition with Christian beliefs'.[692] Nevertheless, the content of the homily reveals something more about the concept behind its structure.

The defence of Anna's conception by Photios is presented in the way Mary's birth was presented from the second century onwards for example in the work of Ignatios of Antioch (first-second century).[693] The support of the marvellousness of Anna's conception imitates the defence Mary's conception in Early Christianity and disbelief for Anna's ability to conceive is related to the disbelief of pagans and Jews for Mary's virginal birth seen in the work of Justin Martyr (first-second century) and Origen (second-third century).[694] Challenging Mary's birth by Jews and pagans means denial of Christ's humanity. Athanasios of Alexandria (fourth century), in his homily *On the Incarnation of the Logos* points to the fact that Jews vilify and pagans scorn Christ's humanization.[695] The extraordinary nature of Mary's birth of Christ together with the disbelief from Jews and pagans in Mary's virginal birth is also attested in the fifth-century homily *On the Nativity of Christ*, composed by Patriarch Proklos: 'the miraculous Conception of Christ by Mary is

---

[690] Mango (trans.) 1958:120.
[691] ibid. 161-4.
[692] Laourdas (ed.) 1959:55*.
[693] PG 5: 929A : 'παράδοξος τοκετός', 'σύλληψις παρθένου παράδοξος'. The marvellousness applies also to Mary's birth by Anna in the second Presentation homily of Gregory Palamas, see Veniamin (trans.) 2005:23 ('your birth was extraordinary').
[694] Marcovich (ed.) 1997: 185; PG 11: 720-1.
[695] PG 25:97A: 'καὶ τὰ περὶ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως τοῦ Λόγου διηγησώμεθα, καὶ περὶ τῆς θείας αὐτοῦ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐπιφανείας δηλώσωμεν· ἣν Ἰουδαῖοι μὲν διαβάλλουσιν, Ἕλληνες δὲ χλευάζουσιν, ἡμεῖς δὲ προσκυνοῦμεν·'.

considered as scandal and is not accepted by pagans and Jews who treat the Incarnation of Christ as a subject for mockery not only because they do not understand it but also because this miracle itself is above logic'.[696] Also in the fifth century,[697] in one of his two homilies on Mary, Hesychios uses strong language against Jews and Greeks who do not believe (among others) in the virginal conception of Christ.[698] Jews and pagans alike were criticized in Church Councils by writers about their disbeliefs in aspects of the Christian dogma, and especially in the conception of Christ.[699] The reference to Jews became a 'topos' in the ninth century, since it has been connected to Iconoclasts who were presented as non-believers earlier than that, especially since the seventh Ecumenical Council (787) claimed that Iconoclasm was initiated by the Jews.[700]

Andrew of Crete in his first homily *On the Nativity* writes on the miracle of Mary's conception by a sterile and the Incarnation of Christ that followed '...it remains difficult to grasp and to understand how much that which is revealed...'.[701] In Photios' homily the exceptional nature of Mary's virginal birth, defended in homilies of earlier centuries, targets Anna and her conception of Mary at an advanced age. The reference to Jews and pagans remained since in the ninth century a number of homilies were placed in anti-pagan and anti-Jewish framework.[702] And although other homilies composed by Photios 'were meant to attack, even if indirectly, the schismatics of his day',[703] the defence of Anna's conception does not denote polemic, since the anti-jewish formula was the medium to unfold the significance of Mary's Nativity for Christianity in a way understood

---

[696] Schwartz (ed.) 1965:104 : 'ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, κἂν Ἰουδαῖοι ἀπιστῶσιν εἰπόντι τῶι κυρίωι·ὁ θεὸς μορφὴν ἀνθρώπου ἐφόρεσεν, κἂν Ἕλληνες κωμωιδῶσι τὸ θαῦμα'. Tsironis sees anti-Jewish polemic as a 'topos' established in homilies by Proklos, see Tsironis 1998a: 295, 301,309 n. 56.
[697] Allen 2003:194.
[698] PG 93:1457A: 'Τίς τὸ καθ' Ἑλλήνων ὑμῶν ἐξηγήσεται μῖσος; Τίς τὸ καθ' αἱρετικῶν ὑμῶν ἀναπετάσει θράσος; Τίς τὸ πρὸς Ἰουδαίους ὑμῶν δυσμενὲς δυνήσεται ἀναγγεῖλαι'.
[699] Tanner and Alberigo (trans.) 1990: 65.
[700] Sahas 1986:18; Mansi (ed.) 13:24E-32A.
[701] Cunningham (trans.) 2008:72.
[702] Cunningham 1998: 285 n. 89, 286; Tsironis 1998a:309-311; Antonopoulou 1998:326.
[703] Tsironis 1998a: 298.

in ninth-century Byzantium. Andrew of Crete also make anti-Judaic comments in his Nativity homilies. He refers to 'blaspheme against Christ' and enemies of Christ and that using the Holy Scripture, he will remove the 'root' that 'disturbs the flock of the Church'.[704] As I will demonstrate shortly, Patriarch Tararios in his comment on Mary's seven-month birth, refers to the need of appropriate reading of text to understand the dogmas of the Church.

Although it will be discussed later in chapter in detail, it is sufficient to say now that in homilies on Mary's early life (Conception, Nativity, Presentation), anti-Jewish polemic is constantly present, which characterizes particularly the homilies of Mary's Presentation. Looking at homilies of Mary's early life as a single entity and their development in time from the eighth until fifteenth century, which has not been attempted until today, anti-Jewish polemic loses its function as a tool for the study of polemic against Mary. I do not repudiate that there could be opponents of Mary in the eighth or ninth century, but in the homilies on Mary's Conception, Nativity, and Presentation anti-jewish polemic is one of the repetitive features similarly to those we saw earlier in this chapter.

Photios' Nativity homily and the dogma of the Incarnation

In his Nativity homily Photios writes 'For the Incarnation is the road to birth, the birth is the result of pregnancy, this is why a woman (= Mary) was selected to bring to an end the divine plan'.[705] Photios' support of the conception of Anna is not only the result of the rising interest of homilists in the early life of Mary from the eighth century onwards and the acknowledgement of the *Protevangelion* at that time, but it is also related to the dogma of Incarnation. The Incarnation was, of course, a central tenet of Christianity but its insistence on Christ's human nature was particularly attractive for the pro-image faction

---

[704] Cunningham (trans.) 2008:87, 92, 108,110.
[705] PG 102: 560B, translated in Mango (trans.) 1958: 174.

during and after Iconoclasm (the debate over the veneration of images in Byzantium), which defended that Christ was incarnated on earth and thus he could and should be depicted. Photios, 'preoccupied with the iconoclastic danger,'[706] defended the pregnancy of Anna, and he also defended the result of it, the Incarnation of Christ, since Christ's humanity is justified by the humanity of his forbearers: 'Christ can be depicted since he was born out of Mary who is a human, and denying Christ's humanity is denying his mother's humanity', writes Theodore Studites, highlighting the importance of supporting the physical forbearers of Christ.[707] One is lead to that concludion by knowing Photios religious and political thought but a century earlier Andrew of Crete had make this connection clear to his audience 'For of these [two] (= births, of Mary and of Christ), whereas one has now received a remission from sterility, the other, a short time later, will supernaturally consent to the birth of Jesus, who was divinely formed to be like us'.[708]

Old textual forms (anti-Jewish and anti-pagan polemic) are now used to reveal the new theological trends in Byzantium after the eighth century, when the debate over the veneration of images and the newly important dogma of Incarnation of Christ that was formed through this debate, necessitated a renewed emphasis on Christ's earthly origins.[709] In their effort to support the dogma of Incarnation, the Byzantines did what they were best at: used tradition as evidence; and the *Protevangelion* had been there since the second century.

Photios' homily and the connection of Mary's to Christ's nativity

---

[706] Dvornik 1953:86.
[707] Dalkos (ed.) 2006:206-7.
[708] Cunningham (trans.) 2008: 103.
[709] For the iconophile feelings of Andrew of Crete in his second Nativity homily, see Cunningham (trans.) 2008: 90 n. 14.

Similarly, to Mango, Laourdas recognises the anti-pagan and anti-Jewish platform in Photios' homily. But Laourdas goes a step further when he holds the view that polemic against Jews and pagans in Photios' Nativity homily is a method applied by Photios to eliminate the possibility of comparing Mary's birth to that of Christ, because – as Laourdas argues – which would seem provocative to the audience.[710] Thus Laourdas aknowledges no direct connection between the Birth of Christ and of Mary in Photios' Nativity homily.

On the contrary, Maguire argues that in the eleventh-century mosaics of Daphni (Greece) the juxtaposition between the scene of Birth of Mary and the Birth of Christ reflects the relationship between the infancy of Mary and that of Christ 'discussed extensively by Byzantine preachers'.[711] The sermons he uses as examples to support his view are the Nativity homilies of George of Nikomedia (ninth century) and Leo VI (866 – 912).[712]

Laourdas acknowledges the anti-Jewish and anti-pagan polemic in Photios' homily, but his view one the comparison made between the births of Mary and Christ would provoke the audience and instead polemic was used, automatically invalidates the function of polemic as a standard feature in ninth-century homilies. He accepts that polemic in Photios' Nativity homiliy is used in order for the homilist to avoid causing any disturbance to the audience by arguing that the birth of Christ can be compared to that of Mary. Byzantine homilists did not compare the birth of Mary to that of Christ, but referred to the two events in order to show the sequence of events until Christ's birth which resulted in the salvation of humanity. Thus anti-Jewish polemic is used to make the miracle of Mary's birth understood by means easily comprehended by his ninth-century audience and not to avoid provoking the congregation.

---

[710] Laourdas (ed.) 1959:52*.
[711] Maguire 1996:156.
[712] ibid. 157,159.

Maguire's view should be reconsidered since, as stated, the birth of Mary and of Christ in the homilies under discussion are considered consecutive miracles of divine grace for the fulfilment of the soteriological plan, which remains the only implied connection between the two events.[713] On whether the Daphni mosaicist wished to establish the connection that Maguire refers to, I will argue that this association is surely not justified by the two texts or any by other homily on Mary's early life. But looking at the visual evidence one reaches to the same conclusion, that the Byzantines understood Mary's birth as the event, which signalised the beginning for Christ's Incarnation: In the church of Mary of the Admiral (twelfth century),[714] Anna and Joachim are depicted as full-length standing figures in the side apses, Anna in the prothesis and Joachim in the diakonikon. In Studenica, also in the twelfth century, the Marian cycle begins in the prothesis and ends in the diakonikon.[715] Taking into consideration that the Prothesis is paralled to the cave where Christ was born,[716] and in terms of iconography both the Prothesis and the Diakonikon are associated with Christ's life, then the presence in these two locations of Mary or of her parents can be easily comprehended: They are reminded of their role in the Incarnation. This is how one should explain the iconography of the diakonikon of Kato Panagia (thirteenth century) in Arta, which, as Papadopoulou notes, is the only known case where the life of Mary and of Christ have been juxtaposed in the diakonikon.[717]

Before I move on to examples of polemic against the *Protevangelion* in Byzantine homilies, I will recapitulate and expand what we have seen so far in this section which deals with the apprehension of the polemic against the *Protevangelion*.

---

[713] In this aspect one should also understand the message of the eighth or ninth-century Castelserpio paintings, where the Presentations of Mary and Christ are grouped together to highlight the succesion between the two events, see Leveto 1990: 407, 412.
[714] Pace 1982: 433-434.
[715] Hallensleben 1963:56.
[716] PG 155: 264C ' Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ πρόθεσις τύπον ἐπέχει τοῦ σπηλαίου τε καὶ τῆς φάτνης'.
[717] Papadopoulou 2007:371.

Patriarch Photios in his homily on the Nativity is the first to defend the conception of Anna in such a straighforward manner. As shown, he based his defense on earlier homilies and in particular, on the way homilists had been defending Mary's birth since the second century. Photios, as a fierce Iconophile and thus defender of Christ's Incarnation, endorses Anna's conception and her birth of Mary because these events effectuated Christ's Incarnation. There are however similar treatments as far as Mary and the *Protevangelion* is concerned: between the early Christianity and Iconoclasm. The *Protevangelion*'s role in both periods is to defend Mary. As stated at the very beginning of this text, the second century apocryphal text was destined to defend accusations against Mary and I think this is the role of the polemic that appeats in the homilies of her early life from the eighth century onwards.

A substantial difference lies between the Nativity homilies of John of Damaskos, Andrew of Crete and the one of Photios: Iconoclasm has emerged and references to the *Protevangelion* are not 'discrete' anymore but homilists openly defended the events recounted in the apocryphal text. The connection between the Nativity of Mary and of Christ lies are not contrasted or compared but consititute events that were prophesied and developed in the Holy Scripture. Mary's birth is not part of the Scripture, which is why homilists such as Photios defend her early life as opposed to an enemy. Photios' homily shows that in the ninth century the events of Mary's early life started enjoying Scriptural authority. This is a very crucial development in Byzantine mentality, which was first attested in the homilies of John of Damaskos and Andrew od Crete and will be emphatically expressed by later homilists, starting from Niketas the Paphlagonian as shown earlier. As stated, the emphasis on the contribution of Anna and Joachim in God's soteriological plan, placed in the context of *Old Testament* prefigurations of Mary's birth elevated the *Protevangelion* to the status of a scriptural work.[718] In time, homilists

---

[718] Nellas (ed.; trans.) 2010: 48 : 'You were proved more righteous than Moses, Noah and Abraham'.

cultivated the notion that the sanctity of Joachim and Anna superseded all biblical figures, which justifies their inclusion in the 'pantheon' of scriptural saints. As Skhirtladze has correctly put, biblical themes give 'a certain canonical shading'.[719] This is why Isidore of Thessalonike sees in the story of the *Protevangelion* the answer to the question why of all saints celebrated in the liturgy only Joachim and Anna are acclaimed 'righteous'.[720]

The *Protevangelion* was never acknowledged as canonical in the Orthodox Church. Its treatment as a text with scriptural authority was a notion perpetuated by preachers who failed to succeed in its inclusion among the officialy recognised works of the Orthodox Church. The Byzantines manipulated their tradition to defend the humanity of Christ, but the acceptance of the *Protevangelion* as a canonical work may have been a step over the line. From the ninth century onwards, when, as we will see, the first feasts of Anna and Joachim emerged, Mary's parents and the *Protevangelion* followed two separate ways: The *Protevangelion* remained an apocryphal work while Mary's parents entered the Church calendar. This why – as shown earlier – biographical information on Anna and Joachim in the tenth-century *Synaxarion of Constantinople* is not taked from the *Protevangelion* but by earlier homilies.

Mary's birth in seven months

Another example of polemic is brought forward by the eighth-century Patriarch Tarasios in relation to Anna's pregnancy.

In his homily on the Presentation of Mary Tarasios writes that Mary stayed in Anna's womb for ninth months according to the human way. Then, he pauses his narrative to comment on a belief that circulated, which presents Mary as having been born in seven months. According to Tarasios: '[...] none of the Church's inmates should accept the

---

[719] Skhirtladze 1998:86-7.
[720] PG 139: 32. However, prophets and martyrs are also named as such, see Detoraki 2002:30.

word(s) that have been put forward, that the Virgin was born in seven months. And I have heard many fools who strive over these, who I think are worse than non-believers. These are inventions of the heretics. These are against to the Church, foreign to orthodox people, because the Virgin and child of God completed nine months in the belly of Anna, as human nature dictates. But the mouths of the foolish are not able to blame the blameless, they attribute this word(s) to the Scripture, (they) have dislocated (the word) from the truth and the correct (dogma)'. [...] I am not convinced until those who are right in their judgement, carefully study the Scripture and explain it with divine thoughts ; and until i hear (or read) that the sayings (of the Scripture) have been understood (by them). And (i am not convinced until), they – as children of the Church (are supposed to do) – have completely cut off the errors they find in it (i.e. the Scripture), which the enemies have sown'.[721] Later in his homily he refers to 'children of heretics' who offend the Virgin with blasphemies,[722] and to the Jews, who have not accepted the Virgin and who say unfair things about her because of envy.[723]

Tarasios is not the only homilist to defend Anna's nine-month pregnancy: The negativity against the seven-month birth has been expressed by John of Damaskos,[724] Andrew of Crete,[725] the Constantinopolitan *Synaxario*n,[726] and the *Synaxarion of Basil II*: Mary was not born, as some claim, on the seventh month or without a man, but was born [when Anna had] completed nine months [of pregnancy] and through Annunciation, through the union with a man'.[727] Tarasios however is the only homilist to criticize the

---

[721] PG 98: 1485. The syntax is very confusing. The sentences have been modified in such a way that they make sense in English.

[722] ibid. 1496C : ‘Αἰσχυνέσθωσαν αἱρετικῶν παῖδες, οἱ την Παρθένον βλασφήμῳ στόματι καὶ ἰοβόλῳ συκοφαντεῖν ἐπιχειροῦντες’.

[723] ibid. 1497A-B. ῾Ὦ Ἰουδαίων Συναγωγὴ, οἱ τὴν ἐκ φυλῆς τῆς ὑμετέρας ἐκλάμψασαν Παρθένον μὴ δεξάμενοι Θεοτόκον, ἀλλὰ καὶ λοιδοροῦντες ἀναξίως καὶ ἀσελγέσι χείλεσι, καὶ τῷ φθόνῳ κινούμενοι, καταλαλοῦντες αὐτῆς ἀδικίαν καὶ ἀνομίαν’.

[724] Kotter (ed.) 1988: 180. Translated in Cunningham 2006:142.

[725] PG 97:1313A.

[726] Delehaye (ed.) 1902: 291.

[727] PG 117: 196B-C.

seven-month birth so strongly. Cunningham argued that 'there could be Christians who believed in the abnormal birth of the Theotokos',[728] but Gambero argues that 'the premature birth of Mary underlines the exceptional character of her future life'.[729] Gambero's view gives us the background for the understanding of Tarasios' comment.

According to Van der Horst, the birth in seven months in Jewish literature has been connected with 'divine beings or [those] whose conception had been miraculous', that there is 'a close link between the short pregnancy and the manner of begetting or conceiving and on the whole when a child is born after six or seven months and is viable, its conception must have been under very favourable circumstances'.[730] This verifies Gambero's view but it is questionable in the light of the criticism of this birth by Byzantine homilists.

Van der Horst' view is verified by the *Gospel of the Hebrews*, an apocryphal work which survives only in fragments.[731] Cyril of Jerusalem (fourth century), in his *Discourse on the Theotokos*, refers to this text and in particularly to its reference that 'Christ was in Mary's womb for seven months'.[732] Klijn argues that the author of Hebrew Gospel wanted to refute the idea that Mary was of heavenly origin,[733] and Baumer and Scheffczyk add that the Orthodox Church was clear the conception of Mary was not immaculate, which is a reason why it was believed that she was born through a man and a woman in nine months.[734]

---

[728] Cunnigham 2006:141.
[729] Gambero 1999:36.
[730] Van der Horst 1978: 359-360.
[731] Mimouni 1998:216-222. Mimouni notes that although its second title is *Gospel of the Nazareens* the title *Gopsel of the Hebrews* was used more often to show that this Gospel was used by the Jews, see Mimouni 1998:215.
[732] For a translation of this fragment, see Klijn 1992:135; Wilson (trans.) 1974:177.1 For its date to the first half of the second century, see Wilson (trans.) 1974:176. Elliott does not include Cyril's reference to the Gospel, see Elliott (trans.) 1993:5. For the history of the text, see Skarsaune and Hvalvik 2007:245-250 with extensive bibliography in p. 247 n. 23; See also Wilson (trans.) 1974: 172-8.
[733] Klijn 1992: 136.
[734] Baumer and Scheffczyk 1988:157.

The *Gospel of the Hebrews* and Tarasios' reference to heretics suggests that the belief in the seven-month birth had Jewish origins. I mentioned in the beginning of the chapter that some scholars claim that the *Protevangelion* was written in a Jewish milieu, and although this view raises serious doubts, the seven-month birth expresses a Jewish notion. As far as its context in a homiletic activity is concerned, Tarasios' comment raises questions about which copy of the *Protevangelion* he consulted. In Testuz's and De Strycker's editions of the *Protevangelion* (third century or fourth century),[735] the passage reads: 'In the seventh month of labour Anna gave birth' but in Tischedorf's edition (of the tenth-century text), the seven-month period of labour is changed to nine.[736] Since the Bodmer V published by De Strycker and Testuz is the earliest known edition of the *Protevangelion* and the seventh month birth is mentioned there, it has been assumed that this detail must be closer to the original version.[737] Tarasios's comment on the seven-month birth of Mary reminds us of the comment of Evodius, bishop of Rome after St Peter in the homily *On the Passion and the Resurrection* attributed to him : 'In the ninth month, like all human beings, she (= Mary) gave birth to him (Christ) and nourished him with the virginal milk'.[738] Unfortunately, I cannot know if and to what extent different versions were used by different homilists. Testuz attempted to answer the puzzle of Mary's seven-

---

[735] Testuz dates the main text to the third century and a number of additions to the end of the third or beginning of the fourth century, see Testuz (ed.) 1958:26. De Strycker, who worked on the same manuscript, dates it to the second half of the fourth century, see De Strycker and Louvain 1964:343. In any case, the Papyrus Bodmer V, to whch Testuz and De Srtycker refer to, 'takes us very near the oldest text', see Stempvoort 1964:425. Although Tischendorf's edition is commonly used as the standard edition, and acknowledging that there are differences in the two editions because of grammar, vocabulary or style (De Strycker and Louvain 1964:347-8), I will also use De Strycker's and Testuz's edition since it is the oldest surviving.

[736] De Strycker (ed.) 1961: 88; Testuz (ed.) 1958:50; Tischendorf (ed.) 1853: 11.The seven-month birth appears also in the sixth-century Armenian version of the Protevangelion. The texts writes 'when Anna was in her 210th day of expectancy, which is seven months [...] gave birth to her holy child'. See Terian (ed.) 2008:11.

[737] Horst, van der1978: 348-9 and n.12.

[738] CSCO 525:88.12-3.

month birth by claiming that the Annunciation of Anna took place when she was in her second month of labour and that this explains the birth of Mary seven months later.[739]

However, I think that Tarasios' reference can be placed in the framework of anti-Jewish polemic in Marian homilies and especially homilies on the Presentation,[740] since an attack on the only surviving account on Mary's Presentation would probably create confusion in the audience and mistrust for the text. Jewish texts on the life of Christ, the most known of which is the Sefer Toledot Yeshu (fourth to seventh centuries),[741] do not refer to Mary's life before the conception of Christ.[742] The *Gospel of the Hebrews* shows that the Jews accepted the seven-month birth and it is this Jewish notion that homilists attack.[743] Thus the seven-month pregnancy may well be placed in the framework of anti-Jewish polemic.

Mary's presentation in the temple

According to the *Protevangelion*, at the age of three Mary's parents dedicated her to the Temple. In Byzantine homilies, Mary's entrance is presented as an issue questioned by unnamed people, or Jews and pagans. Patriarch Germanos (eighth century) in his Presentation homily writes 'Let those who are speaking against her reveal to us, as though seeing yet not seeing, where they have ever observed such things?'[744] In her recently-published work on eighth-century homilies Mary Cunningham has supported that the patriarch 'attacks unnamed people who are speaking against the Mother of God in his second homily on the Entry, suggesting that they question the veracity of the story of her early life recounted in the *Protevangelion* of James'.[745] She adds that 'it is impossible to

---

[739] Testuz (ed.) 1958:51 n.1. This also explains the past tense used by the angel to announce Anna's Conception.
[740] PG 126: 141; PG 98: 312A; PG 100: 1436A and 1453A.
[741] Horbury 2003:282.
[742] Krauss (trans.) 1902: 50, 88-9,122.
[743] Klijn 1992 135; For the date of the text to the first half of second century, see Wilson (trans.) 1974:176.
[744] PG 98: 312A; Translation in Cunningham (trans.) 2008:164.
[745] Cunningham (trans.) 2008: 39.

determine whether Germanos is referring to iconoclasts here or to Christians who opposed the veneration of the Mother of God'.[746] She notes that 'this passage stands out as a rare reference in a liturgical text of this kind to the cultural and religious climate of the period'.[747]

Germanos is the only homilist of the eighth century to make a comment of such kind. He objects to the disapproval by the Jews of Mary's entrance in the holy of holies because of her of her feminine, thus unclean, nature : 'although they saw them [the prophecies], they show disbelief in the second one [Mary's Presentation]'.[748] Before making any comment on this reference I need to place it in a general context, and compare it with other homilies on the early life of Mary.

In his first Presentation homily, George of Nikomedia writes: 'You who hear that the Virgin sojourned in the temple should not doubt it […]. You see the marvellous novelty of nature and you doubt about these [prophecies]?'[749] '[...] Nothing around Mary is to be doubted'.[750] In his second Presentation homily, George of Nikomedia repeats the same notion but adds the recipient of this comment, the Jews: 'and while she spent her time in the temple in the way angels do, the time was present, which commanded that a woman stay away from the holies; (it was a time) when the Jews did not of course stay silent (and) the people advised that she should be excluded from the sanctuary [as if she were] one of them; [they were saying these things] without reason and without having examined [them] I, judging from truth, believe that no filth will ever be detected on her most-spotless body'.[751] Later George of Nikomedia adds: 'But the crowd of the Jews rebels and wrong-doing is provided as a helper to their opinion. It does not know the mystic of

---

[746] ibid. 164, n. 3.
[747] ibid. 40.
[748] PG 98:312A (daughter through prophecies). The same concept applies in kontakia on the prefeast of Mary's Nativity, see Debiasi Gonzato (ed.)1960:124.
[749] PG 100: 1436A.
[750] ibid. 1436B.
[751] ibid. 1452C.

economy, it is not aware of the above-nature cleanness of the Virgin'.[752] Without

pertaining to the Jews, James Kokkinobaphos presents this notion in the form of a dialogue

between the writer and the priest Zacharias, saying to Zacharias that he should disregard

the unusualness of the event and not consider the entrance of Mary in the temple as

unfitting.[753] Similarly, Nikephoros Gregoras refers to the feeding of Mary in the temple by

the angel, does not refer to Jews, but to 'non-believers' and 'fools' who challenged Mary's

sojourn in the Temple.[754] A completely different version from George of Nikomedia and

James Kokkinobaphos is provided by Neophytos the Recluse, who writes that 'it is worth

wondering how come the Jews did not rebel and did not challenge the event, because who

can scatter what God has decided?'[755] Neophytos did not have books on the Presentation of

Mary and needed to borrow some to 'celebrate the feast-day properly'.[756]

The Presentation and Nativity homilies are based on early-Christian polemic

and reveal a known enemy through which Mary's parents and their importance for the

soteriological plan emerges. In the examples we saw, homilists use an inverted defence

which is an attack either on Judaism or paganism. As I will show in the next section, apart

from the Jews and pagans, Byzantine homilists went even further: they present an iconic

enemy of the *Protevangelion* to the accusations of whom they have to respond in order to

defend the veracity of the text. Writers used the motif of an 'enemy' of the *Protevangelion*

to support the text indirectly, in response to its rising acknowledgement from the eighth

century onwards. In the next section, I will discuss the first and only direct defence of the

Protevangelion.

---

[752] ibid. 1453A.
[753] PG 127: 613D. This section is not copied by George of Nicomedia. Evangelatou's view that the text and images of the sixth Kokkinobaphos homily referring to the accusations of unchastity directed by the Jews against Mary, could have reminded Eirene of the slander she herself had faced in a period of her life, neglects this homiletic topos, see Evangelatou 2006:263.
[754] Leone 1991: 22:483-491.
[755] PO 16: [110]-[111].
[756] Galatariotou 1991:159.

Credibility of the Protevangelion

Chirat has correctly argued that Euthymios, James Kokkinobaphos and Niketas David Paphlagon, include the *Protevangelion* in the Holy Scriptures.[757] However, I cannot agree with Chirat that Photios does the same since his defence of the *Protevangelion* lies in the context of anti-Jewish polemic and in his Nativity homily Photios does not refer to the apocryphal story at all.[758] But as shown, the scriptural character is demonstrated by other means by homilists even if they did not name the text as part of the Holy Scripture. To Chirat's list, I would add Andrew of Crete and Nikephoros Gregoras.[759]

The indirect defence of the *Protevangelion* by Germanos, Photios, George of Nikomedia, James Kokkinobaphos and Nikephoros Gregoras, becomes direct in Patriarch Euthymios' Presentation homily. He writes that 'some do not read the evangelic and heavenly dogmas but mythical and disgraceful confessions.'[760] 'Their [Joachim's and Anna's] story is real, does not have something elegant or exalted, but was put together by the Holy Spirit, even though many [who] unfold vain things, saw its beauty in a bad way'.[761] He refers to authors or works whose main aim seems to have 'elaborate language', but are 'empty of theological significance'.[762] Antonopoulou has correctly explained Euthymios' comments as an attempt to target 'his contemporaries whose rhetorical preoccupations tended to overshadow the real purpose of preaching'.[763] She sees no polemic in it. The only example of an actual attack on the *Protevangelion* is made by Epiphanios the monk (780) writes 'because none of them revealed correct and accepted [evidence] about her life and the period of her upbringing or her death. But those who attempted to reveal some parts of her life, did not teach [Mary's life] correctly but they

---

[757] Chirat 1950: 82 n.4-6; PO 19 [325]; PG 127: 600; PG 105: 20A-B.
[758] Mango (trans.) 1958:111.
[759] PG 97: 868B; Leone 1991: 26: 635-642.
[760] PO 19 [332].
[761] ibid. [325], [332].
[762] ibid. [326]. Translated in Cunningham (trans.) 2008:39- 40.
[763] Antonopoulou 1998:327.

became accusers of themselves such James the Jew, Aphrodisianos the Persian and a few others, who, after they referred to her birth, immediately fell silent'.[764] Epiphanios namely refers to the author of the *Protevangelion*, thus he seems to believe that the content of the *Protevangelion* was not appropriate for a holy figure like Mary. But despite his comment, Epiphanios largely bases his information for the life of Mary in the *Protevangelion*.

Eythumios' case constitutes the only direct support of the *Protevangelion* in Byzantine homilies and one could naturally think that it reflects a disbelief in the text's credibility. Nevertheless, this was another formula to defend the apocryphal account based again on the topos of anti-Jewish polemic in ninth- and tenth-century homiletics. Euthymios refers to Plato and Pythagoras, who are not related to the *Protevangelion* but are understood by the congregation as a codified message related to anti-pagan polemic so familiar to them by the tenth century when Euthymios writes.[765] That this reference to ancient Greek philosophers is a 'topos' is shown by the fact that, many centuries earlier, Origen in his defence of Christ's Nativity in his *Contra Celsum* refers to exactly the same philosophers.[766]

Moreover, James Kokkinobaphos in his Presentation homily makes a comment similar to Germanos'. He refers to Mary as a 'desirable spectacle, a beloved novel which most relied on its beauty without understanding its apocryphal mysteries and argues that although some have approached Mary's magnificence most of them were destroyed because of envy'.[767] The contrast between the evil of the past and the good that Mary brought with her Presentation in the Temple appears often in Presentation homilies. The homilies of Leo VI, Michael Psellos and Gregory Palamas show a distinction between

---

[764] PG 120:185.
[765] PO 19 [335].
[766] PG 11: 721C.
[767] PG 127: 629. In early Christian and Byzantine literature Mary is often described as 'book' or 'volume', see Evangelatou 2006:266-7. In a kontakion on Mary's Nativity, Mary is the 'volume that the Maker prepared', the 'sealed book', see Debiasi Gonzato (ed.) 1966: 119-120. See also the fourth homily on Mary's Nativity by Andrew of Crete, Cunningham (trans.) 2008: 125 n. 10.

the coming of the Virgin and the world before, when people were characterised by 'envy, jealousy, hatred, injustice, deceit, and false reasoning'.[768] God wished to save humanity and this is why Mary was brought to life, to destroy the legacy of Eve and Adam so that people would be free from evil. When Byzantine preachers refer to 'envy' in their Presentation homilies, it is not presupposed that people attack the *Protevangelion* or Mary's specific feast because the 'envy' pertains to the state of the world before the Nativity of Mary. And this is a miscomprehension on behalf of modern scholars such as Lafontaine-Dosogne and Ousterhout.

Lafontaine-Dosogne argues that the feast of the Presentation was questioned in the fourteenth century in the Presentation homilies of Gregory Palamas, which is why – according to Lafontaine-Dosogne – the scene was given preminence in the decoration in the Chora monastery.[769] Ousterhout has claimed that the Presentation of Mary was questioned in the fourteenth century.[770] However, Meyendorff, whom Lafontaine-Dosogne quotes, argues that Gregory Palamas does not try to prove the historicity of the feast but it is a work of piety.[771] And this is correct since in the two homilies of Gregory Palamas on the Presentation of Mary no such allusion is made. Palamas emphasized the ability of human beings to understand the wondrous nature of Mary and not to defend the feast itself as a result of attack.[772] Michael Psellos had written three centuries before Gregory Palamas, that Mary's Presentation is incomprehensible by human knowledge'[773]; similarly to Michael Psellos and Gregory Palamas, George Scholarios' (fifteenth century) reference in his Presentation homily to people who 'spend their life in envy' does not target those who disbelieve the feast but to the difficulty in understanding the meaning of the feast

---

[768] PG 107:16B; Toniolo 1971:62:31-4; Christou (ed.) 2009:240,244; Veniamin (trans.) 2005:9.
[769] Lafontaine-Dosogne 1975 :179 n.89.
[770] Ousterhout 1995:100.
[771] Meyendorff 1954:39.
[772] Veniamin (trans.) 2005:47.
[773] ' Ὡς ὑπερφυῆ ταῦτα καὶ ἀνθρωπίνης γνώσεως ὑπερκείμενα', see Toniolo 1971:66:127-8.

'when virtue is missing'.[774] Nikolaos Kavasilas in his Nativity homiliy writes that Mary is free from envy because she entered the Holy of Holies which was not acknowledged only by those 'who were blind and who had sunk into darkness'.[775]

The Presentation homilies offered the most fertile ground for the support of the *Protevangelion*. This was realised by presenting enemies against the apocryphal text, against two events from Mary's life (Presentation, Nativity) or against figures mentioned in this work. The last section aimed to show that the 'attack' to the feast of the Presentation in particular does not imply questioning of its veracity, but targeted all those who have not the spiritual ability to understand its deeper meaning.

Further remarks

Hymns on Mary's early life in the eighth and ninth centuries

I need not repeat the process from the third century onwards until the eighth century and how Mary's life was treated between this centuries. But for the convenience of the reader I will refer in this section to the results of my research conducted so far.

The period between the third and the seventh century, Mary's early life interested authors but they either reluctant to state openly that they were using the *Protevangelion* or they added their own information to the apocryphal story to make it look more 'historical'. The homiletic activity necessiated by Iconoclasm chronologically coincides with the emergence of a number of hymns on the feasts of Mary' life sung in the Orthodox Liturgy. The common denominator for these works is that they were composed from the eighth century onwards when the Marian homilies also started being composed. In contrast to the sixth-century kontakion of Romanos Melodos, these works did not suddenly appear and

---

[774] PO 19 [395].
[775] Nellas (ed.; trans.) 2010: 86-8.

then abruptly stop, but the eighth-century homiletic activity encouraged their composition and their steady appearance from then on.

The following works date to the eighth century: Anatolios wrote a kontakion *On the Nativity of Mary*;[776] Stephen Hagiopolites, a monk in the St Sabas monastery wrote a stichero on Mary's Nativity;[777] and Ephrem of Karia (Asia Minor) has dedicated a stichero to Sts Anna and Joachim and their feast September 9.[778] If the work of Ephrem of Karia is genuine, then it is the earliest liturgical work on the feast of Anna and Joachim, which as we will see will be introduced in the tenth century in the Constantinopolitan *Synaxarion*.

In the ninth century Sergios Hagiopolites writes stichera on Mary's Presentation and Nativity,[779] and then nun Thekla, the only example of female hymnographer who refers to St Anna, in her *enkomion on the Theotokos* writes: 'through Anna the joy of the nation sprang'.[780]

The productivity of hymnographers and homilists in the eighth and ninth century shows that Mary's early life became the favourite theme in way unprecedented compared with what happened before the eighth century. Romanos Melodos' kontakion was the result of Justinian's urge to promote the Virgin and it was not supported by contemporary religious developments, which only takes place after the eighth century and has to do with issues arising during Iconoclasm, which I think it was the most crucial factor in the interest in Mary's early life, her parents and the story of the Protevangelion.

---

[776] Wellesz (ed.) 1936: 34 no. 28.
[777] ibid. 32 no. 26 , 43-7 nos 36-40.
[778] ibid. 49. Emereau notes that there is no information on the life of Ephrem of Karia, see Emereau 1923: 421.
[779] Wellesz (ed.) 1938: 121-130; Wellesz (ed.) 1936:40-2 nos.33-5; Ksydes 1978:240.
[780] Eustratiades1931:166:45. In the tenth century, Symeon Magistros dedicated a canon on Mary's Nativity (Debiasi Gonzato (ed.) 1966: 139-145) although Debiasi Gonzato does not consider him being the original composer of the canon (Debiasi Gonzato [ed.] 1966 419-420). In the eleventh-century, Leo Magister [not to be confused with Leo Magister or Choirosphaktes, a Byzantine official who during the reign of Leo VI served as an ambassador to Bulgaria and Bagdad, (Tougher 1997:12)] wrote a stichero on Mary's Presentation, see Wellesz (ed.) 1938:113-4.

Dependence of homilists on the Protevangelion

When the first homilies on Mary's early life started being produced, the *Protevangelion* was used very selectively. Andrew of Crete, in his second sermon on the Nativity of Mary, used information provided in the apocryphal text only when he draws the lineage of Mary and refers to Matthew's Gospel as his source, although it is in fact based on the *Protevangelion*.[781] I referred earlier to the 'discrete allusion to the Protevangelion' of Andrew of Crete and his 'vagueness on account of its apocryphal nature'.[782] Kazhdan notes that Andrew of Crete in the Nativity homily 'rejects historicity again, hardly mentioning Joachim and Anna',[783] a tendency which is repeated in Marian homilies of the Late Byzantine period and in particular in the homily of Nikolaos Kavasilas (1322/3-after 1391 or 1319/23-after 1397) on Mary's Nativity,[784] and George Scholarios (1400-1474) on Mary's Presentation in the Temple.[785] Interestingly, Andrew of Crete in contrast to John of Damaskos, in his first and introductory homily dedicates a few lines to the inform his audience about Anna and Joachim.[786]

Tarasios briefly repeats the story of the *Protevangelion*, quoting the apocryphal text.[787] John of Euboea quotes the first line of the *Protevangelion* 'In the twelve tribes of Israel…'.[788] Germanos heavily relies on the text but he presents in a more lively way when, in his second homily on Mary's Presentation, Anna tells her story in her own words.[789] In the third homily on the Conception, George of Nikomedia quotes phrases or words from

---

[781] PG 97: 821D-824A; Kazhdan and Talbot 1991-2:19-20.
[782] P. 87.
[783] Kazhdan 1999 (2) :45.
[784] (Nikolaos Kavasilas) PO 19:465-484, 514-525; Halkin 1957: 1107n. For editions of this homily, see Spiteris and Conticello 2002: 330. For the dates of his birth and death, see DeCatanzaro (trans.) 1974:10; ODB 1088; Spiteris and Conticello 2002:315. For his life and works, see Spiteris and Conticello 2002:315-395; Tsirpanlis 1979:415-421.
[785] PO 19 : [395]-[407]. For his dates of death, see Tinnefeld 2002:477-491; Blanchet 2008 :16.
[786] Cunningham (trans.) 2008:79.
[787] PG 98:1484.
[788] Cunningham (trans.) 2008:177; PG 96: 1468A.
[789] PG 98: 313; Cunningham (trans.) 2008 :168 n.25.

the apocryphal text,[790] and James Kokkinobaphos adds a part of the title of the apocryphal text to his homily on the Conception of Mary.[791] Leo VI in his Nativity homily contains the most basic information about the events celebrated.[792] Gregory Palamas repeats many concepts of George Nikomedia as I showed above but he uses legal terminology, as this was one of his personal interests.[793]

However, there are homilies where even the story of the *Protevangelion* is not mentioned such as the Nativity sermon of John of Damaskos, Andrew of Crete and Photios. Even if Photios does not repeat the story, he vehemently defends the conception of Anna and thus automatically defends the veracity of the events mentioned. Additionally, the fact that the greatest number of homilists from the ninth century onwards supported the conception of Anna through prayer, shows that they used and accepted the apocryphal account.

In Late Byzantine homilies the authors barely refer to the story of the Protevangelion, the weight is exclusively on Mary, while Anna's and Joachim's names are sometimes not mentioned. This attitude is explained by the fact that at the beginning of the eighth-century writers were reluctant to use the *Protevangelion* but six centuries later the Nativity and the Presentation of Mary had been dealt so much that the homilists need not rely on the well known story of the *Protevangelion*. For example, Nikolaos Kavasilas refers to Anna and Joachim without naming them, which shows the familiarity of his congregation with these two figures in his time. He dedicates a great part of his Nativity homily to them by addressing them as the 'blessed couple' was used by God to dress

---

[790] PG 100: 1384D-1400B.
[791] PG 127: 544.
[792] Antonopoulou 1997:163.
[793] PG 150: 1090, 1348-1372. Tsironis notes that the use of the 'O men' apostrophe shows that George of Nikomedia 'defends himself for undertaking the attempt to celebrate the feast of the Mother of God as if he were in front of a court'. See Tsironis 1998a:307.

Christ with human flesh taking the mother from them, which alludes to Mary's Presentation at the age of three.[794]

In the period between the eighth- and the fifteenth century there is no specific way to present Mary's early life and the story of the *Protevangelion* was treated according to the perception of each homilist. The promotion of certain features of the story points to this fact; the connection between Mary's birth and biblical prophesies by John of Damaskos and Andrew of Crete, on the respect towards the Probatike by John of Damaskos, the emphasis on Mary's genealogy by Andrew of Crete,[795] on prayer by George of Nikomedia and Gregory Palamas, on the unity of the couple by George of Nikomedia, on Anna's conception by Photios, on motherly images in James Kokkinobaphos, on Anna as a protector of Constantinople in Peter of Argos, on the lack of anti-Jewish polemic in Neophytos the Recluse, on Anna's choice not to have a second child by Isidore of Thessalonike.

Nevertheless, the grouping of themes shows that homilists revolve around similar axes no matter the centuries that might seprate on homily after another. This is shown in the similarities between George of Nikomedia with James Kokkinobaphos, of George of Nikomedia with Gregory Palamas, and it is clearly demonstrate in their similar treatment of the theme of the Presentation, which is – apart from Neophytos the Recluse – always place in a polemic context.

Laourdas has explained the different organization of Photios' Nativity homily by the lack of pattern in the Nativity homilies since there were only five written before Photios' time.[796] A totally different view is offered by Cameron for ninth-century

---

[794] Nellas (ed.; trans.) 2010: 44.

[795] Cunningham (trans.) 2008 : 82 n. 40

[796] Laourdas (ed.) 1959: 53*. Until Photios time, homilies on the Nativity of Mary had been written by Andrew of Crete, John of Damaskos, Patriarch Tarasios, Patriarch Germanos, John of Euboea and Theodore Studites. Laourdas however expresses doubts whether that any homily on the Birth of Mary should attributed to Patriarch Germanos, see Laourdas (ed.) 1959:53* n.1.

Presentation homilies. She argues the ninth-century homilist will spend more time on the qualifications of Anna and Joachim and not that much on the Virgin's birth and her parents' gift of their child to the temple since the topic of the Presentation has been dealt many times in the past: 'So familiar were they with these stories the homilist could concentrate on his own rococo variations'.[797] Antonopoulou, following Cunningham, argues that the homilists of the ninth century followed the footsteps of their eighth-century predecessors with regard to structure and content,[798] and that despite an evolution of homilies from the eighth century the 'actual development of the subject depends on the individual author',[799] with which I agree. Additionally, by the ninth century, four homilies had been preserved on the Presentation by two homilists, so I am not sure where the term 'countless' that Cameron used refers to. The problem with Laourdas' and Cameron's arguments is that they do not compare the Nativity and the Presentation homilies of the ninth century to the homilies of the same subject of later periods to see that the evolution of the homilies on the Conception, Nativity and Presentation of Mary depends on each author and the century in which a homily belongs does not presuppose appearance or promotion of specific elements.

Thus Antonopoulou's view that 'actual development of the subject depends on the individual author' reflects the actual situation.[800] The particular promotion of Mary may have been directed by the homilists' personal reasons such as the deep veneration of Mary as it was the case with Nikolaos Kavasilas,[801] or because – to put Cameron's comment in an appropriate context – their (i.e. Joachim's and Anna's) story had been dealt so much

---

[797] Cameron 1991:100.
[798] Antonopoulou 1997: 103. For Leo's homily on the Nativity of Mary, see ibid. p. 164. As Antonopoulou notes however, he is differentiated from prious homilists in the 'total absence of any narrative elements', see Antonopoulou 1997:166.
[799] ibid. 164.
[800] Antonopoulou 1997: 164.
[801] For a brief overview of Nikolaos Kavasilas' Mariology, see Spiteris and Conticello 2002:357-361.

already that they need not repeat it again but to show once more its importance for the salvation of mankind.

Conclusions

Patlagean argues that what defined an apocryphal text is what books the Church and the heretics used.[802] The *Protevangelion* was on both sides. It was an apocryphal text that was from the ninth century considered as part of the Holy Scripture. The zeal with which the homilists defended its veracity resulted in its inclusion among the accepted books of the Orthodox Church although it was never officially acclaimed as part of the canonical books. Iconoclasm was the filter through which this transformation took place, and this shows how well the Byzantines manipulated tradition to support their views.

The Byzantine culture experienced a change after the eighth century, which is reflected in the attitude of preachers towards the *Protevangelion*. By the ninth century, the *Protevangelion* was transformed from a heretical text equivalent to the Holy Scripture, a process that offers an insight into the way the Byzantines manipulated tradition and the promotion of saints. As Baun correctly notes the 'Apocrypha are diverse product ends of that evolutionary process separately in their own right, for what they can reveal about the religious culture which produced and used them'.[803] The emerging emphasis on the genealogy of Christ during Iconoclasm necessitated the use and promotion of this apocryphal text because it served the iconophile propaganda. The association that St Anna's name received during Iconoclasm trigerred her veneration especially after the official end of the schism in 843, which was the most crucial factor in the spread of her cult and not the wide distribution of the *Protevangelion* per se. Thus considering the popularity of the *Protevangelion* after the ninth century in Byzantium, I have reached to

---

[802] Patlagean 1991:160. Broader discussion on what defines a canonical and a non-canonical work is provided by Gisel, see Gisel 1996: 225-234.
[803] Baun 2007:35.

the conclusion that Anna's and Joachim's story was brought to the surface when it was needed to support the beliefs of the iconophiles. Despite the fact that the *Protevangelion* was a popular work*,* it has not been made clear in scholarship who was using the *Protevangelion* but from what I have shown so far (always in relation to the life of Anna and Joachim) it is the mainly the clergy who make use of it. Although not many detalils can be said on the readership and spread of the *Protevangelion* in Byzantium, it seems that the Byzantines learned the story of Anna only after the eighth century when preachers started repeatedly to use this text and this how knowledge of Anna and Joachim was given to lay people.

The number of homilies often written by active iconophiles,[804] verifies the growing emphasis on the genealogy of Christ at that time, used to support the dogma of Incarnation, and this theme was promoted, in both texts and art.[805] Tsironis noted that poetry and homilies of the iconoclastic period display a shift of emphasis in their treatment of the Virgin,[806] Kalavrezou recognized that Mary was first called 'Mother of God' in the ninth century,[807] and in this context Brubaker has argued that in the ninth century there is a 'new awareness of Mary's emotional bonds with her son' which she shows has 'a solid context in ninth century religious thought.'[808] In twelfth- and thirteenth century kontakia on Anna's death (July 25) the saint is mentioned as 'the mother of the mother of Christ in flesh',[809] a phrase which encapsulates the form of Anna's veneration in Byzantium.

---

[804] Brubaker and Cunningham 2007:241. Andrew of Crete, Peter of Monemvasia, Joseph of Thessalonike, and Antonios of Thessalonike the Confessor were proclaimed saints because of their enrollment against iconoclasm, see Avramea 2004 : 49-51; Sode 2004:177-189.

[805] Grabar 1984: 241-243; Lafontaine-Dosogne 1995:107-113; Demus 1954:52-61; Brubaker has argued that 'after Iconoclasm things change in art but we should not assume that the artist had the same ambition with the writer of the theory of images', see Brubaker 2003:264. Meyer argues that in post-iconoclastic imagery the placement of Sarah framed by a window, a symbol of Incarnation, represents Christ's humanity and 'reflects changed occurring in Byzantine society that have to do with the realization of maternity - both Mariological and cultural'. See Meyer 2007:257-8.

[806] Tsironis 2005:93.

[807] Kalavrezou 1990:168. In an icon from Sinai which dates to the ninth century the inscription was changed from 'Η αγία Μαρία to Μήτηρ Θεού', see Weitzmann 1966a: 12-3.

[808] Brubaker 1999:405.

[809] 'ἡ τοῦ Χριστοῦ κατά σάρκα μητρός μήτηρ', see Nikolopoulos 1958:314.

CHAPTER 3

RELICS - FEASTS - SOCIAL APPROACHES

Introduction

In the first section of this chapter, I will look at the story of St Anna's relics in

Byzantium, which has never been examined in Byzantine scholarship. In the following

section, I will look at the evolution of the feasts of Mary's early life until their appearance in the Church calendar of Constantinople, and I will conclude with the third section, which examines the way women named Anna were presented in Byzantine texts. Chapter three is constructed in such a way to show that the cult of St Anna started gaining ground in the eighth century, when the 'debate' between different cities on the acquisition of her relics justified Anna's first signs of veneration in Eastern Christendom. This process resulted first in the introduction of several feasts into the Church calendar and second in the creation of ideological connotations attributed to Anna's namesakes. Through the attributions made to women named Anna in hagiography and histories, one discerns the way St Anna was perceived by the Byzantines. The main point that I will make in this chapter is a continuation of my results in chapter two: the cult of St Anna in Byzantium was developed and fully established between the eighth and the tenth centuries.

Part 1. *Relics*

Despite modern scholarship's lack of interest in the story behind St Anna's relics in the Byzantine capital, there are two written sources that mention St Anna's relics in Constantinople: the tenth-century *Patria of Constantinopl*e and a sixteenth-century description of the Pammakaristos church.[810] The historicity of the last source is not contested, but the *Patria*'s historicity is; but, as I will demonstrate, the information in the *Patria* has some historical truth in it.

In the introduction of this thesis, I mentioned that the study of Anna's relics is very problematic. This is not only because the information is very often unclear but also scholars tend to obnubilate the topic with unsupported views. For example, even though Byzantine sources are clear in their information on the date or on the way of acquisition of Anna's relics in both East and West, Western scholars have developed views, which create

---

[810] Schreiner 1971:223, 237.

confusion. The reason for this confusion is on the one hand, that there is no Western primary source dated earlier than the *Patria* to support the existence of Anna's relics in Western soil and, on the other hand, Western scholars do not always include the Byzantine sources mentioned above in their discussion on St Anna's relics. And since no study of Anna's relics has been discussed by Byzantine scholars the issue calls for re-examination.[811]

In this section, evidence from both East and West will be examined in order not only to present the debate between sources and views of scholars on the reconstruction of the history of Anna's relics, but also to suggest routes that the saint's relics must have followed and most probable candidate cities for the actual acquisition of her relics.

I have divided the scholarly views in four groups based on the routes that scholars believed the relics followed.

The first group is mainly comprised of nineteenth-century French scholars, who use unreliable material evidence, which they blend with historical events to argue that the relics were located in the Bethesda Pool or that they were brought from Palestine to Apt (France) in the fourth century. Moreover, they claim that it is in Apt that the relics appeared for the first time after leaving Palestine and that they were revealed there in the eighth century.

According to the second group, the relics first appeared in Constantinople and then in Rome in the eighth century. The third group is comprised of sources that present a different route, from Trebzond or Palestine to Mount Athos. In the final group, I have

---

[811] On the one hand, it has been argued that the majority of relics from the Holy Land arrived in Constantinople after the loss of Jerusalem from Byzantine hands, see Kalavrezou 1997:53. On the other hand, scholars argue that a 'cessation in relic-importation' to the capital is attested from the time of Heraklios until the Macedonian emperors, Wortley 1982:270-1. A list of relics that entered Constantinople compiled by Nancy Ševčenko verifies the second view and in particular that the largest number of relics entered the Byzantine capital in the tenth century. However, the relics of St Anna are not included in it. I thank Nancy Ševčenko for sharing this information with me.

placed the sources according to which the relics reached Constantinople and from there were dispersed in Europe.

Despite the lack of historicity of some of the sources I will unavoidingly refer to, it will be shown that the relics of St Anna existed in Constantinople at least before the thirteenth century, but the expansion of her cult triggered scholarly views that offer nothing but confusion to the story of her relics.

I should note that the groups are not always presented in the sequence mentioned in the introduction, because evidence can be used to support the views of two groups simultaneously. For example, the presence of Anna's relics in France in the thirteenth century verifies at the same time that the relics were located until then in Constantinople, where they were taken from in 1204.The first place to start the examination of the problem is Palestine, the place where St Anna lived and, I assume, died.

First group: Palestine. St Anne's relics in the Probatic Pool

Despite the number of pilgrims visiting Jerusalem from the sixth century onwards, discussed in chapter one, who refer to monuments related to Mary's early life, there is no mention of the relics of St Anna in Palestine or the Holy Land before the Latin conquest of Jerusalem in 1099. Epiphanios the Monk (780), the only surviving source on the location of Anna's death, writes: 'Anna left Nazareth to meet her daughter Mary in Jerusalem where she (Anna) died in the age of seventy-two'.[812] There is no other textual or archaeological evidence to provide information on Anna's death and relics. Despite the lack of evidence however, scholars insist on locating the saint's relics in the Probatic Pool.

As shown in chapter one, the Probatic Pool was highlighted in the sixth century as the place where Mary was born. In 1839, the French scholar Cré established a

---

[812] PG 120: 192B. For Anna's and Joachim's tomb in Jerusalem, see Vincent and Abel 1922:677; Cruz 1984:153.

further connection between the parents of Mary and the Probatic Pool, when he argued that it was also the place where Anna and Joachim were buried.[813] Relying heavily on pilgrims' accounts from the twelfth to the nineteenth century and on the location's tradition as Mary's birthplace, Cré argued that the tombs of St Anna and St Joachim were located in the crypt under the still-standing basilica of St Anna by the Probatic Pool, without showing how this connection proves the existence of their relics in Probatic Pool.[814] He dates the crypt to the Constantinian era but he provides no ground evidence for this dating while the crypt dates, similarly to the church of St Anna, to the period of Western rule in Jerusalem, namely to 1099. Cré, by attempting to establish a 'mystic connection' through symbols of marriage to the architecture of the crypt, believed that he was dealing with a couple being buried in the Probatike, which could be any couple.[815]

Two travelers however verify the burial of Mary's parents in the Probatike. The first dates to the fourteenth-century and it is Perdikos, protonotarios of Ephesos and the fifteenth-century traveler, Felix Fabri. Perdikos claims that the tomb of Joachim and Anna was located under their house in Jerusalem,[816] and Felix Fabri says that in his time the tombs of Anna and Joachim were located in Jerusalem, close to the place Mary was born.[817] Various traditions sprang up with the arrival of the Latins in Jerusalem and Perdikos's and Fabri's comments reflect the tendency of the Latins to create new associations in the topography of Palestine around the life of Mary.[818] Perdikos in particular locates in one monument the following buildings: the crypt with the tombs of Anna and Joachim, the Western basilica dedicated to St Anna, the church of Mary in the Probatike, and the Probatic pool.[819] His account reflects the traditions created in the

---

[813] Cré 1893:245-274.
[814] ibid. 246.
[815] ibid. 271.
[816] Baseu-Barabas 1997:165-6.
[817] Hassler (ed.) 1843:130.
[818] See n. 289.
[819] Baseu-Barabas 1997:165-6. In the early Byzantine period a basilica was built in the memory of St Anna in Bayt Jibrin (Eleutheropolis) and its today ruins are located southwest of Jerusalem in modern Nahal Govrin,

specific location rather than what he actually saw, similarly to the pilgrim Theodosios in the sixth century.[820]

Cré's arguments, which are largely based on post twelfth-century pilgrims' accounts, are completely unfounded and offer more confusion than insight into the history of Anna's relics.[821] However, his point of view needs to be mentioned as there has been no work on the saint's relics in the East. Cré's arguments were criticized not long after their publication by Lagrand and Mauss; the latter was responsible for the restoration of the Western basilica at Bethesda and also led the excavation in the crypt located under the still standing Crusader church of St Anna.[822]

Second group: From Palestine to France

The second group is represented once more by French scholars, who claimed that during Charlemagne's return from Italy in 776 and after he had successfully crushed the Lombard conspiracy to throw off Frankish domination, he visited Apt (France) to spend his Easter holidays, where on the seventeenth of April he was shown in front of his court the relics of St Anna.[823] The story of the translation of Anna's body to Apt begins in the fourth century when it was supposingly taken from Jerusalem to France by St Lazaros and Mary Magdalene. Of course St Lazaros and Mary Magdalene lived in the first and not in the fourth century, but it seems that they were involved in hidding the body of St Anna somewhere in Jerusalem. We are told by modern scholars that it was transferred and

---

see CIAP 1999:109, 114; Pringle 2007: no 223. The apse dates from the Byzantine period but the nave from the Latin rule (after the twelfth century), see Pringle 2007:281. The church's current name is Khirbat Sand Hanna or Mar Hanna, (= church of St Anna, St Anna) and mosaics have been found, but unfortunately there is no reference to these in CIAP 1999: 114.

[820] See p. 14.

[821] Baumer, Scheffczyk and Cecchelli argue that the references to St Anna's relics in Jerusalem date from the twelfth century onwards, see Baumer and Scheffczyk 1988:156; Cecchelli 1946:122.

[822] Lagrange 1903:467; Mauss 1888.Geva 1993:781. Vincent 1904:228-241. For the Crusader church, see Prawer 1975:102-8; Kühnel 2006:16-7, 51-3, 56-60, 64-6, 71-2, 84-6, 96-7, 486-9; Folda 1995:133-7

[823] Mathieu 1861:6-7; Baumer and Scheffczyk 1988: 164.

hidden in a cave in Apt by St Auspicius, the first bishop of Apt, thus the body was taken from Jerusalem not in the first but in the fourth century. It is not known what happened between the first and the fourth century but it was probably lying hidden.

Mathieu argues that in order to commemorate the burial of Anna's relics in Apt, St Castor built a church between 400 and 419, which he dedicated to 'sanctae Mariae sedis Aptensis',[824] namely to Mary. The relics were re-discovered during Charlemagne's reign which is verified – as Mathieu argues – by the fact that on the ceiling over the recess where the body was found, there are two ornamented slabs with carved letters – discussed shortly – belonging to the eighth or the ninth century.[825] Ronan following Lagrand supported the veracity of the story behind Anna's relics in Apt, because it was in the Carolinian litanies that the name of St Anna was first inserted, and Charlemagne sent a letter to Pope Hadrian (772-795) where Charlemagne claims the authenticity of the saint's relics.[826] But as Ronan himself admits, these documents are 'not authentic' and the documents concerning the Carolinian liturgy mentioned above 'have not been found yet'.[827] In tenth-century edition of the Carolignian litanies, the names of St Anna and St Elisabeth appear, thus Lagrand's view may have some historical basis, if we accept that the tenth-century version of the Carolignian litanies reflect earlier liturgical traditions.[828] Didier, who explains the construction of the church of Mary in Apt as the result of the Council of Ephesus (431) where Mary was acclaimed Theotokos, believes that the association of the church in Apt with Charlemagne is that it was during Charlemagne's reign that the church was possibly rebuilt.[829]

---

[824] Mathieu 1861:4; Ronan 1927:18-9.
[825] Ronan 1927:22; Cruz 1984:136.
[826] Charlemagne's communication with Pope Hadrian was due to Charlemagne's wish to have the Roman liturgy widely celebrated, see Klauser 1979: 73-4; King 1957:24.For liturgical reforms in the Carolingian period, see Schneider 1999:772-781.
[827] Ronan 1927:21-2; Gharland 1921:294-7.
[828] PL 138:886.
[829] Didier 1967:65.

The construction of the church of Mary is not doubted and the tombs found under the church were used to bury the first bishops of Apt from the fifth century onwards.[830] But the connection of the relics of St Anna with this church lacks historicity for a number of reasons.

First the life of St Auspicius survives in two manuscripts from the thirteenth and fourteenth century, where it is said that he was buried in Apt and his body was discovered by a miracle in 750, namely during Charlemagne's reign.[831] Second in the *Charter of the church of Apt*, which chronologically extends from the ninth until the twelfth century (835-1130),[832] a donation was made to the churches of Mary and of St Castor on 9 April 896 but there is no mention of relics of any saint and no connection to Charlemagne is made.[833] In Didier's version of the charter of Apt, under the date 17 July 835 and 4 July 852, the same dedication appears but, once more, there is no mention or connection of Anna's relics to Charlemagne.[834] Third the fact that the revelation of the relics in front of Charlemagne took place a century before the charter was composed cannot be used as evidence for the existence of Anna' relics in Apt by the eighth century for the reason that the two marble slabs that Mathieu refers to are chancel slabs which retain only floral and geometrical decoration. Fourth the inscription that Mathieu refers to is not part of these slabs but of a slab which stands in the middle of the crypt and commemorates the name of a priest in Apt. Finally, the fact that a church was erected in the name of Virgin Mary, with eighth century or ninth-century slabs that accompany a tomb, does not validate either the presence of Anna's relics or the date of the translation.

The use of the crypt for burials gave rise to the tradition of a saint's relics, but why Anna and why Apt in particular? The answer lies in the French participation in the

---

[830] ibid. 66.
[831] Björkvall 1986:20.
[832] ibid. 20.
[833] De Poli (trans.) 1900:28 no 120.
[834] Didier 1967:89-91.

first Crusade. As Elsberg and Guest note 'the Bishop of Apt is mentioned in the history of the first Crusade, and Raimbadu de Simiane and Guillaume de Simiane, lords of Apt, are named as having taken part in it'.[835] During the sack of Jerusalem in the first Crusade, a textile of Coptic origin dated to 1096-7,[836] was transferred from Jerusalem to the cathedral of Apt where it was opened in the twentieth century and it is has been named since as 'the veil of St Anna of Apt'.[837]

The label given to the veil suggests that in the twentieth century, the Westerners reassumed their post-1204 practise of taking relics to support the authenticity of other relics,[838] because there is nothing to prove that this 'pseudo-veil' belonged to St Anna.[839] The only inscriptions found on the veil are those of El Musta'lî (1094-1101) and El Afdal, the Fatimid Khalif of Egypt and his minister.[840] Didier believes that a part of Anna's body was transferred to the cathedral of Apt, which became an important pilgrimage centre,[841] but there is nothing to show that this event took place before the first Crusade. The interest of the West in St Anna, which is expressed in the construction of a church dedicated to St Anna in the proximity of the Probatike in the twelfth century together with the traditions that rose around her burial, seems to be the case with the interest in her relics as well. As Virginia Nixon has shown in her study on the cult of St Anna in the West, by the twelfth century the cult of Anna was established in Nothern Europe and Jerusalem, and this is reflected in the construction by the Crusaders not only of the church in Jerusalem but also in Sepphoris.[842] Nixon's view is in accordance with what I am suggesting here, that the interest in St Anna and the desire of scholars to include France in the history of the saint's

---

[835] Elsberg and Guest 1936 :145.
[836] Marçais and Wiet 1934:183.
[837] Wiet 1935:281; Elsberg and Guest 1936:145.
[838] Durand 2007:205-218.
[839] Cornu 1999:333.
[840] Elsberg and Guest 1936:145; Cornu 1999: 336 and n. 19. For a translation of its Arabic inscriptions, see Cornu 1999: 333-5.
[841] Didier 1967:21, 66.
[842] Nixon 2004:13.

relics, resulted in the creation of the 'Aptian tradition' which goes back to the activities of the Crusaders in the twelfth century and in the perpetuation of this connection between the cult of the saint and France in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

However, the existence of Anna's relics in France is not fictional. It is verified by a post-1204 source, which at the same time proves the existence of Anna's body parts in the Byzantine capital. In the archives of the Chartres Cathedral, Countess Catherine is said to have taken the head of St. Anna from Constantinople in 1024 and brought it to France, where she built a church to accommodate St. Anna's relics.[843] The interest in Anna is the result of the 'chartrain marian devotion' demonstrated in the thirteenth-century introduction of the feast of Mary's Nativity, which became the patronal feast for the Chartres cathedral.[844] Du Cange refers to this thirteenth-century translation in his brief commentary of the palace-chapel of Leo VI dedicated to St Anna where he also refers to the history of the saint's church in the Deuteron.[845] Du Cange possibly believed that the saint's relics were associated with both churches.   Finally, the archives of the Chartres cathedral constitute the first sound evidence of Western origin to confirm the existence of the relic of Anna in the Byzantine capital

Third group. The relics in Constantinople and Rome: The Patria and scholarly views
The appearance of Anna's relics in the West and Rome in particular needs to be mentioned in collaboration with the account of the *Patria*, because scholars who argue that the relics

---

[843] Chapter III, April 15 1204: 'Qui etiam caput sancte Anna, matris beate Virginis genitricis Dei, apud Constantinopolim acquisivit et huic sancte ecclesie cum pallio precioso transmisit'. Chapter XVII, September 20 1204: 'Et [obiit] Katerina, nobilis comitissa Blesensis et Clarimontis, que caput beate Anna, matris beatissime Virginis Dei genitricis Marie, a viro suo, illustri comite Ludovico, apud Constantinopolim acquisitum et huic missum ecclesie, cum precioso pallio presentavit et tria alia pallia preciosa eidem ecclesie dedit'. See Meulen 1967:168. Mentioned also by Du Cange 1680 (4): 144.
[844] Fassler 2000:406. The Byzantine palace-relics found in the West are not always the result of the 1204 sack of the city. For example, between 1356-7 the wife of the emperor John V, Elena, sold relics to Hospital of Siena, see Hetherington 1983:1-31.
[845] Du Cange 1680 (4) :144.

were first brought in Constantinople and from there were transferred to Rome rely on this tenth-century account.

a) The translation according to the Patria

'The acquisition of precious relics was for an emperor an act of vital importance aiming at consolidating his reign and at giving signal of his dynastic prestige everywhere else'.[846] Emperor Justinian II is credited with the acquisition of St Anna's relics and in particular with the translation of the body of St Anna in Constantinople between either 685-695 or 705-711. The *Patria* claims: 'And then he [Justinian II] built the church of St Anna, because his wife was pregnant and she had a vision of the saint. But also the maphorion of the saint and [her] holy body entered the city in his time'.[847] The account presents Justinian II as the emperor who brought the relics of the St Anna to Constantinople and dedicated a church to her in the quarter of Deuteron to accommodate the saint's body and her maphorion. Gedeon, based on the account of Prokopios that Justinian I constructed the church of St Anna in the Deuteron, suggested that the body of the saint was deposited in that church during Justinian's time.[848] Gedeon's view is not out of context. Maraval argued that Justinian I was interested in gathering relics,[849] and according to the eighth-century *Barberini Euchologion*, during church consecrations the placement of relics in the sanctuary is essential,[850] and as Verhelst notes, it 'was impossible in Byzantium to introduce a new saint into the liturgy without the deposition of the relics or at least a brandeum'.[851] At the same period as the *Barberini Euchologion*, the seventh canon of the second council of Nicaea (787) refers to this rite as one of the 'customs that heretics have

---

[846] Mergiali-Sahas 2001:46; See also James 2001b:124,126.
[847] Preger (ed.) 1989: 244; PG 157:577.
[848] Gedeon 1899:136.
[849] Maraval 1985:96-7.
[850] Parenti and Velkovska (eds) 1995:170-3. For consecrations of churches with relics before the eighth century in the West, see Michaud 1999:199-203; Herrmann-Mascard 1975:162-8; Velkova-Velkovska, 2000: 386 and the bibliography on that page.
[851] Verhelst 2006:454.

abandoned and that now should be renewed',[852] which however refers to the prohibition posed by the iconoclasts of the placement of relics in the altar, and not to a practice abandoned by the Church.[853] Gedeon assumes that the writer/editor of the *Patria* blended the construction of Justinian I with the relic translation of Justinian II. However, I agree with Majeska who rejected this point of view due to the lack of evidence.[854]

Since there is no sound evidence that the relics of St Anna were transferred to the church of the Deuteron during the reign of Justinian I, I will now refer to other, more plausible suggestions about the periods and places that St Anna's relics were trasferred in- and outside Constantinople. A reliquary from Mount Athos points to the interest in the relics of Mary' parents by the tenth century and in particular it shows that the relics not of Anna, but of Joachim were located in Constantinople by that time. According to Mathews and Dandridge, a tenth-century reliquary in the Great Lavra in Mount Athos depicts saints whose relics were venerated in Constantinople.[855] But as its publishers argue, the problem with this reliquary is that although Joachim's bust is included, the busts of Anna, Mary and even Christ are not.[856] Even if we have no information on the relics of St Joachim to confirm the view of Mathews and Dandridge, we can certainly not disregard the evidence of the reliquary and even though the relics of Mary or Christ are not included, the choice of saints might have been directed by the donor's choice to include saints to whom he personally felt related to. However, the reliquary does not invalidate the account of the *Patria* and, as it is shown in the archives of the Chartres cathedral, an earlier, eighth-century introduction of the relics of Anna into the Byzantine capital, as the *Patria* suggests, is not unreasonable. This is what the third group of scholars advocate.

---

[852] Tanner and Alberigo (trans.) 1990:144-5; For the abandonment of relics during church-consecrations, see Mansi (ed.) (13): 427; Christo 2005: 4; Mendham (trans.) 1850:457.
[853] Auzépy 2001:21.
[854] Majeska 1984:370, n. 52; Preger 1989: 77-8.
[855] Mathews and Dandridge 2004:115-6.
[856] ibid. 121.

b) The translation from Constantinople to Rome: scholarly views and evidence

Bannister, Kleinschmidt and Avery locate the relics of St Anna in the eighth century first in Constantinople and then in Rome. Bannister in particular, followed by Kleinschmidt, rejected the notion that the relics were first seen in Apt and accepted the veracity of account in the *Patria*, on which he elaborated. He writes that Justinian II sent an invitation to Pope Constantine (708-715) to visit Constantinople and that during his stay the Pope had the chance to attend the procedure of the translation.[857] Constantine was so impressed by the whole procession that, when he returned to Rome, he commissioned some of the depictions of St Anna in Santa Maria Antiqua.[858] Avery expanded this argument and assumed that Pope Constantine brought a relic of St Anna with him to Rome from Constantinople and this explained – as she argues – the appearance in Santa Maria Antiqua of the depiction of Sts Anna, Elisabeth and Mary as the holy mothers, discussed in chapter four.[859]

Bannister and Kleinschmidt locate the relics of St Anna in eighth-century Rome with two other monuments, St Angelo in Pescheria and St Nicholas in Carcere. Although they provided no evidence of the way the relics were acquired by the first church, they argue that in the second half of the eighth century – during its restoration of Theodotus – St Anna's relics were venerated in the church of Saint Angelo in Pescheria (constructed in 750, 755 or 770),[860] where in the church's inventory the names of Anna and Elizabeth are listed first after those of male saints, as I will discuss shortly. To support the veneration of the saint in the eighth century, Bannister and Kleinschmidt have claimed that in the church

---

[857] Bannister 1903:109-111; Kleinschmidt 1930:73-4; the trip started in 5 October 710 (Duchesne [ed.] 1955:389, 394 no 8; Davis [trans.] 2000: 92) and was completed in 711 (Stratos 1980:134; Head 1972:134).

[858] Bannister 1903:109-111; Kleinschmidt 1930:73-4. The same view is repeated by Baumer and Scheffczyk 1988:164.

[859] Avery 1925:143: Kondakov 1915:307 fig. 208. That St Anna's relics were located in the eighth-century in the chuch of Santa Maria Antiqua is also supported in ODDC 1975:59.

[860] Leclercq 1907:2166; Grisar 1899:173.

of St Nicholas in Carcere, cardinal Mai discovered an inscription with a donation to this church in the honour of St Anna.[861]

Bannister, Kleinschmidt and Avery base their arguments on the *Patria*, an inventory list, an inscription and iconography. As reliable as this evidence might seem, a few points in their arguments need to be re-examined.

First there is no coherence between the date of the translation that Bannister sets (no earlier than 710),[862] and the execution of the frescoes of St Anna in Santa Maria Antiqua, were executed during the papacy of Paul I (757-767).[863] According to the Liber Pontificalis, Pope John VII (705-707) and not Constantine is responsible for the decoration of this part of the church of Santa Maria Antiqua.[864] Ronan argues that even if the existing frescoes do not date to Constantine's time, they are either reproductions of them or at least the reminiscence of Pope Constantine's sojourn in the East,[865] which however cannot be proved. In the *Liber Pontificalis* and the account of Paul the Deacon there is no mention of translation of St Anna's relics or restoration of churches dedicated to St Anna in Rome.[866]

The inventory from Saint Angelo in Pescheria writes 'Sancta Anna Sancta Elisabet Sancta Euphumia' and thus shows that the names of Anna, Elisabeth the martyrs or Mary's mother and cousin (Fig. 11).[867] In the tenth-century Pala d'Oro in Venice, St Anna in medallion is placed near Elisabeth and additional examples from art will show that it is always the mother of John the Forerunner placed next to St Anna.[868] If the inventory does refer to the relics of Mary's mother and cousin, their presence in eighth-

---

[861] Bannister 1903:111; Kleinschmidt 1930:73. Avery makes the same connection and argues that it is difficult to explain this connection. See Avery 1925:143 n.62.

[862] Aurenhammer repeats the information of the Patria and dates the reconstruction to 710, see LCI: 141.

[863] Wilpert 1916: 711; Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992:36-7, n.5.; LCI 1973:172.Lucey (Lucey 1999: 67-83) accepts that St Anna is depicted holding Mary in the sanctuary of Santa Maria Antiqua and dates it between 565-655. The problem of Anna's identification in this depiction, is mentioned in n. 1140.

[864] Davis (trans.) 2000:90; Duchesne (ed.) 1955:385.

[865] Ronan 1927:13.

[866] Head 1972:132-6. Duddley-Fulkee 1907:259, 274.

[867] Grisar 1899: 174.

[868] Hahnloser 1994: Pl. L no.98. and p.49.

century Rome is not surprising, considering the depiction of Anna, Mary and Elisabeth in Santa Maria Antiqua.[869] Moreover, the existence of relics of St Anna in Rome is not out of context since from 790 onwards relics received official support and the translation around 800 fits very well with the fact that by the end of the ninth century all Western churches were assumed to have relics,[870] justifying their characterization of Western sanctity and cult of saints as 'relic-based.' [871]

But as far as St Nicholas in Carcere is concerned, Bannister relied on Kleinschmidt who read the inscription wrongly.[872] The correct reading of the inscription, as it was published by cardinal Mai, is 'sancte (sic) Anna sanctus Simeon'.[873] It refers to Anna the prophetess, who we know from the Presentation of Christ in the temple, as the Gospel of Luke (2:36) informs us. In contrast to St Nicholas in Carcere, the inventory of Saint Angelo in Pescheria constitutes the only sound evidence for the existence of Anna's relics in Rome in the eighth century. The version which presents the relics of St Anna in St Nicholas in Carcere is a scholarly effort to locate the relics in Rome rather than a natural conclusion from reliable evidence.

In both Italy and France a common axis transcends the stories behind the relics of Anna: the relics have been revealed or transferred in the eighth century. As we saw in chapter two, the eighth century is a time when in the East the *Protevangelion* started gaining serious ground in the homiletic activity of Byzantine preachers. In this framework, the attribution to Justinian II of the acquisition of St Anna's relics is in accordance with the rise of the saint's veneration from the eighth century onwards. Taking into consideration the evidence used for the establishment of the entrance of Anna's relics in Europe, the inventory of Saint Angelo in Pescheria and the archives of the Chartres cathedral should be

---

[869] See chapter four.
[870] Geary 1979:13; Herrmann-Mascard 1975:57-8.
[871] Fouracre 1999:145. Smith 2000:318.
[872] Kleinschmidt 1930:73.
[873] Mai (ed.) 1831:41, 218.

regarded as the most reliable proof of the existence of the saints relics in the East. This conclusion, which is significant not only for the Byzantine but for the Western Christendom as well, has not been used in connection to the veneration of the saint in both East and West in the eighth century. The inventory of Saint Angelo in Pescheria and the depiction of Anna with Mary and Elisabeth in Santa Maria Antiqua confirms that by the eighth century, the cult of Anna had started gaining ground in Rome as Bannister, Kleinschmidt and Avery have proposed.

c) The relics in Constantinople in the sixteenth century
The Pammakaristos church

Our knowledge on the presence of Anna's relics in Constantinople until the thirteenth century is based on the Patria and it is verified by the archives of Chartres Cathedral. The only source from Constantinople itself dates to the sixteenth century and it is found in the inventory of the Pammakaristos church.

According to this account, the relics of St Anna were located in this church. It is the last information on the saint's relics in the Byzantine capital and the word 'λείψανον' implies that we are dealing with a body part.[874] Reasons of protection might have directed the placement of the relics in Pammakaristos by the sixteenth century, since the church continued to be used normally after the Turkish occupation.[875] A further association can be made for the placement of St Anna's relics in the Pammakaristos church and it has to do with the eleventh-century donor of the church. According to an inscription in the sanctuary, Anna Dukas and her husband John Komnenos (possibly a court official [died in 1067]), built the church.[876] As we will see in chapter four, women named Anna or

---

[874] Schreiner 1971:223 no.14 [καὶ ἔχει τὸ λείψανον Εὐφημί(ας) καὶ Ἄννης τῆς μ(ητ)ρ(ὸ)ς τῆς Θ(εοτό)κου']. For a translation of the word 'λείψανον', see Lampe 1961:796.

[875] Janin 1969:209.

[876] 'Ἰωάννου φρόντισμα Κομνηνοῦ τόδε Ἄννης τε ῥίζης Δουκικῆς τῆς συζύγου οἷς ἀντιδοῦσα πλουσίαν, ἁγνή, χάριν τάξαις ἐν οἴκῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ μονοτρόπους', see Janin 1969:208. Janin notes that the word 'φρόντισμα', points to a small scale patronage.

husbands whose wives named Anna commissioned depictions of St Anna in churches and the relics of the saint n the Pammakaristos church might have been directed because of name conjunction or thankfulness for a child, since she was considered a protector of childbirth.[877]

Fourth group. From Trebzond to Athos

The last location to look for the relics of the saint is Mount Athos, where the saint's left foot was taken to Athos in the seventeeth century.[878] Smyrnakes argues that the translation to Athos was an initiative of Dositheos Patriarch of Jerusalem (1641–1707), who is famous for his *Dodekabiblos* (= twelfth books, which deal with the history of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem).

According to Smyrnakes, Anna's foot reached Athos on 26 October 1686.[879] A clergyman equipped with a piece of paper (the content of which is not mentioned) from the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople travelled to Armenia, to the city or Theodosioupolis (modern Erzurum, Turkey), where in the church of Sts Menas, Viktor and Vikentios various relics were kept. The clergyman bought the foot of St Anna to prevent it from 'falling into the hands of a non-believer'. He verified its authenticity by receiving a certificate from the metropolitan of Caesareia-Cappadocia, Epiphanios, and of Chaldeia, Sylvestros, the signatures of which appear on this document as he claims but not the date of the purchase. Then two Arab archpriests (αρχιερέων) appear in the story (they are also mentioned later in the story as two 'people from Asia'), and said that they were from Antioch; they bought the foot from the clergyman mentioned and they brought it to the Patriarch of Jerusalem Dositheos and asked him what to do with it. Dositheos,

---

[877] For the association of Anna with childbirth, see section three in this chapter.
[878] The whole procedure of the translation of St Anna's left foot to Mount Athos has been described in a document published by Mikragiannanites, who unfortunately did not publish its content Mikragiannanites 1958:94, no. 7.
[879] Smyrnakes 1988:411.

metropolitan of Caesarea between 1666-1669 and whose mother was named Anna, 'was inclined to this location' (i.e. in Athos), told them (the two Arab priests) to build a church in the name of St Anna and to dedicate the foot there.[880] When these two 'people from Asia' were touring the Holy Mountain for alms, they stayed with Matthew of Mytilene who bought the foot and the certificate from them.[881]

The setting and date of the discovery of St Anna's relics in Theodosioupolis is not accidental. It shows that the three Patriarchates of Constantinople, of Jerusalem and of Antioch were targeting Theodosioupolis. Theodosioupolis was part of the jurisdiction of the metropolis of Trebzond, which from 1461 belonged to the Armenian patriarchate of Constantinople created by Mehmet II.[882] In 1670 a case of Chaldian expansionism is recorded when the bishop of Theodosioupolis was reproved by the Patriarch of Constantinople for claiming revenues which belonged to Trebzond.[883] The fact that the relics of Anna were found in Theodosioupolis as an initiative of the Patriarchate of Constantinople (which received the approval of the Patriarch of Jerusalem) and were brought by two priests from Antioch may well be seen a another expression of the tensions between the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, Antioch and Constantinople against the metropolis of Theodosioupolis. The relics received the approval of the metropolitan of Caesarea - Cappadocia which belonged to the Patriarchate of Constantinople and by the metropolitan of Chaldia which belonged to the metropolis of Trebzond but Chaldia was upgraded into an autonomous archbishopric during the first half of the seventeenth century, during the prelacy of Sylvestros.[884] The metropolitans of Trebzond reacted strongly but unsuccessfully against the secession of Chaldia's province. By presenting Theodosioupolis

---

[880] Ibid. 411.
[881] ibid. 411-2.
[882] Redgate 2000:263.
[883] Ballian 1995:88-9.
[884] Kiminas 2009:109.

as a submissive region towards Constantinople, the text expresses Constantinople's negativity towards the independency of Chaldeia at the expense of Trebzond.

An additional but much earlier connection is made between Trebzond and St Anna's relics. In the church of St Anna in Trebzond, which was built in the ninth century,[885] but retains mural decoration of a later period, a unique scene survives to the North above a small door, which leads to the prothesis, the Dormition of Joachim and Anna.[886] Under Joachim's tomb we read the request of the priest and donor Nikephoros for commemoration.[887] Although the depiction is undated, Bryer and Winfield have noted that 'we are dealing with funerary chapel of the fourteenth and the fifteenth century',[888] thus the scene should be dated to this period.

I mentioned in chapter one that Basil I reconstructed this church. It is tempting to think that Basil's reconstruction was associated with the translation of Anna's relics in Trebzond. The funerary scene of Anna's and Joachim's Dormition could point to the existence of their relics in this church and the story of Patriarch Dositheos points to the same assumption, that the relics of Mary's parents were located in Trebzond whence they were taken in the seventeenth century.

Apart from Smyrnakes' account, the presence of Anna's left foot in Athos is verified by other contemporary (seventeenth-century) sources. French travellers have argued that they saw St Anna's foot on their visit to the Holy Mountain. However, they write that the foot had been transported from Palestine, either from Choziba or Nazareth.[889] The reference to these two cities is not accidental. We saw in chapter one that Nazareth was the place where according to the sixth-century Armenian version of the

---

[885] Bryer and Winfield 1985:218-9.
[886] ibid. 219. It has been argued that the earliest depiction of Anna's death dates to the sixteenth century, see Baumer and Scheffczyk 1988:158.
[887] Millet 1936:25.
[888] Bryer and Winfield 1985:219.
[889] Omont 1902:1019.

Protevangelion Mary was born,[890] a tradition perpetuated by Epiphanios the Monk (although he says that Anna died in Jerusalem), the *Synaxarion of Constantinople*, the homilist Peter of Argos and the Church-historian Nikephoros Kallistos.[891] Additionally, Choziba (Jericho) is where Epiphanios Hagiopolites (a different person from Epiphanios the Monk) locates the house of Joachim.[892] The seventeenth-century travellers may have been aware of the Palestine traditions and did not seem to be aware of the story of the acquisition from Armenia. Finally, that fact that in 1380 Paul Tagaris Palaiologos, the Patriarch of Constantinople, donated a foot of St Anna to the cathedral of Ancona, seems to be 'another figment of Paul's fertile imagination' since in this text an uknown son, Alexios Palaiologos the Despot, appears as the son of the emperor of Constantinople.[893]

Thus for the period until the thirteenth century, the inventory list from Saint Angelo in Pescheria in Italy and the archives of Chartres Cathedral in France are the most reliable evidence on the existence of the saint's relics outside Constantinople. The archives of the Chartres Cathedral shows that account of the *Patria* has historical truth in it and although it is difficult to tell whether the translation took actually place under Justinian II, it is nevertheless verified by the fact they were located in the Great Palace until the thirteenth century. Moreover, the chronological setting for the translation in the eighth century which coincides with the emerging veneration of Mary's parents in Constantinople and the appearance of the relics also in Rome at the same time, show that the *Patria* account is in accordance with the religious trends of the eighth century in both Constantinople and Rome. The iconography of the church of St Anna in Trebzond and the account of Dositheos allude to the existence of the relics in Trebzond and we know for

---

[890] Terian (ed.) 2008:3.
[891] PG 120: 192; PG 145: 652B.
[892] PG 120: 269C; Donner 1971:79 ; Wilkinson 2002:214,294; Schick 1995:481-2; For a German translation, see Donner 1971: 90. I have accepted in this Thesis the view of Dräseke (Dräseke 1895:353) and Diekamp (Diekamp [ed.] 1898:136) that Epiphanios Hagiopolites is a different person from Epiphanios the Monk.
[893] Nicol 1970:295.

sure that Anna's left foot was transferred to Athos in the seventeenth century, where it still survives.

Conclusions

Kleinschmidt has correctly argued that it is impossible to track the destinations and places of origins for the saints' relics.[894] I have shown that St Anna's relics have been detected in various areas from the eighth century until the seventeenth century. The inventories of the Chartres cathedral (thirteenth century) and the Pammakaristos church (sixteenth century) show that the relics of St Anna did enter Constantinople and this is where the historicity of the *Patria* lies. It refers to an actual event but it is extremely difficult to conclude whether it was actually Justinian II who brought them to the Byzantine capital, although an earlier date, as Gedeon suggests, is unfounded.

The inventory of St Nicholas in Carcere shows that there is a strong possibility that a relic of the saint was located in Rome before the thirteentj century although it is usually after 1204 that relics from the East appear in the West.[895] Taking into consideration that apart from Rome, France, Constantinople, Jerusalem, Trebzond and Athos, parts of the saint's body have been also recorded in Cyprus (the right arm of Anna is mentioned between 1449-1450 by Stephen of Gumpenberg and in 1485 by Felix Fabri),[896] the account of the *Patria* becomes even more 'historical', since it refers to the translation of the whole body of the saint and could denote that her body was dismembered at a later period.

---

[894] Kleinschmidt 1930: 404, 395.
[895] Majeska 2002:11 n.25.
[896] Grivaud (ed.) 1990: 65; Meinardus (Meinardus 1970:143) mentions that Felix Fabri venerated the right arm of St Anna in the church of St Anna in Cyprus.

Moreover, in contrast to what happens in the West from the thirteenth onwards, the body parts mentioned do not contradict each other; we are told about her left foot, her head, her right arm, her maphorion. The only case where we are not informed about a speficic part of the body, is a fourteenth century icon, which was offered from Anna Maria Angelina Doukaina Palaiologina, to her brother Ioasaph, abbot of the monastery of the Transfiguration in Meteora.[897] St Anna is one of the saints, who are accompanied by small slots where the relics of each saint would have been kept.[898] This icon testifies that the relics of Anna were not only venerated in fourteenth-century in Byzantium but they were also offered as precious gifts.

Finally, the great number of locations and periods in which the relics of Anna appear shows something more: the interest in the acquisition of her body (parts) from the eighth century onwards demonstrates the importance that saint started gaining in this period. Additionally, and as I will show later, the testimonies of fourteenth-century travellers to Constantinople about multiple of burial places of martyrs named Anna in Constantinople points to the same conclusion.

Part 2. *Feasts*

Introduction

The *Protevangelion* was inspirational for the establishment of three major feasts inserted into the Byzantine Church calendar by the tenth century: Anna's Conception (of Mary), the Nativity and the Presentation of Mary. These three feasts are placed in the framework of Mary's veneration, since they celebrate events of her life; however the promotion of her parents in this procedure is not to be left unacknowledged.

---

[897] Evans 2004:51-2.
[898] ibid:52.

In the introduction of her work on Marian homilies, Mary Cunningham argued that 'it is difficult to reconstruct the history of the introduction of special feast-days in honour of Mary into the liturgical calendar, owing to the lack of liturgical and historical sources for the period before about the ninth century'.[899] There are however conflicting views on the date when Marian feasts of her early life were actually inserted into the Byzantine calendar.

Following Cunningham, I will argue in this chapter that owing to the lack of sources before the ninth century, the ninth and tenth centuries are safer dates for the introduction of the feasts on Mary's early life in the Byzantine calendar. I will also demonstrate that the introduction after the ninth century of one feast that emerged independently from the *Protevangelion*, the Dormition of St Anna and the feast of Sts Joachim and Anna which are celebrated on the same day with the Conception of Anna, points to the same direction, that the parents of Mary were widely venerated from the ninth century onwards.

The Conception of St Anna

The story according to the Protevangelion

According to the *Protevangelion*, Anna could not conceive for years so after the rejection of their gifts by the High Priest, she and her husband prayed endlessly until an angel announced them that Anna would conceive a child.[900]

The significance of the feast in homilies and kontakia

---

[899] Cunningham (trans.) 2008:19. See also Rapp 1995:33-4.

[900] In his Conception homily, Peter of Argos writes that the month when Joachim's and Anna's gifts were rejected was September. This is the Syriac month Gorpiaios, which belongs to the Macedonian lunar calendar, and it is debated to which month it corresponds.The month differs from region to region (Grumel 1958:168-175,177-8). For September, see Burgess and Witakowski 1999:291, 294;Lewis 1939:416; Browne 1844:464 . For July-August, see Mango and Ševčenko 1978:18. For August only, see Kraemer and Lewis 1938:132 n.23. This why Peter of Argos needed to clarify it: 'namely September'.

'The Conception of Anna is the beginning and the reason of all goods and that is why respect should be paid and rejoice', writes George of Nikomedia in the ninth century.[901] The tenth-century Synaxarion reads: 'we celebrate Joachim and Anna on this day not because they died on that day but because they brought the world's salvation'.[902] The tenth-century Patriarch Euthymios wonders whether there is a greater Marian feast than the Conception of Anna where Mary's parents were about to give birth to the one who gave birth to the creator of heaven and earth.[903] The same concept is attested in the fourteenth-century Andrew Levadenos in his iambos on Mary's Nativity.[904] He refers to this feast as the 'first from all feasts' and through which great feasts derive which honour the child of the Virgin.[905]

The central meaning for the celebration of the feast of Anna's Conception is related to Mariology: Anna's conception brought Mary, which lead to the birth of Christ and resulted in the freedom of humanity from sin with the destruction of Adam and Eve, which is a concept first attested in the Nativity kontakion of Romanos Melodos. As Bauckham notes 'Mary's role was bringing Christ to life, and this is why we are informed on her life beyond the birth of Jesus'.[906] Similarly, the celebration of Anna's conception lies in the fact that it opened the way for the births of Mary and of Christ, thus Mary's parents played significant part in the soteriological work of God.

Scholarly views on the development of the feast

---

[901] PG 100: 1356B. For the salvation brought by Anna's Conception, see PO 19 [324].
[902] Delehaye (ed.) 1902:30.
[903] PO 19 (1):[325]; PO 19 (1): [326]; PO 19 (2):[330]; PO 16: [79] 'Ταύτην οὖν τὴν ἡμέραν οὐχ ὡς πρώτην ἁπάντων ἑορτῶν εἰσδεξώμεθα;' This concept is first attested in Andrew of Crete, see PG 97 :805A : 'Ἀρχὴ μέν ἡμῖν ἑορτῶν, ἡ παροῦσα πανήγυρις'.
[904] Lampsides (ed.) 1975:112, 258.
[905] ibid. 109. Andrew Levadenos's was endangered and believed that he was rescued by the intervention of the Virgin, which might explain his devotion to her, see Hinterberger 2005:37.
[906] Bauckham 2000:796.

According to Kyriakopoulos, the feast became known from the homiletic work of George of Nikomedia and probably after 860,[907] nevertheless he sees a tendency from the fifth century onwards in hymnology to establish the feast, but gives no evidence for this.[908] Graef, relying on Andrew of Crete who has written hymns on the feast argues that the feast was established at the end of sixth- or in the course of the seventh century,[909] possibly, I think, due to the desire of the Eastern theologians to complete the cycle of Marian feasts.[910] However, Andrew of Crete lived at the end of the seventh and the beginning of the eighth century and not in the sixth century. Similarly, Jugie relying on Andrew of Crete supports the feast's celebration in the seventh century in some areas.[911] Jugie associates the feast with the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, although he acknowledges the different treatment of this issue by the Eastern and the Western Church.[912] Cunningham, following Jugie, acknowledges the importance of the homiletic activity of Andrew of Crete or of Kosmas Vestitor as proof for the existence of the feast, but argues that the earliest evidence on the celebration of the Conception in an eighth-century homily by John of Euboea when the feast was 'not widely celebrated or even known'.[913] John of Euboea included a number of feasts in his homily on the Nativity of Mary and one of them is the Conception of Anna, but as Cunningham has argued his choice of feasts 'reflects the liturgical rite of a provincial, rather than Constantinopolitan parish, because the Presentation of Mary and Palm Sunday is excluded'.[914] The late appearance of the feast and its non-widespread celebration a century after John of Euboea is implied by George of Nikomedia's first sermon on the Conception of Anna, which is

---

[907] Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976: 373.
[908] ibid. 259. Cameron had argued (Cameron 1978:89) that the girdle had been translated to Constantinople by the fifth century, a view which she later changed, see Cameron 2004:12.
[909] Graef 1985:152.
[910] For the feast of the Annunciation and its introduction to the Eastern Church, see Jugie 1923:129-144.
[911] PO 16:483.
[912] Jugie 1952:29, 31.
[913] Cunningham (trans.) 2008:24 n.79; Jugie 1952: 29-30.
[914] PG 96: 1473C-1476A.

dedicated to the message (χρηματισμόν),[915] which the homilist wishes to convey to his congregation. George of Nikomedia's writes that the feast was celebrated 'with majesty',[916] – repeated by John of Damaskos and Andrew of Crete in their Nativity homilies as we saw earlier – but it does not necessarily mean that it was actually universally celebrated in the ninth century. I am more inclined to think that for George of Nikomedia the feast *should* be celebrated in a majestic way because of its importance for the soteriological work of God. Finally, Euthymios of Constantinople (tenth century) informs us that the feast of Anna's Conception was still considered as a minor one.[917] Lafontaine-Dosogne, Cunningham and Wybrew argue that this comment had general application since the Eastern Church never accepted the Conception of St Anna as a major Marian feast, and that its role remained secondary in comparison to other feasts of the life of Mary.[918]

Celebration in Constantinople

The feast, which is missing from the ninth-century *Kalendarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* and from the ninth-century codex (cod.2) of the skete of St Andrew of Athos, is included in the ninth century *calendar of Naples* (a compilation of a local calendar with a Byzantine one).[919] It is also included in the tenth-century *Synaxarion of Constantinople* and the *Menologion of Basil II*, in the eleventh-century hymnographic

---

[915] PG 100:1336A.
[916] ibid. 1336A.
[917] PO 19:441:12-3, p. 44:1-3.
[918] Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992 :25; Lafontaine-Dosogne 1975:164 (end of eighth - beginning of ninth century); Cunningham 2006:137;Wybrew 1997:2.
[919] Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992:30. Nevertheless, it may have been introduced in Naples a century earlier, see Brandenbarg 1995: 36. The feast was 'borrowed from the Byzantine East' (King 1957:202) as a result of the infiltration of Greek hagiography in the West from the seventh century onwards and from the ninth century in particular in Naples, see Baumer and Scheffczyk 1988:155.

calendar of Constantinopolitan Christophoros Mytilenaios,[920] in the twelfth-century *Constitutions* of Manuel Komenos and in the fourteenth-century *Prochiron auctum*.[921]

Although Jerusalem has exercised influence on the liturgy of Constantinople in relation to the Marian feasts,[922] there is no evidence that the feast of the Conception was celebrated in Jerusalem earlier than in Constantinople, as it was the case with the feasts of the Nativity and the Presentation of Mary. The only liturgical connection between the two cities and the Conception of Anna is that in the tenth century, on 9 December (nine months before the Nativity of Mary),[923] when the Conception was celebrated in the Byzantine capital (in the church of Chalkoprateia), St Anna was celebrated together with John of Damaskos in Jerusalem.[924] The celebration of St Anna and John of Damaskos on the same date possibly derives from the homiletic work of John of Damaskos and in particular his homily on the Nativity of Mary in addition to his veneration of the Probatic Pool, discussed in chapter one. It seems that the connection between the two saints was closer than what we think today, which can be proved by two facts: First during the celebration in the Church Calendar of Constantinople of feasts of Mary's early life, the writings of John of Damaskos were preferred instead of the *Protevangelion*, which makes John of Damaskos more 'authoritative' on the early life of Mary than the composer of the *Protevangelion* in a time (tenth century) when the *Protevangelion* had repetitively been used by homilists.[925] Second John Damaskos was one of the earliest writers to dedicate a homily on Mary's Nativity, and the deep respect he had expressed of the Probatike, resulted in his close connection to the veneration for Mary's parents.

---

[920] Follieri (ed.) 1980 (1):3, 370, Follieri (ed.) 1980 (2):103-4.
[921] Delehaye (ed.) 1902:291-2; Mateos (ed.) 1962:18, 22; PG 117:196BC; PG 133:756D; Zepos and Zepos 1962:319.
[922] Cameron 1978:86.
[923] Delehaye (ed.) 1902:291-2; Mateos (ed.) 1962:18, 22; PG 133:756C; PG 133:757B. Janin notes that in variants of the *Synaxarion of Constantinople* the feast is also celebrated in the church of the Theotokos Evouranois, see Janin 1969:184; Delehaye (ed.) 1902:292 n.6.
[924] Garitte (ed.) 1958:109.
[925] Mateos (ed.) 1962:18,22.

To conclude, the homiletic activity shows that the process of the establishment of Anna's Conception in the church calendar began in the eighth century and was intensified in the ninth century when the feast was introduced into the *Kalendarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* and a century later, in the *Synaxarion of Constantinople*. The homiletic activity does not signify the establishment of the feast but it generated (or responded to) the first steps in the process which was completed in the ninth century and was widely introduced a century later.[926]

The Nativity of Mary

According to the *Protevangelion*, Mary was born seven or nine months after the Annunciation of Anna.

Origins in Palestine: the liturgical evidence

In the Constantinopolitan calendar the date of 8 September is dedicated to the celebration of Mary's Nativity, neverthless different liturgical traditions were developed in Palestine, whence the feast originates.

The date for celebration of the feast is provided by the *Old Georgian Lectionary*, which reflects the liturgy in Jerusalem from the fifth to the eighth century, but to be on the safe side it is used as evidence for the celebration of liturgy in Jerusalem in the eighth century.[927] However, in the tenth century Georgian lectionary the Nativity of Mary is celebrated on 16 January in Choziba together with the Annunciation of Joachim,[928] when in Constantinople 'saint martyr Anna' is celebrated.[929] The feast days for St Anna or martyrs named Anna in both calendars reveals that their choice derives from traditions and

---

[926] Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992:31,33.
[927] CSCO 205:35; Garitte (ed.) 1958:89.
[928] Garitte (ed.) 1958:45.
[929] Delehaye (ed.) 1902:395.

associations made in the two areas liturgically or topographically. For example, I showed in chapter two that Choziba was believed to be the place where Joachim found refuge after the rejection of his gifts. The fact that in Constantinople a martyr named Anna is celebrated on the same day with the Annunciation of Joachim shows that the establishement of feasts of Anna and Joachim in Constantinople is constructed based on the liturgical or ideological association made between Constantinople and the Holy Land.

Demetrios bishop of Antioch (third century) places the date of Mary's birth on the fifteenth day of the month Athor (October),[930] while four or five centuries later, when John of Damaskos writes his homily on the Nativity of Mary, the event is was believed to have taken place, and was also celebrated on 8 September: 'Once a year you received a visit by the angel of God, who troubled the water, strengthening and healing one man from illness that paralysed him, whereas now you contain a multitude of heavenly powers who sing hymns with us to the Mother of God, the source of miracles [and] spring of universal healing'.[931] I cannot know whether the homily was read in the church of Mary at the Probatic Pool at the time of John of Damaskos because the earliest evidence of the celebration of the Nativity of Mary in the Probatike is the tenth-century *Georgian lectionary*.[932]

Scholarly views on its development in Constantinople

Cunningham in one of her recent articles refers to the introduction of the Nativity feast in the Byzantine capital and notes: 'The question which immediately presents itself is why, in the first half of the sixth century, Romanos Melodos accepted the witness of an apocryphal text which had not hitherto received official acceptance or

---

[930] Budge (trans.) 1915:654 and n 2.

[931] PG 96: 669B, 677C. For the translation, see Cunningham (trans.) 2008:68. For the date of John's death, see Louth 2003:9.

[932] Goussen 1923:31.

expression. The most obvious answer is that the institution of Marian feast-days, celebrating events in her life and her role in the Conception and birth of Christ, began to occur in precisely this period'.[933]

Modern scholars place the celebration of Mary's Nativity in the sixth century in Constantinople, either under Justinian I, Justin II, or Maurikios.[934] In particular, Cunningham argues that the only indication that has led scholars to argue for its introduction under Justinian I, is the kontakion of Romanos Melodos on Mary's Nativity, where he writes: 'in your holy Nativity, which your people also celebrate',[935] read on the consecration of Anna's church.[936] Cameron has argued that 'Maurice's initiative in adopting the feast must surely have been a response to pre-existing developments, hardly the bolt from the blue that it might otherwise appear'.[937] Lafontaine-Dosogne has argued that the establishment of Mary's feast took place in the first half of the seventh century,[938] although she dates it to Justinian's reign based on the kontakion of Romanos Melodos.[939]

Spread in Constantinople

The divergence of scholarly views is the result of the lack of a textual base for the introduction of the feast. For example, Cameron argues for the reign of Maurikios based on Xanthopoulos' *Ecclesiastical History*, which dates after 1317 as Cunningham notes.[940] Lafontaine-Dosogne based her arguments for the late seventh- and the early

---

[933] Mary Cunningham, 'The Use of the Protevangelion of James in Eighth-Century Homilies on the Mother of God' (forthcoming). I am indebted to Mary Cunningham from providing me with a copy of her as yet unpublished article.

[934] Shoemaker 2002:116; Cameron 1979b:18; Grosdidier de Matons 1980-1: 39.

[935] Translation by Cunningham in 'The Use of the Protevangelion of James in Eighth-Century Homilies on the Mother of God' (forthcoming). For the original text, see Maas and Trypanis (eds) 1963: 276:3-4.

[936] Grosdidier de Matons 1980-1:39.

[937] Cameron 1978:87.

[938] Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992:25.

[939] This is view is also supported by Baumer and Scheffczyk 1989: 602; Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992:25, 26 and n. 34; Ledit 1976:112; Amann 1910:133. For the kontakion of Melodos, see Pitra (ed.) 1876: 198-201; Romanos the Melodist 1970:276-280; CMP 1974:116-9; Gambero 1999:328.

[940] Cunningham (trans.) 2008: 23 n. 37. For the text of Xanthopoulos, see PG 147: 292.

eighth-century on Andrew of Crete, who wrote four homilies on the feast,[941] and for the sixth century on the kontakion of Romanos. As far as the kontakion of Romanos is concerned, it is certainly an early and the only indication for the celebration of the feast in sixth-century Constantinople but there is no evidence that it was widely celebrated before 899, when Philotheos writes that the Birth of the Virgin was celebrated in the church of Chalkoprateia.[942] The reference to the celebration of the feast does not constitute evidence, since John of Damaskos and Andrew of Crete referred to the 'majestic' celebration of the feast when it is not known whether it was actually celebrated. It took three centuries after Romanos for the first evidence for the celebration in Constantinople of the feast to appear, in 899. Gharib sees the kontakion of Romanos as testimony of the origin of feast from Jerusalem, which Justinian introduced to the Byzantine capital.[943] One cannot deny the involvement of Justinian I in the cult of Mary and Anna and the topography of Jerusalem as shown in chapter one, but a furhter connection cannot be confirmed.

Justinian's desire to promote both liturgically and topographically the early life of Mary waned until the ninth century when Basil I rebuilt the church that Justinian I had inaugurated. Justinian's promotion of St Anna's cult was motivated by his personal interest in the Virgin Mary and in healing saints but also in the introduction of new saints in the Byzantine capital, such as St Peter. As Topping notes, there was no church for Peter in Constantoniple before Justinian I and she adds that 'Romanos' poetry could hardly fail to show the new interest in Peter'.[944] In Carthage, despite the dedication of a church to the Virgin by Justinian I, no feasts of Mary have been recorded in the sixth-century calendar

---

[941] PG 97: 805-882, 1305-1329. As Kazhdan notes in some manuscripts Andrew of Crete is credited with homilies on Mary's Presentation, which however have been proved to be works of George of Nikomedia, see Kazhdan 1999 (2):44 and n. 27. Thus he questions the veracity of some of the Presentation homilies written by Andrew of Crete.
[942] Oikonomides (ed.) 1972:223. For the date of this treatise, see Oikonomides (ed.) 1972: 81.
[943] Gharib 1988:695.
[944] Topping 1976:4-5.

of Carthage.[945] Thus Romanos' kontakion on the Nativity of Mary reflects Justinian's desire to establish new religious developments in the capital but this cannot be used as evidence for the introduction of the feast before 899.

The homiletic activity around the Nativity of Mary starts, as it was the case with the Conception of Anna, in the eighth century but homilies cannot be taken as reflections of liturgical developments; and this is because they reveal the process towards the establishment of the feast but do not guarantee the existence of a feast in the church Calendar by the time they are read. This insertion of the feast of the Nativity takes place in the ninth century, when Philotheos' testimony verifies the actual celebration of the feast.

Outside Constantinople, the first liturgical evidence of the celebration of the feast is a manuscript in Naples (849-872).[946] The feast was introduced to Constantinople in the ninth century, but we cannot know the exact date, because it is included in the *Kalendarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitana*e, for which no additional date is known.[947] In the tenth century the feast was celebrated (apart from the Chalkoprateia), in the Orvikiou church as the *Synaxarion of Constantinople* informs us.[948] In the *Great Typikon of Constantinople* (tenth century) on 8 September (Mary's Nativity) and on 9 September, when Mary's parents are celebrated there is no reading from the apocryphal text,[949] but rather of the homilies of Andrew of Crete and John of Damaskos, which shows the despite the familiarity and promotion of the story of the *Protevangelion* in the tenth century, the Byzantine still relied on homists rathen than on the apocryphal text.[950] Finally, it is also

---

[945] Duval 1983:134. For the ecclesiastical organisation of Carthage in the sixth century, see Markus 1979:279-289.
[946] Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992 : 26. and n.8.
[947] Morcelli (ed.) 1788:19 'ΜΗΝΗ ΤΩ ΑΥΤΩ Η ΕΙC ΤΟ ΓΕΝΕCΙΟΝ ΤΗC ΑΠΑC ΘΕΟΤΟΚΟΥ'; Antonopoulou and Kishpaugh date it to the eighth century, see Antonopoulou 1997:165; Kishpaugh 1941:50. However Ehrhard and Velkova-Velkovska place it to the group of manuscripts that appear no earlier than the ninth century, see Ehrhard 1937:28, 30; Velkova-Velkovska 2001: 157 n.2.
[948] Delehaye (ed.) 1902:30; For the Orvikiou church, see Janin 1969:207.
[949] Mateos (ed.) 1962:18, 22.
[950] Ehrhard 1937:155, 164.

mentioned in the *Synaxarion of Basil II* (around 986),[951] the *Menologion of Symeon Metaphrastes* (second half of the tenth century),[952] and the fourteenth-century *Prochiron auctum*.[953] *Pseudo-Kodinos* (fourteenth century) says that during his time the feast was celebrated in the Lips monastery.[954]

Taking for granted the popularity of the *Protevangelion*, Chevalier argued that the Nativity must have been a great feast,[955] which is true, but the popularity of the *Protevangelio*n would also imply that the Conception of Anna would have been a major feast, but as I showed earlier it was not. The importance of the birth of Mary for Christianity is that initiated the process for the birth of Christ it was considered as the beginning of God's plan to save humanity. As Patriarch Photios writes in the ninth century: 'Incarnation would not have become real through men, because incarnation is the road to birth, and birth is the result of pregnancy this is why a woman (= Mary) was selected to bring to an end the divine plan'.[956] Similarly to the feast of the Conception of Mary by Anna, the Nativity is defined by Christology and this is the reason for its celebration.[957]

The Presentation of Mary

The story according to the Protevangelion

[951] PG 117 : 37C.
[952] Ehrhard 1937:42-3, 49.
[953] Zepos and Zepos 1962:319.
[954] Pseudo-Kodinos 1839:80. The Nativity of Mary is included in the hymnographic calendar of Christophoros Mytilenaios (eleventh-century), see Follieri (ed.) 1980 (1):328,331, Follieri (ed.) 1980 (2):16-7.
[955] Chevalier 1938:67.
[956] PG 102: 560B; Mango (trans.) 1958:174. Christ's proof of his humanization is his birth from a mother who can be depicted, says Theodore Studites : 'κατὰ δέ τὸ ἐκ περιγρεγραμμένης Μητρὸς τεχθῆναι, εἰκότως ἄν ἔχοι εἰκόνα, ἐφάμιλλον τῇ μητρῴα εἰκονουργία', see Dalkos (ed.) 2006:232-3. 'εἰ καὶ ὅτι καθὸ ἄνθρωπος κυηθεὶς ἐκ τῆς Παρθένου, περιγραπτός', see Dalkos (ed.) 2006:218-9. Christ can be depicted since he was born out of Mary who is a human, and denying Christ's humanity is denying his mother's humanity, see Dalkos (ed.) 2006:224-5, which is a view also expressed by John of Damaskos, see PG 94: 608B-609A. That it marks the beginning of salvation is stated also by Gregory Palamas, see Veniamin (trans.) 2005:1-4,7. James Kokkinobaphos writes on that: '(the prophets) rejoiced when they saw the day of your birth, in which the mystery of (divine) economy was revealed, see PG 127: 596A.
[957] Although homilies on Christ's Nativity were composed by 390 in Cappadocia, which reveal interest in the life and the virginity of Mary, there is no evidence for the celebration of any Marian feast at this time, see Comings 2005:122.

When Mary became three years old, she was given – as promised – by her parents to the priest Zacharias and lived until the age of twelve in the Temple.

Of all the scenes of Mary's life with her parents, her Presentation in the Temple is the most often depicted scene in Byzantine art. Counting the number of surviving homilies written on her early life (Conception, Nativity, Presenation), the greatest number of Marian homilies from the eighth until the fifteenth century has been dedicated to the Presentation of Mary. This points to the greater interest of the Byzantines in the Presentation of Mary than in the other two feasts of Mary's early life. Probably the visual impact of the Great Entrance on the Byzantine liturgy gave promincence to the Presentation of Mary because it reminded the procession of the Great Entrance.[958]

Development

The origins of the celebration of Mary's Nativity on 8 September in the tenth-century *Georgian Lectionary*,[959] have been connected to the dedication of the fifth-century-church at the Probatic Pool.[960] The Probatike was the house of Joachim and Anna but the view that from the sixth century onwards the feast of the Presentation was celebrated with a reading of the *Protevangelion* is unsupported.[961] The *Georgian lectionary* is not an adequate witness to sixth-century liturgical developments in Jerusalem, while the feast does not appear in Jerusalem before the eighth century as the *Old Georgian lectionary* (fifth - eighth century) shows. Garitte adds to this that the feast appears for the first time in 864 in the liturgical codex Sin. géorg. 32-57-33 copied at St Sabas monastery.[962]

---

[958] For the Great Entrance see, Taft 1975.
[959] Garitte (ed.) 1958: 324 :' In Probatica, ubi erat domus Ioachim, Nativitas sanctae Deiparae'.
[960] ODB 291.
[961] ibid. 291.
[962] Garitte (ed.) 1958: 324-5.

Kyriakopoulos argued that the location of the Nea church – built in Jerusalem by Justinian I – reminded the apocryphal story of Mary's Presentation and that through this combination the feast of the Presentation emerged.[963] He associates the Nea Church with celebration of the Presentation of Mary and believes this is verified by the fact that in the *Georgian Lectionary*, on 16 November Mary's Presentation was celebrated and the construction of the Nea church was commemorated.[964] However, since the *Georgian Lectionary* dates to the tenth century it is impossible to establish a confirmed connection between the Presentation feast and the construction of the Nea as early as the sixth century.

The earliest account on the celebration of Mary's Presentation in Jerusalem on 21 November is from a tenth-century source (the *Georgian Lectionary*).[965] Moreover, the Old *Georgian lectionary* (eighth century) on 16 November reads: 'Commemoration of king Justinian, who built the church of Mary in the city, the Nea',[966] and on 20 November the dedication of the Nea is celebrated.[967] The proximity of the celebration of the date 20 November with 21 November when the feast of Mary's Presentation is celebrated,[968] urged Kyriakopoulos to connect Mary's Presentation and the Nea Church. Kyriakopoulos probably assumes that since the Nativity of Mary was celebrated in the Probatike, the Presentation was celebrated in the Nea church. As plausible as it may seem, the existing evidence does not allows assumptions of this kind.

Cunningham notes that 'by the end of the eighth and especially by the middle of the ninth century, preachers and hymnographers […] began to produce texts honouring the

---

[963] Kyriakopoulos (ed.) 1976:373-374.

[964] Goussen 1923:38. We remind the reader that a feast on Mary's Nativity was celebrated on 16 January.

[965] Garitte (ed.) 1958:105, 225.

[966] CSCO 205: 52 no.1368.

[967] CSCO 205:52 no.1373; The Presentation of Mary is included in the hymnographic calendar of Constantinopolitan Christophoros Mytilenaios (eleventh-century), see Follieri (ed.) 1980 (2) :86.

[968] Garitte (ed.) 1958:105. The proximity of the Nea church and the celebration there of Mary's Presentation in the temple is supported by Baldovin 1989:44. Cecchelli revolves around Mary's Presentation to justify the proximity of Probatike to the temple (Cecchelli 1954:82-4), who associates the Sheep gate with the fact that offerings were made there (Cecchelli 1946:115), and mixes Byzantine sources with western ones to prove the history behind Mary's house in Jerusalem, see Cecchelli 1946:112-3,136-9. He does not rely on all the available Eastern sources and does not refer to the excavation of Mauss.

feast in great abundance'.[969] She correctly argues that 'such a burst of liturgical composition reinforces the hypothesis that the feast of Presentation was introduced into the churches of Constantinople in the early eighth century, but only gained wider recognition as a major Marian festival in the course of the ninth century'.[970] Kyriakopoulos argues that the feast was introduced in Constantinople earlier than the eighth century and bases his argument on the fact that in his homily, Patriarch Germanos refers to the feast as widely celebrated.[971] But as Cunningham has correctly claimed most recently, since we accept that the emergence of homilies constitute strong evidence for the appearance of a wide acceptance of a feast, and since there are no homilies or other textual evidence for the Presentation of Mary before the eighth century, there is no evidence that the feast of the Presentation of Mary was established in Constantinople before or in the eighth century, since the earliest liturgical evidence dates from the tenth century.[972] It is missing from the ninth-century *Kalendarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, it was celebrated in tenth-century Constantinople in the Chalkoprateia,[973] and it is also mentioned in the *Menologion of Basil II*.[974] In the fourteenth century, when according to Gregory Palamas the feast of the Presentation was celebrated by the 'entire race',[975] it was celebrated in the Perivleptos monastery.[976]

Thus so far we have seen that the feast of the Conception of Anna and the Nativity of Mary were first inserted in the Constantinopolitan Church Calendar in the ninth century, while the earliest appearance of the Presentation feast is the tenth century.

---

[969] Cunningham (trans.) 2008:24-5.

[970] ibid. 26.

[971] Toniolo first published a homily on the Presentation, which he believed to have been written by Patriarch Germanos. See Toniolo 1974a:102-103.

[972] The feast of Mary's Presentation was introduced around 730, see Amann 1910: 46 n.2 who bases his dating on the Presentation homily of Germanos. The date to the eighth century has been accepted by Kishpaugh 1941: 30; Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992:28; Lafontaine-Dosogne 1975 :164.

[973] Delehaye (ed.) 1902:243.1, 290-1.1; Mateos (ed.) 1962:18,22; PG 133:756C, 756D, 757B. See also the Menologion of Basil II, PG 117:172D-173AB.

[974] PG 117:172D-173AB.

[975] Veniamin 2005:31.

[976] Pseudo-Kodinos 1839:80;Verpeaux (ed.) 1966:242,3; PG 157: 96. The feast also appears in the 1300 Prochiron auctum, see Zepos and Zepos 1962:319.

The feast of Anna and Joachim and the Dormition of St Anna

The last two feasts do not celebrate a moment of Mary's life, but refer only to her parents. The Dormition of St Anna is not based on the *Protevangelion*, but has been invented as a counterpart to the celebration of Mary's Dormition. The Dormition of St Anna is first attested in the tenth-century *Synaxarion of Constantinople* under 25 July. The feast of Sts Anna and Joachim (9 December) is attested in the ninth-century *Kalendarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* and the tenth-century *Synaxarion of Constantinople*.[977] In the *Old Georgian Lectionary* (eighth century) and the tenth-century *lectionary of Jerusalem* the feast is celebrated on 9 September,[978] and in the *lectionary of Jerusalem* on 25 July a martyr called Anna is celebrated among other martyrs.[979] As stated, the establishment of the feast days between Jerusalem and Constantinople is not accidental, even though they do not refer to the same saint, the appearance of saints or martyrs named Anna in Jerusalem where in Constantinople the mother of the Virgin is celebrated on the same day demonstrate a reciprocal liturgical influence.

In the eighth century, Kosmas Vestitor summarized the reasons to celebrate Mary's parents 'through whom the beginning of salvation for all has come about'.[980] In Constantinople, the feasts of Anna and Joachim and the Dormition of St Anna are attested in the *typikon of the Great Church* (tenth century),[981] and the twelfth-century *New Constitutions* of Manuel Komnenos. [982] The feast of Sts Anna and Joachim which was

---

[977] Morcelli (ed.) 1788:19 'ΜΗΝΗ ΤΩ ΑΥΤΩ Θ ΕΙC ΜΝΗΜΗΝ ΤΩΝ ΑΓΙΩΝ ΙΩΑΚΕΙΜ ΚΑΙ ΑΝΝΗC'; Delehaye (ed.) 1902: 30, 841.

[978] CSCO 205:35; Garitte (ed.) 1958:89.

[979] Garitte (ed.) 1958:80 : 'Annae, Eupraxiae, Olympiadis, et Cypriani patriarchae Antiochiae et Justinae virginis encratitae et martyris, et Georgii'.

[980] PG 106:1006A; Cunningham (trans.) 2008 :139; Lampsides (ed.) 1975:109. Kosmas Vestitor wrote also kontakia on Anna's Conception, see Sophronios 1937:428.

[981] PG 117: 37D-39A. Gedeon argues that feast of Anna and Joachim was celebrated in the Deuteron, see Gedeon 1899:167. The Dormition of Anna is included in the hymnographic calendar of Constantinopolitan Christophoros Mytilenaios (eleventh-century), see Follieri (ed.) 1980 (1):455,464; Follieri (ed.) 1980 (2) : 377-8.

[982] PG 133:757; Macrides 1981:150 (Feast of the Dormition).

celebrated together with the Conception of St Anna, was celebrated in 'a church of the Theotokos, close to the Chalkoprateia',[983] and the Dormition of Anna in the church of St Anna in Deuteron built by Justinian I.[984] Magdalino speaks of many martyria located around the church of St Anna in the Deuteron, [985] and it could be that connotations of saintly death in this area may have generated the celebration of the Dormition feast in this location.[986]

Conclusions

Apart from the Presentation, we know that all other feasts on Mary's early life discussed above were inserted in the ninth century, while the earliest evidence for the celebration of the Presentation feast is the tenth century. The development towards the establishment of the Conception, Nativity and Presentation of Mary is a process that was initiated in the eighth century in parallel to the composition of the first homilies on Mary's life, the gradual acknowledgement of the *Protevangelion* and with the religious developments associated with Iconoclasm as we will see in the next section, until its full establishment in the ninth century. The ninth century is crucial for this development. It is when the *Protevangelion* was first mentioned as part of the Holy Scripture and the first feasts of Mary's early life were introduced in the Constantinopolitan Synaxaria. The insertion of two feasts in the tenth century, which are not part of the *Protevangelion*, verifies the diffusion of the veneration of Mary's parents in Byzantium in that period.

Part 3. *Social approaches*

---

[983] Delehaye (ed.) 1902: 30.
[984] ibid. 841.
[985] Magdalino 1996:26, n.53.
[986] Delehaye (ed.) 1902:842. The cult of martyrs was strongly associated with death (Delooz calles it the 'cult of death') and remained as such and after the fourth century when their violent death from persecution was not the only reason for their veneration and later canonization, see Delooz 1969:23-4.

Annas in hagiography and histories

The last section of this chapter revolves around St Anna's veneration in texts and in particularly in hagiographies and histories during and after Iconoclasm. The difference from the texts selected in chapter two is not only in genre but in content as well. Apart from the mother of the Virgin, I have included saints and lay women named Anna and discuss the associations made between them and the mother of Mary. I conclude that by looking at these women one discerns further aspects St Anna's veneration in Byzantium, namely how widespread it was, and to which social strata it related.

St Anna, iconophilia and hagiography: the life of St Stephen the Younger

The life of the iconophile saint Stephen the Younger (written around 806) refers to various women named Anna: Stephen's mother, the Virgin's mother and a widow who was a nun. It is the first and only hagiographical work to include a number of women called Anna.[987] It is also the earliest work to make associations between the name Anna, iconophilia and protection of childbirth, which is also attested in later hagiographies and histories.

St Stephen's mother was unable to conceive a boy until a late age and since the church of the Blachernai held the belt of Mary, which was efficacious in childbirth,[988] she visited this church to pray for a male offspring.[989] Mary's role as a healer – we saw in

---

[987] For the date of its composition, see Ševčenko 1977:115; Huxley (Huxley 1977:10) argues that we cannot known the date. Auzépy, Efthymiadis and Featherstone, Kazhdan and Talbot argue for 809, see Auzépy (ed.) 1997:8-9, 18; Efthymiadis and Featherstone 2007: 18; Kazhdan and Talbot 1991-2:94. For Stephen's mother, see Delehaye (ed.) 1902: 261; PMZ p. 137 # 442. Rouan argues that the year of its composition is 807, see Rouan 1981:415.

[988] Herrin 2000:26.

[989] Auzépy (ed.) 1997:94; PG 100:1080A. The Blachernai cured illnesses as well. Although it postdates the story in discussion, in the life of Patriach Euthymios (907-912) which was written around 920/930 (Karlin-Hayter 1955-7:4), Zoe Zaoutzaina had a dream that she would be cured from her 'impure spirit' if she visited the church of the Blachernai and placed the girdle of the Virgin upon her, see Tougher 1997:143 n 55. This story brings to mind the story of Leo's first wife Thephano who was nursed and died in the church of Blachernai, see Karlin-Hayter 1955-7:50...καί ἡ ἀοίδιμος βασιλὶς Θεοφανὼ ἐν τῷ τῆς θεομήτορος ναῷ τῷ ἐν Βλαχέρναις νοσηλευομένη παραγένετο [...] ἐν δέ τῇ δεκάτῃ νοεμβρίου μηνός η τιμία βασιλὶς...πρὸς κύριον

chapter one – was developed and was associated with cure from sterility. Stephen's hagiographer writes that 'this Anna prays to the Virgin to release her sterility as Mary had done with her mother',[990] a parallelism we saw in fifth- and sixth-century Syriac homilies attached to Mary and Eve. In contrast to Syriac homilies, in the *Life of Stephen the Younger* Mary cures not Eve, but Anna, Stephen's mother. Apart from Mary's ability to resolve Anna's sterility, the often visits of Stephen's mother in the church resembles the story of Hanna, mother of Samuel, who could not conceive a child and only after long prayers gave birth to Samuel.[991] In the *Vita*, Stephen's mother is called the 'new Anna',[992] who similarly to her model Hanna, wandered around the churches dedicated to Mary and in particular in the Blachernai to pray for a child.[993] The association between the two women is made through the appellation 'new Anna' as the hagiographer writes: 'because her (Stephens' mother) name is also Anna'.[994] Thus the hagiographer blends the elements of two women, the apocryphal Anna and the biblical Hanna and attributes them to Stephen's mother.[995]

The second woman named Anna mentioned in the *Vita* is a rich childless widow, who sold all her fortune and together with Stephens's mother became a nun in the monastery of Stephen on mount Auxentios in Bithynia and received her name from

---

ἐξεδήμησεν.

[990] PG 100: 1976C.

[991] Auzépy (ed.) 1997:95; PG 100 1080A.

[992] Auzépy (ed.) 1997:94.

[993] ibid. 92.

[994] ibid. 92; PG 100:1076B. In his Nativity homily, Andrew of Crete writes than after the rejection of gifts the apocryphal Anna imitated the biblical Hanna and went to the church and prayed, see PG 97:816B.

[995] Amphilochios in his homily *on Virgin Mary, Symeon and Hanna* associated the New Testament Anna with the biblical Hanna : ʽΚαὶ ἦν Ἄννα προφῆτις, θυγάτηρ Φανουήλ, ἐκ φυλῆς Ἀσήρ, αὕτη προβεβηκυῖα ἐν ἡμέραις πολλαῖς, ζήσασα μετὰ ἀνδρὸς ἔτη ἑπτὰ ἀπὸ τῆς παρθενίας αὐτῆς· καὶ αὕτη χήρα ὡς ἐτῶν ὀγδοήκοντα τεσσάρων, ἥτις ἐν νηστείαις καὶ δεήσεσιν ἐλάτρευεν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν. Εἶδες ἐν τίσιν καὶ οἷα ἡ χήρα Ἄννα ἐν τοῖς θείοις εὐαγγελίοις ἐγκεκαλλώπισται; Ὄντως ἄννα ἡ Ἄννα· συνέδραμεν τῇ τῶν τρόπων εὐδοξίᾳ ἡ τοῦ ὀνόματος προσηγορία. Ἀκουέτωσαν αἱ γυναῖκες καὶ ζηλούτωσαν τὴν ἔνδοξον Ἄνναν· τὸν ὅμοιον δρόμον τρεχέτωσαν, ἵνα τῶν ἴσων στεφάνων ἀπολαύσωσιν. Μηδεὶς ἀπροστασίαν προφασίσηται, ἵνα μὴ τὴν ἁγνείαν τῆς μονογαμίας ἀποσείσηται. Στέφανος τῶν χηρῶν ἡ Ἄννα·ʼ. See PG 39: 49C-52A.

Stephen himself.[996] The importance of this woman for this study lies in the fact that she was accused by her maid of having sexual relations with Stephen.[997] In hagiographies, this type of relationship between a nun or other women dedicated to God and a man is regarded as adultery, since nuns are considered brides of Christ.[998] Anna's accusation in particular brings to mind the reproach of the apocryphal Anna by her maid Judith after the rejection of gifts in the *Protevangelion of James*,[999] and the provocative attitude of the rival wife is reminiscent of Hanna's husband in the *Old Testament*.[1000] Thus an apocryphal and a Biblical event are given new theological connotations in ninth-century iconophile hagiography.

Nikolaou has underlined the negative promotion of the iconoclasts in this story and the betrayal of the maid towards Anna is presented as an attack against iconophiles.[1001] Kazhdan notes that the punishment that the nun Anna received when she denied the fake accusations (she was beaten after she had been lifted up in the form of a cross) signifies the victory of good over evil.[1002] The nun who stands as an iconophile figure against the iconoclast maid, is mentioned in the Vita as a second Sussana, known from the book of Daniel who was falsely accused of having been violated by two men.[1003]

Stephen's *Vita* has been closely associated with iconophilia,[1004] and so are the women mentioned in his *Vita*. The association of Anna the Younger with Stephen the

[996] Auzépy (ed.) 1997:101,116; PG 100:1105-1108; PMZ #450; Ševčenko 1977:128; Kazhdan and Talbot 1991-2:394-5. It was common for the wealthy to leave Constantinopple and go to Bithynia during Iconoclasm, see Kountoura-Galake 1996:169-170. However, Ahrweiler has argued that the differences between iconoclasts and Iconophiles were of social and economic nature and not geographical, and that they leave side by side in various regions, see Ahrweiler 1977:25. Auzépy challenges the notion that the construction of monasteries between the eighth- and the ninth century in Bithynia was the result of the rise of monasticism during Iconoclasm, see Auzépy 2003: 434. Bithynia is credited with the revival of hagiography in the ninth century, see Eftymiadis 1996:69-70.
[997] Auzépy (ed.) 1997:133-5; Kazhdan 1999 (2):189-190.
[998] Nikolaou 2005:169.
[999] De Strycker (ed.) 1961:72; Tischendorf (ed.) 1853:5.
[1000] 1 Sam 6.
[1001] Nikolaou 2005:275-280;
[1002] Auzépy (ed.) 1997:231; Kazhdan 1999 (2) : 190.
[1003] Auzépy (ed.) 1997:134.
[1004] Hennessy 2003:160; Herrin 1982:70-1.

Younger proves her opposition to Iconoclasm.[1005] In the tenth-century *Syxanarion of Constantinople* she is celebrated together with St Stephen on 28 November,[1006] and as Kazhdan and Talbot note although she was martyred in the eighth century 'she received recognition as a saint only two centuries or more after her death',[1007] when Mary's mother had also been established in the Church calendar. The name Anna in the *Vita* of St Stephen demonstrated that at the beginning of the ninth century the name Anna had acquired Iconophile associations. This is elicited from other evidence as well: After Stephen's persecution and exile, the iconophile saint found refuge in Prokonissos in a monastery dedicated to St Anna;[1008] Anthousa of Mantineon (eighth century), who also persecuted during Iconoclasm, mamaged to survive and built a church to St Anna.[1009]

Finally, the association between Stephen and the name Anna in general has not been selected haphazardly. By his name, Stephen is associated with marriage (στέφανος) and Anna with childbirth, also closely associated to marriage, since the birth of children was an essential reason for marriage.[1010] The pairing of Anna and Stephen is a 'natural' one, but also a self-conscious play of words, which the Byzantines favoured.

Anna and childbirth in hagiographies

[1005] Kazhdan and Talbot 1991-2:395.

[1006] Delehaye (ed.) 1902: 264:54. (' Ἡ ὁσία Ἄννα τυπτομένη πρὸς τὸ κατειπεῖν τοῦ ἁγίου Στεφάνου').

[1007] Kazhdan and Talbot 1991-2:395.

[1008] PG 100:1148A; Janin 1975: 135,210. Other churches of Anna are located in Hellespontos in the village of Yenice where an inscription dates the Byzantine frescoes between 992-1092, see Janin 1975:212. No other evidence survives about this church. See also Kazhdan and Talbot 1998: 22-3.

[1009] Delehaye (ed.) 1902:849 '...νεὼν τῇ μητρὶ τῆς Θεομήτορος αὐτὴ ἀνεγεῖραι κατεδυσώπει.' For a translation of this part, see Talbot 1998:17. See also Ruggieri 1991: 238. For the location of Mantineon, see Foss 1987:189. As Constas notes, St Anthousa of Mantineon should not be confused with St Anthousa, daughter of Constantine V, see Constas 1998:21.

[1010] The twenty-sixth Neara of Leo VI reads: 'Marriage is a great and valuable gift of God and the Creator to human beings.[…] it benefits human life with the childbearing'. See Trōianos (trans.) 2007:111. See also the Neara number ninety-eight, Trōianos (trans.) 2007:273. Talbot 1997:123; Kazhdan 1990:132. Already in the sixth century the high status of an empress was acquired partly by her virtue of her motherhood and partly on her marriage to the emperor, see Allen 1992:93; Holum 1982: 28. The word could be also connected to the placement of *stephana* over the heads of the couple during the wedding ceremony, see Delierneux 2004:352.

In saints' lives after the ninth century, there is a growing number of female saints called Anna, such as Anna of Leukate and Anna after Euphemianos.[1011] Mothers of saints are also called Anna, for example the mother of St Philaretos (possibly) in the first half of the eighth century,[1012] of St Euthymios the Younger (+898),[1013] of St Theophano,[1014] of Nikolaos of Oraia Pege (+965-1054),[1015] and of Christodoulos who built the chapel of St Anna in Patmos in the eleventh century.[1016] Some of these women appear to have difficulties in becoming pregnant, so they pray to the Virgin Mary – who acts as mediatress between God and humanity – [1017] to cure their sterility and fulfil their wishes.[1018] The salvation of women by sterility derives from the cure of Mary of her mother's sterility which we see in an epigram written on a Marian icon dedicated – as Pentcheva suggests – by Theodora Komnene (niece of Manuel Komnenos) to the Virgin, and refers to the salvation of Anna by her daughter. The epigram is a plea for a child: 'In the past, O Maiden, by being wondrously born, you extracted Anna from the affliction of barreness'.[1019] Stephen the Younger, Peter of Atroa,[1020] St Theophano or in a later period the monk Nikolaos (eleventh century), all had mothers who had difficulties in conceiving.[1021] In the life of Peter of Atroa, his mother was promised 'like another Anna' (= mother of Samuel) to dedicate the child to the temple if ever she got pregnant.[1022] St

---

[1011] PMZ 140 # 448.
[1012] ibid. 444.
[1013] ibid. 458; Nikolaou 2005:70.
[1014] Nikolaou 2005:72, 44 ; Delehaye (ed.) 1902: 314.
[1015] Nikolaou 2005:72.
[1016] Vranouse (ed.) 1980: *9.
[1017] Graef 1985:148.
[1018] Prayers to goddesses who protected childbirth and miraculous pregnancies of deities occur in ancient Greece, see Robertson 1983:146,153-4,157.
[1019] Pentcheva 2007:126, 209 (Appendix): 'Στεῖρα πρὶν Ἄννα· σὺ δὲ τεχθεῖσα ξένως στειρώσεως τὴν θλίψιν ἐξῆρας, κόρη'.
[1020] Laurent 1956:69.7-8; PMZ 138 # 446; For his life, see Kazhdan and Talbot 1991-2:83-4.
[1021] Nikolaou 2005:29-30.
[1022] Laurent 1956:69.9-12. That it is Samuel's mother, see Laurent 1956:71.27. In the life of St Eutychios, the dedication of a child to God was an act of imitation of Hanna, mother of Samuel, see PG 86: 2280D. The choice of Hanna instead of Anna is because in this *Vita* is because Eutychios' dedication to God by his mother imitated the dedication of Samuel to God by Hanna. Nikephoros Kallistos in his Ecclesiastical History writes: 'and because she (mother of Mary) was barren […] like the mother of Samuel became suppliant in the church of God', see PG 145: 652.

Theodora of Kaisareia (tenth century) was born after her parents had for long time been sterile. According to her biographer, when Theodora reached an appropriate age, she was dedicated to the monastery of St Anna in Rigidion. When her mother conceived, the hagiographer wrote that she 'accepted the grace of Anna the mother of the Theotokos'.[1023] St Thomais of Lesbos however, is the only case that has come down to us where a saint prayed for a child to St Anna and not Mary, and parents are compared to Anna and Joachim.[1024]

The prayer to Anna for a child is confirmed by material evidence as well. Eleventh- and twelfty-century engraved intaglios and cameos depicting the Medusa include images of St Anna holding Mary.[1025] They usually bear the 'hystera formula', a phrase which reads: Ὑστέρα μελάνη μελανόμενη...'(= Womb, black, blackening...), or the name of the saint.[1026] The 'hystera formula' intended to exorcise demons from the womb,[1027] and the medusa with the seven heads is connected with the seven female demons that appeared to king Solomon in the apocryphal 'Solomon's Testament'.[1028]

Moreover, James argues that it is more or less common to find saints who were born from women who could not conceive or were too old for childbirth,[1029] but Pitarakis sees a clear connection between St Anna and problems of sterility within the Byzantine society.[1030] The infertility of a saint's parents, a frequent commonplace in vitae, has its roots in the biblical motif of barren parents, who at long last bear a holy child such as Isaac, Samuel, and John the Baptist.[1031] Nikolaou notes that the recurrence of the name

---

[1023] Nikolaou 2005:43.
[1024] ibid. 293; For her life, see Kazhdan and Talbot 1991-2:108-9.
[1025] Bakaloude 1998: 212.
[1026] Spier 1993:28-30. For the date of this intaglio in the middle Byzantine period, see Spier 1993:31, 56 no 56 and pl. 5a.
[1027] ibid. 43.
[1028] ' Καὶ ἦλθον πνεύματα ἑπτὰ συνδεδεμένα και συμπεπλεγμένα...ἡ Ἀπάτη... ἡ Ἔρις... ἡ Κλωθώ... ἡ Ζάλη... ἡ Πλάνη... ἡ Δύναμις...ἡ Κακίστη.' McCown (ed.) 1922: 31-2.
[1029] James 2003:160.
[1030] Piratakis 2005:156-7.
[1031] Talbot 1996:123 n.29; Karras (trans.) 1996:123 n.29; Baumer and Scheffczyk 1988:154; For a different view, see Halsall 1996:299.

Anna in hagiographies is not haphazard and it is commonly associated with women facing the problem of sterility.[1032]

The name Anna is equivalent not only to problems related to childbirth but also to demonstration of motherly affection. Nikolaou uses among others the example of Anna Euphemianos and Anna (mother of Peter of Atroa), to show that breastfeeding was important for the child's upbringing in Byzantine society.[1033] After Mary's birth, Anna's maternity was manifestly shown in her breastfeeding in the *Protevangelion of James*.[1034] Anna Euphemianos breastfed her child and before her departure for the monastery, she did not abandon it but gave it to person of her family to take care of.[1035]

As I have shown, hagiographies shows that from the beginning of the ninth century the name Anna was associated with iconophilia and with the protection of childbirth since mothers of saints who had problems begetting a child are named Anna. This association is not demonstrated only in hagiographies. Iconophilia and childbirth appear in other literary genres from the ninth century onwards, namely in the histories the *Chronographia* of Theophanes the Confessor and the *Patria of Constantinople*.

Anna and iconophilia in histories: Theophanes's Chronographia – The Patria of Constantinople

Theophanes records an incident, which highlights demonstration of Orthodoxy by a woman called Anna. The (according to Theophanes) iconophile Artavasdos (the son-in-law of Emperor Leo III),[1036] was incarcerated by Emperor Constantine V. His iconophile

---

[1032] Nikolaou 2005:72.
[1033] ibid. 124.
[1034] ' καὶ ἔδωκε μασθὸν τῇ παιδί… Ἀκούσατε ἀκούσατε, αἱ ιβ΄ φυλαὶ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ ὅτι Ἄννα θηλάζει', see De Strycker (ed.) 1961:93-4.
[1035] Nikolaou 2005:148.
[1036] De Boor (ed.) 1963:386 : Λέων δέ [...] εἶχε δὲ συμπνέοντα αὐτῷ καὶ συντρέχοντα Ἀρτάβασδον... ῷ καὶ συνέθετο δοῦναι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θυγατέρα εἰς γυναῖκα· ὃ καὶ πεποίηκεν De Boor (ed.) 1963:395 [...] εἶχε δὲ συμφωνοῦντα αὐτῷ καὶ συντρέχοντα Ἀρτάυασδον[...]ὃν καὶ γαμβρὸν μετὰ τὸ βασιλεῦσαι αὐτὸν εἰς Ἄνναν τὴν θυγατέρα αὐτοῦ πεποίηκεν.

feelings are shown by Theophanes' claim that during his reign (741-2) Artavasdos restored the icons.[1037] He had nine children and a wife called Anna (the daughter of Leo III)[1038] who, after her husband's and children's death, buried them in the Chora monastery close to the relics of patriarch Germanos. As Judith Herrin has noted, 'the existence of Germanos' relics in Chora developed a strong Iconophile tradition for this monastery'.[1039] The same Anna appears in one patronage story in the tenth-century *Patria of Constantinople*.

There are numerous examples of female patronage in the *Patria* where monuments have been ascribed to multiple personae and in various periods,[1040] but I will examine four cases, which share common peculiarities.[1041] These instances, which have been highlighted by Berger,[1042] are very similar to each other and all pertain to the construction, mainly by empresses, of churches dedicated to St Anna.[1043]

First, according to the *Patria*, Justinian II built the church of St Anna in the Deuteron after his wife got pregnant and had a vision of the saint.[1044] Second, in order for the editor of the Patria to explain the name of the monastery of Spoude (= haste),[1045] he refers to the following story: The pregnant wife of Leo III, Anna, was coming from Blachernai and while she going down to the house of a protospatharios she gave birth in that spot. Later she bought the house and called it the 'Monastery of Haste'.[1046] Third, in

---

[1037] ὁ δὲ Ἀρτάυασδος κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν πόλιν τὰς ἱερὰς εἰκόνας ἀνεστήλωσεν, see De Boor (ed.) 1963:415.

[1038] PMZ 137 # 443.

[1039] Herrin 2006:10.

[1040] James 2004:58.

[1041] James 2001a:151.

[1042] Berger 1988:411, 439, 520, 524, 528.

[1043] For a discussion of the pairing of Anna and Joachim with Constantine and Helena see pp 251-2.

[1044] Preger (ed.) 1989:244; Berger 1988:524-5.

[1045] In the sixth-century Madaba mosaic, attached to the Holy Sepulchre the monastery of Spoudaeon which had a chapel of Mary of Spoudaei, see Vincent and Abel 1922:923; Petrides 1900-1:225-231; Petrides 1904: 341-8; Patrich 2001:305 n.4.

[1046] Berger notes that there was a monastery of Haste mentioned in the Book of Ceremonies, Berger 1988: 525 n. 107. In the Gospel of Luke, (1.39-40) shortly after her pregnancy, the Virgin visited Elizabeth 'with haste', which has been understood as a sign of Mary's demonstration of joy, which however has not been accepted by Schaberg who writes that it was because Mary's fear of being pregnant. See Schaberg 89-90. However, that the word haste was meant for joy it is shown in the tenth-century 'discourse to the virgins' of Lukas Adialeiptos: 'Ὁ δὲ μετὰ περιχαρείας ἀπήει καὶ σπουδῆς, προσδοκῶν ἤδη τῆς ἐπιθυμίας αυτοῦ ἐπαπολαῦσαι.' See Rigo 2009:335: 440-1.

the same story the empress is credited with the construction of another church called 'ta Annes' (of Anna), the location of which I do not know.[1047] Fourth, a century later, Theophilos' wife, Theodora, while coming back from the Blachernai realized she was pregnant when her horse flinched, which motivated her to build the church of St Anna in the Dagestheas area, the bath of which is located in the proximity of the Tetrapylon.[1048] As Janin argues, we cannot know whether there is a link between all the monuments mentioned in the *Patria* about St Anna and whether they all relate to the same monument.[1049] But the connection between pregnancy and Anna is clear.

Was there any particular reason to attribute the churches of St Anna to Theophilos' and Leo's wives? Is it easy to ignore the fact that both Theodora and Anna were wives of Iconoclast emperors?[1050] The stories of female patronage in the Patria place the female protagonists in a specific ideological context. They appear to worship a saint whose role as Christ's progenitor was established after the end of Iconoclasm. The dating of these patronage stories coincides chronologically with the establishment of Mary's parents in the Church calendar and the widespread acceptance of the *Protevangelion* from the ninth century onwards. The iconophile hint on these stories is strengthened by the fact that after the official end of Iconoclasm in 843 empress Theodora made a procession which started from the Blachernai,[1051] a church which became symbol of the triumph of Orthodoxy.[1052]

One cannot fail to see the similarities in the content of these four stories. The common elements are the wives of the emperors, their pregnancy, and the dedication of a church after that. The last three stories are almost identical. The wife of the emperor, who

---

[1047] Preger (ed.) 1989:251, Janin 1969:470; Berger 1988: 525;
[1048] Preger (ed.) 1989: 232; Mango 1985:60.
[1049] Janin 1937:150.
[1050] Leo did not destroy any relics, see Auzepy 2001:13-24.
[1051] Theophanes Continuatus, 1838 :60. For Theodora's role in the restoration of images and the motives behind it, see Brubaker and Haldon 2011:448-9.
[1052] Abrahamse and Domingo-Forasté 1998:223.

returns from Blachernai, gives births and builds a church to St Anna. The alleged wife of Leo III, Anna, who was actually his daughter,[1053] is mentioned twice and one of the foundation stories she is involved with, resembles almost identically that of Theodora, the wife of Theophilos, who had a daughter named Anna.[1054] The story of Leo's daughter and that of Theodora, wife of Justinian II, are also similar, apart from the way the saint appears to them, namely either in a dream or in the flinching of a horse. The vision of the saint that the two empresses (Justinian's and Theophilos' wives) shared, shows that that in the tenth-century in popular belief, St Anna appeared in visions or dreams.

The historical nucleus in the *Patria* stories consists in the following three points. As I have shown, according to Prokopios, a church had been dedicated to St Anna in the quarter of Deuteron however not by Justinian II, but by Justinian I.[1055] A chapel to St Anna had been dedicated by Leo VI and also by Leo the patrician and his wife Anna not by any wife of Leo III.[1056] Finally, the visits of Theodora, wife of Theophilos, to the Blachernai are verified by Theophanes, and we know that Leo VI's wife, but not the wife of Leo III, Theophano and her husband were frequent visitors of Blachernai.[1057] The location of the churches at Deuteron and Dagestheas are mentioned elsewhere but the story behind their construction of 'ta Annes' and Haste (Spoude) is only mentioned in the *Patria*.

Berger argues that the church build by Theodora in the Dagestheas area was a gesture of gratitude for her daughter Anna.[1058] Kaplan uses the Dagestheas story to show

---

[1053] PMZ 137 # 443; PMZ 138 # 445.

[1054] Theophanes Continuatus, 1838 :90 ,628, 658,757,823.

[1055] Weber (ed.) 1838a:185. According to the *Continuator of Theophanes*, the statue of Bardas on a column standing close to the church of St Anna fell during an earthquake, which prophesized his death, see Weber (ed) 1838b:197, 324,677; Bekker (ed.)1842:168. Other sources that mention the church of St Anna in the Deuteron, see Du Cange 1680 (4) :143-4, Delehaye (ed.) 1902:20.2, 90.5, 127.2, 842.1:15; Gedeon 1899:136; Mateos (ed.) 1962:16,50.

[1056] Weber (ed.) 1838b:146. 18-19; Berger 1988: 525; Janin 1969 35-7; Mango 1972:205. For the dedication by the wife of Leo the patrician, see Ruggieri 1991:212. This Leo had been corresponding with the iconophile Theodore Studites, see Efthymiadis 1995:157-8 and n. 70.

[1057] Weber (ed.) 1838b: 88, 93, 174, 793, 803; Karlin-Hayter 1955-7: 26. It was accustomed for empresses to visit the church,see PG 100: 1080A; PMZ 1999: 137 (442). Apart from empresses, often members of imperial family visited it, see Mango 2000: 21; Croke 2005:61.

[1058] Berger 1988: 441. Its location should be looked for next to St. Anastasia's church.

how locations, which do not correspond to the urban plan of the city, are haphazardly established in history and sacred topography by miracles, which in this case occurs through the flinching of a horse.[1059] Herrin has correctly pointed out that 'when writers found a monument the story of which they do not know they made their own connections according to the legends associated with an area'.[1060] But it is evident that this also happens for monuments the history of which was already known such as the Deuteron church, first mentioned by Prokopios but in the *Patria* the story changed to fit the ideological perspective of the tenth-century writer. This is in accordance with Liz James' recent argument that 'when people associated with places, change, we can see how they were put to different uses'.[1061] The stories of the empresses in the *Patria* and their placement in a fictional set do not differ from other stories of empresses who were credited with stories or qualities they did not have.[1062] In contrast to the information provided by hagiographical texts, in the *Patria* empresses associated with Anna are not sterile as it was an essential prerequisite to leave offspring, thus ideologies are manipulated differently according to the social group a text targets.

Women at the church of Blachernai

The connection of the Blachernai to St Anna and women named Anna in the *Patria* is similar to other examples I have examined so far of the blending of various traditions.

First, the Blachernai was the most important church to worship Mary. After the arrival of the Virgins's relics from Jerusalem and especially the girdle of Mary, which

---

[1059] Dagron 1977:8, 25.
[1060] Herrin 2002:197.
[1061] James 2004:60.
[1062] For example, Pulcheria'connection to Virgin Mary has been considered as a post-iconoclastic 'imaginative development', see Cameron 2004:11; Delehaye (ed.) 1902:354.

dates during the Patriarch of Germanos (715-730),[1063] the site was considered efficacious for women in childbirth.[1064] This is why women such as the mother of St Stephen the Younger and empresses are presented as having given birth after their regular visit to the church. The fact that the feasts celebrating events from the early life of Mary such as the Conception, the Nativity and the Presentation were not celebrated in Blachernai but in Chalkoprateia,[1065] did not matter to the editor of the *Patria* who incorporated an element from the life of the empresses.[1066]

Second and as Pratch argues, the prayer for a child in a church, its birth, and the subsequent dedication to the temple is not a hagiographical 'topos' but women praying in the church and associating themselves with the Lukan Anna is.[1067] The place of the Lukan Anna in a church gave rise to a number of saints connected not only to a church but also to the Blachernai in particular. In the tenth-century *Synaxarion of Constantinople*, Anna the Holy Mother the Younger and Anna after Eyphemianos appear as daughters of a diaitarios and a deacon respectively in the church of Blachernai.[1068] The first is Anna the Holy Mother the Younger (28 October) daughter of John, a diaitarios in the church of the Blachernai,[1069] and the second is Anna named after Euphemianos (29 October), born in Constantinople around 760 and the daughter of a deacon in Blachernai.[1070] The tenth-century *Patria* editor blends the protection of childbirth from the belt of Mary in the Blachernai, Anna's maternity and resistance of women named Anna toward iconoclasts.

[1063] Babić 1969: 36. Mango 2000:24 n. 19.
[1064] Herrin 2000 :26. For the girdle, see Lathoud 1924:40-6.
[1065] Mateos (ed.) 1962 :110.
[1066] Empresses visited the Blachernai regularly, see Tougher 1997:138.
[1067] Pratsch 2005:78.
[1068] Delehaye (ed.) 1902:170.7, 173-5:15-35; Halkin 1957:8.
[1069] Delehaye (ed.) 1902:170.7; Halkin 1957:8.
[1070] Delehaye (ed.) 1902:173-5: 15-35. AASS October 12: 913A, 915B-917A. Nikolaou 2005:43. Kazhdan assumes that the two Blachernai saints are the same person since he argues Anna is an enigmatic figure, scarcely mentioned in contemporary sources. The *Synaxarion of Constantinople* contains a very brief notice (under December 28) of Anna the Younger, daughter of John, diaitarios of Blachernai, see Kazhdan and Talbot 1991-2:395. His reference from the Synaxarion is correct but it on October 28, not December (p. 392). He also claims it is the nun that was accused of having sexual relationship with Stephen, see Kazhdan and Talbot 1991-2:394.

The *Synaxarion of Constantinople* with the inclusion of two women named Anna related to the Blachernai demonstrates the ideological connection between this church and the saint or women named Anna in the tenth century. As far as hagiography is concerned, Delehaye has discussed the process through which the hagiographer writes his vita using true or false written, oral, and pictorial tradition and how all these contribute to the creation of the vita and the attribution of characteristics to saints.[1071] The same process was followed by the editor of the Patria who took actual and fictional elements and placed them in a tenth-century ideological dress. This connection in the form that it is presented in the *Patria* seems to be the result of a blending of hagiographical works, biblical figures, social practices, religious symbolisms and actual facts.[1072]

In a wider framework, the presence of a woman named Anna in a church transcends various texts and brings to mind Anna the prophetess who dedicated herself to the church and constantly prayed. In the seventh-century life of St Artemios a woman named Anna used to light a lamp before the icon of John the Baptist,[1073] and in the tenth-century *Synaxarion of Constantinople*, St Anna the Virgin (discussed later) in order to keep her body unviolated by the Persians 'made earnest and continuous supplication with many tears'.[1074] Theophano's mother, spent her days praying for a child in the church of the Theotokos in the area of Bassois,[1075] and in Theophanes' *Chronographia*, before Basil's rise to the throne, the mother of Basil I used to 'visit a church similarly to Anna (the prophetess) and would not leave the temple but spent her time there praying and fasting'.[1076] Basil reconstructed the church of St Anna in Deuteron and had a daughter

---

[1071] Attwater (trans.) 1998:55-68.

[1072] Other stories which are influenced by histories and hagiography is St. Theodosia's passio.

[1073] Crisafulli and Nesbitt (eds) 1997: 176-7. This story is used to support the rise of image-worshipping in the seventh century, see Cameron 1992: 5.

[1074] Bonner 1942-3:147. 'ἐκτενῆ οὖν προσευχήν ὥστε διαφυλάξαι αὐτῆς τήν παρθενίαν ἄφθορον'. See Bonner 1942-3:145.

[1075] Delehaye (ed.) 1902: 314. St. Thecla is directly linked with the prophetess because of her endurance in her childlessness and prayer. See Davis (trans.) 2008:62.

[1076] Weber (ed.) 1838b :225-6.

called Anna,[1077] a move similar to that of Leo VI, who built a chapel of Anna in the palace possibly in need for a male heir to the throne.[1078] These examples show the importance of name conjuction for the cult of Anna in Byzantium which it is supported by texts as well, as shown in chapter two.

Finally, the *Patria* provides us with the opportunity to see the number of ideologies existing in Byzantine histories and how authors adjusted tradition to accomodate the social and ideological standards of their period.

Demonstration of Orthodoxy: Annas in monasteries- the Synodikon of Orthodoxy

Further demonstration of opposition against Iconoclasm is shown in the number of abbesses or nuns named Anna who were actively opposed to Iconoclasm.

Theodore of Studios corresponded with four nuns or abbesses named Anna.[1079] One was the abbess of the monastery of Ignaik or one of the monasteries dedicated to the Virgin in the first half of the ninth century;[1080] another one was the sister of emperor Leo VI, who was a nun in the monastery of St Euphemia;[1081] the third Anna was the abbess of Vardaine in the tenth century;[1082] the fourth Anna was abbess of St Stephen's monastery in Thessalonike, who was persecuted by the iconoclasts.[1083]

Kazhdan and Talbot note that 'almost all the female correspondents of Theodore of Stoudios embraced iconophile views'.[1084] Moreover, demonstration of the popularity of that name is shown in the martyrs and saints named Anna and celebrated in Constantinople, who do not appear before the tenth century perhaps due to the lack of

---

[1077] PMZ 148 # 463.
[1078] Discussed shortly in more detail.
[1079] Kazhdan and Talbot 1991-2:397 no 6 and 398 no 21 and 399 (Abbess of Nikaia- This Anna was sent to prison because did not denounce the veneration of icons, look letters 42, 96, 289, 85, 316) PMZ 142-3 #452, #453, #453A #454. Pratsch 1998:52; PG 99:1808-9; Speck (ed.) 1968:312.
[1080] PMZ 144 # 457.
[1081] Nikolaou 2005:204.
[1082] ibid. 139.
[1083] Paschalides (ed.) 1991:3, 24; Talbot 1996:181 n.107; Talbot 1994b:120-1.
[1084] Kazhdan and Talbot 1991-2: 398.

liturgical evidence. The basic information on these women and their place of burial is drawn from the *Synaxarion* and the Russian travellers of the twelfth century and fourteenth century discussed shortly.

Women named Anna associated with iconophilia are included in a text destined to praise Orthodoxy, the *Synodikon of Orthodoxy*. This ninth-century text has sustained alterations until the fourteenth century and refers to three women called Anna as 'very pious',[1085] a characterisation equated with Orthodoxy since this is the criterion for the inclusion of the text in that corpus. The text reads: 'John, our orthodox emperor, and Anna Augusta the very pious' and then: 'Anna [...] nun Anastasia, who, in her writings and words, all her life, struggled with all her soul for the affirmation of the teachings of the apostles and Fathers of the Church and (struggle for) the destruction of the wicked heresy and impious figure of Barlaam, Akindynos and their supporters, endless her memory'. Finally, the text also reads 'Anna, our glorious despoina of pious memory, endless her memory'. The three quotations refer to Anna of Savoy, who built the monastery of Hagioi Anargyroi in Thessalonike and entered this monastery under the name Anastasia.[1086] The same person is recorded in a text of the Protaton monastery commemorating her memory: 'our Empress Anna of immortal fame known as the nun Anastasia who in words and deeds laboured all her life in support of the apostolic and patristic dogmas of the church',[1087] which copies accurately the text of the *Synodikon*. Nicol argues that the deposition of patriarch Kalekas as heretic by Anna of Savoy gave her a place in the *Synodikon*.[1088] Moreover, in the *Synodikon* two additional women appear together: 'Anna and Helena, the very pious augustae'.[1089] These are probably Anna and Helena daughters of Michael of

---

[1085] Mango 1977:134.
[1086] Nicol 1994:93.
[1087] ibid. 94.
[1088] ibid. 94.
[1089] Gouillard 1967: 95,101,103.

Epiros who had a reputation for virtue and sanctity.[1090] But Anna could be Queen Anna wife of Nikephoros of Epiros, who was anti-unionist and welcomed to Epiros the refugees from their persecution in Constantinople.[1091]

The *Synodikon* has included two women who showed support for the Orthodox dogma in a time when the union of churches under Michael VIII Paleologos in 1274 and the synod in Lyon has divided the Byzantines into pro-unionist and anti-unionist camps. It is not different from the role of Anna during and after Iconoclasm since both the eighth and ninth centuries and 1261 called for demonstration of Orthodoxy. The association of Anna as a symbol of Orthodoxy in its literary sense 'correct dogma' is clearer in the *Synodikon* than in the patronage stories of the *Patria* or in hagiography. This is why I believe that the connection between the name Anna and Orthodoxy in the *Synodikon* is not accidental. From the ninth century onwards (*Vita* of St Stephen the Younger) and until the thirteenth century – when the women mentioned in the *Synodikon* lived – Annas kept being associated with iconophilia, a development which I have presented in the current chapter and in chapter two.

Onomatology- Martyria of various Annas in Constantinople

The fact that St Anna's cult was spread rapidly after the ninth century and in various forms is also shown in the popularity of this name. During the whole Middle Byzantine period twenty-seven women called Anna have been recorded, only three of them date to the seventh century, while in the eighth and ninth century we find ten and fourteen respectively.[1092] In the eleventh century and twelfth century we find eighty Annas,

---

[1090] Nicol 1994:15.
[1091] ibid. 25.
[1092] PMZ 1999:136-149.

being the second most popular female name after Mary.[1093] In the fourteenth century the name has gained particular fame. The acts of Lavra list forty-eight Annas.[1094] Onomatology in association with the various martyria in the city of Constantinople testifies the popularity of this name in the middle and especially in the late Byzantine period.[1095]

The Russian travellers

Russian travellers (Stephen of Novgorod [1348-9], Russian Anonymous [c. 1389-1391]),[1096] visited Constantinople in the fourteenth century and kept records of churches they visited and relics they saw or venerated. One of the tombs they mentioned is of St Anna, but the information they provide on its location is problematic.

First the location of the saint's relics is different in the two accounts and second the travellers refer to a number of of tombs of saints or martyrs under the name Anna in Constantinople, which makes it difficult to discern the actual burial place of Mary's mother.

On the one hand Stephen of Novgorod locates Anna's tomb in the Manganas church,[1097] on the other hand the Russian Anonymous locates her relics in the Philanthropos church.[1098] The Russian Anonymous refers to St Anna sometimes as martyr,[1099] and Majeska believes that this could be any martyr, such as St Anna of Heraklea.[1100] Majeska notes that the saints mentioned by the two pilgrims refer to the same person but not to St Anna. He bases his argument on the fact that if Anna had been buried

---

[1093] PBZ 2006 http://www.pbw.kcl.ac.uk/pbw/apps/ .
[1094] ODB 102.
[1095] Majeska argues that there were specific guide tours around the city, see Majeska 2002:107.
[1096] Mango 1952:385.
[1097] Majeska 1984:36.
[1098] ibid. 373. Holy water existed In the Philanthropos church, which was consumed for healing. See Majeska 1984:140.
[1099] ibid. 140. n.46.
[1100] Bonner 1942-3:145-6; Majeska 1984:370 n.52.

either in the Philanthropos or the Manganas church, then her annual liturgical commemoration would have been held at one of these two churches; but neither of those churches were stational for Anna's commemoration, it was the Chalkoprateia and the church in the Deuteron.[1101] Additionally, Makeska rejects the notion that the Russian Anonymous refers to Mary's mother, since he sometimes refers to her as Anna the 'martyr'.[1102] While his view that it might not have been St Anna in both cases is correct, it is not clear why it should be the same person in both cases.[1103]

However, confusion is not only created by the account of the Russian travellers but also by the *Synaxarion of Constantinople*, where various Anna appear with different appellations. The following section is dedicated to saints and martyrs Annas that one finds in the tenth-century *Synaxarion*, who, although they are nowhere else mentioned, testify that the name Anna had become popular by the tenth century. They also show that Melicharová's reference to 'St Anna of Constantinople' cannot stand on its own without explanation to which Anna one is referring to.[1104]

Anna the Virgin

According to the fourteenth-century travellers, St Anna the Virgin was buried in a church near the Blachernai, beyond the church of Sts Cosmas and Damian.[1105] A century earlier, Antony of Novgorod (1200) had mentioned the relics of Anna (without any further details such as to which saint the church was dedicated), which were located close to the

---

[1101] Majeska 1984:370.
[1102] ibid. 140 n 46 and 370 n. 58.
[1103] Although the identity of the woman buried in Manganas cannot be confirmed, she must have been buried there after the twelfth century since in a twelfth-century description of Constantinople, when the pilgrim refers to the Manganas church, he makes no mention of St Anna's relics, see Ciggaar 1976: 250. Nevertheless it could be that different pilgrims took different tours around the city they were shown fewer relics even in the same shrine, see Majeska 2002:95. For the differentiation in the account on relics' location of Marian relics in the twelfth century, see Wortley 2005:16.
[1104] Melicharová 2007:339.
[1105] Majeska 1984:332, n .122.

Golden Horn.[1106] It could be the church of Kosmas and Damian or the church of St John the Baptist at Petra, which both served a station for liturgy in the middle Byzantine period.[1107] This Anna is not mentioned in the *Synaxarion* but only in a copy of a tenth- or eleventh-century calendar.[1108] In this manuscript, Anna is named 'holy virgin' (ἀγία παρθένος) and 'bride of Christ',[1109] and she is commemorated on 7 May. The historical framework for her life is seventh-century Jerusalem and in particular 614, when the city was captured by the Persians.[1110] The story repeats Greek stories of early women martyrs or copies Arabic and Georgian texts, which focus on Jerusalem's capture,[1111] the fact that very common name was chosen for this martyrs, shows that the saint 'was originally nameless'.[1112]

Martyrs and Mothers named Anna

In the *Synaxarion of Constantinople*, six martyrs named Anna are commemorated: one on 16 January,[1113] one on 26 March,[1114] three on 6 June,[1115] and on 20 January one who died in Rome.[1116] The relationship between the liturgy of Jerusalem and Constantinople mentioned earlier is once more underlined here; on June 6, when the martyr Anna is celebrated in Constantinople, in Jerusalem, a feast was celebrated in the Probatike (mentioned in the *Georgian lectionary*), which, although it is not related to Anna, shows that the feasts of saints named Anna are connected either nominally or geographically to Jerusalem.[1117]

[1106] Janin 1937:150; Berger 1988: 441.
[1107] Berger 2001: 86-7 nos 16, 18.
[1108] Bonner 1942-3:144.
[1109] ibid. 146.
[1110] Bonner 1942-3:144-5; Halkin 1957: 2028.
[1111] Bonner 1942-3:149,151-2.
[1112] ibid. 148.
[1113] Delehaye (ed.) 1902: 395.
[1114] ibid. 559.
[1115] ibid. 731.
[1116] ibid. 408.
[1117] Goussen 1923:24.

Additionally, two holy mothers are celebrated on 29 October and on 13 June the latter with her son.[1118] There is no information about the latter but the first one is Anna after Euphemianos, who appears in the *Synaxarion* as 'holy Mother Anna'; the chronological setting of her story is placed between Leo III's reign and sometime after the rule of Constantine VI and Eirini.[1119] She travelled to Greece, resided in a monastery near Olympos Mountain after having dressed up as a man and changed her name to Euphemianos.[1120]

The Russian travellers inform us also about about the martyrs Elizabeth and Anna who were both buried with their husbands in the church of Virgin in 'ta Kyrou'. One wonders whether the commemoration of this Anna in the 'ta Kyrou' church generated the healing connotations around Anna in association with Justinian I and the specific church, mentioned in chapter one. In any case, Majeska is reluctant to confirm that this Anna is the servant of Elisabeth the body of whom is recorded by the Russian Anonymous at the same shrine.[1121] It is possible that the Russian travellers refer to one of the two pairs of martyrs under the names Anna and Elisabeth that appear in the *Synaxarion* on 9 and 22 October.[1122] The first pair has an entourage, which the second does not and they are commemorated in different churches on the same month. The fact that they constitute two different couples is implied by the fact that other saints such as John the Forerunner who is commemorated six times in the calendar year but not the same month.[1123] In the Kyparission, near the Exakionion and diametrically opposite to the Blachernai, there is an another martyrium of

---

[1118] Delehaye (ed.) 1902: 174, 747.
[1119] Delehaye (ed.) 1902: 173 verses 20-1 and 24-5; AASS October 12: 916D; Kazhdan and Talbot 1991-2:21-2.
[1120] Euphemia appears to be the sister of a fifth-century Syriac martyr, Mary, written in the sixth century by John of Ephesos. See Brock (trans.) 1987:124-133. For the dating of his work, see Van Ginkel 1996:77.
 Majeska 1984:322, n.58. For bibliography on transvestite saints, see Ringrose 2003:229 n. 62. Delehaye notes that women dressing up as men to enter a monastery is a commonplace in saints' lives, see Attwater (trans.) 1998:51.
[1121] Majeska 1984:322, n.58.
[1122] Delehaye (ed.) 1902:124.4 and 156.3; Mateos (ed.) 1962:64, 74; AASS October 9:520A-521A.
[1123] Topping 1976 :2-3.

a woman named Anna.[1124] Majeska does not state whether this is a martyr but his view not out of context, since it is not unusual to find one saint and several martyrs with the same name.[1125]

Anna of Leukate

The last Anna mentioned in the *Synaxarion* is St Anna of Leukate who was commemorated on 23 July.[1126] She was born during Theophilos' reign (829-842) and died when she was fifty years old.[1127] Her life as recounted in the *Synaxarion* informs us that she was the descendant of a very rich family and that at an early age, she lost her parents and devoted herself to charity. The most interesting part of the story is that she is the only Anna whose relics are mentioned in the *Synaxarion*.[1128] We are not told where, but the location accompanying the saint name, Leukate (Λευκάτη), is either Bithynia where we know that there was a monastery of St Anna at least by the early ninth century, or Leukada the Greek island in the Ionian Sea.[1129]

The recurrence of martyrs called Anna in the *Synaxarion of Constantinople* may have been due to error of the editor,[1130] but it seems to me that the emergence of multiple Annas was in no way accidental, since it is a further testimony to the saint's spread of cult by the fourteenth century.[1131] The evidence from the commemoration of saints named Anna in the *Synaxarion* is in accordance with the widespread use of the name Anna in the fourteenth-century acts of Laura, mentioned earlier. The cult of St Anna had by that time

---

[1124] Janin 1969: (enclosed map) 8B; Mateos (ed.) 1962:74. Majeska does not state whether this is a martyr but his view not out of context, since it is not unusual to find martyrs with the same name such as St. Aberkios for example under the name of whom we have one saint but many martyrs, see Majeska 1984:373.

[1125] Majeska 1984:373.

[1126] Delehaye (ed.) 1902: 837.7: 2-3; Scholz 1997:24.

[1127] PMZ 1999:140 (448).

[1128] Delehaye (ed.) 1902: 838 verse 20-24.

[1129] Kazhdan and Talbot 1991-2: 20-1 (in favour of Bithynia). In Theophanes 'Chronographia' it signifies a rocky and coastal location in Nikomedeia, see De Boor (ed.) 1963: 366 ; In favour of the Greek island, see AASS July 5: 486C; Da Costa-Louillet 1961: 315. See also Janin 1975:135.

[1130] Attwater (trans.) 1998:62.

[1131] The often appearance of a saint's name is used to denote the spread of cult, see Davis (trans.) 2008:201, 204.

experienced the process from disregard to expanded veneration in Byzantium, and the use of the name in saint verifies it. Finally, I should note that the celebration of the feast might not be accidental, since Anna Leukate is celebrated two days before the feast of the Conception of St Anna in Byzantium, which alludes to a liturgical connection due to name conjuction made by the Byzantines.

Conclusions to chapters one - three

The next chapter deals with the iconography of the saint in Constantinople and the areas artistically influenced by it and where a comparison is made between the image of the saint in textual and visual evidence. Thus it is valuable to recapitulate what we have seen so far in terms of topography, textual production and evidence for the cult of St Anna in Byzantium, as a comparison will be made in the last chapter between her image in these aspects and her visual promotion.

This survey started with the Probatike, where Mary was born. This location did not give rise to the veneration of Anna in the Holy Land since the celebration of Mary's early life targeted Mary and not her parents. The contribution of Jerusalem to the study of St Anna's cult is that it provides an understanding of the one of the factors that formed sixth-century Constantinopolitan topography. The aquatic and healing connotations of the monuments of St Anna in the Byzantine capital are part of the creation of sacred topography, in which, as I have demonstrated, Justinian I was particularly interested.

But the cult of St Anna was not initiated by Justinian. His building activity and the kontakion of Romanos are two phenomena that pertain to Justinian's interest in Mary and did not have wider application before the eighth century. With the outbreak of Iconoclasm, Anna's role in the Incarnation of Christ is made obvious to the Byzantine world through the homiletic production of the eighth- and especially of the ninth century.

However, she is not only the physical grandmother of Christ but also a holy figure, which is demonstrated in her life with Joachim as it is recorded in the *Protevangelion.* Her emerging importance for the soteriological plan of God for the salvation of mankind resulted in the recognition, in homilies, of the *Protevangelion* as part of the Holy Scripture.

The story of Anna, a sterile woman, who finally conceived, combined with aquatic and healing connotations of the sixth century, was developed and resulted in the association of Anna with childbirth from the eighth century, as hagiography and the *Patria* show.

In the *Patria*, the construction and rebuilding of all the known monuments of St Anna was initiated by male rulers (Justinian I, Leo VI, Basil I) but in the *Patria* – and only in the Patria – a connection is made with female patrons. The reasons why the connection is made only in the *Patria* are difficult to tell. One reason could be that hagiography does not offer fertile ground to record the architectural achievements of imperial patronage, which the *Patria* offered because of the nature of the text. In turn, patronage as it is recounted in the *Patria*, may have a historical nucleus, – as it has in the case of Anna's relics – but, as I have shown, the four patronage stories were manipulated according to the wish of their writer/editor, which was the promotion of Anna as a patron of childbirth and the association of the name Anna with the pro-image cause. Four centuries earlier than the *Patria*, in the patronage story of Justinian I mentioned by Prokopios, there is no connection of the saint to childbirth, which could point to the fact that there was not such a connection as early as the sixth century or that Prokopios did not record it.

Looking at Theophanes' *Chronographia*, the *life of Stephen the Younger*, the *Patria* and the *Synodikon of Orthodoxy* one concludes that these four works in combination demonstrate that St Anna functioned the same way Mary did: she resolved

sterility issues, secured protection of children, and were both equated with Orthodoxy.[1132] However, it is not St Anna herself being credited with Orthodoxy but women who bear her name. Anna and Joachim gained their veneration entirely by being Mary's parents, which motivated their inclusion in works where the human side of Christ had to be defended. I argued that in the *Patria* ideologies were manipulated to target specific social groups and this also occurs in homilies. The homiletic activity from the eighth century onwards was filtered through the theological needs of the eighth and nine centuries and resulted in giving 'Orthodox' connotations to St Anna. The first known church dedicated to St Anna dates to the sixth century but it took four centuries for a separate feast – no longer part of the Marian feast cycle – to be established. The construction of monuments, homilies and hagiography show that there has been a process, which opened the way for the patronage stories and the introduction of Anna's Dormition feast in the tenth century. Finally, the evidence on her relics clearly marks the interest shown in the saint from the eighth century in Byzantium, which is accordance with the emergence of the homiletic activity around her life at that time.

Apart from the conception of St Theodora of Kaisareia by her mother, Anna is not attributed with typical saintly qualities such as performances of miracles as it has been recorded in Western sources.[1133] Rather, Anna's role in protecting children emerged through her story in the *Protevangelion* and the Byzantine familiarity with her life through the homiletic activity resulted in the 'translation' of the apocryphal text in term into social practices. There is no new *vita* of St Anna been written in Byzantium as in the West thirteenth-century (Jacob of Voragine), but the Byzantines did what they did best when it came to defending their views: stay close to the tradition. And the *Protevangelion* had been there since the second century.

[1132] Tsironis 2005: 99.
[1133] Brandenbarg 1995: 54-6.

205

CHAPTER 4

THE VISUAL EVIDENCE

Introduction

The representations of St Anna in Byzantium and the West were given scholarly attention in 1962 by Lafontaine-Dosogne and her work *Iconographie de l'enfance de la Vierge dans l'Empire byzantin et en Occident*.[1134] Until then, Réau, Croce and Kleinschmidt had included in their works brief references to the saint's cult and representations but they primarily dealt with the cult of St Anna in the West, while their information on the saint's cult in the East is repetitive and meager.[1135] In 1985, Freytag, in his book *Die autonome Theotokosdarstellung der frühen Jahrhunderte*, considers non-narrative images of Mary, but only those where she is portrayed with or without Christ; Freytag excluded the depictions of Mary with Anna.[1136]

Lafontaine-Dosogne dedicated one of her two volumes to the depictions of St Anna in the East which opened the way for the study of the saint's representations and until today it remains a point of reference for the depictions of the saint in Byzantine art.[1137] Lafontaine-Dosogne's effort to collect so wide a range of material both chronologically and geographically is unquestionably of unprecedented usefulness but it

---

[1134] Cartlidge and Elliott summarized Lafontaine-Dosogne's conclusions on the depictions of Mary in the East, based on the apocryphal text and presented a brief discussion of depictions of the life of Mary in both East and West. See Cartlidge and Elliott 2001:21-46.

[1135] Réau 1958:90-91, 93-6; Réau 1957:79,155-161,162-6; Croce 1961: 1270-1295; Kleinschmidt 1930.

[1136] Freytag 1985:155. Freytag included the portrait of Anna holding Mary in Santa Maria Antiqua in Rome (discussed later) because Mary is holding Christ in the same depiction, see Freytag 1985:178.

[1137] Kalokyres (Kalokyres 1972) repeated the work of Lafontaine-Dosogne in Greek but his treatment of the subject is not as profound as Lafontaine-Dosogne's, which appeared in 1962. I have consulted the revised edition of Lafontaine-Dosogne's work published in 1992.

does not exhaust the portraits of St Anna and Joachim, even those which have been published long before the second publication of Lafontaine-Dosogne's work in 1992.[1138]

In this chapter I will examine the depictions of Sts Anna and Joachim in chronological order relying on the material provided by Lafontaine-Dosogne and works that postdate the second edition of her work, but unlike Lafontaine-Dosogne I will not look at narrative scenes of the Mariological cycle but I will primarily focus on portraits of Mary's parents. The aim of this chapter is to examine to what extent perceptions demonstrated in texts around St Anna are also manifested in her visual representations. But I will not confine this study in comparing the visual with the textual evidence. It will be also shown that a number of associations made with Mary's parents such as their supplicational role or as defenders of the Christian faith is either missing or it is not made clear in texts.

Constantinople and Rome in the fifth and sixth centuries

The first depiction where Mary's parents appear is on Western ground. It is located in Rome, in the church of Santa Maria Antiqua, it dates to the eighth century and although its Byzantine character is not debated I still need to justify its inclusion in this study and define its contribution to Anna's images in Byzantium.

In this section, I will argue that stylistic and epigraphical evidence point to the fact that this depiction should be included in the corpus of the portaits of St Anna in Byzantium and the reason is that by the eighth century the Westerners were skilled enough to manipulate Byzantine style. Andaloro would argue that the 'romanity' of icons is connected more with the context rather than style and that there are both Roman and Byzantine elements in many works produced in Rome in the pre-iconoclastic period and

---

[1138] Its title does not suggest that iconic portraits of Anna and Joachim would be included, however she has included a few.

supports the 'Constantinopolitan stamp' on these works.[1139] To this view I would argue that

the Westerners had assimilated Byzantine elements in their art, is justified by the manifold

relations developed between Constantinople and Rome from the fifth century onwards. I

should note here, that scholars are divided into those that support the strong influence of

Constantinople on Rome from the fifth century, which I use as 'springboard' to argue that

for the eighth century depiction of St Anna discussed shortly and to those who reject the

notion that Santa Maria Antiqua should ever be considered in studies of Byzantine art.

However, as I will show, the two views should not necessarily contrast each other.

The first view is based on the influence of Constantinople on Rome from the fifth

century onwards in art, text-production and topography.[1140]

Weigel, in his study on the ciborium of St Mark in Venice, perceives the

iconography of the columns as the result of Roman imitation of fifth- and sixth-century

Constantinopolitan scultpure exported to Italy.[1141] Campanati relies on the relations

between Constantinople and Rome, which were secured between the reign of Justin II (565

to 578) and the eighth century, and refers to the fresco of the 'beautiful angel' in Santa

Maria Antiqua for the infiltration of Byzantine elements in Rome in the sixth century, a

view defended also by Russo.[1142] Sansterre speaks of 'incontestable Byzantine origins of

---

[1139] Andaloro 2002:750.

[1140] In Santa Maria Antiqua in Rome on the western wall of the sanctuary, a female saint is portrayed holding a female baby in front of her accompanied by an inscription 'Saint...' in Greek but the name has not survived. The identification of the saint with Anna has been based on the fact that a female of advanced age holding a female child in front of her and that the importance of these two female figures is exalted by their placement near the sanctuary. The lack of epigraphical evidence to confirm that it is St Anna and Mary depicted, is the reason why this monument has been excluded from this thesis. See Nordhagen 1987:4; Nordhagen 1968:89. Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992:36 n.4; For the date of this depiction, see Wilpert 1916: 653-726; Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992:36 n.4; Kitzinger 1958:40; Nordhangen 2000:116; LCI 1973:172; Hadermann-Misguich 1975:252. Brenk has argued that the dating of this image is a matter of faith, see Brenk 2004:76.
Also in Italy, St Anna has been identified in Santa Maria Maggiore (fifth century), but no epigraphy identifies her, see Croce 1961:1277; Ferrari 2004:115; Ladner 1992:63. However as Spain notes, 'Anna, Rachel, Salome, a Sybil, Sophia, Ecclesia ex Gentibus, Ecclesia ex Circumcisione, and Ecclesia audiens have been proposed', see Spain 1979: 534 n. 70. Marini-Clarelli argues that a Sybil is represented there, see Marini-Clarelli 1996:337.

[1141] Weigel 2000:20; Brenk 1977:62; Barclay Lloyd 1996:231-2.

[1142] Campanati 1982:182, 208; Russo 2006:283.

the painting in Rome between 570- 650',[1143] and marks the beginning of strong influence of Constantinople on Rome in 570, when Cameron sees 'a whole network of Franco-Byzantine relations' and when there were many Westerners in Constantinople around this time,[1144] which was initiated in the fourth century in the framework of public affairs.[1145] Lafontaine-Dosogne has included the eighth-century depiction in Santa Maria Antiqua in the volume on the iconography of Mary in the East and not in the West, and Babić refers to the eighth-century iconography of Santa Maria Antiqua in her discussion of the evolution of Byzantine iconography of Constantinopolitan side chapels.[1146] Apart from Santa Maria Antiqua, Russo sees the construction of Santa Maria Maggiore in both Ravenna and Bologna and of Santa Maria in Castelseprio as products of Constantinopolitan artistic influence.[1147] Cameron argues that the sixth century is the time when Rome was influenced by Constantinople in terms of textual production around the figure of Mary,[1148] which Russo sees as the result of the introduction of Mary's cult from Constantinople to Rome.[1149] The approach between Rome and Constantinople in the first half of the sixth century is according to Pani Ermini attested in the dedication of churches in Rome to Eastern saints – initiated in the fifth century – and particularly in the oratories of Mary in Santa Maria Antiqua and of Kosmas and Damian (500),[1150] and – according to Goodson – in the construction in Rome of churches with relics of Eastern saints after the visit of Pope Pelagius I and Pelagius II to Constantinople.[1151]

[1143] Sansterre 1983: 164.
[1144] Cameron 1978: 91.
[1145] Morello 1990: 42-43.
[1146] Lafontaine-Dosogne 1995:89-92; Babić 1969:84.
[1147] Russo 2006: 280. For the influence of architecture during Justinian's time on Rome, see Campanati 1982:181-2 and at the same time on Ravenna, see Pasquini Vecchi 1995: 187-206.
[1148] Cameron 1978:90.
[1149] Russo 2006: 280.
[1150] Pani Ermini 1998:88-9; Barclay Lloyd 1996:230. Jessop 1999: 233-279; Between 440-460, Pope Leo I dedicated a church in Via Latina to martyr Stephen, (Pani Ermini 1998:85-6) who is included in the iconographical program of Santa Maria Antiqua, Pani Ermini 1998:91. Two churches were already constructed to honour Sts Kosmas and Damian around 440 in Constantinople, see Van Esbroeck 1981:71; Skrobucha 1965:10; Lafontaine-Dosogne 1995:61-2.
[1151] Goodson 2008: 56. In Western martylogia, it is common to find Eastern saints, but not the opposite, see Palachkovsky 1953:37.

Thus the influence of Constantinople on Rome is assumed on the basis of the assimilation between the two cities from the fifth century onwards in terms of sculpture, topography, liturgy and text production. Against the view of the Byzantine character of Santa Maria Antiqua is Brenk and Brubaker, who use the iconography of the monunent as evidence to support the Roman character of the church.

In particular, Brenk characterises the decorative programme of the church as 'avowedly anti-Byzantine' and Brubaker does not consider Santa Maria Antiqua as a Byzantine monument because of the 'papal meaning it conveys',[1152] namely because Eastern Church Fathers were depicted holding scrolls (written in Greek) on the divine and human will of Christ supported by the Papacy against Byzantine monothelitism.[1153] The influence of Constantinople on Rome in terms of iconography will remain an assumption since there are no images of Anna surviving from Constantinople in the eighth century and thus we are not allowed to make an iconographical comparison. But sculpture, topography, liturgy and text production *can* be used as evidence. In this aspect, I will agree with the questions raised by Brenk and Burbaker on the Byzantine character of the depictions in Santa Maria Antiqua, but a few comments should be made on that.

First the anti-Byzantine message that the frescoes convey and the fact that they targeted Greek-speaking audience is not in question,[1154] and this is the main issue to address here but on a different perspective, that the term 'anti-Byzantine' does not necessarily mean non-Byzantine. Through the influence that Constantinople had been exerting since the fifth century on Rome, the Westerners were by the eighth century well acquainted with Byzantine style and they were skilled enough to transmit their anti-Byzantine message using Byzantine artistic language. An example from a different period

---

[1152] Brubaker 2004:44.
[1153] Brenk 2004:45, 74. For the tense relations between Pope John VII and Justinian II and their reflection in the iconography of John's oratory in Santa Maria Antiqua, see Dijk 2001: 323-324; Sansterre 1987:435.
[1154] Krautheimer 1980:90.

which helps us to understand the treatment of Byzantine style in eighth-century Rome, is the second-century Roman general Aemilius Paullus. In order to commemorate his victory over the Greek king Perseus of Macedonia, Aemilius Paullus built in Greece a monument which is 'closely related to the far more ahistorical Greek relief tradition'.[1155] Aemilius Paullus used Greek art to transmit a political message to the Greeks because in this way he would make his statement easily comprehensible by the population that Greek art expressed. A second reason is that the image of St Anna in Santa Maria Antiqua shows iconographical affinities with other portraits of Anna in Byzantium from the eighth century onwards and this is the reason it is included in this study.

Santa Maria Antiqua: The Three Mothers

On the eighth-century layer, St Anna is identified by inscription in Latin but easily read by a Greek audience 'SCA ANNA'. Elsewhere in the same church, inscriptions are in both Greek and Latin such as 'IACIμ' for Joachim and 'ANNη' for Anna, which make the names legible by both Greeks and Latins.[1156] Mary and Elisabeth are depicted in a niche on the western wall of the aisle destined for women each holding their children and are accompanied by a Greek inscription, 'Three Mothers' (Fig. 12).[1157] All the figures are haloed; Christ is distinguished from John the Baptist to his left and from Mary to his right by his mandorla and by his placement to the centre of the depiction (Fig. 13). This is the first of a series of images of family portraits of Christ, Mary and Anna, which will become very popular in mainland Greece from the tenth century onwards.

On the same layer, two scenes of the Mariological cycle survive, the Meeting of Anna and Joachim and below this scene is the Nativity of Mary.[1158] The depictions of this layer form

---

[1155] Hannestad 1986:38.

[1156] Wilpert 1916: 711 n.3. In two late eighth- or early ninth-century scenes from the Marian cycle (Rejection of gifts, Presentation) in Castelseprio, Greek inscriptions accompany the depictions, see Leveto 1990:402, 403 n.30.

[1157] Lucey 2004:87.

[1158] Wilpert 1916: 711 refers only to the depiction of the Meeting of Anna and Joachim.

a group of frescoes painted during the papacy of Paul I (757-767).[1159] Referring to the

Meeting of Joachim and Anna, Myrtilla argues that the use of this 'rare subject', combined

with the effigy of St Anna in the three-mother depiction, indicates a 'devotion to the

mother of the Virgin quite unexpected in Rome and the West until much later'.[1160] Myrtilla

assumes that a scene from the Mariological cycle and the eighth-century iconic depiction

of Anna is an early sign of Anna's veneration in the West. Nevertheless, the lack of

monumental painting concerning the cycle of Mary's early years until the eighth century in

Italy does not allow assumptions on how rare or common a scene was.[1161] It is misleading

to see the scenes of the Mariological cycle as evidence for the cult of Mary's parents. If the

scenes of the Christological cycle where the parents of Christ are included cannot support

Marian veneration, likewise the presence of Mary's parents in the Mariological does not

justify the existence of their veneration. Anna and Joachim are included in the iconography

of Mary's early life because of their parental relationship to Mary, but the exalted figure in

the Mariological cycle is Mary. Despite my disagreement on the evidence she uses,

Avery's assumption on the existence of Anna's cult appears to be correct, but it is justified

by the iconic depiction of Anna and not by her inclusion in the Mariological cycle. Avery

however assumed that there is a connection between the iconography of Santa Maria

Antiqua and the church of St Angelo in Pescheria in Rome, because the names that appear

in the eighth-century list of relics held at the second church also appear in the

iconographical programme of Santa Maria Antiqua. She does not consider accidental the

---

[1159] Wilpert 1916: 711; Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992 :36-7, n.5.;760 in LCI 1973:172; Baumer and Scheffczyk 1988:157.

[1160] Avery 1925:143.

[1161] Other churches in Italy where the Marian cycle has survived, is the eighth-century Presentation of Mary or the Rejection of gifts (Kalokyres 1972:102 in favour of the Presentation) in St. Sabas in Rome (Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992 :37; Styger 1914:60-4) and two late eighth- or early ninth-century scenes (Rejection of gifts, Presentation of Mary) in Castelseprio (Leveto 1990:402, 403 n.30). Based on the assumption that the feast of Presentation of Mary was introduced first in the West (although she acknowledges that this is not fully accepted), Leveto sees the art of Casteserpio as a product of Western art (Leveto 1990:404, 406), and does not adequately explain the early appearance of the feast in the West and the condemnation of the apocryphal Gospel of James (Leveto 1990:406).

fact that Theodotos, who was a donor of Santa Maria Antiqua was also the restorer of St Angelo in Pescheria.[1162] She finally admits that there has not been an explanation of the connection between the names of saints appearing in these two churches, nor does she offer one. But Theodotos painted the chapel during the pontificate of Pope Zaccharias (741-752) so the depiction of Anna postdate his contributions, since the Three-Mother depiction was ecexuted between 756-767. Consequently, chronology does not permit the association of Theodotos with both Santa Maria Antiqua and St Angelo in Pescheria. The depiction of Anna as a mother pertains to cultural developments in Italy in the eighth century, which Leveto explains as an interest of Western theologians in Mary in the eighth and ninth century and as a result of Byzantine infiltration.[1163] No other known contemporary portrait of Anna has survived in Rome and only in the tenth century do we find another iconic image of the saint in Italy, as I will discuss later.[1164]

The depiction of the three Mothers in Santa Maria Antiqua is repeated in the church of the chapel dedicated to St Nicholas and which belongs to the church of Ekatontapyliani in Paros (Greece),[1165] which dates to the eighth century.[1166] The depiction is found on the northern wall of the chapel in front of the templon and shows two women each one holding a baby in their arms. Drosogianne has identified one figure with St Elisabeth holding John the Forerunner and the other figure, which is closer to the apse – which aims to elevate the status of the figure – with St Anna holding Mary, who is depicted in a mandorla (Fig. 14).[1167] In the depiction in Santa Maria Antiqua, Christ is also depicted in a mandorla and placed in front of his mother's chest. The depiction,

---

[1162] Avery 1925:145 n.79.
[1163] Leveto 1990:411.
[1164] Pope Leo III dedicated to to the church of Mary ad Praesepem (around 798-9 or 799/800) a cloth with gold-studded disks representing the Annunciation of Joachim and Anna : 'in basilicam beatae Mariae ad praesepe...sed alliam vestem in orbiculis chrysoclabis habentem historias annunciationis, et sanctorum Joachim et Annae'; For the original text, see Mansi (ed.) 13: 933E. For a translation of this part, see Davis (trans.) 2000:193.
[1165] Dresken-Weiland 2005:59.
[1166] Drossogianne 1998: 58, fig .4.
[1167] Drossogianne 1998: 64-5.

Drossogianne notes, is unique since nowhere else is Mary depicted in a mandorla and in front of her mother, and the composition probably imitates Christ's depiction in a mandorla in front of his mother (Nikopoios).[1168] The fact that the image was found in the templon points to the early veneration of the saint in Greece and there are addtional but only later examples of Anna in the templon such as in the church of St Nicholaos in Geraki (Greece, thirteenth century) and in the church of St Anna at Anisaraki in Crete (1357). Based on style, Drosogianne dates the depiction fifty years earlier than the depiction of the three Mothers in Santa Maria Antiqua. I cannot take for granted that the Paros depiction predates the Santa Maria Antiqua one, but I accept the stylistic affinity of the two frescoes for the dating of both to the eighth century. This makes these two depictions the earliest portraits of Anna in Byzantine art. The depiction in Paros verifies that St Anna was from the very beginning promoted as a holy mother and only after her cult was spread she was given theological connotations.

Egypt - Cathedral of Faras (eighth and tenth centuries)

The frescoes of the 'cathedral of Paul' in Faras in Lower Nubia (today is the area South of Egypt and North of Sudan), dated by two foundational inscriptions in both Greek and Coptic to 707,[1169] represent the peak of Nubian art and have dominated studies on Nubian art.[1170] The excavation of the Polish archaeological team under the supervision of Michałowski revealed two depictions of St Anna one from the eighth, and one from the tenth century.[1171]

[1168] ibid.65.

[1169] Godlewski 1992:104,113; Vantini 1970:199.

[1170] Michałowski-Jakobielski 1974:78; Godlewski 1992:100.

[1171] Jakobielski 1982:147. Michałowski (Michałowski 1970:15) initially dated the violet style (to which the first depiction of Anna under discussion belongs to) to the beginning of the eighth- or the middle of the ninth century; Seipel also dates it to the ninth century, see Seipel 2002: 67). However, in a later publication, Michałowski dated it to the beginning of the eighth century, see Michałowski-Jakobielski 1974:78l. See also Kubińska 1974:122 no 62 who supported the eighth-century dating.

First I need to stress one point concerning Nubian and Egyptian (Coptic) art. Modern scholarship holds that we should move away from considering Nubian art as a simple branch of Coptic art. David Edwards in his book *The Nubian past. An archaeology of the Sudan* writes : 'Nubian archaeology is not just about Lower Nubia and the margins of Egypt,' with which I totally agree, but the reason I have made the connection between Egypt and Faras is the sixth-century Christianisation by the Byzantines of the kingdoms of Nobadia and Makuria between which Faras is located, and the fact 'Lower Nubian sites are often rich in imported Egyptian artefacts' as Edwards himself notes.[1172] This means that Egypt exerted strong influence on Lower Nubia, where the church of Paul in Faras is located.

Ferrari, Nordhangen and Gerstel have underlined Anna's aspect as a senior woman.[1173] Talbot has noted that 'In Byzantium sanctity and old age went together, since old people were highly esteemed because of their supposedly higher state of moral purity and the aging process itself was viewed as dulling sexual passions'.[1174] However, although the Egyptian church valued the advanced age of sacred persons,[1175] the case is different in the following depiction of St Anna.

Anna's image in Faras, which has been considered as a masterwork of the Christian painting of Faras,[1176] shows a young woman wearing a blue maphorion slightly inclining her head to her left (which occurs in other female saints in Faras),[1177] and is accompanied by a Greek inscription: 'Anna, Mother of the Theotokos, (the) saint and

---

[1172] Edwards 2004:7.
[1173] Ferrari 2004:115. Nordhagen 1987:4; Gerstel 1998: 98. According to Dionysios of Fourna, this is how Anna should be depicted in Byzantine art, see Papadopoulos-Kerameus (ed.) 1909:77. In the church of St. George in Kurbinono, Anna's face is wrinkled 'even as she suckles her child', see Maguire 1996:31. Later in this chapter, it will be shown that it was accustomed in Byzantium to depict Anna as a woman of advanced age.
[1174] Talbot 1984: 273.
[1175] Giamberardini 1974:25.
[1176] Seipel 2002:66.
[1177] Pomerantseva 1982:200.

Mary' (Fig. 15).[1178] Jakobielski notes that the inscription implies either that Mary was also included in the depiction or that the most correct reading of the inscription would be: 'Anna, mother of the Theotokos, the saint, and Mariatokos', a reading which is in accordance with the period when the fresco originated and it is also found in painting influenced by Byzantium.[1179] This portrait is located on the northern wall of the nave and, similarly to Paros, very close to the sanctuary (Fig. 16).[1180]

Mary had a special place in Coptic Church and in the church of Faras alone she is depicted twenty-nine times.[1181] Scholz explained the strong matriarchal tradition in the Faras frescoes by the fact that the depiction of Anna was later covered by the depiction of Queen Martha 'as a result of the succession of authoritative women'.[1182] Anna in Faras is depicted without halo, which Michałowski saw as a result of the saint being mentioned only in an apocryphal gospel, the *Protevangelion of James*.[1183] The lack of nimbus from the Virgin in the Presentation scene of the ninth-century Pope Paschal's (813-820) cross, has been explained by Thunø as an effort to reveal her holiness through her intimacy with Christ and as an expression of her humanity.[1184] In the fifteenth-century scene of the Rejection of the Gifts in the church of St Matrona in Kimolos (Greece), Joachim and Anna do not bear haloes – as Xanthaki notes – because they gain their sanctity by the future birth of Mary.[1185] It seems however difficult to understand why in the fifteenth century, namely five centuries after the insertion of Anna and Joachim to the Church calendar and after seven centuries of constant appearance in homilies, Mary's parents still do not bear a halo.

[1178] 'Η αγία Άννα η μήτηρ της θεοτόκ[ος] (sic) η αγία κ(αί) Μα[ρ...]'. The inscriptions of the eighth century are without a fault compared to what happens in later centuries (Hägg 1982:103), which Hägg explains by the fact that the person who painted the church and wrote the inscriptions is identical, see Hägg 1982:103-4.
[1179] Michałowski and Jakobielski 1974:284.
[1180] ibid. 74 (plan). No 1.
[1181] Scholz 1985:324. He notes that the special place of Mary is in accordance with the special status of Egyptian godesses, Scholz 1985:326.
[1182] Scholz 1985:328.
[1183] Michałowski-Jakobielski 1974:76. The lack of nimbus in the depiction of the Seven Sleepers in St. Barbara is explained by the fact that 'their images are painted by devotion than by a more or less superstitious spirit'. Jerphanion 1938:304.
[1184] Thunø 2002:46.
[1185] Xanthaki 2008:172.

In the formative period of the eighth century that the depiction of Faras dates to, iconographical deviations of Anna's portraits in comparison to what will follow in the subsequent centuries are understood or even expected. However, one suggestion could be that the donor of the church of St Matrona wished to promoted the human nature of Mary's parents in contrast to the wondrous sanctity of Mary, who at the age of three had surpassed her parents in sanctity by entering the Holy of Holies. Taking also into consideration the view that 'The images of figures from the apocryphal gospel in Nubian art (Anna included) are treated similarly to the canonical figures',[1186] I would argue that in Faras, Anna does not bear halo as the result of the saint's lack of established iconography.

Pomerantseva saw Anna's portrait as some kind of 'abstract pattern that could have been used by a master working on a fresco [...] rather than a Byzantine painter having before him an iconographical model of a face'.[1187] In her study on the proportions on Anna's face, Pomerantseva identified affinities with the Fayum portraits but as she argues 'its semantic role in Christian art is lost in comparison to the magical meaning of the eyes'. She writes that 'the look has become more intense and dynamic and dominates the face and that the increased size of the eyes corresponds to the decrease in the size of the mouth'.[1188] Thus Pomerantseva sees a mystical symbolism in this depiction but I think this should be orientated not in the eyes but in Anna's hand gesture.

Anna places her finger on her lips, making a gesture of silence.[1189] The importance of hand gestures has been highlighted by Kenna, who describes them as 'essential to the study of images because it does not only inform the onlooker what is happening within an icon but also acts as a clue to the type, and therefore the meaning and significance, of the whole icon'.[1190] The gesture of silence is not widespread in middle and

---

[1186] Roquet 1991:204, 213.This view is contrasted by Rassart-Debergh 1996:253-9.I
[1187] Pomerantseva 1982:201.
[1188] ibid. 199.
[1189] Seipel 2002:65.
[1190] Kenna 1984:14.

late Byzantine art. One example from the middle Byzantine period is the eleventh-century crown of emperor Constantine Monomachos where the figure of 'Truth' is depicted placing her pointing finger of her right arm to her lips. Bárányné-Oberschall argues that this gesture implies that truth comes from the mouth.[1191]

The interpretation that I will propose is related to the silence that prevails during birth as it has been developed in Christianity. Anna's gesture in Faras is not repeated elsewhere in Byzantine art. Michałowski connected it to the Immaculate Conception of Mary since Anna conceived by kissing Joachim,[1192] but as I have already demonstrated this dogma was never developed in Byzantine theology. Michałowski claims that this gesture might have also been a sign of modesty, meditation, protection from bad thoughts, or a sign of prayer for a child.[1193] The different explanations provided by Michałowski fits with Van Moorsel's observation on the development of rich mysticism in the Faras iconography. [1194] Grillmeier's discussion on the Faras paintings documents the rich theological messages of Nubian art but he argued that the theological associations on the meaning of the images made by its excavators have lead to misinterpretations.[1195]

The first explanation of Anna's gesture is that it constitutes a pictorial allusion to the command of Paul in his first *Letter to the Corinthians* (Cor 1, 14:34) : 'Women are to keep silent in the churches; for they are not permitted to speak'.[1196] Origen is his comment on the first *Letter to the Corinthians* refers to the prophetess Anna and writes: 'in the Gospel it writes Anna prophetess […];but she did not speak in church, so that a prophetic sign will be given that she was a female prophet; but it is not allowed to her to speak in the church'.[1197] It could also refer to the *Gospel of Matthew* (Matthew 6.7) : 'when

---

[1191] Bárányné-Oberschall 1937:53, pl. 1 fig. 6, pl. X fig.2.
[1192] Seipel 2002:67; Michałowski-Jakobielski 1974:76. That the kissing of Anna and Joachim depicts the Immaculate Conception is also supported by Réau, see Réau 1957: 79.
[1193] Seipel 2002:67.
[1194] Van Moorsel 1987:217.
[1195] Grillmeier 1987:280-1 and n .77.
[1196] Fee 1987:699-705.
[1197] Cramer (ed.) 1844 (5) : 279.

you pray , do not speak a lot as the pagans do', or to *Psalm 38.2* : 'I will be careful on how I walk, so my tongue will not make me sin, and I shall put a gag in my mouth, as long as the impious stands in front of me'.

Tikkanen explains the gesture of placing the fingers onto the lips as a sign of silence and as a sign of thought.[1198] Egypt has a tradition on using this specific gesture. In the frescoes of chapel 28 in Bawit three psalters, identified as such by an inscription,[1199] put their index finger onto their mouth to call for silence (Fig. 17). Grabar correctly argues that the finger that makes silence ('κατασιγάζων δάκτυλος' or 'signum harpocraticum'[1200]) is an Egyptian motif,[1201] a form of apotropaic prayer by priests who prayed in silent voice (σιγώση φονῆ).[1202] It had a double meaning, first that people should not let bad words enter their mouth and second when they pray they should do so in silence.[1203] Hieroglyphics refer to the attender's responsibility to stay silent in the presence of the divine out of respect.[1204] Other hieroglyphics claim 'Put the good word on your tongue, but the bad (word) is (= should be kept) hidden in your body'.[1205] The gesture of silence in Faras is an Egyptian motif which has been given Christian connotations and it refers to the believer's behaviour

---

[1198] Tikkanen 1913:4.

[1199] Grabar 1945:126 fig.4.

[1200] Chastel 2001:65-86. The term 'Harpocrapticum' derives from the name 'Harpocrates', the ancient Greek god of silence, who succeded the Egyptian god Horus. For Horus, see Pinch 2004:146-7 and the bibliography included there. The influence of Horus on Christian art is shown in the scene where he deafets evil, which is represented as a crocodile, and gave rise to the imagery of St. George killing the dragon. For this and other examples of inflitration of Egyptian deities into Christian art, see Holthoer 1993:44. For elements of Pharaonic art that were incorporated into Coptic art, see Bresciani 1981:21-30.

[1201] Grabar 1945:126.

[1202] Grabar 1945:127; Chastel 2001:74.

[1203] Grabar 1945:128. For this double meaning, which Chastel explains as being simultaneously a passive (I stay silent) and active (Stay silent) form of prayer, see Chastel 2001:32-34,67; The same concept is reflected in hieroglyphics : 'The Gods will be quiet from you, when Gods' novelty has laid its hand onto its mouth'. According to this sentence the beholder is asked to stay silent (active) when the God makes the gesture of silence (passive), see Dominicus 1994:19.

[1204] Dominicus 1994:19.

[1205] ibid. 19 n. 46. A similar concept is expressed by Ephrem the Syriac, who – as Russel notes –is not against the use of speech in theology but the inappropriate use of speech: 'You may learn admirably from your own word a glorious word : the Word of God. In your own word ever does not know what to say, honour with your silence the Word of your Creator, Whose silence cannot be inquired into'. See Russell (trans.) 2000:29-30. Similarly, Cyril of Jerusalem writes: 'O God, pass not over My praise in silence; for the mouth of the wicked, and the mouth of the deceitful, are opened against Me; they have spoken against Me with a treacherous tongue, they have compassed Me about also with words of hatred' (Ps. 1-3). See Schaff and Wace (eds) 1894: 85.

in confrontation with the holy in religious space and during prayer. Athanasios of Alexandria in his *Second Letter to the Virgins* refers to the silent virgins in the sense that they should be silent even if they are accused and that they should 'speak only to God'.[1206]

However, the meaning of silence as it has been developed by Basil the Great is associated not only with behavioral types in churches or with personal prayer but also with birth in a wide framework.[1207] Grillmeier argues that the patristic thought of the fourth and fifth centuries was influential on the depictions of portraits in the church of Faras,[1208] and it has been argued that Basil's homilies were very influential on the Coptic church.[1209] In his *Hexaemero*n, in one of Basil's homilies *On the end of the world*, Basil elaborated on the silence in which the world was created in contrast to the disturbance that will prevail when the world will be destroyed.[1210] Similarly, Patriarch Proklos of Constantinople in the fifth century writes 'When creation was mute He graced it with speech'.[1211]

On a different level, silence during creation does not pertain only to the creation of the world but it also applies to the creation of human beings, their birth. In the seventh century St Isaac the Syriac in his homily *On silence* writes: 'Let us force ourselves first to be silent, and then from out of this silence something is born'.[1212] He refers to the creation of angels and humans and writes that although they 'are not necessarily speaking parts', they were created in silence.[1213] Ephrem the Syriac (fourth century) on his sermon *On Christ's Nativit*y writes: 'your Birth is sealed up within silence, what mouth then dare to meditate

---

[1206] Brakke 1995:296.
[1207] For an overview of early mystic Church Fathers, see Dinzelbacher 1994:64-74; Ruh 1990:53-58.
[1208] Grillmeier 1987:280.
[1209] Doresse and Lanne and Capelle 1960; Orlandi 1997:86 and Orlandi 1997:64 where a short presentation of Basil's creation homily is given.
[1210] Budge (trans.) 1910:248. The notion of silence trascends his *Hexaemeron* less directly though: 'ἡ μεγάλη καὶ ἄφατος τοῦ Θεοῦ δύναμις' (PG 29:148C), 'Ἡ μὲν φωνὴ τοῦ προστάγματος μικρὰ, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐδὲ φωνὴ, ἀλλὰ ῥοπὴ μόνον καὶ ὁρμὴ τοῦ θελήματος' (PG 29:149A). 'ἡ ἄφατος ἐκείνη παρήγαγε δύναμις (PG 29:152B), (Περὶ ἑρπετῶν), Ἀλλ' ὅμως κοιμίζονται μὲν πάντες ἄνεμοι, ἡσυχάζει δὲ κῦμα θαλάσσιον, ὅταν ἀλκυὼν ἐπωάζῃ τὰς ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας' PG 29:177B (Περὶ πτηνῶν καὶ ἐνύδρων).
[1211] 'Κωφευούσῃ γάρ τῇ κτίσει γλῶτταν ἐχαρίσατο', see Constas (ed.) 2003: 166-7.
[1212] Holy Transfiguration Monastery 1984:310.
[1213] Lossky 1957:107-8.

upon it?'.[1214] Ignatios bishop of Antioch (second century) in his *Letter to the Ephesians* writes: 'Now the virginity of Mary was hidden from the ruler of this world, as it was also the case with her offspring and the death of the Lord; three mysteries of noise which were wrought in God's silence'.[1215] Mary's virginity and Christ's Nativity were formed in silence because of their paradoxical nature which cannot be perceived and thus cannot be expressed in words. Hanna, mother of Samuel before her conception of Samuel prayed in silence (Sam.1.13) which was disrupted by the 'noise' of her husband's words who could only see Hanna's mouth moving. In the *Protevangelion*, Anna secluded herself in her garden where she compared herself with the universe and after her silent prayer – like the universe – Mary was created. Basil's perception of silence during the world's creation is illustrated in the Chludov Psalter (f. 88),[1216] where the wind is depicted making a gesture of silence and the text that accompanies it (Psalm 88.10) 'praises the powers of the Creator'.[1217]

Anna's gesture is in my view, a pictorial reference to the silence in which creation is developed, because the conception of Mary by a sterile woman is a work not easily perceived. Thus Anna calls for silence in order for the believer to understand the way God's works are created. The familiarity with Anna's story and the *Protevangelion* in Coptic Egypt is demonstrated in a homily *On the Incarnation* dated to the eighth century where among other sources the *Protevangelion of James* is used,[1218] and in the Coptic frescoes of Deir Abu Hennis and Bawit.[1219] Anna's appearance in Faras is explained by use

---

[1214] Brock and Kiraz (trans.) 2006:203.

[1215] PG 5:753A. For the translation of 'ἡσυχία' as 'silence' and 'tranquility', see Lampe 1961:658. For this phrase of Ignatios Barnard comments 'For Ignatius the Being of God could not be fully comprehended and exhausted in the Incarnation. The Deus absconditus-the riches and depths of the Divine Nature - remained beyond human grasp. The idea of God as Ztyr expressed this perfectly', see Barnard 1963:202.

[1216] Walter 1986:285.

[1217] Gregory of Nyssa: 'ἡ μὲν τοῦ ἀέρος κατασκευὴ σιωπᾶται' (the creation of the wind becomes silent), see PG 44:85D.

[1218] Giamberardini 1974:21. It however starts with the story of Mary shortly after her Presentation.

[1219] Der Nersessian 1944:187. The decoration in Bawit 'suggests a kinship with the period of Justinian', see Milburn 1988:148.Walters sees discrete Byzantine influences in the churches of Bawit in the military costum and knotted curtain also seen – as he argues – a in Saint Apollinaire Nuovo in Ravenna, which dates in part to Justinian's time. Walters (Walters 1974: 142-3) denies the view that the Bawit and Saqqara could be

of the *Protevangelion* in eighth-century Egypt and the fact that she is given a prominent place (near the sanctuary), verifies that from an early period she was perceived as a figure closely aligned with the Incarnation.

This connection is made in the second depiction in the church of Faras, which dates to the tenth century and it is located on the left hand side of the prothesis' entrance. This depiction is largely destroyed and depicts the upper part of a throne and imitates the Kyriotissa type of Mary (Fig. 18).[1220] The identification of the person sitting is clear from the surviving inscription on top of the throne: 'Saint Anna mother, Mary mother', which identifies the figures as Anna and Mary.[1221] This depiction in Faras remains the earliest depiction of Anna on a throne and will reappear again in the late Byzantine period. An additional tenth-century fragmentary depiction of Anna is found in the church of Abdallah-n Irqi or Abdallah Nirqi from Lower Nubia. St Anna is identified by a Greek inscription 'The holy Anna, Mother' and is portrayed as Orans (in supplication).[1222] Van Moorsel notes that the Virgin was not included in the depiction and that Anna is making a gesture of acclamation. Similarly to Faras, the epigraphy in Abdallah-n Irqi underlines the motherly relationship of Anna to Mary.

The lack of organisation between the several paintings of Faras shows that images had votive character, as Weitzmann has suggested.[1223] The desire of Nubian kings to imitate Byzantine officialdom,[1224] and the fact that they were ordained priests and were

regarded as an offshoot of Byzantine art, see Walters 1974: 152.

[1220] Lafontaine-Dosogne accepts that by 473 a portrait of Mary enthroned existed in the church of the Blachernai, although the manuscript she uses dates from the tenth century, see Lafontaine-Dosogne 1995:190, 206 n. 6.

[1221] Kubińska 1974: 121 no 61, gif 55; Seipel 2002:66; Michałowski and Jakobielski 1974: 57; Detlef and Müller 1978: 214 n.1.

[1222] I thank Dobrochna Zielińska of the Institute of Archaeology of the University of Warsaw, who brought this depiction to my attention. For this depiction, see Van Moorsel 1975:93.

[1223] 'There are many figures or individual saints distributed over the walls which clearly reflect the character of icons such as the frontally standing S. Anna…' See Weitzmann 1970: 338.

[1224] Texts dating from the eighth to the eleventh century show that in their court and provincial administration the Nubians copied the hierarchy of the Byzantine officialdom, see Zabkar 1963: 217-9; Grillmeier 1987:168. Grillmeier and Frend see the formation of Nubian kingdoms as an 'offshoot of the imperial ecclesiastical structure of the Byzantine Empire', see Grillmeier 1987: 277; Frend 1972:301-3. Merkurios of Makuria (died after 710) was celebrated as the 'new Constantine' the actions of who seemed to resemble the

permitted to celebrate the liturgy,[1225] in addition to the Christianisation of Nubia in the sixth century, initiated by the empress Theodora, wife of Justinian I,[1226] shows that Lower Nubia was largely influenced by Byzantine culture.[1227] The inclusion of Anna and her daughter in the iconographical programme of Faras is the result of the 'concrete consideration and defence of the economy of the incarnation and the presentation of the mysteries of the life of Jesus and their celebration in the liturgy stand in the foreground'.[1228]

In Santa Maria Antiqua, Faras and Greece, the iconography underlines Anna's motherhood. The evidence from southern Italy will point to the same conclusion but it will be demonstrated that by the tenth century Anna was considered protector of childbirth.

Southern Italy- Crypt of St Christina (tenth century)

---

two men, especially in the transformation of the old pharaonic temples into Christian churches, see Godlewski 2001:177-178. The trip of king George I's wife in the ninth century to Byzantium could have invigorated the existing Byzantine influence on Nubia (Godlewski 2001:172) and is placed in the framework of close relations between the two states. The association of the Nubian kings with the Byzantine rulers is obvious also in Nubian apocalyptic literature, where the last emperor of Byzantium will be Nubian, see Reinink 1992:84. Detlef and Müller (Detlef and Müller 1978:224), who see in the murals of Nubia Syriac influences, argue that the dependence of the Nubian from Byzantium cannot be denied. Recent scholars differentiate themselves from the harsher statements of Der Nersessian : 'the Copts seems to have disliked (the Greek civilization) as much as they did the Byzantine domination or Monophysitism was for them another type of opposition to the domination of Constantinople and to everything that it represented, another way of upholding their national independence'. See Der Nersessian 1944:186. However, he recognizes the Byzantine influences on Coptic art since he connects it with Cappadocia (Der Nersessian 1944:186) and similar theological associations are made both in Byzantine and Coptic iconographical programs, see Der Nersessian 1944:190.

[1225] Grillmeier 1987:278.
[1226] CSCO 106:142; PO 17:189. See also Kirwan 1994:245-9; Grillmeier 1987:267-271.
[1227] The Byzantine influence in Nubia is also attested in the architecture and church decoration of Nubian basilicas, see Godlewski 2001:173-4 (for the ninth century); Lafontaine-Dosogne 1995:85-6. The effort of Nubian kings to imitate the Byzantine rulers is implied by the resemblance of the crown of king George II with that of Leo VI, see Godlewski 2001:168, 170. fig 2. and 172,176-7. For Byzantine crosses found in Nubia, see Pitarakis 2006: 32, 34, 132, 389 no 647. The group of the 'violet style' to which the portrait of St Anna belongs to, is influenced by Byzantine art through frescoes, manuscripts and icons. See Weitzmann 1970:333-4, 336, 338; Michałowski 1970:18 where it is argued that the Faras paintings show relations with both Coptic and Byzantine art.
[1228] Grillmeier 1987:281.

Italy offers another tenth-century iconic depiction of St Anna. It dates to 959 (based on an inscription that accompanies it) and it is found in the crypt of St Christina in Carpignano, a village in Salento (Puglia).[1229]

In this fresco of provincial character,[1230] St Anna is standing and is holding baby Mary in front of her. Under Anna a painted podea survives, which intensifies the liturgical meaning of the iconography, since the podea is the traditional tissue to cover the holy bema (Fig. 19).[1231] The names of the donors are not mentioned and the Greek inscription reads: 'Remember Lord, your servant Anna and her child, Amen'.[1232] As Safran argues this is 'a clear case of conjunction of an onomastic with a name saint',[1233] an example of which is also attested in a twelfth-century seal depicting Anna holding Mary, which belonged to Anna Komnene.[1234] In Carpignano, the inscriptions cite three women by name, so in Carpignano the veneration of the St Anna was associated with women and protection of children. Safran argues that this depiction was executed 'for the mother and the child, most likely after their death, by the husband of Anna',[1235] thus we are dealing with an image a votive character – often attested in Puglian churches.[1236] Safran sees the 'preference of iconic decoration, in contrast to the cyclical one, as a function of patronage in rupestral monuments, which encouraged the donation of votive imagery'.[1237] It may be that in Carpignano the donors felt they had more freedom to adjust the iconography of the cave church to their preference of specific saints.

[1229] For the Byzantine influence on southern Italy and Carpignano, see Campanati 1982:219-252, 268-9. For the Byzantine influence from the tenth century in Southern Italy in terms of textual production, see Morello 1990:47-8. Belting argues that the Carpignano frescoes were influenced stylistically by ninth-century Constantinopolitan book illumination and in particular with the Kosmas Indikopleustes, see Belting 1974: 12-3.

[1230] Medea 1938: 29; Pace 1982: 458. Campanati 1982:251.

[1231] Kotoula 2006:124.

[1232] 'Μνησθητι Κυριε της δουλη σου Αννας και του τεκνου αυτης, Αμεν'. Safran 2011 (forthcoming).

[1233] Safran 2011 (forthcoming).

[1234] Cotsonis 2005:477.

[1235] Safran 2011 (forthcoming). To 1146 dates an inscription from the father for his deceased child, where Mary and St. Nicholas are cited, who were also protectors of children. See Hörandner and Rhoby and Paul 2009:267-8 (no 186). For the date, see Hörandner and Rhoby and Paul 2009: 270.

[1236] Sciarra 1970:102.

[1237] Safran 1997: 54.

The promotion of Anna's maternity, which occurs also in other Byzantine provinces in this period, such as in Greece, receives a more personal form in Carpignano than in Santa Maria Antiqua, Paros and Faras. The cult of St Anna might have passed to Southern Italy through the Italo-Greek monks who were crucial in popularising Byzantine saints from the ninth century onwards,[1238] but in the ninth century in particular, the Conception of St Anna has started gaining ground in Italy, as one can deduce from the Church calendar (849-872) from Naples, a compilation of a local calendar with a Byzantine one.[1239] The merging of these two liturgical traditions in Carpignano is alluded to by the placement of St Anna's portrait next to that of St Christina who is celebrated on 24 July in the Western calendar while St Anna is celebrated a day later in the Eastern calendar. The connection however of Anna with afterlife is attested only in Carpignano because of the epigraphy that accompanies the representation.

From the depictions I discussed from Italy and Egypt, it is significant to underline that by the eighth century saint Anna is depicted as a mother and that by the tenth century she is considered a protector a childbirth. These two associations are reflected also in Byzantine homilies and hagiographies as shown in chapters two and three. In Cappadocia, further associations are made with Anna and Joachim which are not always reflected in texts.

Cappadocia (ninth to thirteenth centuries)
The earliest extensive Mariological cycle

According to the most recent publications on churches in mainland Greece and the evidence provided by the work of Lafontaine-Dosogne, the most often depicted scene from the early life of Mary and until her Presentation, is the Presentation of Mary, which counts

---

[1238] Hester 1992: 148.
[1239] Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992:30.

one-hundred and twenty-two depictions and then the Birth of Mary, which follows with ninety-four depictions.[1240] The preference for the Presentation scene, which is often given a processional character, reflects the impact of the Byzantine liturgy and in particular of the Great Entrance, which was visually the most dramatic Byzantine rite.[1241] Additionally, it functioned the same way the Nativity did, since the Presentation was associated with the progressive purification of the Virgin in preparation for the Incarnation, and, similarly to the Nativity, it opened the way for the salvation of humanity.[1242] The scenes from the Mariological cycle encountered less frequently are the Meeting of Joachim and Anna and the Rejection of the Gifts (forty-one),[1243] the Annunciation of Anna (thirty-nine), the Annunciation of Joachim (thirty-six), Mary caressed by her parents (thirty) and finally the Benediction of Mary (twenty-nine).[1244] Although the Presentation outnumbers the Nativity and the Meeting of Joachim and Anna, the earliest surviving representations are the Birth of Mary and the Meeting, which are found in Italy in the churches of Santa Maria Antiqua, Castelseprio (not the Nativity) and St Sabas. An extended cycle is found in the chapel of Joachim and Anna in Cappadocia, which dates to the ninth or tenth century and marks the beginning of Cappadocian art.[1245] Cappadocia differs not only from Italy and Egypt, but also from what we will see outside Cappadocia in later centuries, because there the Mariological cycle is attested less often. The most frequent depictions from the ninth and until the thirteenth century in Cappadocia are Anna and Joachim in medallions, found

---

[1240] There are exceptions to the rule: the cult of Mary was established in the fifteenth century in Ethiopia when the *Protevangelion* was translated into Ethiopian but despite the inclusion of the feast of the Birth of Mary into the church calendar the scene is 'virtually unknown in Ethiopian painting'. See Chojnacki 1983:315.

[1241] Meyendorff 1984:20-1.Linardou argues that the scene of the Presentation of Mary in the Kokkinobaphos homilies reflects contemporary religious process of icons of Mary in Constantinople, see Linardou 2004:80. In the eleventh-century Mary's Presentation offered visual record of the Tuesday procession of the icon of Hodegetria in Constantinople. Pentcheva notes 'the processional character of the Presentation of Mary becomes an image of procession', see Pentcheva 2006:136-8,143.

[1242] Christou 2008: 584. (Gregory Palamas's homily on the Nativity of Mary).

[1243] Leveto 1990:409.

[1244] Emmanuel has correctly characterised them as the most important scenes from the Mariological cycle, see Emmanuel 2002:114.

[1245] Restle 1967:16.

usually on piers or around the main apse. Scenes from the Mariological cycle (usually one or two scenes in a single monument) are slightly outnumbered by portraits of Mary's parents.

The only case of an extended Marian cycle depicted in Cappadocia is found in the chapel of Joachim and Anna in Kizil Tchoukour, which is explained by the fact that the church was dedicated to them. In the beginning of this chapter, I noted that the Mariological cycle will not be discussed as it points to the veneration of Mary but in this cycle several details deserve attention because they deviate from the 'standard' iconography of Mary's early life and provide information about beliefs concerning Mary's parents in the late ninth- or the beginning of the tenth century.

The Marian cycle in the chapel of Joachim and Anna at Kizil Tchoukour

The majority of scholars date the Mariological cycle in Kizil Tchoukour to the late ninth or beginning of the tenth century.[1246] Thierry has noticed that the iconography in Kizil Tchoukour has similarities with the iconography of column A of the ciborium of Saint Mark in Venice, which may imply that in Kizil Tchoukour a pre-Iconoclastic model survives, which was however discontinued.[1247]

The cycle is found in the Northern chapel dedicated to Anna and Joachim.[1248] Twelve scenes survive, ten of which include Mary's parents: the Rejection of Joachim,[1249]

[1246] Thierry 2002:122; Thierry 1994:203, 236; Thierry and Thierry 1958a:146; Leveto 1990:402;Wharton-Epstein 1975:108,111; Babić 1961:169. Restle dates them from 850/860, see Restle 1967(3): chapel no: xxxiii. See also Wharton-Epstein, A.1975:109 where some views of scholars on the date have been collected. Grabar dates it between the tenth- and the eleventh century, see Grabar 1968:129.

[1247] Thierry 1994:228. Dosogne argues that the cycle dates from Iconoclasm and she has included it in one of the earliest Byzantine Marian cycles. See Lafontaine-Dosogne 1987: 331 n.53, 332; Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992:37, 91. Lafontaine-Dosogne 1975:165.

[1248] Thierry and Thierry 1958:115.

[1249] Thierry and Thierry (Thierry and Thierry 1958a:121) argue that one cannot see whether the gifts have been accepted or rejected. The inscription bears 'ΠΡΟΣΦΟΡΑ'. But since in the next scene, the reading of the books of the tribes of Israel follows, it is assumed that it is the Rejection of the gifts because according to the text after Joachim was informed that he was the only man without a child, he consulted the book of the tribes of Israel to confirm the words of the High-Priest.

Joachim consulting the books of the tribes of Israel,[1250] the Annunciation to Joachim,[1251] the Reproach of Anna,[1252] the Annunciation of Anna,[1253] the Meeting of Joachim and Anna (the Conception of Anna)[1254] or 'Anna awaits Joachim' according to Restle, [1255] then Anna pregnant,[1256] the Nativity of Mary,[1257] Mary's first steps,[1258] Mary's journey to the temple,[1259] and Mary's Presentation.[1260]

Since we are not aware of an earlier complete Marian cycle, the iconography of the Kizil Tchoukour chapel incorporates details that we see for the first time in Byzantine art, such as the rare scene of Mary's first steps,[1261] the offer to Anna of the royal band and Anna's representation as pregnant woman;[1262] The last two are both details of the Conception scene.

The Conception of Anna as we find it in Cappadocia is unique in monumental art because of its iconographical peculiarities and because it is the earliest surviving Conception scene.[1263] Anna is depicted standing, two maids help her stand and one of them places her hand in Anna's abdomen (Fig. 20). The depiction follows the instructions given by Soranus (second century) in his *Gynecology* on what maids should do with pregnant

---

[1250] Thierry and Thierry 1958b:620-1.
[1251] Restle 1967(3) : chapel no. xxxiii, depiction no. III, IV; Thierry and Thierry 1958a:121.
[1252] Restle 1967(3) chapel no. xxxiii no II; Thierry 2002:122 sch. 37; Thierry and Thierry 1958a:123.
[1253] Restle 1967(3) chapel no. xxxiii no I; Thierry 2002:122 sch. 37; Thierry 2002:134 pl.18d and pl. 38. Thierry and Thierry 1958a:123-4.
[1254] Thierry 2002:123 sch. 38. Thierry and Thierry name the scene as the return of Joachim, see Thierry and Thierry 1958a:125; The inscription writes ΙΟΑΚΗΜ ΚΑΤΕΡΧΟΜΕΝΟC ΑΠΟ ΤΟΥ ΟΡΟΥΣ Κ(ΑΙ) ΑCΠΑΖΟΜΕΝΟΣ ΤΗΝ ΑΝΑΝ, namely Joachim coming down from the mountain and embracing/kissing Anna, see Thierry and Thierry 1958a:125.
[1255] Restle 1967(3): chapel no. xxxiii no VI.
[1256] Anna expecting in Thierry and Thierry 1958a:126.
[1257] Restle 1967(3): chapel no. xxxiii no VIII; Thierry and Thierry 1958a:128.
[1258] Thierry and Thierry 1958a:128. According to Lafontaine-Dosogne 1975:177 this scene frist appeared in the ciborium of St. Mark in Venice and then here.
[1259] Thierry 1994:225.
[1260] Thierry and Thierry 1958a:129-130; Restle 1967:xxxiii; Lafontaine-Dosogne (Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992:37) names the scenes as follows : Rejection of Joachim, Joachim consulting the books of the tribes of Israel and the Annunciation of Joachim, the Reproach of Anna, the Annunciation to Anna, Meeting of Joachim and Anna, the Immaculate Conception, the Nativity of Mary, Mary's first steps and the Presentation of Mary to the temple. Lafontaine-Dosogne argues that the Conception scene definitely alludes to the Immaculate Conception of Anna, see Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992:103.
[1261] Aspra-Vardavake 1991-2:220; Thierry 1994:24.
[1262] Thierry and Thierry 1958a:123-124 and pl. X.
[1263] ibid. 140-1.

women: 'And the servants standing at the sides should softly press the mass down toward the lower parts with their hands'.[1264] In the same scene, the headcover of Anna is elaborately decorated with gems and a cross (Fig. 21).[1265] As we will see shortly, both Anna and Joachim are often depicted with the cross in Cappadocian churches. The *Protevangelion* demonstrates in different ways the high status of Mary's parents and one of them is attested in the scene when Judith reproaches Anna after the rejection of the gifts saying: 'Take this headcover, the owner of the shop gave it to me but I cannot wear it because I am your servant and (because) it has a royal mark (on it)'.[1266] Anna's rejection of the headcover is included in the Mariological cycle in Kizil Tchoukour (Fig. 22).

The headcover of Anna is a proof of her royal descendance which was vehemently defended by Byzantine homilies as we saw in chapter two. Thierry recognised in Anna's headcover the influence from fifth-century Syriac versions of the *Protevangelion* and from the sixth-century Armenian version of the *Nativity of Christ*,[1267] which according to Thierry explains the rarity of the theme in Byzantine art.[1268] Lafontaine-Dosogne argues that an oriental version of the *Protevangelion* was consulted in the depictions in Kizil Tchoukour.[1269] Lafontaine-Dosogne follows Thierry's view that the painter relied on a Greek text of a 'very old Syriac manuscript or Syro-Mesopotamian, a version more complete than those which have reached us'.[1270] The basis for this argument is that the headcover is missing from later copies of the *Protevangelion* and this is why the headcover was not inserted in later Conception scenes, which is however attested in Testuz's, De Strycker's and Tischendorf's editions. Thierry however very recently accepted the Greek

---

[1264] Temkin (trans.) 1991:76.
[1265] Thierry and Thierry 1958a:126.
[1266] De Strycker (ed.) 1961:70. De Strycker however argues that the Greek term 'βασιλικόν' should be translated as 'imperial' and not 'royal' because in Roman period stamps were placed on textiles to guarantee the high quality of the product. See De Strycker (ed.) 1961:71.
[1267] Thierry and Thierry 1958b:622.
[1268] Thierry 1994:220.
[1269] Lafontaine-Dosogne 1975:163,165.
[1270] Thierry and Thierry 1958a:145.

version of the *Protevangelion* as the influential text for the depiction of headcover in this scene,[1271] which agrees with the overall influence of the Greek version of the *Protevangelion* on Kizil Tchoukour.[1272] Although some iconographical details mentioned above move away from Byzantine tradition they do not belie the chapel's Byzantine iconography.[1273]

Another detail in the Conception scene is the standing posture of Anna which made Thierry name the whole scene as 'Anna expecting'.[1274] According to Thierry, this depiction is influenced by the Armenian infancy Gospel since it is not found in the Greek version of the *Protevangelion*. Lafontaine-Dosogne argues that this image derives from a reference that was originally in the Greek version but then disappeared and remained only in the Syriac version of the apocryphal text.[1275] There is no surviving depiction of Anna as pregnant before or after Kizil Tchoukour, which verifies once more the uniqueness of the specific scene in Byzantine art.[1276]

On the one hand, Thierry's and Lafontaine-Dosogne's explanation of the iconography is 'too textual' and does not leave speace for social and theological approaches which I think is the case here. On the other hand, Thierry correctly notes that the Marian cycle in Kizil Tchoukour illustrates a doctrine of the human conception of Mary, and that it glorifies the human nature of Christ.[1277] This is the reason the painter wished to highlight Anna's pregnancy in the Conception scene: she is honoured because she carries the Theotokos in her.[1278] However, the allusion to the Immaculate Conception which was 'vehemently fought in the work of Epiphanios of Salamis' as Thierry notes

---

[1271] Thierry 2002:123 (she quotes there De Strycker (ed.) 1961:69-73), 139.
[1272] Thierry and Thierry 1958a:132.
[1273] ibid. 138, 140-145.
[1274] ibid. 128.
[1275] Lafontaine-Dosogne 1975:165 n.1.
[1276] Mary is portrayed as pregnant in the sixth-century ivory throne of Maximian, where Joseph supports the pregnant Mary on their way to Bethleem,see Grabar 1968:101-2; Cecchelli 1944:156.
[1277] Thierry 2002:123.
[1278] Thierry and Thierry 1958a:127.

(following De Stycker's argument on the word used by the angel to announce Anna's expectancy), should be reconsidered. [1279] Moreover, Lafontaine-Dosogne and Grabar name scene 'the Immaculate Conception'.[1280] In contrast, Kalokyres notes that 'Byzantine art depicted the Orthodox belief that the Virgin was born not without a man, which can be verified by the inscription 'Conception of Anna', that in this scene the depiction of the kissing of Joachim and Anna and the birth of Mary are depicted together, which presupposes natural conception'.[1281] First as I mentioned in chapter two, the miraculous conception was never developed in Byzantium as it was developed in the West and second it depended on the viewer to interpret the difference between natural and physical conception when looking at Conception scenes. Grabar saw the depiction of Mary as pregnant in Maximian's throne as a naturalistic element,[1282] and I think this is also the case here. By depicting Anna's pregnancy the painter highlights her human nature, which led to the birth of Christ by giving birth to Mary, thus it is a deliberate effort to emphasize the humanity of Christ's forbearers.

The emphasis on the conception on Anna in the most extended Mariological cycle in Cappadocia may have been inspired by the homiletic activity, or it may responded to liturgical developments. Joachim's and Anna's numerous iconic depictions, mostly dating from the eleventh century onwards, reflect the spread of their cult from the tenth century when the feast of Joachim and Anna was introduced into the Byzantine calendar.

[1279] ibid. 144.

[1280] Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992:37; Grabar 1968:129.The fact that the dogma of Immaculate Conception is inappropriate for the Orthodox Church is shown in Lossky's comment: 'this dogma breaks the continuation created in Orthodox Church which emphasized on the role of Mary in the Incarnation, and that a series of people were chosen to fulfil this process, shown in her connection with her ancestors, David and Joachim and Anna and reaches its term at the moment of the annunciation', see Lossky 1950:30. PG 106:1009B: [blessed are] the prophets who truthfully predicted the incarnation of Christ through them (Anna-Joachim); PG 96:664C. The ninth-century homilist, George of Nikomedia in his sermon on Mary's Nativity elaborates on the selection of Mary's parents with the words 'they were preferred', 'they were selected', 'they were deemed worthy'. See PG 100:1337C. Similarly in Gregory Palamas, see Christou 2008: 592 (Nativity homily); Christou (ed.) 2009:250 (Presentation homily) and in Nikolaos Kavasilas, see Nellas (ed.; trans.) 2010:44-53 (Nativity homily).

[1281] Kalokyres 1972:88.

[1282] Grabar 1968:102.

A final comment on the iconography of Kizil Tchoukour should direct the use of its iconography as evidence for Anna's cult in Byzantium as Thierry claims.[1283] I argued earlier that the Mariological cycle cannot be regarded as testimony for the veneration of St Anna but the specific iconographical programme at Kizil Tchoukour is an exception in comparison to what happens after the eleventh century, which is the reason for its inclusion in this study. The veneration of Anna in Cappadocia is however demonstrated by the numerous iconic depictions of Anna and Joachim.

Anna's and Joachim's iconic portraits

The majority of depictions outside the Marian cycle in Cappadocia consists of portraits of Joachim and Anna together, Anna on her own or with Mary, either standing or in busts in medallions. The great number of medallions could be either because of lack of space,[1284] or local taste.[1285] The multiplicity of themes is attested nowhere else on this scale and allows us to see the various associations that the Cappadocian Byzantines made with Anna and Joachim.[1286]

Anna as a mother

Thierry has argued that some among the few pre-iconoclastic portraits in Cappadocia are of St Anna and Mary.[1287] However, current scholarship dates the earliest depictions of Anna and Mary together to the tenth century and of St Anna alone to the ninth century. In the chapel of Direkli Kilise dated between 976/9-1025, Anna and Mary respectively occupy the northwestern and southwestern pillar opposite the church

---

[1283] Thierry 1994:267.
[1284] The Cappadocian decorations are 'consistent in scale', see Wharton- Epstein 1998:18.
[1285] Local traditions in Cappadocia affect also Cappadocian architecture. see Teteriatnikova 2000:118-122.
[1286] As mentioned in the beginning of the chapter, in order to avoid repetition, I have grouped the iconic depictions thematically. Their presentation will come first and their analysis will follow.
[1287] Thierry 2002:113.

entrance.[1288] On the northwestern pillar, Anna holds baby Mary and on the southwestern Mary holds Christ.[1289] The promotion of both Anna's and Mary's motherhood in Santa Maria Antiqua and Paros is repeated here. The same concept underlines the depiction of Joachim and Anna in Yilanli Kilise in Irhala (second half of the eleventh century),[1290] where Anna holding Mary is placed on a pillar opposite Zacharias and Elisabeth.[1291] The theme of Elisabeth holding John the Baptist imitates Anna holding Virgin Mary,[1292] and the first connection between Anna and Mary with Elizabeth was made in the eighth-century depiction in Santa Maria Antiqua and in Paros.[1293] Thierry and Thierry who date the depiction in Yilanli Kilise between the ninth and beginning of the eleventh century,[1294] note that the composition, which includes the enthroned Christ between archangels and John the Baptist, aims to glorify Christ;[1295] namely apart from promoting Anna's maternity it also makes Christological associations. Christology is the main axis that connects the depictions of St Anna in Cappadocia because similarly to Mary who is Christ's mother, Anna's role as grandmother of Christ is the reason she is venerated. Byzantine texts such as the Horologion (Book of Hours) point to the same direction, where on 9 December the reverence to Joachim and Anna is justified by the fact that because of them Christ is venerated.[1296]

Glorification of Christ-Motherhood-Incarnation-Healing

[1288] Restle 1967 lxii; Thierry 2002:110; Thierry and Thierry 1963:192; Giovannini 1971:158.

[1289] Restle 1967: lxii; Rodley 1985:90, 94; Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992:37; Jolivet-Lévy 1991:323; Restle 1967(1) but does not refer to the scene, 178-9; Thierry and Thierry 1963:188-9.

[1290] Restle 1967: chapel no LVII no 37, 38.

[1291] Restle 1967 (1)173-4; Thierry and Thierry 1963:102.

[1292] Talbot Rice 1936: 32.

[1293] In the church of St Nicholas of Rodia in Arta (end of the thirteenth century, see Orlandos 1936:147), the Pentecost is depicted in the Prothesis and on its southern wall we find the unique scene (if it has been correctly identified) of the Meeting of Anna and Elisabeth. See Orlandos 1936:141; Skawran 1982:182.

[1294] Thierry and Thierry 1963:114.

[1295] ibid. 102.

[1296] 'Τῶν δικαίων Θεοπατόρων σου Κύριε, τήν μνήμην ἑορτάζοντες, δι'αὐτῶν σε δυσωποῦμεν·'. Zervos (ed.) 1876:192-3. For the translation of the word 'δυσωποῦμεν' as 'reverence'and 'respect', see Lampe 1961:394.

In relation to Christology, the theme of Anna and Joachim next to Christ, next to a cross or next to the sanctuary is also related to Christology. The purpose of combining the cross with Mary's parents is the glorification of Christ by his progenitors. The examples known to us date from the ninth until the thirteenth century and apart from a twelfth-century depiction in Italy are nowhere else found gathered in such abundance.

In the church of Peter and Paul in Çavuşin (ninth century),[1297] Anna raises her right hand towards the apse, where Christ or the cross would have been depicted (Fig. 23).[1298] The Christological association here is made first through the depiction of the fish, one of the early Christian symbols of Christ before the official acknowledgment of Christianity, and second through the cross (symbol of Christ) especially when it is placed in the sanctuary.[1299] In the church on the road Ali Reis in Ortahisar (first quarter of the thirteenth century), St Anna and St Joachim are depicted standing in a vaulted arch close to the apse. Joachim is holding a scroll, Anna a small cross in her right hand and her left palm is open towards the spectator (Figs 24-5); Jolivet-Lévy explains the attribute of the cross as revealing either the painter's confusion between St Anna and a martyr or as an attempt to glorify the saint.[1300] Nevertheless, as I will demonstrate, it is very common for Anna to hold a cross in her right arm and it was intended to glorify not the saint but Christ.

In chapel 23 in Karakli Kilise, Anna's and Joachim's busts are placed in the apse together with Christ and four archangels.[1301] Jolivet-Lévy has identified them again in chapel 19 in Göreme on the two northern pillars towards the sanctuary,[1302] in the northern

---

[1297] Jolivet-Lévy 1991:62. Anna is depicted on the southern pillar of the church of Peter and Paul in Meskendir, see Thierry 2002:125. A thirteenth-century depiction survives in Ḥiṣn Sinan (near Akhisar), where apart from the Presentation of Mary, Anna is probably depicted in the niche of the southwestern wall, see TIB 278.
[1298] Thierry 1994:306.
[1299] Thierry 2002:113,118-9, 120 sch. 31.
[1300] Jolivet-Lévy 1991:199.
[1301] ibid. 132. She dates it to the eleventh century or a bit later, see ibid. 135.
[1302] ibid. 124.

apse in chapel 22 Karikli Kilise,[1303] and on the northern wall of the basilica of Constantine.[1304] On the northern apse of the church of Kambazli Kilise in Ortahisar, Joachim has not survived but Jolivet-Lévy assumes he was originally included since Mary is depicted enthroned holding Christ with Anna in prayer on one side; thus Joachim was presumably depicted on the other side.[1305] Jolivet-Lévy's argument is based on the fact that a similar depiction survives in Tatlarin. The iconography dates to 1215 and shows Anna and Joachim on the southern apse on either side of the Virgin who is flanked by the Archangels Michael and Gabriel; all are depicted standing facing the viewer.[1306] In contrast to Kambazli Kilise and to Elmali Kilise (eleventh century), where Jerphanion identified Anna on the eastern pillar of the nave with her arms opened in front of her chest,[1307] Anna is not praying but is holding a cross in her right hand and her left palm is depicted outward, towards the spectator; Joachim blesses with his right hand and holds a roll in his left hand. The depiction of Anna holding a cross, which is a common attribute on both male and female saints in Cappadocia,[1308] and her palm open outward is also depicted in a twelfth-century golden medallion from Kiev of Graeco-Russian craftsmanship,[1309] which depicts Anna on the side accompanied with an inscription written in Slavonic.

However demonstration of glorification of Christ is also achieved by portraits of Joachim alone. In chapel 4 in Çavuşin, dedicated to St John, and dates around 913-920, Joachim is depicted holding a cross in the bottom of the apse together with the prophets

---

[1303] ibid. 130. She dates to the eleventh century, see ibid. 131; Restle dates it to 1190-1220, see Restle 1967 (1):127-134.

[1304] Jolivet-Lévy 1991:282. She dates it to the eleventh century, see ibid. 283.

[1305] ibid. 197. She dates it to the beginning of the thirteenth century, although as she mentions Thierry dates it to the second half of the eleventh century. See ibid. 198; TIB 2 : 250 where a early thirteenth century date is accepted. They are possibly also found in Karlik, see Jolivet-Lévy 1991: 176, a depiction, which Jolivet-Lévy dates it to the eleventh century (Jolivet-Lévy 1991: 176) and argues that Jerphanion has identified there the female saint with Mary.

[1306] Jolivet-Lévy 2001:137,144 (picture).

[1307] Jerphanion 1936:435. In Belli Kilise (eleventh century) Anna is depicted with three other saints whom Jerphanion does not describe not provides any further details. See Jerphanion 1932:295.

[1308] Jerphanion 1938:308.

[1309] Piatnitskiĭ 2000:256, fig. Bc.

Ezechiel, Zacharias and St Stephen.[1310] The connection of Joachim with Zacharias is either because the wives of both gave birth at an advanced age (Luke 1:5-25) and less likely because of the high priest Joachim mentioned in the *Book of Nehemiah*, where Zacharias appears as a priest (Neh. 12:12, 12:16).

The ways to demonstrate Anna's and Joachim's glorification of Christ are manifold and the solution selected by individual painters must have depended at least in part on how much space was available. Anna's and Joachim's glorification is either discretely shown through their proximity to the sanctuary, or through the cross they hold in their hand, or, in more extensively scenes, by their interaction with additional figures such the Christ, the Virgin or archangels. The Borradaile triptych (988) presents the earliest non-Cappadocian association of Mary's parents with the glorification of Christ.[1311] Anna and Joachim are depicted in medallions and frame together with other saints and martyrs' crosses which are accompanied by the inscription 'Jesus Christ is victorious' (Fig. 26).[1312] Since the cross underlines tha salvation of mankind, Anna's and Joachim's contribution in this process is demonstrated here as it has been vehemently supported by Byzantine preachers.

Even through I have thematically divided the depictions of Cappadocia, it is impossible to see only one meaning in each representation. Images are multifunctional and they express multiple theological meanings. For example, the placement of Anna and Joachim holding crosses next to Mary aims not only to glorify Christ but also to promote the Incarnation of Christ, which was made possible through the parenthood of Anna and Joachim. Jolivet-Lévy notes than the association of Mary's parents with the Incarnated Logos as it is illustrated in Cappadocia is the earliest testimony of a tendency that will

---

[1310] Jolivet-Lévy 1991: 39. For the date, see ibid. 44.
[1311] Testa 1962:18.
[1312] Buckton 1994:142-3; Rice 1959:314-5. Depictions of the victorious Christ are attested since early Christianity in sarcophagoi, see Charalampidis 2007:80 fig.1.

appear from the thirteenth century onwards in Greece and particularly in Crete and Mani.[1313] In Mani, the Nativity of Mary is placed in the southern side of the prothesis arch and in the church of the Theotokos in Kitta the Presentation is placed on the nothern side of the prothesis, which consolidates Jolivet-Lévy's argument.[1314] The proximity of Joachim next to St Stephen might be associated with Iconoclasm since as I showed earlier Stephen the Younger was an iconophile saint, but I think that Joachim is linked here with Stephen the Protomartyr, since Joachim is related to a series of prophets and martyrs, who prophesised Christ's Incarnation or were martyred for him.

The final association is that of Anna is related to healing, which I have discussed in chapter one in the framework of topography. In Cappadocian art, Anna's depictions with healing martyrs combines healing, to the glorification of Christ and to intercession. Namely the healing saint who testify the glory of God intervene to offer their healing qualities to the faithful. Dionysios of Fourna (seventeenth century) correctly includes Sts Anna, Kyriake, Marina and Paraskeve among the female healing saints,[1315] since in the chapel 33 in Göreme (first half of the eleventh century), St Anna is grouped with the martyrs Kyriake, Marina, Eudokia, Paraskeve, who all have healing qualities (Figs 27-9).[1316] In the church of stylite Niketas (tenth or eleventh century) Anna is placed among male healing saints such as Sts Kosmas and Damian and St Panteleimon (Fig. 30).[1317] Similarly to St Damian she is accosted by two or three felines, one fish and one small hart, which Thierry sees as a survival on Anatolian goddesses depicted with animals.[1318] I

[1313] Jolivet-Lévy 1991:343. They will be discussed later in this chapter.
[1314] Drandakes 1964:71.
[1315] Papadopoulos-Kerameus (ed.) 1909:278-9.
[1316] Jolivet-Lévy 1991:145; Restle 1967: xxv 421; Restle 1967 (1) 134-5. According to Dionysios of Fourna, St. Kyriake is placed next to St Marina and that St. Eudokia is by one female saint apart from St. Paraskeve, see Papadopoulos-Kerameus (ed.) 1909:169-170, 273. For its date to the eleventh century, see also Wharton-Epstein 1998: 37, 44.
[1317] Thierry 1994: 267, 268 fig. 76b, p. 269. Jolivet-Lévy dates it to the late eleventh century, see Jolivet-Lévy 1991:56; Thierry 2002:126 and 133 where she dates the iconographical program around 700, but Rodley (Rodley 1985:186) has argued that the date of the church is uncertain, see Rodley 1985:189; Wharton- Epstein places it in the ninth century, but he does not recognise St Anna in this depiction ('Cosmas and Damian, Panteleimon and a female saint'), see Wharton- Epstein 1998: 18.
[1318] Thierry 1994:269.

cannot be sure whether the association of Sts Damian and Kosmas with the veneration of the Theotokos suggested by Mantas played role in this depiction.[1319]

In any case, as stated, the meaning of the depictions of Mary's parents in rarely one-sided; Anna's demonstration as a healer combined with a fish, a purely Christological symbol, shows the promotion of two messages simultaneously, glorification of Christ and healing. I showed in chapter one the way in which healing was associated with St Anna through topography and in chapter three how this idea was perpetuated in hagiography. In Cappadocia Anna's healing powers are illustrated although they are not specifically related to childbirth, as they are in literary sources. Anna here is not vested with the role of a defender of the Christian faith. Although an explicit connection of St Anna to water is not made in Cappadocia, in both Yilanli and Direkli Kilise where depictions of the saint survive, a cross is painted on the back wall of a water basin to underline the symbolic-liturgical relationship between the water basin and the cross, where water symbolizes rebirth and the cross the victory over death. Lucey notes that liturgical was also the function of the vessel for water use of the southeast chapel in Santa Maria Antiqua.[1320] In these cases, Anna is not promoted as a healer and she is not connected with these water constructions but she is included in monuments where water has liturgical functions.

Intercession-Deesis

The Virgin Mary is the accustomed figure in Byzantium to intercede between the faithful and Christ. In middle Byzantine churches, Mary's placement in the apse shows that she transfers the supplication from the earth (saints in the nave) to heaven (Christ in the dome). An alterative form of supplication lies in her depiction with Christ and John the Forerunner, who form the basic group of the Deesis (= supplication). Anna's proximity to

---

[1319] Mantas 2001:167.
[1320] Lucey 2004:90.

the sanctuary or the placement of Anna and Joachim inside the sanctuary or in a Deesis scene, underlines the depictions of Anna of Joachim in Cappadocia, who from the eleventh century onwards are depicted as mediators, taking on a role that Mary reserved, that of Mary Orans, as we saw earlier in the church of Abdallah-n Irqi in Egypt.

In the church of the Forty martyrs of Sebasteia (second half of the eleventh century) Anna and Joachim accompany a Deesis scene,[1321] and in the chapel 33 in Göreme, mentioned above, St Anna is grouped with the martyrs Kyriake, Marina, Eudokia, Paraskeve, who all make a gesture of supplication.[1322] As Jolivet-Lévy notes this Anna has been identified by Jerphanion as Anna Ephemianos,[1323] but her identification with a saint or martyr is problematic considering the great number of saints and martyrs named Anna in the Constantinopolitan *Synaxarion*, as I mentioned in chapter three. In Karabas Kilise (1060/1), Anna and Joachim form part of a Deesis scene located close to the sanctuary.[1324] In Tagar, in the chapel of St Theodore (1080) Anna and Joachim are placed in the sanctuary again in connection to the Deesis scene, where Anna is found between the feet of Mary and Christ and Joachim between the feet of Christ and John the Forerunner (Figs 31-2).[1325] In chapel 19 in Göreme (1190-1200), two figures are placed between a Deesis scene, one has been identified as St Anna, but it is not certain that Joachim accompanies the scene.[1326] In Karanlik Kilise (thirteenth century), John the Forerunner in the Emmanuel form accompanies the medallions of Joachim and Anna.[1327]

Anna's supplicational role apparently suggested her placement among donors. In chapel no 3 (beginning of the eleventh century) in the region of Hasan Dağı, Jolivet has

---

[1321] Jolivet-Lévy 1991:274.
[1322] Restle 1967:xxv 421; Restle 1967 (1)134-5.
[1323] Jolivet-Lévy 1991:145.
[1324] Rodley1985:198. Restle 1967 (1)162; Thierry 2002:110; Restle 1967: xlviii no. 38. The date is based on a dedicatory inscription, see Jerphanion 1932:334. Jerphanion refers only to Anna's depiction on the arcade of the nothern wall, Jerphanion 1932:336.
[1325] Jolivet-Lévy 1991:212; Restle 1967 (3) xxxv nos 37, 38. fig. 359; Restle 1967(1) 146-8; Thierry 2002:183; Jerphanion 1932:190.
[1326] Restle 1967:xviii nos 37,38; Restle 1967 (1)124-5; Jolivet-Lévy 1991: 125 (eleventh century).
[1327] Warland 2000:381; Rodley (Rodley 1985: 56) dates the paintings to the middle of the eleventh century.

identified Mary and Anna between the donors in a niche in the North wall.[1328] In chapel 20 (Göreme) dedicated to St Barbara (second half of the eleventh century),[1329] Jolivet assumes that a figure pictured with other saints in a rare example of polychrome votive panels is St Anna.[1330] Although these two examples are both dated to the eleventh century and since I am not aware of earlier or later ones surviving in Cappadocia, St Anna first votive images appear in the tenth-century crypt of St Christina in Carpignano.[1331]

In Cappadocia, Anna's with Joachim's association with intercession does not antedate the eleventh century. St Anna (Anna Orans) in particular, functions as a mediator between the faifthful and Mary or Christ, thus she assumes Mary's role. The supplicational role of Mary is demonstrated in Byzantine iconography by the placement of Mary in the apse of the church so that she can mediate between earth and heaven. In Cappadocia, Mary's parents are placed near the apse and the inclusion of John the Forerunner shows that they transmit the same message her daughter does: their ability to transfer the supplication of the faithful to Christ.

Overview of the depictions of Mary's parents in Cappadocia – Additional remarks

The associations made with Anna and Joachim in the churches of Cappadocia vary from promotion of motherhood and healing qualities, to intercession and demonstration of the glorification of Christ. This is unique in Cappadocia: in no other region are so many variations in the associations made for Anna and Joachim. Anna's and Joachim's busts do not appear so often in a single location elsewhere in Byzantine art but this did not restrain the Cappadocian painters from vesting the two figures with multiple symbolisms.

[1328] Jolivet-Lévy 1991 287, 291 (for the date).
[1329] Thierry 1975b: 84 dates it between 1006-1021.
[1330] Jolivet-Lévy 1991: 125, 126; Restle 1967 (1) (but does not refer to the scenes or date of monument) 126.
[1331] However, if it will be shown that the sixth century depiction in Santa Maria Antiaqua of a woman holding a female infant is Anna and Mary, which would be the earliest votive image of Anna.

Cappadocia provides best array of images illustrating the various interpretations that the couple enjoyed, which is in accordance with their 'textual image'. For example, the Christological associations – which we will see again to a smaller degree in Italy in the twelfth century – acknowledge their role in Christ's humanization, which has been supported by Byzantine homilists from the eighth century. This is also the case with Anna's image as a mother. Nevertheless, one should not overemphasize the support this depiction received from texts, because Anna's representations as a mother appears as early as the eighth century in Rome and Greece, simultaneously with the homiletic activity. Despite the various associations made with Anna, her motherhood is her dominant characteristic, linking most of her depictions in Cappadocia.

I mentioned earlier Jolivet-Lévy's view on the iconographical affinities between Cappadocia and Greece (Mani, Crete). Similarities are also attested between Cappadocia and twelfth-century Sicily, in two points: the placement near the apse and hand gestures.[1332]

In Martorana (1154-1166),[1333] which is dedicated to Mary, Anna and Joachim are depicted standing in the side apses, Anna in the prothesis, Joachim in the diakonikon. They are accompanied by archangels and flank Mary who is depicted in the main apse (Figs 33-4). At Kizil Tchoukour, the Presentation of Christ is also placed in the prothesis.[1334] In the Cappadocian cave churches, the Virgin Mary often accompanies the prothesis,[1335] and scenes from her life, such as her Presentation in the Temple, give Eucharistic connotations to the iconographical programme.[1336] The placement of Joachim and Anna in the prothesis

---

[1332] For the Byzantine influence from the seventh century in Sicily, see Morello 1990:43-46; Kitzinger argues that the Byzantine influence to Sicily was achieved through icons, see Kitzinger 1966: 12; For the influence of Byzantine art at a later period in Sicily, see Buchthal 1966:108-111;Pace 1982: (examples from manuscripts) 454-5.
[1333] Pace 1982: 433-434.
[1334] Teteriatnikov 1996:91.
[1335] Teteriatnikov 1996:87. Mary with Christ appears often in this location, see Asutay: 1998:31-3.
[1336] Teteriatnikov 1996:90. For examples of the Birth or the Presentation of Mary in the prothesis in churches of Greece, see Altripp 2000:28, who offers an overview of the iconography in the Prothesis. In Studenica the Marian cycle begins and ends between the prothesis and the diakonikon, see Hallensleben 1963:56.

reflects the Byzantine connection of the prothesis to the birth of Christ, as Symeon of Thessalonike tells us, who parallels the prothesis with the cave where Christ was born.[1337] Kitzinger notes that the fact that Anna and Joachim are depicted full standing and not in busts is unusual, as it is the placing of Anna and Joachim in the lateral apses.[1338] This motive is however attested in Cappadocia, and in the churches of Eastern Europe (discussed later) Joachim and Anna flank the main apse; thus this arrangement is not uncommon in areas around the periphery of the empire.

Further similarities between Cappadocia and Sicily and Greece have to do with gestures. According to Demus, Anna and Joachim make 'unusual gestures' in the Martorana.[1339] They namely raise their hands before the spectator having their palms outward. This gesture however is assumed by Anna in the tenth-century Pala d'Oro,[1340] in Hagioi Saranta in Lakonia, Greece (end of the thirteenth century),[1341] in Kambazli Kilise (eleventh century),[1342] and in the church on the road of Ali Reis in Cappadocia (first half of the thirteenth century).[1343]

Demisch includes this gesture in his group of gestures of raised hands, which was used in Christian art to promote the meaning of salvation to the beholders.[1344] He explains the gesture of Mary in the fourteenth-century Santa Maria in Donato, which imitates exactly the position Anna receives in Martorana, as either supplication or blessing.[1345] Demus notes that this gesture is often adopted by the Virgin and it could be an alternative for the Virgin Orans (= in supplication), but he admits that 'there is no good explanation of

---

[1337] PG 155: 264C ' Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ πρόθεσις τύπον ἐπέχει τοῦ σπηλαίου τε καὶ τῆς φάτνης'.
[1338] Kitzinger 1991:136; Malmquist 1979:145-6.
[1339] Kitzinger 1991:137.
[1340] Hahnloser 1994:49, pl. 98.
[1341] Bakourou 1980:166, pl.68.
[1342] Jerphanion 1938:308.
[1343] Jolivet-Lévy 1991:pl.24 fig. 3. For its date, see Jolivet-Lévy 1991:199.
[1344] Demisch 1984:134. For examples of figures having their palm toward the spectator in early Christian and Byzantine art, see Demisch 1984:138 Abb.182;140 Abb 185 (first register).
[1345] ibid. 140-1 Abb. 188.

this'.[1346] In the Kokkinobaphos homilies Mary is represented holding her palm outwards against those who accuse her of having lost her innocence,[1347] but I follow Demisch in thinking that the open palm towards the spectator has to do with imitating martyrs' gestures rather than defence of the saint herself proposed by Jolivet-Lévy. This is also the case with the holding of a cross and the placement of Anna next to martyrs.

Constantinople and its environs (tenth to fourteenth centuries)

Locality plays a significant role in St Anna's depictions in Byzantium, because emphasis iconographical details are treated differently. In Cappadocia, medallions and non-narrative scenes are preferred, in Greece as we will see portraits of Anna alone prevail, and in Constantinople the representations of Mary's parents retain aristocratic character.[1348]

Outside Constantinople, the associations made with Anna and Joachim are similar to those we have seen so far. In the thirteenth-century church of Hagia Sophia in Trebzond, Joachim and Anna frame Mary who holds Christ in the conch of the diakonikon (Fig. 35).[1349] This is an example of a visual genealogical tree attested in Rome, Greece and Cappadocia. In the narthex of the Koimesis church (eleventh century) in Nicaea, medallions of Christ, John the Baptist, Joachim, Anna surround a cross depicted in the vault, and Mary in supplication (Mary Orans) is depicted in the lunette over the central door.[1350] The glorification of Christ, the emphasis on Christ's humanity and the connection

---

[1346] Kitzinger 1991:138.

[1347] Evangelatou 2006:276.

[1348] Fragmentary scenes of the Marian cycle has been attested in the church of the Virgin Pantovasilissa in Kemerli Kilise in modern Bursa (late thirteenth or the first quarter of the fourteenth century), where the Rejection of the offerings has been identified. See Mango and Ševčenko 1973: 238, 240. Mango has argued that the church of Kamariotissa in Chalke, was originally built in the fourteenth century, although its frescoes the Conception of Anna included) dates to the seventieth century (1672), see Mathews and Mango 1973:129-130 and fig. 16 for the fresco of Anna's Conception.

[1349] Talbot 1968:104 pl. 29b and pl.30. Its cross-in-square design shows direct Constantinopolitan influence which is rare in the churches of Pontos, see Sinclair 1987:27. For its date to the thirteenth century (after 1250), see Talbot 1968:244.

[1350] Mango 1959a: 246. fig.1.

of Anna and Joachim to the Deesis (supplication), have been repeatedly depicted in the Cappadocian cave churches. Moreover, in the Koimesis church we find for the first time the headcover often used in Palaiologan depictions of holy women and which covers the head of St Anna who is holding Mary.[1351]

As stated, in Constantinople emphasis is placed upon the aristocratic origins of the couple. By confirming the noble origins of Joachim and Anna the account of the *Protevangelion* permitted the use of artistic motifs taken from the Byzantine court or aristocracy, which is the case in the *Synaxarion of Basil II* but especially in the twelfth-century homilies of James Kokkinobaphos and the fourteenth-century mosaics in Chora.[1352]

The *Synaxarion of Basil II* (Vat.gr. 1613) is the oldest surviving Constantinopolitan work to include the parents of Mary.[1353] It dates around 986 and contains scenes from the early life of Mary and two standing portraits of Anna and Joachim.[1354] The inclusion of Mary's parents in this liturgical work is justified by the introduction of the feast of St Anna and Joachim in the tenth century in Constantinople.[1355]

The aristocratic motifs are found in the scene of Mary's Nativity where women bring gifts to Anna after she has given birth to Mary. Lafontaine-Dosogne argues that the eggs offered to Anna in the same scene symbolise fertility and constitutes an iconographical innovation of the *Menologion*'s painter.[1356] Babić argues that in no version of the *Protevangelion* is there a reference to the presents brought to Anna after she has given birth, which shows that the influence originates from Constantinopolitan customs.[1357] He is correct about the Byzantine customs in this Nativity scene, but ignores the fact that Mary's birth was modelled on that of Christ, where the three Magi offer their gifts to

---

[1351] Aspra-Vardavake 1991-2:207.
[1352] De Strycker (ed.) 1961:64; Lafontaine-Dosogne 1975:172. Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992: 74.
[1353] Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992: 37; Babić 1961:169,175; Chirat 1950:89; Hadermann-Misguich 1975:252; Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992 :92.
[1354] Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992: 92.
[1355] See chapter three part two.
[1356] Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992: 92.
[1357] Babić 1961:173-4.

Christ.[1358] However, Babić's argument on the use of traditions from the Byzantine custom in the Nativity scene is not ungrounded. As Chirat has argued, during the birth symbolic offerings such as eggs were given to the empress, and he sees a connection with the white oval-shape objects offered to Anna by three servants in the *Menologion* Nativity.[1359] Thus iconographical continuity and details from the Constantinopolitan social customs underline the depiction of Mary's Nativity celebrated on 8 September in the *Menologion*, and the inclusion of Anna and Joachim's portraits is justified by the celebration of their feast on 9 September.

The twelfth-century homilies of the monk James of the Kokkinobaphos monastery in Bithynia strongly emphasize the noble origins of Mary's parents. As stated, this element is found in the *Protevangelion of James* but the details in the Kokkinobaphos illustrations were apparently drawn from local aristocratic practice. In this work, the high social status of the possible patron Eirene Sevastokratorissa,[1360] who wished to promoted her aristocratic qualities such as ευγενεία (originating from a good family),[1361] is apparently placed in the wider framework of social values and Komnenian aristocratic ideology.[1362] The wealth of Joachim and Anna gave rise to a number of iconographical details to support the aristocratic origins of the patron and associate her with Mary's family. Luxurious bedchambers, double-storied residence equipped with elaborate furniture and supplied with numerous maidservants and attendants, identify Mary and her parents as members of the Byzantine aristocracy (figs 36-7).[1363]

The luxury in the iconography of the Kokkinobaphos homilies is superseded in the mosaics of the Chora monastery (Kariye Camii). It is the only surviving example in

---

[1358] ibid. 93,95.
[1359] Chirat 1950:91-2. According to Jewish law, offerings were given to the highpriest after childbirth, see Levitikon 12.6-8. For issues between women in labor and offerings in the Mishnah, see Danby 1933:563-4.
[1360] Linardou herself leaves space for differentiation 'there is no indisputable proof to affirm this', see Linardou 2004:286. See also Evangelatou 2006:265.
[1361] Magdalino 1993:320.
[1362] Linardou 2004:27.
[1363] ibid. 62, 283. For Mary' good upbringing, see Boissonade (ed.) 1962:30-31.

Constantinople to contain such a large number of scenes from the Mariological cycle and one of the most expanded Marian cycles in Byzantine art.

In the iconographical programme of this cycle St Anna receives a role, which she is not often given in Byzantine art, that of a female aristocrat whose wealth is demonstrated through iconography, such as indoor and outdoor architectural details and garments.[1364] In the Annunciation of Anna for example, Anna's house is represented with 'unusual lavishness, which could point to the dwellings of the rich and highly placed personages of the period' (Fig. 38).[1365] Moreover, the Nativity of Mary offers evidence on the material culture of the Byzantine aristocracy. Similarly to the *Menologion* Nativity, three maids approach Anna to offer their gifts after the birth of Mary. One maid brings to Anna a small blue vial, the second maid brings another vessel with golden and red bands and the last one holds a flat dish of food, which she is about to place on a golden table,[1366] in contrast to earlier representations where the table is bare (Fig. 39).[1367] Parani notes that glass objects are included in fourteenth-century Nativity scenes such as that at the Church of Sts Joachim and St Anna at Studenica (1314),[1368] but she sees a difference with representations of Mary's Nativity in the middle Byzantine period, when maids carried ceramic bottles, but not glass vessels. This may indicate that luxury glass objects had become readily available in the Balkans during the late Byzantine period, yet remained valuable enought to be given as high-status gifts.[1369] Already in the eleventh century, the Daphni monastery had incorporated details, which reflect customs of the Byzantine court.[1370] In the Nativity of Mary and particularly in the maid who holds gold containers

---

[1364] Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992:74,109. However, identification of the buildings with actual buildings is out of the question.
[1365] ibid. 172.
[1366] Lafontaine-Dosogne 1975 :176.
[1367] ibid. 176 n.75; Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992:109 n.2.
[1368] Parani 2005:5.
[1369] ibid. 18.
[1370] The depictions in Daphni monastery in Greece and the homilies of James Kokkinobaphos are exceptional in the sense that they St Anna is promoted in an unusual way. See Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992: 71-3. See also Mouriki 1980-1: 96.

Maguire sees similarities with the celebration of the birth of a male child in the *Book of Ceremonies*,[1371] and the spreads woven with gold, give Anna and Mary imperial connotations.[1372] The iconography in Dafni may reflect a lost tradition, which we have the chance to see in the *Menologion* which was later intensified in the Kokkinobaphos homilies and culminated in the Chora mosaics.

Nevertheless, the contribution of Mary's parents in the Incarnation is not forgotten in the Chora monastery. In the Annunciation to St Anna the introduction of the fir cone is a reference to fertility; and it does not appear in the Annunciation to Mary, because Mary had no issues with infertility.[1373] The incarnational role of Anna and Joachim is reiterated in the full figure of St Anna standing (and probably of Joachim) holding the infant Mary has survived in the exonarthex, separated by the cycle of Mary (Figs 40-1).[1374]

The *Protevangelion* facilitated the spread of the notions on Joachim's and Anna's social status but the works themselves have been associated either with emperors such as Basil II (*Menologion*) or members of the Byzantine court such as Eirene Sevastokratorissa (Kokkinobaphos homilies) and Theodore Metochites (Chora monastery). The attachment of the aristocracy to works where Anna is included shows a continuity with the early and middle Byzantine period where emperors and empresses were connected with the construction of St Anna's churches in the Byzantine capital.

The iconography of the Kokkinobaphos homilies and the monastery of Chora aim at Mary's glorification, and the treatment of Anna as a Byzantine aristocrat is conveyed from Mary to Anna. Anna's iconography and cult cannot be understood independently from Mary depictions and veneration and looking at Mary's iconography, one explains

---

[1371] Maguire 1996:151.
[1372] ibid. 151,155.
[1373] Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992: 71-2.
[1374] ibid. 46-7,134.

Anna's depictions as well. This is why I strongly believe that Mariology is the framework to explain the phenomena related to Anna's cult in Byzantium.[1375]

Eastern Europe (twelfth- fourteenth centuries)

In Kurbinovo (1191), St Anna is depicted in the top register of the northern wall, holding Mary who looks at her mother. Anna is nursing and is leaning her head towards the left. At the beginning of the western wall, Joachim holds a scroll in his left hand. They stand next to Constantine and Helena (Fig. 42).[1376] The image of Anna nursing Mary appears here for the first time and it is inspired by the Galaktotrophousa type of Mary.[1377] The portrayal of nursing Anna next to Joachim is exceptional and the closest iconography of which is their depiction in Studenica.[1378] Here too, the message transmitted is twofold: Anna and Joachim brought salvation to the world through Mary (Anna holding Mary), the birth of whom has long been prophecised (Joachim holding the scroll). The placement of Joachim and Anna next to two of the most important figures for the establishment of Christianity exalts the position of Mary's parents in the iconography of the Kurbinovo. The proximity of Joachim and Anna to Constantine and Helena associates Joachim and Anna with defence of Christianity, because of the connection of these two iconographical couples with the cross, the symbol of Orthodoxy. The salvation role of the Holy Cross that Helena found in Golgotha is underlined by Cyril of Jerusalem (fourth century): 'for this Golgotha is the very centre of the earth. It is not my word, but it is a prophet who hath said, Thou hast wrought salvation in the midst of the earth'.[1379] The proximity of Joachim and Anna with Constantine and Helena in Kurbinovo is also attested in the church of

---

[1375] For similarities between the two cults, see p. 295.
[1376] Hamann-Mac Lean 1976:pl. 39C; Hamann-Mac Lean 1963:plan 6a nos 21,22; Hadermann-Misguich 1975:251.
[1377] Hadermann-Misguich 1975:253.
[1378] ibid. 254.
[1379] Schaff and Wace (eds) 1894: 89. The passage quoted is *Psalm* 74.12.

Panaghia Phorphiotissa (twelfth century) in Asinou (Cyprus),[1380] and in the Virgin Kykkotissa icon of Sinai (thirteenth century) and we will see it again in Greece but overall is an uncommon theme.[1381]

In Nereditsa (1199),[1382] Anna and Joachim are located in the northern (Anna) and southern (Joachim) pendentives under the dome where usually Prophets and Evangelists are placed (figs 43-4).[1383] Anna and Joachim are elevated to the status of prophets who prophecised the coming of Christ on earth, which was verified by Christ's Incarnation recorded in the four Gospels. Their depiction in Nereditsa is the visual equivalent of the 'canonization' of Anna and Joachim in Byzantine thought through the recognition of their contribution to the humanity of Christ.

In the Boyana church (1259) in Bulgaria,[1384] Anna and Joachim (and not Joseph as Miyatev suggested),[1385] frame Mary, who is holding Christ; both bow towards Mary, as a result of their placement in the arch of the western wall of the narthex (Figs 45-6).[1386] This image is another family portrait such as the ones we saw in Italy and Egypt and the message it transmits is the Incarnation, as Bakalova notes: 'Theologically the composition in the Boyana implies the importance of the Incarnation through the Virgin, with Joachim and Anna as witnesses of the mysterious event and, at the same time, as advocates for the salvation of humankind'.[1387] A similar composition is attested in a Russian icon of 1381, where Joachim is placed to the right of Mary holding Christ and Anna to the left (Fig. 47).[1388] Similarly to the church of Saviour in Veroia (Greece), discussed shortly, the

---

[1380] Connor 1999:215, 217; Lafontaine-Dosogne 1979:296.
[1381] Hadermann-Misguich 1975:253.
[1382] Malmquist 1979:154.
[1383] Sheviakova 2004: 55, 76,106; Malmquist 1979:154. Malmquist assumes that they might also be depicted in the Transfiguration church in Velikaja (1138-1156), where in the eastern and western pendentives the Mandylion and the Kerameion are depicted, see Malmquist 1979:157.
[1384] Penkova 2000:249-250.
[1385] Miyatev 1961: 92 no 39.
[1386] Bakalova 2006: 270; Penkova 2000:250; Schweinfurth 1965:55 fig.48.
[1387] ibid. 271.
[1388] Kondakov 1929:pl.13.

emphasis on the Incarnation in Boyana is justified by the church's funerary program.[1389] Finally, in the monastery of Cozia (1386) in Romania, on the northern wall of the nave Anna is depicted holding Mary,[1390] which shows that the promotion of Christ's humanity allowed the depiction of family portraits, which is a favourite theme of the churches in Eastern Europe. However, sound emphasis on genealogy is given in the next example, the church of Anna and Joachim in Studenica.

The Serbian ruler Milutin, who married Simonis, the daughter of the Byzantine emperor Andronikos II, built a church dedicated to Anna and Joachim in Studenica (1313-4).[1391] This and the chapel at Kizil Tchoukour in Cappadocia are the only monuments I am aware of which were dedicated to both the parents of Mary. The church at Studenica was used as a chapel and was attached to a church dedicated to the Virgin. Its topographical arrangement brings to mind the topographical model of a chapel/church dedicated to Anna being attached to a church dedicated to Mary, discussed in chapter one. Milutin and his wife are represented offering a church to Anna, who is holding Mary, and to Joachim (Fig. 48).[1392] The dedication of a church to the ancestors of Mary is in accordance with the Serbian need to sanctify their dynasty,[1393] and to establish their rule through the incorporation of iconography of Christ's genealogy, mostly seen in the depiction of the Tree of Jesse.[1394]

In the nave of the same church, Anna assumes Mary's posture in the Hodegetria type. Similarly to Kurbinovo, she is standing and is holding her daughter in her right side, leaning her head towards Mary as Mary raises her head toward her mother (Fig. 49).[1395] The exceptional promotion of Mary's parents by the Serbian ruler may be the result of

---

[1389] Penkova 2000:250.
[1390] Stefanescu 1928:20.
[1391] Millet 1962:xvi; Evans 2004:70-1.
[1392] Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992:50.
[1393] Maksimović 2004:114.
[1394] Taylor 1980-1981:165.
[1395] Millet 1962:pl.70 fig. 2; Hadermann-Misguich 1975:252.

Milutin's urge to associate himself with Byzantine emperors whose reign is blessed by Christ and Mary. His interest in the geneaology of Christ implies that he wished to establish himself as a Byzantine monarch who succeded the Roman emperors to the throne.

Similarly to Boyana, Anna and Joachim are placed in the narthex of the church of Archangel Michael in Lesnovo monastery (1349),[1396] the iconography of which underlines the Incarnation of Christ.[1397] Similarly to Cappadocia and the Martorana, Joachim is holding a scroll and is placed to the right while Anna opens her palms towards the spectator.[1398] These gestures are affiliated with the glorification of God as in the depiction in Mileśevo (1230-7),[1399] where Joachim and Anna in medallions are respectively placed to the right and to the left under the Ascension scene (Fig. 50).[1400] Lesnovo is the only example, where Anna and Joachim are placed over the 'Christ reclining' (Anapeson) depiction (Fig. 51). Christ is depicted lying between Mary who covers Christ's body with a piece of cloth and the Archangel Michael who holds instruments of the Passion of Christ. The depiction is related to the *Old Testamen*t prophecy on the coming of Christ to the world and aims to emphasize Christ's Passion and Resurrection.[1401] The connection between Anna and Joachim to the fulfilment of prophecies is made in Byzantine homilies in connection to Mary's birth, as shown in chapter two. In Lesnovo, they are associated with the Reclining Infant, which is nowhere attested else in Byzantine art. Joachim holds a scroll and Anna has her both palms open towards the spectator. Joachim functions as a vindicator of the *Old Testament* prophecies of the coming of Christ and Anna glorifies the event of Christ's advent. The depiction, however unique, it is placed in the framework of

---

[1396] Millet 1969:5.
[1397] Gavrilovic 1980:46-7.
[1398] Millet 1969:pl.19 fig. 41.
[1399] Millet 1954:x.
[1400] ibid. pl.64 fig.3.
[1401] Gen. 49.9 : 'ἐκ βλαστοῦ, υἱέ μου, ἀνέβης· ἀναπεσὼν ἐκοιμήθης' (= from the prey, my son, thou art gone up: you stooped down, you couched)

the Christological associations made with Anna and Joachim first encountered in Cappadocia.

In the fourteenth-century Markov monastery near Skopje two standing images of Anna and Joachim are placed opposite each other near the sanctuary. Elisabeth stands next to Anna, and Zacharias stands next to Joachim. Under Anna and Elisabeth the scene of Mary's Annunciation is placed, and between Joachim and Zacharias, the 'Noli me tangere' (figs 52-3).[1402] Apart from connections to the Incarnation, the programms unerlines the Ressurection of Christ similarly to what we saw in Lesnovo.

Finally, one fourteenth-century examples of Anna suckling Mary are attested in the church of St Mary Zahumska in Ochrid. As we will see this theme is very popular in Crete.[1403]

To sum up, the associations discussed of Anna and Joachim in the churches of Eastern Europe do not differ from what we have seen so far, apart from an emphasis on genealogy, which however alludes to the Incarnation of Christ. The new iconographical theme is their proximity to the 'Christ reclining' theme and the Ascension, which does not appear outside Eastern Europe and thus it could be the result of the donors' preference to associate Mary's parents with these two scenes. Nevertheless one can include it in the group of images which aim at promoting Anna's and Joachim' contribution to the Incarnation of Christ, which has long been propheciced in the *Old Testament*.

Ethiopia (thirteenth century)

[1402] I would like to thank Marka Tomic from the University of Belgrade, who brought these depictions to my attention and has kindly allowed me to use photographic material from her doctoral thesis.

[1403] I would like to thank Elena Draghici-Vasilescu from the University of Oxford, who brought this depiction to my attention. The bibliography I was given for this image by Elena Draghici-Vasilescu is C. Grozdanov, *La peinture murale d'Ohrid au XlVe siècle* (Ohrid, 1980); p.111,197, fig. 75 and also A.Nikolovski, D. Cornakov, K. Balabanov (eds), *Spomenici na kulturata vo ipMakedonija,* [The cultural monuments of Macedonia], Nova Makedonija, Skopje, 1961, pp. 246-247. However, I have not consulted these two books until now and thus I have not seen the image.

One of the oldest extant Ethiopian murals is found in the church of Gannata Māryām (Lalibela), which dates to the thirteenth century. In this monument, Anna is depicted on the south-eastern pier in the Hodegetria type with baby Mary in front of her chest.[1404] This family portrait has a supplicational character as the inscription tells us: 'Anne, Mother of Mary, may her prayer be upon us' (Fig. 54). The image has also a narrative character since it is included in the scene of Mary's Presentation, thus – as Heldman Eiseman notes – it is not a portrait per se.[1405] The first example of a portrait inserted into an illustrative cycle is Anna's Conception in Kizil Tchoukour, where Anna is represented as pregnant, in contrast to Mary's depiction as pregnant on the throne of Maximian, which is clearly part of a narrative cycle. The frontality of Anna in Cappadocia and in Gannata Māryām reduces the images' narrative character, and – in Gannata Māryām – the votive character of the inscription accompanies the depiction. Similarly to Kizil Tchoukour and chapel 9 in Göreme (end of the tenth century), where Anna and Joachim are depicted in the sanctuary as part of a narrative scene such as the Presentation (Fig. 55),[1406] the painter in Ethiopia wished to promote a particular message by including a portrait in a narrative scene. The imposing figures of Anna and her daughter, which dominate one side of the pier, are surrounded by female figures, which form part of the Presentation that extends until the other side of the pier. The promotion of Anna's motherhood combined with the supplicational message of the epigraphy suggests a female audience and highlights the image's role in the protection of children. The dedication of Anna's portrait by the donor in the church of Gannata Māryām is similar to the dedication of Mary to the temple by Anna, which Anna promised when she was praying in her

---

[1404] Heldman-Eiseman 1994: 116, 118 fig. 68.
[1405] ibid. 116-7.
[1406] Jolivet-Lévy 1991:81. For the date, see Jolivet-Lévy 1991:82; Restle 1967: XII fig.37, 38; Restle 1967 (1) (but does not refer to the scenes or date of monument) 117-9.

garden. Thus by including a portrait inside a narrative scene the donor achieves to identify herself with Anna's story and to justify her patronage.

Similar concept but attached to a different depiction is valid for the scene of Mary's Nativity in the chapel of Hagia Sophia in Mistras (after 1366) where according to Emmanuel the female donor wished to associate herself with Anna in her effort to have offspring.[1407] As with Eastern Europe, the associations made with St Anna do not add something new to what I have discussed so far (promotion of Anna's motherhood), and the inclusion of portrait into a narrative scene is attested in Cappadocia as well. But in contrast to other Eastern European churches such as in Lesnovo and Mileśevo, although the role of the donor in thee decorative program of this monument cannot be affirmed, in Ethiopia the exceptional iconographical type of an iconic scene within a narrative scene, is the result of the donor's wish to be commemorated in the inscription.

Greece (tenth to fifteenth centuries)

Mainland Greece

The study of the iconic depictions of Mary's parents in mainland Greece was an initiative of Sharon Gerstel, who in 1998 included a number of them in her article *Painted sources of female piety*. Gerstel highlighted the lack of studies on St Anna in Byzantium and identified the association of Anna with childbirth based on Anna's iconography in Greece. The main axis that connects the depictions of Anna not only in mainland Greece but in the whole country, is her motherhood and Christological associations such as the Incarnation and the glorification of Christ. The different political scenery after the Fourth Crusade in 1204, when parts of Greece were taken by the Crusaders did not substantially affect the iconography of the saint but rather emphasis was given to certain themes.[1408]

[1407] Emmanuel 2002:115.

[1408] As until now, the presentation of the iconography will be based on the iconic depictions of Anna and Joachim and not the Marian cycle, and they will be presented geographically since in most cases depictions

Macedonia

The themes that appear in Macedonian churches are mainly related to Anna's motherhood, followed by Anna's supplicational role (Deesis) and the Incarnation of Christ.

In the church of Hagioi Anargyroi in Kastoria, an image of Anna holding the infant Mary is placed on the eastern wall of the narthex (the second layer dates to the late eleventh- or early twelfth-century),[1409] under the Patriarch Abraham and his wife Sarah (Fig. 56).[1410] Corrigan notes that the sacrifice of Abraham has Eucharistic content since it prefigures the sacrifice of Christ,[1411] but this proximity could be also explained by the fact that in the *Protevangelion*, Anna recalls Sarah in her lament over her sterility.[1412] The image of Anna in Hagioi Anargyroi may be, similarly to Carpignano, the result of male patronage although the wife of the donor (Theodore Lemniotes) was called Anna,[1413] and both of them are depicted with their son on either side of the Virgin.[1414] As I mentioned in chapter three, Mary was the accustomed figure to intercede in problems related to childbirth and the iconography in Hagioi Anargyroi is the visual equivalent of this tendency.

Additionally, in the church of St Stephen in Kastoria two depictions of Anna survive from the second half of the thirteenth century.[1415] They are located in the nave

---

in the same location remain closely related across time.

[1409] Pelekanides and Chatzidakis 1985: 25 no 127, for the date see p. 28. See also Gerstel 1998: 97; Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992 :39; Malmquist 1979: 19 no 81,p.23; The connection of St Anna with the churches of Kastoria continues in the post- Byzantine period, as we see from the number of churches dedicated to the saint, some of them built on early Christian churches, Papazotos 1994:164, but most of them have now been destroyed (Papazotos 1994:113 n. 38), such as in Metropole (Papazotos 1994:161) and Profitis Ilias (Papazotos 1994:162).

[1410] Skawran 1982:172.

[1411] Corrigan 1992:54.

[1412] De Strycker (ed.) 1961:74.

[1413] Pelekanides and Chatzidakis 1985:22; Darling 2004:17-9.

[1414] Panayotidi 2006:157-167, esp.159-162.

[1415] Pelekanides and Chatzidakis 1985:11; Gerstel 1998:96; Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992:44. Orlandos dates it to the fourteenth century, see Orlandos 1938:124. Paintings survive from the tenth century in St Stephen, see Wharton- Epstein 1980:190.

above the Crucifixion scene on the western wall, on both sides of the piers, which divide the window that looks to the interior of the gallery.[1416] The two depictions are placed side by side; in the first depiction, Anna is similarly to Kurbinovo nursing Mary and in the second one Anna is depicted alone (Fig. 57).[1417] Anna is also depicted holding Mary in her left arm in the conch of the apse chapel dedicated to Anna. Orlandos mistakenly argued that this theme is uncommon in Byzantine art (Fig. 58).[1418] Orlandos was the first to note that the level over the narthex was dedicated to St Anna and was used by women,[1419] and his arguments were accepted by modern scholars such as Gerstel who adds that the chapel of Anna is 'filled with painted images of maternity'.[1420] In the church of St Stephen the wife of the donor (Constantine) is also named Anna.[1421]

In both St Stephen and Hagioi Anargyroi the iconography shows that we are dealing with cases of name conjuction, as we saw in Carpignano for example. The patronage in St Stephen and Hagioi Anargyroi resembles the patronage of Justinian II, who according to the *Patria*, brought the body and the maphorion of the saint and built a church dedicated to her after his wife had dreamt of the saint, and that of Leo VI who built a chapel of St Anna in the palace next to his wife's vestiary. These cases together with the image and dedicatory inscription next to the portrait of St Anna in Carpignano verifies that this is actually male request (or even indirect female patronage) practised by the husbands of the women who relied to the saint either to secure childbirth, or in thanks for their child or for healing.

Another 'image of maternity' survives in St Nicholas Orphanos in Thessalonike (first decades of the fourteenth century),[1422] where a monumental image of Anna holding

---

[1416] Orlandos 1938:122, fig. 84.
[1417] Pelekanides and Chatzidakis 1985:8-9 nos η, θ. Orlandos 1938:123 fig. 85.
[1418] Orlandos 1938:123.
[1419] ibid. 122.
[1420] Gerstel 1998: 96.
[1421] Pelekanides and Chatzidakis 1985: 11.
[1422] Xyngopoulos 1964:26-7.

the infant Mary is located in the northern aisle.[1423] Anna holds Mary with both arms, and similarly to Kurbinovo, Studenica and Kastoria she is leaning her head to the left and Mary reaches her mother's cheek (Fig. 59).[1424] They both wear a white head-cover, only Anna's is more elaborated with pears on its edges.[1425] This representation of Anna and Mary in the Holy Apostles, dated from the second half of the fourteenth century, are the only surviving portraits of Mary and her mother in Thessalonike.[1426] Kirchhainer sees this portrait as a variation of Mary's Eleousa type,[1427] which is an alternative form of Deesis.[1428]

Anna's depictions in Saint Nicholas Orphanos blend maternity and intercession. The supplicational role of Anna is first attested in Cappadocia, in the Pala d' Oro, and in the chapel of St John Theologos in the Mavriotissa church (twelfth-century), where Anna and Joachim are located on the middle zone of the southern wall.[1429] Joachim is depicted full standing, blessing with his right hand, and holding a scroll in his left hand. Anna is located above the window of the same wall making a gesture of supplication (Figs 60-1). Apart from imitating a posture often taken by the Virgin, Anna could be also functioning as a one of 'mediating saints' who are depicted extending their arms in supplication,[1430] similarly to Sts Paraskeve, Kyriake, Anastasia, Eudokia, Marina and Anna Euphemianos in Cappadocia.[1431]

In the church dedicated to the Resurrection of Christ in Veroia (late thirteenth or early fourteenth century) Anna is depicted next to Zacharias, holding the infant Mary on the southeastern corner of the southern exterior, above Mary's Koimesis (Fig. 62).[1432] The

---

[1423] ibid. 72 fig.141; Gerstel 1998: 97.
[1424] Tsitrouridou 1986: 197 (EZ.6), pl.100.
[1425] For headcovers of women of the Byzantine aristocracy, see Emmanuel 1994:113-120.
[1426] Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992 :47.
[1427] Kirchhainer 2001:123.
[1428] Zervou Tognazzi 1990:408.
[1429] Moutsopoulos 1967: 24 no 16-7 and fig 31. See also Wharton-Epstein's drawing no VII for their location in the church in Wharton-Epstein 1980:204-6.
[1430] Zervou Tognazzi 1990:401.
[1431] Jerphanion 1938:302.
[1432] Gerstel 1998:109; Kallierges 1973:17,90, table 1 no 80.St.

relationship of Anna to Zacharias is established in two ways: through Zacharias' fatherhood to John the Forerunner, Christ's cousin, thus this image promotes Christ's humanity; or it is established through Zacharias' role as a priest and as the one who took Mary in his hands during her entrance to the Holy of Holies. However, it seems that the first connection is more plausible as the iconography of Santa Maria Antiqua shows, where Anna is placed next to John the Forerunner, son of Zacharias. The close thematic relation of Mary's parents to Christ's humanity and Incarnation is also demonstrated in the church of the Saviour in Veroia by their placement close to the Mandylion where Joachim holds a closed scroll and Anna is depicted in advanced age praying.[1433] The proximity of Anna and Joachim to the Mandylion is favorite theme of Cretan churches, as we will see shortly.

Peloponnese

Despite the Latin occupation from 1204 onwards the iconography of the Peloponnese follows the trends of Byzantine iconography.[1434] Anna's motherhood, and Christological associations dominate the images of Anna and Joachim.

Gerstel argues that the depictions of Anna as a mother holding the Virgin implies a female audience, that they were destined to be viewed by female population, because of the saint's association with childbirth.[1435] This tendency is first attested in the images of Anna with Mary and Elizabeth in Santa Maria Antiqua where the right aisle was destined for women.[1436] The same association is made clear in Carpignano by the dedicatory inscription, but the connection with children belongs to the wider framework of Anna's promotion as the mother of the Theotokos as we saw in Rome and Faras.

[1433] Tsitouridou-Turbié 2000:341 and pl. 45. As it is the case with the Boyana church, this one was placed in a funeral context (Tsitouridou-Turbié 2000:342) hence its emphasis on the Incarnation of Christ and the mystery of salvation.

[1434] For the impact of the Fourth Crusade on the art of the Peloponnesse, see Kalopissi-Verti 2007: 63-88.

[1435] See chapter two part three.

[1436] Lycey 1999: 87.

In the church of St John the Theologian (thirteenth century) in Argolid,[1437] Anna leans her head to the left holding Mary on her left arm, and Joachim stands next to them (Figs 63-4).[1438] Similar depictions are found in the church of the Koimesis of Mary in Ellinika Antheias in Messenia (thirteenth century) (Fig. 65),[1439] and in the church of Sts. Sergios and Bacchos (1262-85) in Mani.[1440] In the church of Panagia also in Chrysapha Anna is once again depicted holding Mary on the northern wall of the nave under the Presentation of Mary to the Temple.[1441] I remind the reader that an iconic portrait of Anna and Mary within a Presentation scene is attested in the same century in Ethiopia. Finally, in the church of St John Theologos in Kranidi (thirteenth century), Anna is depicted on the southern wall holding Mary and next to her is Joachim (Fig. 66). Both figures are standing and accompanied by military saints.[1442]

The connection between Anna and John the Forerunner (Baptist) we saw in Karabas Kilise, in the chapel of St Theodore (Tagar), in Karanlik Kilise, in Yilanli Kilise, in the Koimesis church in Nicaea and on the Pala d'Oro is also attested in the church of St Nicholaos in Geraki (end of the thirteenth century). On the western side of the templon Christ and Mary are depicted enthroned and are accompanied by John the Baptist and St Anna, who is depicted frontal and standing (Fig. 67).[1443] We saw earlier that in the seventh-century life of St Artemios, a woman named Anna used to light a lamp before the icon of John the Baptist.[1444] I argued earlier that women named Anna are often placed within the context of praying in a church and we saw in Cappadocia that the connection of St Anna to

---

[1437] Panselinou 1992:165.

[1438] ibid. 161.

[1439] Kalokyres 1973:114-5.

[1440] Gerstel 1998: 97. Similar depiction is attested in the church of the Transfiguration in Koropi (South-Eastern Attica), Gerstel 1998:97 n.40.

[1441] Albani 2000:39 no 59 (Anna and Mary), no 60 (Mary's entrance in the Temple), 37-38 no 59.

[1442] Chatzedakes 1967: 23 pl.30a.

[1443] Moutsopoulos and Dimitrokalles 1981:233 fig.40; Haustein-Bartsch 2007:102; For the date of the iconography, see Moutsopoulos and Dimitrokalles 1981:73; Based on its similarity with the portrait of Mary in the church of St. John Theologos in Patmos Orlandos dates it to 1185-1190.

[1444] Crisafulli and Nesbitt **(eds)** 1997:176-7. This story is used to support the rise of image-worshipping in the seventh century, see **Cameron 1992:** 5. See also Calofonos 1984:215-220.

John the Baptist is made through the Deesis scene in the church of St Nicholas in Geraki. The miracle from the life Artemios suggests that this connection might have been much earlier than we thought, since if the relation between Anna in the life of artemios Artemios and St Anna was intentional, Anna's role as a mediator had begun as early as the seventh century. Finally, Joachim and Anna are also found in two churches of Sparta dated to last quarter of the thirteenth century, in Hagioi Saranta, where Anna is depicted holding a cross in her right hand and has her palm open toward the spectator (Fig. 68),[1445] and in the church of Prodromos (Fig. 69-70).[1446]

The promotion of Christ's humanity and his genealogical relationship to Mary's parents in particular is shown in the church of John Prodromos in Chrysapha of Lakonia (last quarter of the thirteenth century),[1447] where Joachim is depicted under the Nativity of Christ.[1448] The lack of space dictated their placement not in columns (where Anna was located in Cappadocia) but on the northern wall.[1449] Anna's upper half has not survived but it is very unlikely that another female saint accompanied Joachim as he is never depicted on his own.[1450] He is blessing with his right hand and is holding a scroll with his left.[1451] Gerstel has argued this is the single case of a full-length figure of Joachim in Greece.[1452] However, Joachim's depiction at Chrysapha makes the depictions two. In this representation, Anna would have been depicted holding Mary on her rigth arm, next to St Joachim.[1453] We have seen other depictions of Joachim, in Cappadocia in particular, where Joachim holds a scroll and blesses while Anna holds a cross. Joachim's depiction in this

---

[1445] Bakourou 1980: pl.68.
[1446] Drandakes 1991: 180.
[1447] ibid. 193.
[1448] Drandakes 1991:191-2.
[1449] For a plan of the church, see Drandakes 1991: 179.
[1450] In the 22nd Intenrational Congress of Byzantine Studies in Sofia, Dionysios Mourelatos presented an icon possibly of the thirteenth century of Joachim worshipping Mary. This is the only image I am aware of where Joachim is depicted without Anna. For this icon, see p. 281.
[1451] Drandakes 1991:186.
[1452] Gerstel 1998: 97.
[1453] Drandakes 1991:187.

form imitates the iconography of prophets who hold scrolls with text from the Old Testament that prophesised the coming of Christ, and Anna testifies to the glory of Christ. The images in Chrysapha are purely Christological: Joachim acts as a prophet whose parenthood resulted in the Incarnation of Christ. I argued earlier that the reason for the composition of homilies on Mary's early life is placed in the framework of iconophilia when the human side of Christ had to be defended. The depiction at Chrysapha is the visual equivalent of this ideology.

Finally, in the church of Kyriake in Myrtia (fourteenth century, Mistras) Joachim and Anna are located in the proximity of a Christogram.[1454] A similar context is attested in the church of Sts Theodoroi in Kaphiona (end of thirteenth or, beginning of the fourteenth century) (Fig. 71).[1455] Here, medallions of Joachim and Anna frame the Holy Mandylion and under them, the Annunciation of Mary is depicted, a theme often attested in the churches of Crete.[1456]

In the Hodegetria church (Aphentiko, thirteenth century) in Mistras,[1457] Bakourou assumes that the female saint holding a cross and wearing a white heardcover is St Anna.[1458] We saw St Anna wearing a white headcover in the fourteenth century in St Nicholas Orphanos in Thessalonike. Women of the Byzantine aristocracy wore headcovers,[1459] and this allusion may be intended here, or the cloth could be a pictorial reference to the royal headcover that Anna wore and removed after the rejection of the gifts, as the *Protevangelion* informs us.[1460]

[1454] Bakourou 1980:139.
[1455] Drandakes 1995a:100.
[1456] ibid. 77 and pl. 7 no 4-5.
[1457] Bakourou 1981:141.
[1458] ibid. 141 pl.78b.
[1459] Emmanuel 1994:113-120.
[1460] De Strycker (ed.) 1961:70.

In the Pantanassa church (fifteenth century),[1461] also in Mistras, Anna and Joachim are located in the main apse under Mary holding Christ and two angels (Fig. 72).[1462] The prominent position Anna and Joachim receive in this church is due to the dedication of the church to Mary (Pantanassa = queen of all),[1463] and emphasizes once again the strong association between Christ and his forebearers (Figs 73-4). Their placement in the apse in the Pantanassa and the depiction of Anna with her right palm toward the spectator and a cross in her left hand in the cave-church of Hagioi Saranta in Lakonia (end of the thirteenth century),[1464] as well as Anna's placement next to St Marina in the church of Hodegetria (1311) in Spilies (Fig. 75), and the church of Prodromos (mentioned earlier) are two details we already saw in Martorana (Sicily) in the twelfth-century. The placement of Anna next to St Marina is attested for the first time in Carpignano. Since the two saints are celebrated with one day difference but in two different calendars, Byzantine (for Anna) and Latin (for Marina) this suggests that local celebration followed a calendar that merged a Byzantine and a Western practice, as mentioned. The presence of a strong western population in Lakonia and the Peloponnese in general after 1204 must have been the reason for the recurrence of this proximity. Both Anna and Marina hold a cross in their right hand and have their palm open toward the spectator.[1465]

To sum up, similarly to Cappadocia, in mainland Greece a great number of portraits of Anna and Mary have survived, but unlike Cappadocia Joachim is almost never depicted outside the Marian cycle. In contrast to Eastern Europe where Mary's parents usually accompany larger scenes, in mainland of Greece Anna is often depicted as a mother holding Mary in her arms. This theme is the earliest image of St Anna, as the examples from Santa Maria Antiqua, Paros, Carpignano and Cappadocia have shown.

[1461] Dufrenne 1970:9.
[1462] ibid. pl.21 no 2-3.
[1463] Debiasi Gonzato (ed.) 1966:119 (kontakion on the prefeast of Mary's Nativity).
[1464] Bakourou 1980:166, pl.68.
[1465] Ioannou 1959: pl. 73.

Greek islands (excluding Crete)

The geographical distribution of the depictions of Mary's parents in both mainland Greece and the islands show that they are accumulated in the southern part of the country, mainly the Peloponnese, the Cyclades (Andros, Naxos, Sikinos, Santorini, Mykonos) the Dodecanese (Patmos, Rhodes), the Eptanisa (Kithyra) and Crete.[1466] A few examples are attested in the northern part of the country, in Macedonia and the Peloponnese while no single case is found in central Greece and only one case in the Ionian islands. The greatest number of depictions are located in areas held by the Franks after 1204 but this does not apply everywhere, namely in the Ionian Sea the Western presence was also significant but few depictions survive. In the Cyclades, a growing number of frescoes appear in the second half of the thirteenth century and in some cases for the first time, which is not connected with the presence of the Latins (Venetians in this case) since after 1261 the Byzantine state verified its authority on the region by signing an agreement with Mario Sanudo, dux of the archipelago to which Cyclades belonged.[1467] Nevertheless, the case of the Peloponnese and Crete where the greatest number of depictions are attested, implies that art production was closely associated with the Latin presence, despite the fact that in the Peloponnese the depictions strongly rely on Byzantine models. The connotations attached to St Anna in the Greek islands are not different from

---

[1466] Dresken-Weiland refers to Papageorgiou's article that the earliest depictions of Joachim and Anna are two medallions in the church of Solomoni in Komē tou Gialou in Cyprus (Papageorgiou 1969: 282-4). Based on stylistic affinities with other monuments he dates them to the seventh- or eight century (Dresken-Weiland 2005:59) but raises doubts that the saints depicted are Mary's parents since he claims that 'their sandals are too big and their garments too short', see Dresken-Weiland 2005:47 n. 38. Without explaining how a medallion should include anything else than the upper torso, Papageorgiou (whom Dresken-Weiland uses as a source) nowhere in this article mentions medallions of Anna, but only the scene of the Meeting of Anna and Joachim. See Papageorgiou 1969:284, where he refers to the depictions of the western wall.
Churches which served as katholika were dedicated to Anna by the thirteenth century in the island of Kea, see Kalopissi-Verti 2000:133; Mitsani 2000:98.
[1467] Mario Sanudo took over Naxos and the most important islands of the Cyclades, Setton 1969:238.

what we have seen so far in other locations in and outside Greece, namely motherly, supplicational and Christological associations dominate Anna's and Joachim's depictions.

Medallions of Anna and Joachim are located in the inner narthex of the eleventh-century katholikon of Nea Moni in the island of Chios (Fig. 76).[1468] Their medallions are attested in the pendentives under the presentation of Mary Blachernitissa before a medallion of Christ in the late twelfth- or early thirteenth-century church of Taxiarches in Andros.[1469] As mentioned earlier, the placement of Anna and Joachim in the pendentives aims at the glorification of Christ and the emphasis on his humanity prophecised in the Old Testament.

A number of churches dedicated to Anna and depictions survive on the island of Euboea. According to Ioannou, the proximity of the Euboean churches is explained by the fact that nine out of ten churches have been constructed within twenty five kilometres in length and fifteenth kilometres in width, and are painted between the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Ioannou advocates that this proximity reflects the social and financial well-being of the population of the island of Euboea and the relative religious freedom the Orthodox enjoyed.[1470] However, I think that the arrangement of Euboean churches around a nucleus may be an indication of the opposite, that the church or donor did not feel secure enough to construct a free-standing church of the saint elsewhere. Nevertheless, the appearance in a certain geographical area of a number of churches dedicated to Anna after the Venetian occupation of the island, indicates at least in terms of financial well being that it was probably connected with the Latin presence on the island, since as it will be shown the depictions of Anna multiply after the thirteenth century in Greece.[1471]

[1468] Mouriki 1985: 70, pls. 67, 69, 213, 215; Orlandos 1930:pl.24.2.
[1469] Skawran 1982:176.
[1470] Ioannou 1959:viii; Georgopoulou-Verra 1977:9-10. Euboea belonged to the juridiction of Venice and Achaia (Greece), see Setton 1969:240.
[1471] Anna's relics discussed in chapter one, the two churches dedicated to St Anna by the Crusaders in the Holy Land and a few images later in this chapter, underline the role of Anna for the West as early as the eighth century.

In St Nicholas in Pyrgos (thirteenth century), Anna holds Mary on her left side leaning her head to the left (Fig. 77).[1472] Emmanuel mistakenly noted that Anna holding Mary to her left is uncommon in Byzantine art,[1473] but it is attested in the church of Koimesis in Oxylinthos and the church of Metamorphosis in Pyrgi (thirteenth century),[1474] where Anna, depicted with dark wrinkled skin to show her advanced age,[1475] is placed under the scene of the Lament and next to the military saints Theodore Stratelates and Theodore Teron; she holds Mary in her left arm and looks to the left (Fig. 78).[1476] The association of Mary's parents with the military saints Theodore Stratelates and Theodore Teron may derive from the fact that these two military saints were considered defenders of faith and thus their depiction had an apotropaic character or from the fact that they sometimes assume the role of martyrs, the very first defenders of the Christian faith.[1477]

Supplicational connotations are made in two churches of Euboea, the Koimesis church in Oxylinthos and the church of St Nicholas in Geraki. In the first case, Joachim and Anna are placed in the narthex under the scene of Abraham's hospitality.[1478] Apart from having prophesied Mary's coming, Abraham is associated (when depicted with the Mandylion) with the Incarnation (when depicted in Isaac's sacrifice), with the Eucharist and the Crucifixion.[1479] Anna opens her arms in supplication and she is placed on the right and Joachim to the left (Fig. 79). In the same church, Anna is portrayed possibly next to St Paraskeve, and is standing holding Mary on her left arm (Fig. 80).[1480] In the second church, which dates, around 1280,[1481] Joachim is placed to the right and Anna is portrayed as a

---

[1472] Ioannou 1959: pl. 3; Gerstel 1998: 97.
[1473] Emmanuel 1991:147-8.
[1474] Georgopoulou-Verra 1977:10.
[1475] ibid.:21 n.73.
[1476] ibid:21, pl. 7b;Ioannou 1959: pl.54.
[1477] Walter 2002:61.
[1478] Emmanuel 1991:147 and pl. 73.
[1479] Velmans 1995: 183.
[1480] Emmanuel 1991:147-8 and pl. 77.
[1481] Gkiaouri 1977:114, pl.38a-b.

young woman,[1482] and she is placed to the left of St Nicholas.[1483] Similarly to martyrs, they both hold triple crosses in their right hand (Figs 81-2).[1484] Giaouri adds that their placement next to St Nicholas give the depiction a supplicational tone.[1485] St Nicholas was also considered as protector of orphan children,[1486] thus we are probably dealing once again with another votive image for the protection of a child or childbirth.

We do not see in the Greek islands the iconographical variations we saw in Cappadocia. In Euboea, the proximity of a few churches dedicated resulted in the repetition of Anna's depiction holding Mary on her left arm. The fact that this portrait is repeated three times in Euboea, nowhere in mainland Greece and it will appear again in Crete, is the result of two possible reasons: the fact that the same workshop/painter was responsible for their decoration or that it was a theme preferred by the Latins. However, since the preference of themes in Crete is different, I am inclined to think that the wealth the Latins offered to the island was the reason for the painting of a number of churches and not the selection of the imagery per se, since it follows the trends of Byzantine iconography.

Crete

The depictions of Mary's parents in and outside the Marian cycle in Crete date from the early thirteenth century but they rapidly multiply from the beginning of the fourteenth century. The late appearance of Anna's depictions needs to be placed in the general framework of Eastern and Western alienation in the thirteenth century, which

---

[1482] ibid. 105.
[1483] ibid. 95.
[1484] ibid. pl 38b, and p. 105. The association of the cross with martyrs must originate from the association of their martyrdom for Christ with the association of the cross with his own martyrdom, see Charalampidis 2007:80-2 figs 4-5, p. 95.
[1485] Gkiaouri 1977:105.
[1486] Tsitouridou 1986: 35; Miller 2003:229.

changed as soon as the Byzantine traditions started being manipulated by the Venetians,[1487] and resulted in the loosening of the tensions in the course of the fourteenth,[1488] although they never entirely disappear.[1489] The uneasy alliance between the two religions found its expression in art. Vassilakis-Mavrakakis has argued that the surviving material creates a distorted image, because no painted decoration survives from the urban centres of Crete and that it is usually found in the churches of the countryside.[1490] Overall, we are dealing with monuments of a more conservative style,[1491] despite their influence by the three major artistic centres, Constantinople, Thessalonike and Serbia.[1492]

Christological associations: Anna and Joachim and the Mandylion

The preferred non-narrative themes in the churches of Crete are Anna holding Mary, the two of them together, and Joachim and Anna in medallions. Less frequently, we find depictions of Anna or Joachim standing or Anna suckling Mary. They are mostly associated with parenthood and the Incarnation of Christ and the new element in their iconography is that in Crete the message of the Incarnation is transmitted through the placement of Anna's and Joachim's busts near the altar and particularly near the Holy Mandylion (known as the Holy Face) and the Holy Kerameion (= tile).[1493]

The well studied motif of the Mandylion,[1494] a beloved theme in the iconography of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Crete,[1495] depicts the face of Jesus, which

---

[1487] Georgopoulou 1995: 3. For iconographical themes that entered in fifteenth-century Crete to promote the union of the two churches, see Gkioles 2004:278-9.

[1488] Neff 1999:17; Maderakis 2002:129.

[1489] Gkioles 2004:279-280.

[1490] Vassilaki 2007: 35; Vassilakis-Mavrakakis 1982:302. However, Chatzidakes argues that the location is not always the reason for their conservative style but it is a choice to ignore new iconographical tendencies. See Chatzedakes 1952:85.

[1491] Vassilakis-Mavrakakis 1982:302; Kalokyres 1954:389,396.

[1492] Bissinger 1995: 111.

[1493] Grabar 1931:25;Velmans 1995:173 in this case Velmans says it is depicted above or on top of the doors; Nicolaïdès 1996:205.

[1494] Grabar 1931; Gerstel 1998 and the included bibliography.

[1495] During that period the Mandylion is depicted fifty-three times in the churches of Crete, see Passarelli 2007:110.

is reflected in the vespers of the feast of the Holy Mandylion : 'You took the shape of the icon which you made look alike to the archetype'.[1496]

The first example where the Mandylion associated with Mary and Joachim in Crete, is found in the church of Mary (1444) in Monofatsi, Herakleion, Joachim is accompanied by Anna who is holding Mary and the three of them are depicted close to the Mandylion.[1497] Six medallions are under them, two of which depict John of Damaskos and Joseph the Hymnographer. These are the only identifiable figures, which led Spatharakis to suggest that six humnographers must have been depicted there.[1498] Joseph the Hymnographer in particular wrote kontakia on Mary's Nativity,[1499] and on Anna's Conception,[1500] and John on Damaskos dedicated a homily on Mary's Nativity and dedicated a few lines on the Probatike and the life of Mary's parents in his works. Taking into consideration that both John of Damaskos and Joseph the Hymnographer have dedicated works on Mary's and St Anna's life it is very probable that the rest of the poets originally included had composed works for St Anna or Mary.

In the church of St John in Voroi Pyrgiotissis, the busts of Joachim and Anna are placed between the Mandylion and the Kerameion.[1501] Medallions of Anna and Joachim are also found in the sanctuary of the church of Koimesis in Alikampos Apokoronou dated by an inscription to 1315/6,[1502] and in the church of Our Lady Kalyviani in Kalyvia (1300), where they are placed on the Eastern wall on either side of the Mandylion.[1503] Lymberopoulou justifies the presence of the medallions by the dedication

---

[1496] 'Σύ γάρ τήν σήν εἰκόνα μορφωσάμενος , αὐτήν πρός τό ἀρχέτυπον ἀνήγαγες' , see Lagges 1984: 264 (Menaion, August 16).
[1497] Spatharakis 2001:195.
[1498] ibid. 196.
[1499] Tomadakes 1971:109; Sophronios 1937:14-5.
[1500] Tomadakes 1971:205, 227; Sophronios 1937:428; Szöverffy 1979:29.
[1501] Papadaki-Ökland 1966:432. The Kerameion appears from the twelfth century onwards and it was considered a Constantinopolitan relic brought to the city by Nikephoros Phokas in the tenth century. See Grabar 1931: 24.
[1502] Lymberopoulou 2006:131.
[1503] Papadaki-Ökland 1966:433.

of the church to Mary.[1504] However as we will see below they are also found in churches dedicated to St George, to St Demetrios and to the Saviour.

Christological associations: Anna and Joachim, the Mandylion and Mary's Annunciation

The Mandylion appeared in the tenth century,[1505] but artistic evidence mainly from the twelfth century onwards shows that in several regions of the Byzantine Empire the Mandylion was placed in the sanctuary and in association with the Annunciation of Mary, because it was this event that announced the Incarnation of the Logos.[1506] The Virgin's work on the veil of the temple is an activity coincident with the Incarnation, because it produces the thread for the veil of the Temple and the labour of Mary's hand symbolises the activity of the womb,[1507] which is a reason why Mary is depicted spinning in front of her house.[1508] Patristic, monastic and hagiographical texts appropriate the image of a spinning woman as a symbol of female saints' virginal purity and feminine piety.[1509] Purity, however, was never a stressed characteristic of Mary's mother who in her Annunciation is always depicted in a garden; instead the common element shared by the two Annunciations is that Byzantine sermons were both embellished with metaphors of renewal and fertility.[1510]

From the last decade of the thirteenth and until the middle of the fifteenth-century six examples of Mary's parents associated with the Holy Mandylion, the Holy

---

[1504] Lymberopoulou 2006:131.
[1505] Grabar 1931:25-6.
[1506] ibid. 24; Gerstel 1999:70; Peers 2004:128;Velmans 1995: 178-9; Evagelatou 2003: 261-279; Passarelli 2007: 106; Thierry 2002:125.
[1507] Gerstel 2007:174. For other locations in the church where the Mandylion is depicted, see Demetrokalles 1986:156-7.
[1508] Maguire 1981:47; Badalanova-Geller 2004:211-260.
[1509] Evangelatou 2006:241; Kuchenbuch 1991:145-7; Bitel 2002:214; Kalokyres 1954 :397.
[1510] Maguire 1981: 47. In the twelfth-century church of Mary Damiotissa in Naxos, the Mandylion is placed under the Presentation of Mary. See Skarwan 1982:181.

Kerameion and Mary's Annunciation are attested in Cretan churches.[1511] The first example comes from the church of St George in Selino in Chania (1290-1291). The Mandylion is depicted in the sanctuary; underneath it are Sts Joachim and St Anna and underneath them lies Mary's Annunciation.[1512] The same theme occurs in the church of St Demetrios (1292-3) in the same village, but here the positions of Anna and Joachim are reversed.[1513] In the church of Saviour in Kissamos (1319-1320) in Chania, we find Joachim and Anna in the sanctuary under the Mandylion, which is depicted on the triumphal arch framing Archangel Michael.[1514] Below them, two unidentified figures have been placed where usually the Annunciation of Mary is located, a combination which according to Spatharakis is rare and owes its influence to the West.[1515] In the fifteenth-century church of Panagia at Kavousi (Crete) scenes from the life of the Virgin have been inserted in the Akathistos cycle, which, as Spatharakis notes, do not belong there. Above the Conception of Christ, Joachim in the Desert and Mary's Nativity emphasize once more the humanity of Mary and of Christ.[1516]

Anna as a mother

According to Gerola, no depiction of Mary's parents survive from the thirteenth century on the island.[1517] Modern research however dates the earliest representations of

---

[1511] For the association between the Annunciation of Mary and Christ's humanity, see Papastaurou 2007: 227-240.

[1512] Spatharakis 2001: 12.

[1513] ibid. 16-7. Spatharakis argues that these iconographical peculiarites suggest an influence from Western iconography, see Spatharakis 2001:58.

[1514] ibid. 56; Bissinger 1995:106; Papadaki-Ökland,1966:431 pl. 468b.

[1515] Spatharakis 2001:57.

[1516] Spatharakis 2005:41. Xyngopoulos has argued that the placement of Matthew and John in the eastern side of the nave, close to the sanctuary of the church of Holy Apostles in Thessalonike, is justified by the fact Matthew in his work has emphasized the human side of Christ and John's Gospel on Christ's spiritual side. The fact that they are near the Mandylion could provide an association between these three, but, as he notes, this cannot be proved. See Xyngopoulos 1953:44-5.

[1517] Gerola 1908: 299.

Anna to the beginning of the thirteenth century; it is found in the churches of St Panteleimon in Bizariano (Herakleion).[1518]

In this church, Anna stands between two warrior saints and holds Mary on her left arm, and is, similarly to Kurbinovo, Nereditsa and Kastoria, leaning her head to the left.[1519] The depiction of Anna holding Mary on her left arm and surrounded by warrior saints is also attested in the churches of Euboea.[1520] In the church of the Transfiguration in Kissamos in Chania (1362), where Anna is depicted holding Mary, Spatharakis notes that the exceptional place that St Andrew is given on the right hand side of the half cylinder of the apse is possibly because Andrew of Crete was one the first churchmen to write a kanon on St Anna's Conception and homilies on Mary's Nativity.[1521]

The rare theme of Anna suckling the Virgin, depicted swaddled on her mother's left arm, is attested in the church of the Saviour (1389) in Akoumia (Rethymno).[1522] In this church, Anna is shown sitting on a throne, which we encounter very rarely,[1523] but which is also attested in the churches of St Vlasios and Mary in Kythira and the early-fifteenth century frescoes of Peribleptos in Mystra.[1524] In the church of Mary at Fodele in Malevizi (1323),[1525] Anna holds Mary on her right arm is adjacent to a depiction of St Menas with an image of Christ in his mantle.[1526] Outside Greece, the same theme is attested in the church of the Forty Martyrs in Tirnovo (1230) in Bulgaria, where St Anna and Elizabeth respectively suckle the Virgin Mary and St John the Forerunner.[1527] Finally, in the church

---

[1518] Skarwan 1982:182;Gerstel 1998: 97.
[1519] Skawran 1982: fig.413.
[1520] See p. 268.
[1521] Spatharakis 2001:7.
[1522] Bissinger 1995:191,1389; Spatharakis 2001:128. Anna's depiction brings to mind the fourteenth-century icon from Venice, today in the Marcian Museum of Venice, see Geymonat 2005:564 fig.29.
[1523] Spatharakis 2001:130.
[1524] Lasareff 1938:33.
[1525] Spatharakis 2001:69.
[1526] ibid. 67.
[1527] Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992 : 44; Lasareff 1938:33. Similar depictions are attested in Santa Maria Antiqua and Cappadocia.

of Archangel Michael (fourteenth century), in Kissamos Anna is suckling Mary (Fig. 84).[1528] The depictions of Anna and Elizabeth we saw in eighth-century Paros and Santa Maria Antiqua is repeated here although in Paros the mothers are not suckling their children. Although this theme appears only four times, it clearly lasted across the Byzantine period.

In the church of St John in Kritsa, in Lassithi (1389-1390) Anna holds the Virgin in her right arm and brings her face close to hers, imitating the type of the Virgin Glykophilousa,[1529] and in St George at Ano Viannos (1401) (Herakleion) Anna places Mary in front of her chest (a depiction first attested in Santa Maria Antiqua and in Paros) and is followed by other female saints such as Marina and Anastasia.[1530] The pairing of Anna and Marina is attested in Carpignano and Anna's placement next to both Marina and Anastasia was first attested in Cappadocia.[1531]

In the southern chapel dedicated to St Anna in the church of Mary in Kritsa (1305-1310),[1532] Anna is portrayed alone looking to the left raising her hands (in the type of Platytera) in the chapel's apse; she imitates the supplicational role and the position that Mary takes when depicted in the main apse (Fig. 85).[1533] The northern chapel (dedicated to St Antonios) contains portraits of donors George, his wife and child. Their images should be connected to the southern chapel dedicated to Anna because of the association of Anna with the protection of children.[1534] Thus the practise initiated in the ninth century in Italy (Carpignano), where a family associated with patronage of St Anna's portrait is repeated in the fourteenth–century Venetian held Crete.

[1528] Passarelli 2007: fig. 140.
[1529] Spatharakis 2001:135.
[1530] ibid. 149.
[1531] Jerphanion 1938:302.
[1532] For the dedicatory inscription, see Kalokyres 1980: 85; Chatzedakes 1952:61 who read it as '1292'.
[1533] Kalokyres 1980:42, fig.32; Borboudakes 1972: pl. 621a; Chatzedakes 1952:61.
[1534] Chatzedakes 1952: 62.

In the nave of the same church, Anna holds Virgin Mary on her right arm and next to them is Andrew of Crete, who, as we saw earlier, has written kontakia on Anna's Conception and has been also depicted in the church of the Transfiguration in Kissamos.[1535] Only in Crete do we find such an emphasis on composers of hymns to St Anna. As the three examples demonstrate, painters in Crete were particularly prone to portraying the hymnographers of earlier periods, namely John of Damaskos, Andrew of Crete and Joseph the Hymnographer. This might have been directed by the popularity of the saint in the island since he was originally from Crete or in particular by the fact that churchmen were responsible for the painted decoration of the three churches in question.

In the church of St Anna at Anisaraki in Chania (1357),[1536] Anna is depicted as a young woman holding Mary on her left arm (Hodegetria type) in the templon (Fig. 86).[1537] A seraph is painted above the two figures and two half figures of angels surround the upper part of the entrance.[1538] Gerstel has placed this representation in a group of devotional images,[1539] similarly to the votive icons we saw in Italy and in Greece in the middle Byzantine period.[1540] Joachim is depicted near Anna on the Northern wall, creating a 'holy family' portrait.[1541] He makes the gesture of blessing, which maybe be intended to glorify Anna, as Xanthaki notes,[1542] but may not, as she is shown making this gesture in Cappadocia.[1543] Anna is depicted once more at Anisaraki as a woman of advanced age suckling Mary, which is the only depiction in Crete of Anna's breastfeeding (Fig. 87).[1544]

[1535] Kalokyres 1980:77.
[1536] Xanthaki argues that the majority of scholars argue that the decoration of the church is dated to 1457 but that this is due to Gerola's wrong reading of the dedicatory inscription. See Xanthaki 2010:83-4.
[1537] Passarelli 2007:127 fig 136, p.129.
[1538] Spatharakis 2001: 207; Passarelli 2007:126 fig. 135,p. 129.
[1539] Gerstel 2007:138.
[1540] For the scenes from the Mariological cycle in the church at Anisaraki, see Xanthaki 2009:187-196.
[1541] Xanthaki 2010:78.
[1542] ibid. 72.
[1543] The glorification of Anna in Cappadocia has been defended also by Jolivet-Lévy but as mentioned I think it aims at glorifying Christ, not Anna.
[1544] Xanthaki 2010:73.

The similarities of this depiction with Western iconography can be attested if compared with Western contemporary images of Mary suckling Christ.[1545]

Additional depictions of Anna and Mary are found in St Dimitrios in Hondros Vianos (fourteenth-fifteenth century),[1546] and in the church of Anna in Kantanos (1457 or 1473).[1547] In Our Lady of Lambini (first half of the fourteenth century) Anna is located in the prothesis holding Mary, who holds a flower in her hand, which we will also see in an icon painted by Aggelos Akotantos (Fig. 88).[1548] Kalokyres correctly notes that the depiction in Kritsa of Anna holding Mary on her right arm, we saw earlier, is not common in Crete, since it is repeated only once more, here in Lambini.[1549] Finally, in the southern apse of the church of Virgin Kera in the Chromonastiri monastery (second half of the fourteenth century) Anna is depicted alone).[1550]

To sum up, the preference for the Mandylion is unique in Crete. The Mandylion, the Kerameion and Mary's parents are nowhere else in Byzantine art (or in areas artistically influenced by Byzantium), depicted so often in one location. The recognition of Anna's and Joachim's contribution to the soteriological plan for the salvation of humanity is made very clear in Cretan iconography. Christ's human side is demonstrated not only in connection to the Mandylion, the Kerameion and Mary's Annunciation but also in the number of portraits of Anna holding Mary. As stated earlier, Anna's depictions often carry multiple meanings, through the iconographical patterns associated with her often reinforce one another. Her placement in the proximity of the Mandylion and the emphasis on her motherhood stress Christ's humanity and concentrates on the role of his grandparents in making his humanity reality, while the associations we saw in Cappadocia is missing from Crete: there are no healing connotations, no glorification of Christ. Additionally, special

[1545] See Geymonat 2005:564, fig.29.
[1546] Borboudakes 1973: 601.
[1547] Lassithiotakis 1970:190.
[1548] Kalokyres 1972:95,104.
[1549] Kalokyres 1980:77 n. 182.
[1550] Papadaki-Ökland 1966:432.

veneration is paid to hymnographers and homilists who wrote on St Anna and the early life of Mary while the theme of Anna suckling does not appear often in a single location elsewhere in Greece. The special veneration of Anna in Crete is shown by the dedication of a chapel to her in Lady Kritsa where she is depicted as the Platytera in the apse following Mary's iconography.

The fact that in the West the cult of Anna was also established, thus the Westerners may have been responsible for the infiltration of some iconographical elements in Cretan iconography, such as the emphasis on maternity, may have been one of the reasons of the preference of a number of themes, however, as I explain in chapter five, the iconography of Anna in Byzantium depends on locality which means that the presence of the Westerns in the island cannot be used as the only reason behind the selection of certain themes. As in the case of Euboea, the financial prosperity of Crete resulted in the painting of the churches and I strongly believe that the spread of the cult of Anna in the West as the reason for the appearance of multiple depictions of the saint in the island should be treated with cautiousness.

Icons-Book covers

In the following and final section of this chapter, I have selected examples from icons and book-covers to discuss the ways in which Anna appears in these two media. As I show, the iconography does not change from what we have seen so far, however since the media is different, I have decided to divide this material from frescoes and mosaics, in the sense that a book and an icon have more private use than the iconographical cycle of churches and thus it reveals a deeper connection between the donor and the portayed saint.

Fulfilment of prophecies

In chapter two, I looked at Byzantine homilies and the way in which homilists presented the involvement of Mary's parents in the soteriological work of God. I argued that by giving birth to Mary, Anna and Joachim took active role in the fulfilment of *Old-Testament* prophecies on the coming of Christ to the world. Church decoration perpetuates this association and so do icons and book covers.

Old Testament figures together with 'biblical, poetic and liturgical inscriptions' constitute the decoration of a Constantinopolitan or Sinaic icon (1080-1130).[1551] One of the inscriptions quoted is a verse from Romanos Melodos' kontakion on Mary's Nativity: 'Joachim and Anne conceived and Adam and Eve were liberated'. Under the inscription, five figures are represented: Joseph, Mary's husband, stands in the middle holding a scroll, which exalts Mary's purity; He is flanked by Anna and Joachim who are flanked by Adam and Eve (Figs 89-90). The image 'links Old Testament vision to New Testament revelation and the Incarnation to the Second Coming',[1552] and promotes the destruction of sin and the rebirth of mankind achieved through Christ's birth, which we saw being promoted in Byzantine homilies.

On a late tenth- or early eleventh-century book cover of Constantinopolitan origin, Mary stands in the centre in praying position. Anna and Elisabeth are placed on the level of Mary's feet and Joachim, who is depicted among other male saints holding a red scroll, is placed on the lower level for reasons of symmetry. (Figs 91-92). Anna holds a cross with the left arm and similarly to Elisabeth opens her right palm outward similarly to her depictions in the Martorana and in the churches of Cappadocia. But in contrast to Cappadocia, Anna holds the cross in her left hand for reasons of symmetry since the other

---

[1551] ibid. 372.
[1552] Evans and Wixom 1997: 372.

276

figures (except for the archangels), have their right hands bare and so has Anna. The Virgin stands out as the second most important figure after Christ, and aside from the Virgin, Anna and Elizabeth are the only female saints included in the cover among the four evangelists, Church Fathers, apostles and prophets.[1553] The imagery alludes to those who prophesied or were part of the salvation of humanity through the Incarnation of Christ.[1554]

Anna's and Joachim's contribution to the Incarnation is underlined in a Kykkotisa type of icon from Sinai dating to second half of the twelfth century (Figs 93-4). Mary is enthroned in the centre holding Christ; Anna and Joachim are among the twenty pairs of saints placed along the bottom, under Mary's feet, to the right of Joseph, on the left side of whom left Adam and Eve are included.[1555] This is the earliest depiction of the theme of Ἄνωθεν οἱ Προφῆται (= the Prophets from above), where Mary is framed by prophets who hold scrolls with passages which refer to the Incarnation of the Logos.[1556] Similarly to the first icon discussed above the inscription under Mary's feet quote the same phrase from Romanos' kontakion on the Nativity of Mary.[1557]

On the right plate of a diptych (last quarter of the thirteenth century) in Sinai depicting the Virgin Kykkotissa, Anna and Joachim are placed on top of the icon on either side of Mary who is represented as 'the burning bush', an Old-Testament reference to Mary.[1558] Constantine the Great and his mother Helena are placed on the bottom of the icon.[1559] In this icon, biblical prefigurations of Mary are interwoven with the establishment of Christianity and the finding of the True Cross, which we have observed in monumental

---

[1553] ibid. 88.
[1554] Rice dates it to the twelfth century, see Rice 1959:322.
[1555] Nelsonand Collins 2006:107;Vokotopoulos 1995:196-7, fig. 22-3.
[1556] Vokotopoulos 1995:197.
[1557] ''Ἰωακείμ καί Ἄννα ὀνειδισμῷ ἀτεκνίας καί Ἀδάμ καί Εὔα ἐκ τῆς φθορᾶς τοῦ θανάτου ἠλευθερώθησαν, ἐν τῇ ἁγία γεννήσει σου', see Pitra (ed.) 1876:198-201; Nikolopoulos 1958:288; Maas and Trypanis (eds) 1963:276; For a similar context in kontakia, see Debiasi Gonzato (ed.)1960:154. Similar rendering is attested on a twelfth-century icon of St Catherine in Sinai, see Eastmond 1999: 35.
[1558] Exod. 3.2 : 'And the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush: and he looked, and, behold, the bush burned with fire, and the bush was not consumed.'
[1559] Weitzmann 1966b:68 figs 35-6.

decoration of Cappadocia in Greece, which intends to connect Mary and her parents with the fulfilment of prophecies and emphasize the veneration of the Cross.[1560] Finally, I should mention an unpublished thirteenth-century icon from Sinai of Joachim venerating Mary, where Mary is depicted as the Burning Bush. The icon belong to a group of icons where Mary is depicted as the Burning Bush and a saint or a prophet accompanies her. Joachim's function here is as one of Mary's forebearers who facilitated the Incarnation of Christ.[1561] This is the only example I am aware of where Joachim is depicted without Anna and alone with Mary.

Military saints

In Greece, we encountered examples of military saints and especially Theodore Stratelates who are depicted in the proximity of Anna and Joachim. The same theme is attested in a fourteenth century icon (1382-4) mentioned in chapter three, which was given as a gift from Anna Maria Angelina Doukaina Palaiologina, daughter of Uros Palaiologos, ruler of Thessaly, to her brother Ioasaph, second founder and abbot of the monastery of the Transfiguration in Meteora.[1562] Mary and Christ are depicted in the centre and are surrounded by saints. Above Mary, Theodore Stratelates is depicted next to St Anna, who wears a red maphorion (Figs 95-6). The portraits of saints are accompanied by small slots where the relics of each saint would have been kept.[1563]

This icon was used as model for the Cuenca diptych (1382-1384), which was sent by the husband of Maria Palaiologina to Italy.[1564] In this second icon, Theodore Stratelates is once again depicted next to St Anna who wears a red maphorion and is accompanied by

---

[1560] Walter 2006:52.
[1561] In Soteriou's book, an icon of similar arrangement is mentioned (no 163),with Prophet Isaiah standing next to Mary, see Soteriou 1958: fig. 163.
[1562] Evans 2004:51-2.
[1563] ibid:52.
[1564] ibid:52.

the inscription: 'Saint Anna Mother of the Theotokos' (Figs 95-6).[1565] As mentioned earlier, this icon testifies that the relics of Anna were also offered as precious gifts in Byzantium in the fourteenth century.

Donors

The previous icon constitutes one of the three examples of icons commissioned from a donor or offered as a gift and all are associated with a monastery, either the Meteora , Sinai or Athos.

Apart from monumental art, the proximity of St Anna to donors is attested in a late fourteenth-century icon in Sinai showing Mary holding Christ between her parents (Fig. 99),[1566] and the donor is depicted in front of Joachim and is kneeling before Mary. The fact that the donor is included in a family portrait of Mary reveals that the intercession of Mary (or of Joachim and Anna to Mary) is related to family issues or childbirth.

Demus has noted that portable mosaic icons are among the rarest and most precious objects of Byzantine art,[1567] thus we are fortunate that one of St Anna has survived. A luxurious late thirteenth century or early fourteenth-century,[1568] portable mosaic icon of St Anna[1569] given as an imperial gift is now in the Vatopedi monastery.[1570] The saint is depicted holding Mary on her left arm and is surrounded by the Archangels, three Apostles, Joachim and Joseph and at the top the icon the 'Hetoimasia'.[1571] The inscription 'Saint Anna Mother of God' accompanies the icon (Fig. 100).[1572] The association of Anna

---

[1565] ibid:53.

[1566] Soteriou 1956:143-4; Soteriou 1958:fig.164.

[1567] Demus 1960:89.

[1568] Chazal and Bonovas 2009:156.

[1569] Demus 1960:92. According to Demus, this icon of Anna has stylistic similarities to the icon of the 'Visitation of the Virgin' (Athens, Byzantine Museum Nr. 145) which he dates around 1300, see Demus 1991: 115-16; Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992 : 43; Kalokyres 1972 :95;Chazal ; Bonovas (eds) 2009: 156.

[1570] Demus 1960:93. Chirat dates it from the twelfth century, see Chirat 1950:105. According to a monogram at the back of the icon the donor was 'Queen and great princess Anastasia' (sixteenth century) who possibly received it as a gift, see Kondakov 2004:113; Chazal ; Bonovas (eds) 2009:156.

[1571] Furlan 1979:27-8.Kondakov 1915: 113. For the Hetoimasia of God, see PG 100: 1393B.

[1572] Furlan 1979:no 25.

and Mary's parents in general with the Hetoimasia is made in Byzantine homilies since they prepared Mary for the salvation of humanity and since Joachim's name means Preparation of God in Hebrew as mentioned in chapter two.[1573]

Icons from Crete and Cyprus

St Anna's depictions are enriched with Western elements in the hands of Constantinopolitan painters who went to Crete, and based on their Paleologan background, 'renewed' Byzantine art with Western iconography.[1574] This is the case of Angelos or Angelos Akotantos,[1575] a fifteenth-century Cretan painter, who had profound knowledge of Palaiologan art and had visited Constantinople and the monastery of Chora in particular.[1576] He is said to have painted three icons of St Anna:[1577] two of Anna holding Mary,[1578] and one with Anna, Mary and Christ.[1579]

On one of two icons, now in the Benaki Museum (Athens), Anna is depicted holding Mary in the Hodegetria type.[1580] In this icon Mary offers Anna a flower, the 'unfading rose' and symbol of Mary's purity (Fig. 101),[1581] and the message conveyed here is exactly that, that Mary purifies Anna through Mary's purity. The unfading rose has not been associated with Mary and Anna in Byzantine icons. The only surviving example derives from Crete, the church of Our Lady in Lambini, which alludes that in this detail Angelos was influenced by Cretan iconography. The fact that a Western iconographical theme which accompanies the depictions of Mary's Immaculate Conception appears only in the Venetian-occupied Cretan and in the work of Cretan painter shows the infiltration of

---

[1573] PG 43: 488C.
[1574] Lymberopoulou 2007a:181;Vassilaki 1989: 212; Gouma-Peterson 1983:160;Tourta 2008:xxvi-xxvii.
[1575] Vassilaki 2009: 348.
[1576] Lymberopoulou 2007a:178-181;Vassilakis-Mavrakakis 1981:294.
[1577] Photopoulos-Delevorias 1997:274 fig. 464; Chatzedakes 1998:151.
[1578] Acheimastou-Potamianou (ed.) 1987:169.
[1579] ibid. 171.
[1580] Lymberopoulou 2007a:190; Kalokyres 1972 : 95. This icon has mistakenly been attributed in the past to Emmanuel Tzanes, see Acheimastou-Potamianou (ed.) 1987:169; Chatzedakes 1968:fig.no .95.
[1581] Kalokyres 1972:94.

Western elements in Cretan art and which is verified by the fact that it is nowhere else found in Byzantine art.

The image with Anna, Mary and Christ is, as I have repeated throughout the thesis, a family portrait. The genealogy of Christ based on his mother's and grandmother's side is a iconographical motif which was developed in the West from the thirteenth century onwards and found its expression in the 'Annaselbsdritt' images.[1582] This iconographical theme, which shows Anna and above her Mary and Christ, appears in the post-Byzantine period,[1583] however the only surviving example from the Byzantine period is this icon of Angelos (Fig.102). Bynum-Walker notes that this theme signifies the importance of women in late medieval conceptions of family and emphasizes Mary's Immaculate Conception.[1584] However, I think that the Annaselbsdritt images emphasize the Incarnation of Christ. Similar iconography is attested in the Nestorian church of St George the Exiler in Famagusta, which although it is not an icon it fits well to the westerinizing character of the depictions under discussion. In this church we find the type of Sant' Anna Metterza, which is a rare theme in Renaissance art and it is not seen before the fourteenth century. A medallion portrays Christ on his mother's chest and St Anna is shown praying behind Mary.[1585] It is identical to the Annaselbsdritt type, the difference being that Anna is praying in the Sant' Anna Metterza type. It could be the Western alternative to Anna's intercessory role we often encountered in Byzantine art. Additionally, it is a reference to Christ's Incarnation since it depicts the genealogy to Christ from the side of his immediate female forbearers. Angelos's images deviate stylistically but not iconographically from Byzantine art. He stresses Anna's motherhood and her genealogical connection to Christ, which is a common theme in both icons and monumental art.

[1582] Baumer and Scheffczyk 1989:169; Bonito 1982:275-6; Kleinschmidt 1930:101 fig. 75.
[1583] One example is from Patmos monastery, see Kalokyres 1972:85-6. pl. 97 (b).
[1584] Bynum-Walker 1991:80.
[1585] Bacci 2006:212-3.fig.4.

Before I conclude, a last example of merging Byzantine with Western art is attested in a fifteenth-century icon of Italo-Byzantine origin, from either Crete or Venice, painted by an unknown artist. The icon portrays four saints, two male saints on the top register and two female saints on the lower register. St Eleutherios is placed on the left and next to him St Francis of Assis; below St Eleutherios we find St Anna and next to her St Catherine.[1586] Apart from the Western St Francis, the Eastern saints are depicted in a typical Byzantine style.[1587] Similarly to the other two eastern saints, St Anna is depicted frontally; she is portrayed as a woman of advanced age, wearing a red maphorion and having her both palms outward toward the spectator. St Catherine holds a cross and has her left palm open, a gesture that also Anna adopts as we saw earlier. As Chatzēdakē notes, St Eleutherios is venerated on the Adriatic coast,[1588] and this, together with the inclusion of St Francis, show that, although the style is '*alla maniera Greca*' (= in Byzantine style), the icon targeted a Western donor. This is supported by Lymberopoulou's view that while the three Eastern saints are depicted frontally, St Francis is depicted in three quarters to show the 'patron's special affiliation to the saint'.[1589] Thus this icon points to the fact that by the fifteenth century St Anna had reached a point when her veneration by both Orthodox and Catholics had been established, which we have seen in the numerous depictions of the saint from Venetian-held Crete. Finally, I agree that the selection of saints had to do with the donor's personal attachment towards them but I would add that the selection of St Eleutherios in particular was made because he is also considered protector of childbirth as we read on his feast day (15 December) : 'You are concerned about women in labour and you give them freedom...'.[1590] The choice of St Anna and St Eleutherios alludes either to a female donor

---

[1586] Chatzēdakē 1993:41 fig.5.
[1587] ibid. 40.
[1588] ibid. 40.
[1589] Lymberopoulou 2007b:197.
[1590] 'Τῶν ἐπιτόκων γυναίων Πάτερ κηδόμενος, ἐλευθερίαν δίδως...'

or to a male donor who commisioned this icon on behalf of his wife in order to secure the health of his child or of a labour.

Conclusions

In chapter four, I looked at the iconic images of Sts Anna and Joachim and I dated the earliest one (of Anna) in Santa Maria Antiqua to the eighth century and of Joachim in the chapel of Kizil Tchoukour to late ninth-early tenth century. I argued that the images of St Anna in Santa Maria Antiqua have characteristics, which are attested in later portraits of Anna in Byzantine art: Anna is depicted frontally, standing and holding Mary in her arms. The evidence from Rome, Greece and Faras also point to the fact that the promotion of Anna's motherhood is the earliest association made with the saint in art, while in Byzantine texts it is not attested earlier than the ninth century with the homilies of George of Nikomedia. Joachim's depictions do not vary, he is usually found in medallions or standing, blessing and (or) holding a cross or a scroll.

The examples from Faras, Cappadocia, Constantinople, Eastern Europe, Ethiopia and Crete show that the depictions of Joachim and Anna largely depend on locality. In Lower Nubia, I examined the unique scene of Anna making a gesture of silence, which will not be repeated everafter in Byzantine art and it follows the iconography of ancient Egyptian deities. The iconography of Mary's parents and St Anna in particular is characterised by standard features such the promotion of parenthood, healing, and the glorification of Christ but as mentioned above, different characteristics are emphasized in different locations. In Cappadocia, the iconography offers various theological associations; Mary's parents function as martyrs and defenders of the faith, as parents, as healing saints, as prophets and they are often depicted holding a cross or a scroll. Moreover, in Kizil Tchoukour, the emphasis on Anna's conception will not be repeated in Byzantine

monumental art. In Constantinople, elements from the court ceremonial are infused into the Marian cycle, while in Eastern Europe and Ethiopia, unique iconographical details were created or *hapax* associations with the scenes of the Ascension and the Christ reclining were made. In Crete, the images of Anna suckling Mary are strongly associated with motherhood and can only be compared to similar depictions of Anna in mainland Greece and one example from Eastern Europe, while the placement of Anna and Joachim next to the Mandylion and in relation to the Annunciation is unique in Crete. The choice to have a saint depicted in a speficic way reveals, apart from the donor's preferences, contemporary social perceptions attributed to the saint.

Mouriki characterizes as 'problematic' the non-narrative images of Mary and her parents and claims that when they are grouped together they promoted the Incarnation of Christ.[1591] Certainly, the main axis of Anna's and Joachim's depiction is related to Christology. Mouriki however advocates that the depictions of Mary at a young age with her parents, which is 'has a hue of human tenderness but works with Mary at a mature age have a deeper theological content'.[1592] Mouriki ignores that the human tenderness in the depictions of Mary was triggered by serious theological issues (Iconoclasm) and despite having profound knowledge in Byzantine literature Mouriki does not seem to consider that in Byzantine homilies Mary's young age is used to prove her exceptional character from her very early years of life. I think that Mouriki's approach to the depiction of Mary's parents with Mary is primarily based on iconographical observations and fails to place their role in Byzantine art in the appropriate theological context.

Aurenhammer has argued that Joachim is depicted without attributes in contrast to Anna, and that they are usually depicted in medallions and in secondary arches under depictions of Mary.[1593] Although one cannot ignore that fact that Joachim enters the scenes

---

[1591] Mouriki 1969:50.
[1592] ibid. 50.
[1593] LCI: 142.

of Mary's Nativity in the fourteenth century for the first time,[1594] which is a result of the Palaiologan tendency to include numerous figures in one scene, Anna's and Joachim's placement inside or in the proximity of the sanctuary (in Italy, Faras and on Crete) shows their significant role in the Incarnation of Christ and thus their importance in the salvation of humanity. Hadermann-Misguich notes, 'they occupy often places which isolated them rather than inserted them in chorus of the saints'.[1595] This is made intentionally, to empasize their exceptional role as Mary's parents, which is in accordance with the view of Isidore of Thessalonike who differentiated Anna and Joachim because of all saints celebrated in the liturgy only Joachim and Anna are acclaimed 'righteous'.[1596] In terms of art production, Anna is the only figure in the Martorana dressed in a costume the folds of which are rendered by means of decoration with gold and argues that it was a means of bestowing honour on Anna.[1597] This detail together with the iconography in Cappadocia and Greece, where Joachim and Anna are placed in lateral apses are given a special chapel, invalidates Aurenhammer's argument while evidence shows that Hadermann-Misguich's reflect the reality. This iconographical choice underscores their distinction from other saints: since Mary herself supersedes all the saints and thus her parents are given a special place in the church.

However, I need to clarify one point here. The depictions of Anna outnumber by far the depictions of Joachim. This choice reveals that the Byzantines related differently to Anna and differently to Joachim. To the Byzantine eye, Joachim was defined by his relation to Anna but the opposite was not always the case, since we have numerous depictions of Anna alone but only one case of Joachim alone.[1598] The iconography of

---

[1594] Chirat 1950:94.
[1595] Hadermann-Misguich 1975:253.
[1596] PG 139: 32. However, prophets and martyrs are also named as such, see Detoraki 2002:30.
[1597] Kitzinger 1991:231.
[1598] In the 22nd Intenrational Congress of Byzantine Studies in Sofia, Dionysios Mourelatos presented an icon possibly of the thirteenth century of Joachim venerating. This is the only image I am aware of where Joachim is depicted without Anna. The image is unpublished.

Joachim is influenced by Joseph's (Mary's husband) iconography, where his role is that of Mary's husband.

Nevertheless, examples from art show that the textual and visual evidence often correspond to a great extent. Textual images of Anna as a tender mother in Byzantine homilies correspond with the great number of her depictions holding Mary. Anna's and Joachim's role in the Incarnation of Christ is vehemently demonstrated in their association with the Kerameion and the Mandylion, their proximity to Biblical figures who prophecised the coming of Christi to the world, the Annaselbsdritt icon of Angelos Akotantos, the Kykkotisa icons and in their proximity to sanctuaries. The reason for the composition of a number of homilies on the life of Mary's parents from the eighth century is triggered by the acknowledgement of Anna's and Joachim role in the Incarnation and the numerous depictions I have looked at are the visual equivalent of this theological change in Byzantium.

The interest in Mary's forebears in Byzantium is developed in the framework of imperial patronage by Justinian I. Since then, a number of emperors and empresses were associated with the (re-)construction of churches dedicated to Anna, perpetuating the tradition that Justinian I initiated. The connection of St Anna with the imperial family in Constantinople is also shown in the saint's surviving depictions in the Byzantime capital where as we saw, she is depicted as a member of the imperial family and nowhere (apart from Daphni) is Anna give such prominent place in Byzantine art. Moreover, the pairing of Anna, Joachim with Constantine and Helena belongs to framework of royal genealogy, since Mary's parents were themselves descedants of David. But I would place the pairing of Anna and Joachim with Constantine and Helena not only in the framework of royal descendance but also defence of the Orthodox dogma. Constantine and Helena were the propagators of the Christian faith; Constantine signed the Decree of Milan in 313 where

Christianity was recognised as the state's official religion and Helena found the Holy Cross, the symbol of Orthodoxy. Images from Cappadocia, hagiography and the *Synodikon of Orthodoxy* shows that Anna became as well an image for the defence of Orthodoxy.

In relation to Anna's pairing to other saints, one cannot fail to attest the connection between St Anna and St Nicholas. The first image of St Anna as a mother is found in the church of St Nicholas in Paros and the next surviving examples come from the church of St Nicholas Orphanos in Thessalonike, in St Nicholas in Pyrgos and in the church of St Nicholas in Geraki, where St Anna is placed next to St Nicholas.[1599] Although only in one case is Anna depicted together with St Nicholas, and in the rest three cases she is depicted in a church dedicated to the saint, I think that this ideological pairing derives from the role of Sts Anna and Nicholas as protectors of children.

Another iconographical pair is attested between Joachim, Anna and Abraham. Mary's parents are placed under Abraham's hospitality, where Abraham is associated with the Incarnation, the Eucharist and the Crucifixion, as mentioned. The affiliation of Joachim with Abraham is made in homilies not to transmit the dogma of the Christ's sacrifice but to propagate Joachim's preponderance over Abraham.

Finally, St Elisabeth, John the Forerunner and (less often) Zacharias are depicted in the proximity of Anna and Joachim or of Anna alone. The attempt here is first to associate the two genealogical trees and underline the role of Anna's birth to Mary, which resulted in the coming of Christ to earth and the beginning of the soteriological plan for the salvation of mankind, and second in the formation of an alternative Deesis scene, with Mary's parents. Except for a woman named Anna, who lights a candle in front of the icon of John the Baptist in the miracles of St Artemios, nowhere in Byzantine homilies or other

---

[1599] ibid. 95.

texts is an association made between Anna and Elisabeth. The connection between the two women was made only visually

In her article on Mary's cult in early Byzantium, Cameron asks 'how often does Mary appear alone, without the child? In other words, is this growing popularity of images of the Virgin about her own personal cult, or it is rather about Christology?'.[1600] If we asked the same question of St Anna I would suggest that she is related to Mariology and consequently to Christology,[1601] because the number of depictions without any motherly connotations is less common,[1602] and is mainly confined to Cappadocia. The typology of St Anna's depictions follows the depictions of Mary: Orans, the Hodegetria, the Kyriotissa, or the Nikopoios.[1603] While the variations in the associations made with St Anna are not always 'mariocentric', they are always christocentric.[1604] When Anna's motherly relation to Mary is not visualised then Anna's depictions are related to the Glorification of Christ, to supplication, or to demonstration and defence of Orthodoxy. It is through her role in the Incarnation of Christ and thus through Christology that Anna's cult gained ground rather than through the liturgical and architectural efforts of Justinian I.

[1600] Cameron 2004:18.
[1601] Tsironis 1998b:5.
[1602] LCI:144; Réau 1958:94.
[1603] Weitzmann 1970:336; Vantini 1970:201-2; Lasareff 1938:38 n.89; Kalokyres 1972:94; LCI 142.
[1604] Cunningham 1988:61.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

This study is the first undertaking in Byzantine scholarship to focus on St Anna, the mother of the Virgin Mary, and its contribution lies in the fact that it enriches our knowledge of otherwise unknown aspects of the Byzantine culture. The title 'Aspects of St Anna's cult in Byzantium' successfully introduces the multiplicity of the material selected to substantiate this endeavour. I looked at topography, texts, relics and visual evidence to reconstruct aspects of St Anna's veneration in Byzantium from the sixth until the fifteenth century. The sixth century – and Justinian's I reign in particular – has been selected as starting point because it is when the first church of St Anna was dedicated in Constantinople.

More analytically, the first topic discussed is sixth-century Constantinopolitan topography. Although the topography of the Byzantine capital is a well-studied topic in Byzantine studies, the proximity of St Anna's churches both to water and to churches dedicated to Mary has not been brought forth by any Byzantine scholar. Using topographical evidence from Jerusalem and Constantinople, I demonstrate not only the influence of the topography of the Holy City on the Byzantine capital in the sixth century and explain the reasons behind this proximity but also the ideological associations that Justinian I gave to this topographical model. Namely, emperors' active role in the creation of new topographical patterns has not been examined by scholars, but, as I showed, Justinian's profound interest in creating sacred spaces is a fact, and derives from his inclination towards healing saints and his interest in Mary. The interest in Mary's past in Jerusalem is reflected in the Constantinopolitan topography. Thus a new idea is introduced to the studies of Constantinopolitan topography, that of the association of imperial patronage to healing, creation of sacred space and St Anna.

Moreover, this work revolves around literary works, starting from the *Protevangelion of James,* the only account on the life of Mary's parents. As mentioned in the introducton, I looked at the way Mary's genealogy was developed in writing from the third century onwards, the attitude of early writers toward the *Protevangelion of James*, and the way Byzantine preachers use the *Protevangelion* and Mary's early life. The study of St Anna's cult in Byzantium introduces new perceptions about the way the Byzantines made use of their tradition and the process from disregard to acknowledgment of the *Protevangelion* witnesses this development. Early Christian writers and Church Fathers did not give credit to this second-century apocryphal text. But from the eighth century onwards preachers started using the story of Anna and Joachim in their homilies on Mary's early life, which ultimately changed not only the perception of each congregation towards

Mary's parents but also of the whole Byzantine culture. I clearly demonstrate that the lever that agitated this crucial development is the theological implications created by the outbreak of Iconoclasm, when the dogma of the Incarnation of Christ necessitated the promotion of Christ's physical forbearers. As a result, the *Protevangelion* reached a certain point when despite its apocryphal (non-canonical) nature, it was considered even 'part of the Holy Scripture', as preachers themselves admit. Additionally, although Marian homilies has recently been brought to the surface by M. B. Cunningham, there has not been any study on the way Mary's parents are presented in these homilies. This is achieved here and covers all the time span of their appearance in homilies, namely from the eighth and until the fifteenth century, making this proposed work a major bibliographical contribution to Marian studies.

In order to introduce the social aspects of St Anna's veneration in Byzantium, I used hagiography and histories (Theophanes' *Chronographia*, the *life of Stephen the Younger*, the *Patria of Constantinople* and the *Synodikon of Orthodoxy*) where I showed that iconophilia was associated with women named Anna, that St Anna resolved fertility issues and also that women who bear that name have problem in begetting a child. St Anna was barren according to the *Protevangelion* but managed to conceive the Virgin through praying.The perpetuation of this information in relation to the popularity of the *Protevangelio*n in Byzantium and resulted in Anna's establishment as a protector of childbirth. This tendency is reflected in the life of saints whose mothers are named Anna and in tenth-century patronage stories of Byzantine empresses, who appear to construct a monument dedicated to the saint after conceiving or giving birth. Apart from the relation between male patronage and St Anna, female patronage as well has itself not been studied in connection to childbearing and St Anna. Additionally, this category of text shows that from the eighth century onwards and by the end of the tenth, St Anna was established as a

protector of childbirth; the study of women named Anna in hagiography and histories bring to the surface another connection, that of the name Anna and demonstration of Orthodoxy. The connection of St Anna with demonstration of Orthodoxy is nowhere found in Byzantine studies and it is another contribution to Byzantine studies.

Using textual evidence from the eighth century onwards, I have brought together all the information, textual and visual, of the presence of St Anna's and Joachim's relics in various locations and reconstructed the story of their presence in Byzantium. I mentioned in the introduction that this attempt is perplexing. The complicated nature of this endeavour is likewise reflected in the number of martyrs named Anna, who were worshipped in the Byzantine capital as the tenth-century Constantinopolitan *Synaxarion* shows. The results from the examination of St Anna's relics in combination with the fact that the first appearance of the story of Anna and Joachim in Byzantine homilies appeared in the eighth century, shows that the eighth century is the starting point for the spread of St Anna's veneration in Byzantium. We also saw that the earlier and only testimony of Joachim's relics dates from the tenth century (reliquary from Athos), when the *Patria of Constantinople* dates, which is also the earlier work to refer to the relics of St Anna. The mention of the relics of Anna and Joachim in the tenth century may well be seen as a further clue to the spread of their cult in the tenth century, when feasts of Mary's life sprang independently from the *Protevangelion*. But the stories of the first appearance of Anna's relics are placed in the eighth century, when the first homilies on Mary's early life emerged and also when the first mention of Mary's relics are mentioned. The writer/editor of the Patria might have combined older textual traditions or wished to place the transportation of the relics of Anna at the same century when Mary's relics entered Constantinople. However, St Anna's veneration was not established earlier that the ninth

century as the evidence from church-calendars shows, which are also examined here for the first time in relation to Mary's parents.

Finally, the last section of this work is dedicated to pictorial evidence. The material used encompasses works of Byzantine art from a significant number of areas of Byzantine authority either political or artistic. After an extensive presentation of the iconography of Mary's parents in both monumental art and minor arts, I provide a complete overview of the depictions of Mary's parents, since I combine both published and unpublished material to present the first complete iconographical corpus of St Anna's in Byzantium. Since the scenes of Mary's early life (where Mary's parents have unavoidably been included), has been studied in detail by Lafontaine-Dosogne, in this work I present the first corpus of iconic depictions of the saint (and her husband's) and thus this work together with that of Lafontaine-Dosogne are the only and most complete iconographical contributions of St Anna in Byzantium.

The study of the depictions of the saint offers a better understanding of the society that produced these images, since they reveal the associations made with the saint by the Byzantines. For example, the fact that nowhere in the *Protevangelion* is Anna associated with demonstration of Orthodoxy, nevertheless she is depicted as a defender of the Christian faith due to her genealogical association with Christ, shows that the Byzantines manipulated the existing information they had on the saint which they vested with ideological trends. Moreover, the fact that it is not Joachim but only Anna, who is attributed with healing qualities and is placed between both male and female saints, shows that the Byzantines believed that it was only Anna who could heal, since according to the *Protevangelion* she was the one inflicted by the 'disease' of bareness and was cured only with the help of God. Finally, Joachim's depictions are strictly placed in the framework of Mary's genealogy and we do not see the image of a tender father either in art or in

homilies, which reveals that the Byzantines did not credit fathers with feeling of tenderness towards their children as it was the case with mothers.

Another conclusion that I have reached to is that Anna's cult in Byzantium is relation to Christology, but the base upon which the development of Anna's cult was created was Mary's cult. I am driven to this conclusion by looking at the similarities between the two cults which I have summarised in the following points:[1605]

In chapter one, I showed that St Anna gained the role of a healer through her proximity to healing waters and to Mary. The church of Pege and the Blachernai in Constantinople, the Probatike in Jerusalem, the testimony of Sozomenos and of the Piacenza pilgrims point to Mary's association with healing qualities, which passed on to Anna in topographical terms in Constantinople (Pege, Hodegetria, Chalkoprateia) and Sinai (proximity of chapel of Joachim and Anna to chapel of healing saints) and in artistic production as we saw in Cappadocia and Greece, in their proximity to healing male and female saints. Moreover, both Anna and Mary were promoted by Justinian I in terms of topography and liturgy (church of St Anna in the Deuteron, kontakion of Romados Melodos). In chapter two, Anna is – similarly to Mary – the 'second Eve' in Byzantine homilies; she is also the greatest mother (after Mary) and she is connected to biblical prophecies. Mariology is also the basis upon which the celebration of the feast of Anna's Conception is developed : Anna's conception brought Mary to life, which led to the birth of Christ and resulted in the freedom of humanity from sin. Furthermore, I showed that in hagiographies and histories women named Anna are equated with Orthodoxy, which, as Tsironis has shown, is also valid for the Virgin. Further similarities are attested between the lament of Mary and of Anna. Tsironis has supported that the 'features of the Marian lament' are 'sympathy of nature, the solitude of the mourner, the contrast between the past and the present and

---

[1605] Due to length restrictions of this thesis, I will need to develop this topic in a later work.

contemplation of the future without the beloved person';[1606] these characteristics are also found in the lament of Anna after the reproach she experienced for her sterility and the departure of Joachim, where she compares herself to refers to nature in contrast to her bareness. As mentioned earlier, the discussion of Anna's relics in chapter three points to the fact that the story behind the relics of Anna and Mary saints displays similarities. The tenth-century Patria refers to the transportation of Anna's maphorion in Constantinople in eighth century when Mary's maphorion was also taken to Constantinople. Finally, I showed in chapter four that Mary's representational types such as the Nikopoios, the Hodegetria or the Kyriotissa are adopted in Anna's iconography.

St Anna's cult dispays similarities to the cult of Mary, which shows that the Byzantines understood Anna through her relation to Mary and Mary through her relation to Christ which takes us back to what I argued earlier, that Christology is the axis to understand the formation of Anna's cult in Byzantium.

Having established the conditions of for the development of Anna's cult in Byzantium is usefull to look at the views of scholarship for this matter. Lafontaine-Dosogne sees the emergence of Anna's role in Christ's genealogy in the same framework that created Mary's cult, the defence of the duality of Christ's nature.[1607] Similarly, Baumer and Scheffczyk have correctly pointed out that the interest in St Anna in the Orthodox thought begins at a late period and it is connected to Christ's soteriological plan.[1608] However, they draw a parallel between the cult of Mary and St Anna in the sense that both cults started spreading after the Council of Ephesos.[1609] Voicu argues that the *Protevangelion* was consecrated in the Council of Ephesos in 431,[1610] and Fabricius has argued that the Councils of Ephesos and Chalkedon (451) in order to support theological

---

[1606] Tsironis 1998b:195.
[1607] Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992:24; For Mary as a guarantor of the two natures of Christ, see Cameron 2004:7.
[1608] Baumer and Scheffczyk 1988: 155.
[1609] ibid. 163. Mary's cult started being formulated from the fifth century onwards, see Cameron 2004:1-21.
[1610] Voicu 2007:119 n.5.

matters such as the Presentation of Mary apocryphal texts were used.[1611] He strengthens his theory by referring to a fifth-century fresco in the necropolis in Bawit in Egypt, which has been identified both as Mary's Presentation and the parable of the Foolish Virgins.[1612] However, I have shown that the emergence of Anna's cult in the fifth century (shortly after the council of Ephesos) cannot be supported. As mentioned in the conclusions of chapter two, the imperial promotion that Anna received in the sixth century by Justinian I was not the most important factor for the spread of her veneration in Byzantium, but Iconoclasm which also resulted in the production of homilies on Mary's early life.

To conclude, this work had demonstrated that although St Anna is a completely underexposed figure in Byzantine studies, the examination of the formation, establishment, and promotion of her veneration offers a fresh insight to the way saints were manipulated in Byzantium. By using different tools for the study of the saint in Byzantium I have detected the reasons and presented the form that Anna's veneration took in Byzantium. By studying various aspects of the Byzantine culture such as topography, visual evidence and material culture in a broader sense, social aspects, theology and a variety of texts such as homilies, hagiography and histories, I have highlighted the importance of looking at different types of material for the study of a Byzantine saint. Material of different nature was put together for the study of St Anna's veneration in Byzantium and the conclusions drawn prove the contribution that the study of saints offers in order for modern scholars to understand aspects of the Byzantine culture. I hope that this study will urge modern scholars to orientate their interest towards saints using a variety of methodological tools offered in Byzantine studies.

[1611] Fabricius 1956:116.
[1612] ibid. 117; Cartlidge and Elliott 2001:36, 37 fig. 2.8.

Appendix

The location of the Deuteron - Scholarly views and sources

Pierre Gilles, Van Millingen, Mordtmann and Skarlatos place the Deuteron on the extreme southern part of the city. In particular, Pierre Gilles (sixteenth century) writes that the Deuteron belongs to the suburb of Hebdomon, on the seventh hill, in the fourteenth ward and in the area of Exakionion,[1] which was located on a route leading from the Xerolophos to the Pege.[2] Van Millingen identified the location of the Deuteron relying on Pseudo-Kodinos and argued that it covered the area north of the Golden Gate, between the thirteenth and the fourteenth towers.[3] Mordtmann considers the Exakionion and the Deuteron as identical, since Mordtmann locates it between the second and the third gate, near the church of St. Andrew in Crisi where the church of Mary in Pege was located in the Silivrikapi gate.[4] In Mordtmann's map, the Exakionion is situated between the third and fifth gate in the fourteenth region, where Pierre Gilles also places the quarter of Deuteron.[5] In contrast to Mordtmann, Skarlatos places it in the twelfth region, two stadia (= 370 metres) away from the walls of Constantine.[6]

Mordtmann has argued that the church of St Anna would have been close to the mosque near the gate of Selymbrie (Sigma) and in the proximity of the churches of St. Bassianos, St. Floros and St. Lauros,[7] but Mango invalidating Gilles and

---

[1] Gilles 1561:200-1
[2] Cameron and Herrin [trans.] 1984:196.
[3] Pseudo-Kodinos 1843:98; Van Millingen 1899:74-5.
[4] Mordtmann 1892: 76, 78; Asutay-Effenberger 2007:87.
[5] Mordtmann 1892: map pl. 1 and p. 63; Ball (trans.)1988: 232 (map).
[6] Skarlatos 1890:341.
[7] Mordtmann 1892:78.

Mordtmann argued it was located in the area of the Golden Horn.[8] Janin stretches the Deuteron until the fourth hill (in contrast to Pierre Gilles -Van Millingen – Mordtmann who argue for the seventh hill), namely North-East from Pege and very close to the gate of Andrianople (modern Edirnekapi).[9] He argues that this quarter was not limited to the area between the Golden Gate and the Gate of Pege as Van Millingen and Mordtmann argue, but (similarly to Mango) it stretched until the area of Golden Horn and reached the Constantinian Forum.[10] On Van Millingen's map the Xylokerkos gate is located north of Deuteron, close to the Blachernai area, while on Janin's map it is located on the opposite side, on the southern side and close to the gate of Pege. Relying on the twelfth-century typikon of the Kecharitomene monastery, he suggested that the church of St Anna was close to the junction created by a road coming from the church of the Blachernai and another from the Holy Apostles,[11] changing his earlier view that the church was located near the Gate of Pege.[12] Tsangadas (following Van Millingen and in contrast to Janin) argues that the Deuteron should be identified with the second military gate and places the Deuteron 'outside the Constantinea wall, to the East of Exakionion, the Palaia Porta, the cistern of Mokios and near the last street of the city'.[13] Guilland (in accordance with Mortdmann and Van Millingen and in contrast to Janin) argues that the Exakionion was divided in seven quarters making Deuteron one of them.[14] Mango locates the quarter toward the fifth hill, between Fatih and the gate of Andrianople,[15] and the church of St Anna in particular 'on the main street leading to the Andrianople gate',[16]

---

[8] Mango 1986b:4.
[9] Janin 1936:210.
[10] Janin 1937:150.
[11] Janin 1969:191; Janin 1953:41.
[12] Janin 1936:210-211.
[13] Tsangadas 1980:18.
[14] Guilland 1969:62.
[15] Mango 1985:49.
[16] Mango 1993:9.

where Müller-Wiener also places it.[17] Ousterhout argues that to the west of Chora monastery there was probably a road which connected Chora to the Blachernai palace and Chora was in the proximity of St Anna.[18] The sixth-century historian Prokopios having referred to the construction of Anna's church in the quarter of Deuteron to which he adds no details on the location he writes 'not far from this church, somewhere about the last street of the city a church of martyr Zoe was built' : 'τούτου δέ δή τοῦ νεὼ οὐ πολλῷ ἄποθεν ἀμφὶ τῆς πόλεως ἀγυιὰν ἐσχάτην Ζωῇ μάρτυρι σεμνὸν ἐπιεικῶς ἕδος πεποίηται'.[19] Symeon Magistros refers to the church of Anna on the occasion of an earthquake which caused the collapse a column of the church,[20] which probably signifies the Andrianople gate.[21] Skarlatos argues that this church is confused with the church in the Deuteron and the one of Haste, which was located toward the Golden Horn.[22] In the Patria of Constantinople no topographical association is made for the name Deuteron since according to this account the name was given after the second entry (Deuteron means second) to the city by Justinian II who was exiled and returned back to Constantinople to reassume the throne.

Anna Komnene writes that when the Komnenias marched to the Great Palace they were waiting in the area of the martyr St. George Sykeotis, whose martyrion was located in the Deuteron.[23] Using this reference, Magdalino adds the Komnenians entered the city 'via the gate of Andrianople'.[24]

---

[17] Müller-Wiener, W.1977:21 (map).
[18] Ousterhout 2000:243; Janin 1969:532.
[19] Weber (ed.) 1838a:185:17-19. I follow the syntax of αμφί plus accusative (ἀμφὶ ἀγυιὰν) of Liddell-Scott 1996:89.
[20] Symeom Magister 1838: 677; Downey 1955:599.
[21] Tafel (ed.) 1859:114.
[22] Skarlatos 1890:406.
[23] CHBS 1839:2.12; Delehaye (ed.) 1902: 619-621.
[24] Magdalino 2001:66-7.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

When a number appears in brackets ( ) after the date of publication, it denotes the volume number of an edition. For example, Kazhdan 1999 **(2) :**307. When the mark ' : ' appears next to the page number, it indicates the verse found in that page. For example, Leone 1991: 26**:** 635.

Primary sources

Allen, P. (ed.) 2009. *Sophronius of Jerusalem and seventh-century heresy: the Synodical letter and other documents : introduction, texts, translations, and commentary*, Oxford.

Amann, É. 1910. *Le Protévangile de Jacques et ses remaniements latins. Introduction, textes, traduction et commentaire*, Paris.

Antonopoulou, T. (ed.) 2008. *Leonis VI Sapientis Imperatoris Byzantini homiliae*, Turnhout.

Auzépy, M.-F. (ed.) 1997. *La vie d'Étienne le Jeune*, Aldershot.

Baldi, D. (ed.) 1982. *Enchiridion locorum sanctorum: Documenta S. Evangelii loca respicientia*, Jerusalem.

Beckby, H. (ed.) 1957. *Anthologia Graeca*, v.1, Book I-VI, München.

Bekker, I. (ed.) 1839. *Codinus Curopalates De Officialibus Palatii Cpolitani*, Bonn.

Bekker, I. (ed.) 1838.*Georgius Cedrenus. Ioannis Scylitzae*, Bonn.

Bekker, I. (ed.) 1842. *Leo Grammaticus, Chronographia*, Bonn.

Björkvall, G. 1986. *Les deux tropaires d'Apt, mss.17 et 18*, Stockholm.

Bidez, J. (ed.) 2008. *Sozomène, Histoire ecclésiastique*, *Livres VII-IX*, A.- J. Festugière (trans.), Paris.

Boissonade, J. F. (ed.) 1962. *Anecdota Graeca e codicibus regiis*, 3 vols, Hildesheim.

De Boor, C. (ed.) 1963. *Theophanis Chronographia*, Hildesheim.

Cachia, P. (ed.) 1960. *The book of the demonstration*. 2 vols, W. M. Watt (trans.), Louvain.

Christ, W.; Paranikas, M. (eds) 1871. *Anthologia graeca carminum christianorum*, Lipsiae.

Christou, P. K. (ed.) 2009. *Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ. Ἅπαντα τὰ ἔργα, v. 11,Ομιλίες (ΜΓ΄ - ΞΓ΄)*, Thessalonike.

Christou, P. K. (ed.) 2008. *Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ. Ἅπαντα τὰ ἔργα v. 10,Ομιλίες (ΚΑ΄ - ΜΒ΄)*, Thessalonike.

Crisafulli, V. S.; Nesbitt, J. W. (eds) 1997. *The miracles of St. Artemios : a collection of miracle stories by an anonymous author of seventh century Byzantium*, Leiden ; N.Y.

Cohn, L.; Wendland, P. (eds) 1962. *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, (reprint of the 1897 edition), Berlin.

Comfort, P. W- Barrett, D. P. (eds) 1999. *The complete text of the earliest New Testament manuscripts*, Grand Rapids, Mich.

Constas, N. (ed.) 2003. *Proclus of Constantinople and the cult of the Virgin in late Antiquity: homilies 1-5, texts and translations*, Leiden; Boston.

Cramer, J. A. (ed.) 1844. *Catenæ græcorum patrum in Novum Testamentum*, 6 vols, Oxford.

Dalkos, K. (ed.) 2006. *Λόγοι αντιρρητικοί κατά Εικονομάχων*, Athens.

Debiasi Gonzato, A. (ed.) 1966. *Analecta hymnica Graeca, Canones septembris*, vol.1, Rome.

De Lagarde, P. (ed.) 1979. *Iohannis Euchaitorum Metropolitae quae in Codice Vaticano Graeco 676 supersunt*, Amsterdam.

Delehaye, H. (ed.) 1902. *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae. Propylaeum ad Acta sanctorum Novembris*, Brussels.

De Strycker, É. (ed.) 1961. *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*, Brussels.

Didier, N. 1967. *Cartulaire de l' église d' Apt*, Paris.

Diekamp, F. (ed.) 1907. *Doctrina Patrum de incarnatione Verbi : ein griechisches Florilegium aus der Wende des siebenten und achten Jahrhunderts*, Münster in Westf.

Diekamp, F. (ed.) 1898. *Hippolytus von Theben. Texte und Untersuchungen*, Münster.

Dindorf, L. (ed.) 1833. *Historiae*, Bonn.

Du Cange, C. 1680. *Constantinopolis Christiana, seu descriptio urbis Constantinopolitanis, qualis exstitit sub imperatoribus Christianis, ex variis scriptoribus contexta & adornata*, Paris.

Duchesne, L. (ed.) 1955. *Le Liber pontificalis*, vol. 1, Paris.

Eustratiades, S. (ed.) 1931. *Θεοτοκάριον*, Chennevièresśur-Marne.

Fatouros, G. (ed.) 1992. *Theodori Studitae epistulae,* Berlin.

Firmin Didot, A. (ed.) 1865. *Flavii Josephi opera*, vol. 2, Paris.

Follieri, E. (ed.). 1980. *I calendari in metro innografico di Cristoforo Mitileneo*, Bruxelles.

Garitte, G. (ed.) 1958. *Le Calendrier Palestino–Géorgien du Sinaiticus 34 (Xe Siecle).* Bruxelles.

Gedeon, M. 1899. *Byzantinon heortologion*, Constantinople.

Gilles, P. 1561. *Petri Gyllii De topographia Constantinopoleos et de illius antiquitatibus libri quatuor*, Leiden.

Goar, J. (ed.) 1960. *Euchologion sive rituale graecorum*, Graz.

Grivaud, G. (ed.) 1990. *Voyageurs occidentaux à Chypre au XVème siècle*, Nicosia.

Hassler, C. D. (ed.) 1843. *Fratris Felicis Evagatorium in Terrae sanctae, Arabiae et Egypti peregrinationem*, vol. 2, Stuttgart.

Holl, K. (ed.) 1933. *Epiphanius of Salamis, Ancoratus und Panarion haer. 65-80 De fide*, vol. 3, Leipzig.

Hunger, H.; Kresten, O. (eds) 1981. *Das Register des Patriarchats von Konstantinopel. T.1, Edition und Übersetzung der Urkunden aus den Jahren 1315-1331*, Vienna.

Ignatius Aphram I Barsoum, 2003. *The scattered pearls: a history of Syriac literature and sciences* , M. Moosa (trans. ; ed.), Piscataway, N.J.

Klostermann, E. (ed.) 1904. *Das Onomastikon der biblischen Ortsnamen*, Leipzig.

Kotter, P.B. (ed.) 1988. *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, vol. 5, Berlin.

Kotter, P.B. (ed.) 1975. *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, vol. 3, Berlin.

Kotter, P.B. (ed.) 1973. *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, vol 2, Berlin.

Kuehn, C.A.; Baggarly, J. D. (eds) 2007. *Anastasius of Sinai: Hexaemeron*, Rome.

Kyriakopoulos, K.T. (ed.) 1976. *Αγίου Πέτρου επισκόπου Ἄργους Βίος και λόγοι*, Athens.

Lagges, M. (ed.) 1984. *Ο μέγας συναξαριστής της Ορθοδόξου Εκκλησίας*, Athens.

Lampsides, O. (ed.) 1975. *Ἀνδρέου Λιβαδηνοῦ βίος καὶ ἔργα*, Athens.

Laourdas,V. (ed.) 1959. *Φωτίου Ὁμιλίαι,*Thessalonike.

Lefort, J. [et al.](eds) 1995. *Actes d'Iviron. 4, De 1328 au début du XVIe siècle. Texte*, Paris.

Lefort, J. [et al.](eds) 1994. *Actes d'Iviron.3, De 1204 á 1328. Texte*, Paris.

Lemarié, J. (ed.) 1969. *Chromace d' Aquilée Sermons*, v. 1, Sermons 1-17A, H. Tardif (trans.), Paris.

Maas, P.; Trypanis, C. A. (eds) 1963. *Sancti Romani Melodi cantica: cantica dubia*, Berlin.

Mai, A. (ed.) 1831. *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio e Vaticanis Codicibus*, Rome.

Mann, F. (ed.) 1996. *Gregorii Nysseni opera. V. X. T. 2, Gregorii Nysseni Sermones. Pars III*, N. Y.

Mann, F. (ed.) 1975. *Die Weihnachtspredigt Gregors von Nyssa : Überlieferungsgeschichte und Text*, Münster.

Mansi, G. D. (ed.) *Sacrorum conciliorum: nova et amplissima collectio*, Florence.

Marcovich, M.(ed.) 1997. *Iustini Martyris Dialogus cum Tryphone*, Berlin.

Mark the Deacon, 2003. *The life of Saint Porphyrios bishop of Gaza* (in Greek), Athens.

Mateos, J. (ed.) 1962. *Le Typicon de la Grande Église: Ms. Sainte-Croix no.40, Xe siècle*, Rome.

McCown, C. C. (ed.) 1922. *The Testament of Solomon, edited from manuscripts at Mount Athos, Bologna, Holkham Hall, Jerusalem, London, Milan, Paris and Vienna*, Leipzig.

Meyendorff, P.1984. *On the divine liturgy. St. Germanus of Constantinople ; the Greek text with translation, introduction, and commentary by Paul Meyendorff*, N.Y.

Meyendorff, P.1954. *Défense des saints hésychastes*, Louvain.

Morcelli, S.A. (ed.) 1788. *Menologion ton euangelion heortastikon sive Kalendarium Ecclesiæ Constantinopolitanæ e Bibliotheca*, Rome.

Munitiz, J.A. (ed.) [et al.] 1997. *The Letter of the Three Patriarchs to Emperor Theophilos and related texts*, Camberley.

Nellas, P. (ed.; trans.) 2010. *H Theometor (treis Theometorikes homilies)*, Athens.

Oikonomides, N. (ed.) 1972. *Les listes de préséance byzantines des IXe et Xe siècles*, Paris.

Papadopoulos-Kerameus, A. (ed.) 1975. *Varia graeca sacra*, Leipzig.

Papadopoulos-Kerameus, A. (ed.) 1963. *Ανάλεκτα Ιεροσολυμιτικής σταχυολογίας*, vol. 4, Bruxelles.

Papadopoulos-Kerameus, A. (ed.) 1909. Διονυσίου ἐκ Φουρνᾶ, Ἑρμηνεία τῆς ζωγραφικῆς τέχνης, St. Petersburg.

Parenti, S. ;Velkovska, E. (eds) 1995. *L'Eucologio Barberini gr. 336*, Rome.

Paschalides, S. (ed.) 1991. *Ὁ βίος τῆς ὁσιομυροβλύτιδος Θεοδώρας τῆς ἐν Θεσσαλονίκῃ*, Thessalonike.

Pitra, J.B. (ed.) 1876. *Analecta sacra Spicilegio Solesmensi parata* ,vol .1,Paris.

Preger, Th. (ed.) 1989. *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum*, Leipzig.

Refoulé, R. F. (ed.) 2002. *Tertullien, Traité de Baptême*, Paris.

Riedinger, R. (ed.) 1969. *Pseudo-Kaisarios: Überlieferungsgeschichte und Verfasserfrage*, München.

Schwartz, E. (ed.) 1965. *Concilium universale ephesenum*, vol. 1, Berlin.

Schwartz, E. (ed.) 1940. *Collectio Sabbaitica contra acephalos et origenistas destinata. Insunt acta synodorum Constantinopolitanae et Hierosolymitanae A. 536*, Berlin.

Schwartz, E. (ed.) 1939. *Kyrillos von Skythopolis*, Leipzig.

Seeck, O. (ed.) 1962. *Notitia dignitatum. Accedunt Notitia urbis Constantinopolitanae et latercula prouinciarum*, Frankfurt am Main.

Smid, H.R. (ed.) 1965. *Protevangelium Jacobi: a commentary*, Assen.

Speck, P. (ed.) 1968. *Theodore Studites. Jamben auf verschiedene Gegenstände*, Berlin.

Tafel, L. F. (ed.) 1859. *Theodosii Meliteni Chronographia*, Munich.

Terian, A. (ed.) 2008. *The Armenian Gospel of the Infancy: with three early versions of the Protevangelium of James*, Oxford.

Testuz, M. (ed.) 1958. *Papyrus Bodmer V, Nativité de Marie*, Cologny.

Tischendorf, C. (ed.) 1853. *Evangelia apocrypha: adhibitis plurimis codicibus graecis et latinis maximam partem nunc primum consultis atque ineditorum copia insignibus*, Lipsiae.

Tobler, T. (ed.) 1877. *Itinera et descriptiones Terræ Sanctæ*,Geneva.

Verpeaux, J. (ed.) 1966 . *Traité des offices -Pseudo-Kodinos*, Paris.

Vitti, E. (ed.) 1989. *Die Erzählung über den Bau der Hagia Sophia in Konstantinopel: kritische Edition mehrerer Versionen*, Amsterdam.

Vogt, A. (ed.) 1935. *Le livre des ceremonies*, v.1, Paris.

Vogt, A. (ed.) 1939. *Le livre des ceremonies*, v .2, Paris.

Vranouse, E. L. (ed.) 1980. *Βυζαντινά έγγραφα της Μονής Πάτμου. Α΄, Αυτοκρατορικά-Διπλωματική έκδοσις-γενική εισαγωγή - ευρετήρια - πίνακες υπό Έρας Λ. Βρανούση*, Athens.

Weber, E. (ed.) 1838a. *De aedificiis*, Bonn.

Weber, E. (ed.) 1838b. *Chronografia*, Bonn.

Wellesz, E. (ed.) 1938. *The hymns for the Sticherarium in November*, E. Wellesz (ed. et al.), Copenhagen.

Wellesz, E. (ed.) 1936. *Die Hymnen des Sticherarium für September*, E. Wellesz (ed. et al.), Copenhagen.

Zepos, I; Zepos, P. 1962. *Jus Greacorum*, vol. 7, Aalen.

Zervos, S. (ed.) 1876. *Ὡρολόγιον τὸ μέγα*, Venice.

Sources in translation

Amidon, P.R. (trans.) 1990. *The Panarion of St. Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis: selected passages*, N.Y.; Oxford.

Attwater, D. (trans.) 1998. *The legends of the saints*, Dublin.

Ball, J. (trans.)1988. *The antiquities of Constantinople*, R.G. Musto (ed.), N.Y.

Brock, S. P; Kiraz, G. A. (trans.) 2006. *Ephrem the Syrian. Select poems*, Provo.

Brock, S. (trans.) 1994. *Bride of Light. Hymns on Mary from the Syriac Churches*, Kottayam.

Brock, S. (trans.) 1987. *Holy Women of the Syrian Orient*, Berkeley.

Budge, W. E. A. (trans.) 1927. *The book of the cave of treasures: a history of the patriarchs and the kings their successors from the creation to the crucifixion of Christ*, London.

Budge, E. A. W. (trans.) 1915. *Miscellaneous Coptic texts in the dialect of Upper Egypt*, London.

Budge, E. A. W. (trans.) 1910. *Coptic homilies in the dialect of Upper Egypt*, London.

Budge, E. A. W. (trans.) 1899. *The history of the Blessed Virgin Mary; and The history of the likeness of Christ which the Jews of Tiberias made to mock at, vol. 2, The English translations*, London.

Cameron, A.; Herrin, J. (trans.) 1984. *Constantinople in the early eighth century : the Parastaseis syntomoi chronikai : introduction, translation and commentary*, Leiden.

Cunningham, M.B. (trans.) 2008. *Wider Than Heaven: Eighth-century Homilies on the Mother of God*, N.Y.

Daley, B. E. (trans.) 2006. *Gregory of Nazianzus*, London; N.Y.

Davis, R. (trans.) 2000. *The book of pontiffs (Liber pontificalis)*, Liverpool.

DeCatanzaro, C. J. (trans.) 1974. *The life in Christ*, Crestwood, N.Y.

Dewing, H. B.; Downey, G. (trans.) 1940. *On Buildings*, vol. 7, London: Cambridge, Mass. : Heinemann..

Elliott, J. (trans.) 1993. *The Apocryphal New Testament: a collection of apocryphal Christian literature in an English translation*, Oxford.

Halsall, P. (trans.) 1996. Life of St. Thomais of Lesbos in *Holy women of Byzantium: ten saints' lives in English translation*, A. M. Talbot (ed.) Washington, D.C., 291-322.

Hansbury, M. (trans.) 1998. *Jacob of Serug: On the Mother of God*, N.Y.

Holy Transfiguration Monastery 1984. A*scetical Homilies of Saint Isaac the Syrian* , Boston.

James, M.R. (trans.) 1924. *The Apocryphal New Testament,* Oxford.

Jordan, R. (trans.) 2000. Typikon of Empress Irene Doukaina Komnene for the Convent of the Mother of God Kecharitomene in Constantinople in *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents*, *: a complete translation of the surviving founders' typika and testaments*, II, J. Thomas; H.A. Constantinides (eds) Washington D.C., 664–717.

Karras, V. (trans.) 1996. Life of St. Elisabeth the Wonderworker in *Holy women of Byzantium: ten saints' lives in English translation*, A. M .Talbot (ed.) Washington, D.C.,117-135.

Krauss, S. (trans.) 1902. *Das Leben Jesu nach jüdischen Quellen*, Berlin.

Lasker, D. J.; Stroumsa, S. (trans.) 1996. *The polemic of Nestor the Priest : Qiṣṣat Mujādalat al-Usquf and Sefer Nestor Ha-Komer*, Jerusalem.

Lo Castro, G. (trans.) 1992. *Omelie cristologiche e mariane, Teodoto di Ancira*, Roma.

Mango, C. (trans.) 1958. *The homilies of Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, / English translation, introduction and commentary*, Cambridge,Mass.

McCarthy, C. (trans.) 1993. *Saint Ephrem's Commentary on Tatian's " Diatessaron" : an English translation of Chester Beatty Syriac MS 709*,Oxford.

McVey, K. E (transl.) 1989. *Ephrem the Syrian: Hymns*, N.Y.

Mendham, J. (trans.) 1850. *The seventh general council, the second of Nicaea, in which the worship of images was established, with copious notes from the "Caroline Books" compiled by order of Charlemagne for its confutation*, London.

Menzies, A. (trans.) 1896. *Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol.9,* Michigan.

Miller, T. (trans.) 2000. Theodore Studites: Testament of Theodore the Studite for the Monastery of St. John Stoudios in Constantinople in *Byzantine monastic foundation documents : a complete translation of the surviving founders' typika and testaments*. T. J. Thomas; H.A. Constantinides (eds) Washington D.C.

Neusner, J. (trans.) 2006. *The Talmud : what it is and what it says*, Lanham, Md. ; Oxford.

De Poli, O.V. (trans.) 1900. *Cartulaire de l' église d' Apt*, Paris.

Ramsey, B. (trans.) 1997a. *Ambrose*, London.

Ramsey, B. (trans.) 1997b. *John Cassian: The conferences*, London.

Russell, N. (trans.) 2007. *Theophilus of Alexandria*, London.

Ryan, W. G. (trans.) 1993. *The golden legend: readings on the saints*, Princeton.

Roberts, A.; Donaldson, J. (trans.) 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. 6,* Michigan.

Schaff, P. ; Wace, H. (eds) 1894. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: 2nd Series, vol.7 St. Cyril of Jerusalem: Catechetical Lectures; St. Gregory Nazianzen: Select Orations, Sermons, Letters; Dogmatic Treatises*, Michigan.

Schaff, P. 1889. *Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, vol.14*, Michigan.

Schaff, P. (ed.) 1888. *Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, vol.7. Mass.

Tanner, N. P; Alberigo, G. (trans.) 1990. *Decrees of the ecumenical councils. V.1, Nicaea I to Lateran V*, N. Tanner (ed.), London.

Temkin, O. (trans.) 1991. *Soranus' gynecology*, Baltimore.

Trōianos, S. N. (trans.) 2007. *Oi Neares Leontos St´ tou Sophou*, Athens.

Veniamin, C. (trans.) 2005. *Mary the Mother of God: Sermons by Saint Gregory Palamas*, PA.

Wilson, R. McL. (trans.) 1974. *New Testament Apocrypha*, E. Hennecke ; W. Schreemelcher (eds), London.

Whiston, W. (trans.) 1987. *The complete works of Josephus: Complete and Unabridged*, Mass.

Whitby, M.; Whitby, M. (trans.) 1989. *Chronicon paschale, 284-628 AD.*, Liverpool.

Secondary bibliography

Abel, F. M. 1956. Sanctuaires marials en Palestine. in *Maria: Études sur la Sainte Vierge*, v. 4, Paris, 855-866.

Abel, F. M. 1914. Recensions, *RB*, 453-462

Abrahamse, D.; Domingo-Forasté, D. 1998. Lives of Sts David, Symeon and George of Lesbos in *Byzantine defenders of images : eight saints' lives in English translation*, A.M Talbot(ed.), Washington, D.C, 143-241.

Acheimastou-Potamianou, M. (ed.) 1987. *From Byzantium to El Greco, Greek Frescoes and Icons*, *Royal Academy of Art, London, 27th March-21st June 1987* (exhibition catalogue), Athens.

Ahrweiler, H. 1977: The geography of the Iconoclast period in *Iconoclasm: papers given at the Ninth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Birmingham, March 1975*, 21-7.

Albani, J. P. 2000. *Die byzantinischen Wandmalereien der Panagia Chrysaphitissa-Kirche in Chrysapha/Lakonien*, Athens.

Alchermes, J.D.2006. Art and architecture in the age of Justinian *in The Cambridge companion to the Age of Justinian*, Cambridge, 343-375.

De Aldama, J. A. 1965. *Repertorium pseudochrysostomicum*, Paris.

Allen, P. 2004. *Severus of Antioch*. London; N. Y.

Allen, P. 2003. Hesychius of Jerusalem in *Let us die that we may live: Greek homilies on Christian martyrs from Asia Minor, Palestine and Syria, (c. AD 350-AD 450)*, London, 194-214.

Allen, P. 1992. Contemporary portrayals of the Byzantine empress Theodora (A.D.527-548) in *Stereotypes of women in power: historical perspectives and revisionist views*, B.Garlick; S. Dixon; P. Allen (eds), N. Y. ; London, 93-103.

Al-Ratroutm, H.F. 2004. *The Architectural Development of Al-Aqsa Mosque in the Early Islamic Period: Sacred Architecture in the shape of the 'Holy'*, Scotland.

Altripp, M. 2000. Beobachtungen zum Bildprogramm der Prothesis in *Byzantinische Malerei: Bildprogramme, Ikonographie, Stil: Symposium in Marburg vom 25.-29.6.1997*, Wiesbaden, 25-40.

Anastasiou, I. E. 1959. *Τὰ Εἰσόδια τῆς Θεοτόκου*, Thessalonike.

Andaloro, M. 2002. Le icone a Roma in età preiconoclasta, in *Roma fra Oriente e Occidente. Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, XLIX Spoleto 19-24 Aprile 2001*, Spoleto, 719-753.

Andalaro, M.1986. I mosaici parietali di Durazzo o dell'origine constantinopolitano del tema iconografico dim aria Regina in *Studien zur spätantiken und byzantinischen Kunst : Friedrich Wilhelm Deichmann gewidmet, Teil 3*, Bonn,103-112.

Angelidi, C . 1998. *Pulcheria: la castità al potere (c. 399-c. 455)*, Milano.

Angelidi, C. 1994. Une texte patriographique et édifiant: le 'Discours narratif' sur les Hodègoi, *REB* 52, 113-149

Angelidi, C ; Papamastorakis, T. 2000. 'Η μονή των Οδηγών και η λατρεία της Θεοτόκου Οδηγήτριας' in *Μήτηρ Θεού:Απεικονίσεις της Παναγίας στη Βυζαντινή τέχνη*, M.Vassilaki (ed.), Athens, 373-385.

Angold, M. 1989. Greeks and Latins after 1204: the perspective of exile in *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204*, B.Arbel, B. Hamilton, D. Jacoby (eds), London, 63-86.

Antonopoulou, T. 1998. Homiletic activity in Constantinople around 900 in *Preacher and audience : studies in early Christian and Byzantine homiletics*, M. B. Cunningham; P.Allen.(eds), Leiden ; Boston, 317-348.

Antonopoulou, T. 1997. *The Homilies of the Emperor Leo VI*, Leiden.

Aspra -Vardavake, M. 2003. Παρατηρήσεις σε σιναϊτικό υστεροκομνήνειο τετράπτυχο, *D.C.A.E.* 24, 211-221.

Aspra -Vardavake, M. 1991-2. Οι τοιχογραφίες της Παναγίας Μεσοχωρίτισσας στις Μάλλες Λασιθίου Κρήτης, *Diptycha* 5,176-248

Asutay-Effenberger, N. 2007. *Landmauer von Konstantinopel-Istanbul : historisch-topographische und baugeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, Berlin.

Asutay, N. 1998. *Byzantinische Apsisnebenräume: Untersuchung zur Funktion der Apsisnebenräume in den Höhlenkirchen Kappadokiens und in den mittelbyzantinischen Kirchen Konstantinopels*, Weimar.

Atzemouglou, N. 1990. *T' αγιάσματα της Πόλης*, Athens.

Auzépy, M-F .2003. Les monastères in *La Bithynie au Moyen Âge*, B. Geyer; J. Lefort (eds), Paris, 431-458.

Auzépy, M-F .2001. Les Isauriens et 1'espace sacre: 1'eglise et les reliques in *Le* sacré et son inscription dans l'espace à Byzance et en Occident, M. Kaplan (ed.), Paris, 13-24 (reprinted) in *L'histoire des iconoclastes,* 2007, Paris, 341-352.

Avery, M. 1925. The Alexandrian Style at Santa Maria Antiqua, Rome, *ABull* 7, 131-149

Avi-Yonah, Y.1975. Jerusalem in the second temple period in *Jerusalem revealed : archaeology in the Holy City, 1968-1974*, Jerusalem, 9-13.

Avi-Yonah, M.1954. *The Madaba mosaic*, Jerusalem.

Avi-Yonah, M.1975. Jerusalem of the second Temple period in *Jerusalem revealed : archaeology in the Holy City, 1968-1974,* R. Grafman (trans.), Jerusalem, 9-13.

Avner, R. 2007. The Kathisma : A Christian and Muslim Pilgrimage Site, *Aram* 19, 541 - 557

Avramea, A. 2004. Άγιοι επίσκοποι του Ελλαδικού χώρου, που έζησαν ή καθιερώθηκαν κατά τους 8ο-10ο αιώνες, με ειδική αναφορά στον Άγιο Αχίλλιο Λαρίσης in *Οι ήρωες της Ορθόδοξης Εκκλησίας: οι νέοι άγιοι, 8ος-16ος αιώνας*, E. Kountoura-Galake (ed.), Athens, 47-64.

Babić, G. 1969. *Les chapelles annexes des églises Byzantines*, Paris.

Babić, G. 1961. Sur l'iconographie de la composition " Nativité de la Vierge" dans la peinture byzantine, *ZRVI* 7, 169-175

Bacci, M. 2006. Syrian, Paleologan and Gothic murals in the 'Nestorian'church of Famagusta, *D.C.A.E.* 27, 207-220.

Badalanova-Geller, F. 2004. The spinning of Mary: Towards the Iconology of the Annunciation, *Cosmos* 20, 211-60

Baert, B. 2005. The pool of Bethsaïda: The cultural history of a holy place in Jerusalem, *Viator* 36, 1-22

Bahat, D. 1996. The Physical infrastructure in *The history of Jerusalem. The early Muslim period 638-1099*, J. Prawer; H. Ben-Shammai (eds), Jerusalem; N.Y.,38-100.

Baillet, M.; Milik; J. T.;Vaux, de R.1962. *Discoveries in the Judaean desert. 3, Les 'petites grottes' de Qumran*, Oxford.

Bakaloude, A.D. 1998. Αποτροπαϊκά φυλακτά της πρώτης βυζαντινής περιόδου: Η λειτουργία των απεικονίσεων και των επωδών. Ο ρόλος των Χριστιανών Αγίων, *Byzantina* 19, 207-224

Bakalova, E. 2006. Hymnography and Iconography: Images of Hymnographers in twelfth- and thirteenth-century church painting in Serbia in *Ritual and art Byzantine essays for Christopher Walter*, P. Armstrong (ed.), 246-273.

Bakourou, E.1980. *AD* 36. 135-146

Bakourou, E.1980. *AD* 35,158-168

Baldovin, J. F.1989. *Liturgy in ancient Jerusalem*, Bramcote.

Ballian, A.-R. 1995. *Patronage in Central Asia Minor and the Pontos during the Ottoman period : the case of church silver, 17th -19th centuries* (Ph.D Thesis), Birmingham.

Bannister, H.M.1903.The introduction of the cultus of St. Anne into the West, *EHR* 69,107-112

Báránynē-Oberschall, M. 1937. *The Crown of the Emperor Constantine Monomachos*, Budapest.

Barber, Ch. 2005. Theotokos and Logos: the interpretation and re interpretation of the sanctuary programme of the Koimesis Church, Nicaea in *Images of the Mother of God: perceptions of the Theotokos in Byzantium*, M. Vassilaki (ed.), Aldershot, 51-9.

Barclay, Lloyd, J. 1996. Sixth-Century Art and Architecture in "Old Rome": End or Beginning? in *The Sixth century - end or beginning?* , P. Allen; E. Jeffreys (eds), Brisbane, 224-235.

Bardill, J. 2003. *Brickstamps of Constantinople*, Oxford.

Barnard, L. W. 1963. The Background of St. Ignatius of Antioch, *VC* 17, 193-206

Barton, J; Muddiman, J.2001. *The Oxford Bible Commentary*, Oxford.

Baseu-Barabas, T. 1997. Perdikas von Ephesos und seine Beschreibung Jerusalems: die heiligen Stätten gesehen von einem Byzantiner des 14. Jhs., *Symmeikta* 11, 151-188

Baumer, E.; Scheffczyk, L. 1988. *Marienlexikon*, vol.1, St. Ottilien.

Baumer, E.; Scheffczyk, L.1989. *Marienlexikon*, vol.2, St. Ottilien.

Bauckham, R. 2000. Imaginative Literature in *Early Christian World,* 2 vols, Routledge, 719-814.

Baun, J. R. 2007. *Tales from another Byzantium: celestial journey and local community in the Medieval Greek Apocrypha*, Cambridge.

Baur, C. 1960. *John Chrysostom and his time; vol.2, Constantinople,* M. Gonzaga (trans.), London.

Beatrice, P.F.1996. Traditions apocryphes dans la *Theosophie de Tübingen*, *Apocrypha* 7, 109-122

Beatrice, P.F.1995. Pagan wisdom and Christian Theology according to the Tübingen Theosophy, *JECS* 3:4, 403-418

Beck, E.1961. *Kirche und theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich*, München.

Beck, E.1956. Die Mariologie des echten Schriften Ephräms, *OC* 40, 22-39

Beinert, W.; Petri, H. 1984. *Handbuch der Marienkunde*, Regensburg.

Belting, H. 1994. *Likeness and presence: a history of the image before the era of art*, Chicago.

Belting, H. 1987.Eine Privatkapelle im frühmittelalterlichen Rom, *DOP* 41, 55-69

Belting, H. 1974. Byzantine Art among Greeks and Latins in Southern Italy, *DOP* 28, 1-29

Benoit, P. 1971. L'Antonia D'Hérode le Grand et le Forum Oriental D'Aelia Capitolina *The Harv Theolog Rev* 64, 135-167

Berger, A. 2001. Imperial and ecclesiastical processions in Constantinople in *Byzantine Constantinople : monuments, topography, and everyday life*, Leiden ; Boston,73-88.

Berger, A.1988. *Untersuchungen zu den Patria Konstantinupoleos*, Bonn.

Berger, A.1982. *Das Bad in der Byzantinischen Zeit*, München.

Bienert, W. A. 1972. *Allegoria und Anagoge bei Didymos dem Blinden von Alexandria*, Berlin; N.Y.

Bilde, P. 2006. Early Christian cult buildings. The development of early christian architecture from the 'House churches' to Constantinian basilicas in *Kalathos : studies in honour of Asher Ovadiah*, S. Mucznin;Y. Turnheim; T. Michaeli (eds),Tel Aviv,127-142.

Bitel, L. 2002. *Women in early medieval Europe 400-1100*, Cambridge.

Blaauw, de S. 1994. *Cultus et décor: liturgia e architettura nella Roma tardoantica e medievale*, Vatican City.

Blanchet, M.-H. 2008. *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios (vers 1400-vers 1472) : un intellectuel orthodoxe face à la disparition de l'empire Byzantin*, Paris.

De Blois, F. 2002. Naṣrānī (Ναζωραîος) and ḥanīf (ἐθνικός): Studies on the Religious Vocabulary of Christianity and of Islam, *BSOAS* 65, 1-30

Boldman, E.S. 2004. The Coptic Galaktotrophousa revisited in *Coptic studies on the threshold of a new millennium : proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Coptic Studies, Leiden, August 27-September 2, 2000*, Leuven, 1173-1184.

Bonito, V. A. 1982. The Saint Anne Altar in Sant'Agostino: Restoration and Interpretation, *BurM* 124, 268-276

Bonner, C. 1942-3.The maiden's stratagem, *Byz* 16,142-161

Børtnes, J.; Hägg.T. 2006. *Gregory of Nazianzus: images and reflections*, Copenhagen.

Bouras, L.1976. Some observations on the Grand Lavra Phiale at Mount Athos and its Bronze Strobilion, *D.C.A.E.* 8, 85-96

Borboudakes, E. 1972. Chronika, *A.D.* 27.

Borboudakes, E. 1973. Chronika, *A.D.* 28, 597-607

Botte, D. B. 1968. Rites and liturgical groups in *The church at prayer. Introduction to the liturgy*, vol. 1, A.G. Martimort (ed.), N.Y.,13-31.

Brakke, D. 1995. *Athanasius and the politics of asceticism*, Oxford.

Brandenbarg, T. 1995. Sainte Anne: A holy grandmother and her children in *Sanctity and motherhood: essays on holy mothers in the Middle Ages*, Mulder-Bakker, A.B.(ed.), N.Y; London, 31-68.

Brenk, B. 2004. Papal patronage in a Greek church in Rome in *Santa Maria Antiqua al Foro romano : cento anni dopo : atti del colloquio internazionale, Roma, 5-6 maggio 2000*, Osborne, J.; Brandt, J. R.; Morganti, G.(eds), Rome, 67-81.

Brenk, B. 2003. *Die Christianisierung der spätrömischen Welt: Stadt, Land, Haus, Kirche und Kloster in frühchristlicher Zeit*,Wiesbaden.

Brenk, B. 1977. *Spätantike und Frühes Christentum*, Frankfurt am Main.

Bresciani, E. 1981. Dall' Egitto Ellenistico all' Egitto Christiano:L'eredità faraonica in *XXVIII corso di cultura sull'arte Ravennate e Bizantina*, Ravenna, 21-30.

Brock, S. 2006. The genealogy of the Virgin Mary in Sinai Syr. 16, *Scrinium* 2, 58-71

Brock, S. P. 1979a. *The Holy Spirit in the Syrian baptismal tradition*, India.

Brock, S. 1979b. Jewish Traditions in Syriac Sources, *JJS* 30, 212- 232

Brock, S. P. 1974. The Epiklesis in the Antiochene baptismal 'Ordines' (reprinted in) *Fire from heaven: studies in Syriac theology and liturgy (variorum), 2006*, Aldershot XII,183-218.

Browne, H. 1844. *Ordo Sæclorum: A Treatise on the Chronology of the Holy Scriptures*, London.

Brownrigg, R.1993. *Who's who in the New Testament*, Routledge.

Brubaker, L.; Haldon, J. 2011. *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era, C. 680-850: a history*, Cambridge.

Brubaker, L.; Cunningham, M. 2007. Byzantine veneration of the *Theotokos*: Icons, relics and eighth-century homilies in *From Rome to Constantinople : studies in honor of Averil Cameron*, H. Amirav & Bas ter Haar R.(eds), Leuven ; Dudley, MA , 235-250.

Brubaker, L. 2006. In the beginning was the Word:Art and Orthodoxy ay the Councils of Trullo(692) and Nicaea II(787) in *Byzantine orthodoxies : proceedings of the 36th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Durham, 23-25 March 2002* / A. Louth and A. Casiday(eds), Aldershot, 95-101

Brubaker, L. 2004. 100 years of solitude: Santa Maria Antiqua and the history if Byzantine art history in *Santa Maria Antiqua al Foro romano: cento anni dopo: atti del colloquio internazionale, Roma, 5-6 maggio 2000* , Osborne, J.; Brandt, J. R.; Morganti, G.(eds), Rome, 41-7.

Brubaker, L. 2003. Texts and pictures in manuscripts. What's rhetoric got to do with it? in *Rhetoric in Byzantium: papers from the Thirty-fifth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Exeter College, University of Oxford, March 2001*,E. Jeffreys(ed.), Aldershot , 255-272.

Brubaker, L.1999. Vision and meaning in ninth-century Byzantium : image as exegesis in the homilies of Gregory of Nazianzus, Cambridge.

Brubaker, L.1985. Politics, Patronage, and Art in Ninth-Century Byzantium: The "Homilies" of Gregory of Nazianzus in Paris (B. N. gr. 510), *DOP* 39 ,1-13

Bryer, A., Winfield, D.1985. *The Byzantine monuments and topography of the Pontos*, Washington, D.C.

Buchthal, H. 1966. Early Fourteenth-Century Illuminations from Palermo, *DOP* 20, 103-118

Buckton, D. (ed.). 1994. *Byzantium: treasures of Byzantine art and culture from British collections*, London.

Bulkeley, K. 2009. *Dreaming in Christianity and Islam: culture, conflict, and creativity*, New Brunswick, N.J.

Burgess, R. W.; Witakowski, W. 1999. *Studies in Eusebian and post-Eusebian chronography,* Stuttgart.

Bynum-Walker, C. 1991. *Fragmentation and redemption : essays on gender and the human body in medieval religion*, N.Y.

Calofonos, G. 1984. Dream Interpretation: A Byzantinist Superstition? *BMGS* 9, 215-220

Cameron, A. 2004. The cult of the Virgin in Late Antiquity: Religious development and myth-making in *The Church and Mary*, R.N.Swanson (ed.) Studies in church history 39, Woodbridge, 1-21.

Cameron, A.2003. How to read heresiology, *JMEMS* 33.3, 471-492

Cameron, A. 2000. The cult of the Virgin in late antiquity: religious development and myth-making in *The Church and Mary: papers read at the 2001 Summer Meeting and the 2002 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society* R. N.Swanson (ed.), Suffolk,1-21.

Cameron , A. 1992. The language of images: The rise of icons and Christian representation (reprinted) in *Changing cultures in early Byzantium* (variorum), Aldershot, XIII.

Cameron, A. 1991. *Christianity and the rhetoric of empire: the development of Christian discourse*, Berkeley.

Cameron, A. 1985. *Procopius and the sixth century*, London.

Cameron, A. 1979a. The Virgin's robe: An episode in the history of early seventh-century Constantinople, *Byzantion* 49, 42-56

Cameron, A, 1979b. Images of authority: Elites and Icons in late sixth-century Byzantium, JHS 1979 (reprinted in) *Continuity and Change in Sixth-Century Byzantium (Variorum)*, London 1981, XVIII, 3-35.

Cameron, A. 1978. The Theotokos in Sixth-Century Constantinople: a city finds its symbol (reprinted in) *Continuity and Change in Sixth-Century Byzantium (Variorum), London, 1981*, XIV. 79-108

Cameron, A.1965. Procopius and the church of St.Sophia, (reprinted in) *Continuity and Change in Sixth-Century Byzantium (variorum), London,1981*. IV

Campanati , R. F. 1982. La cultura artistica nelle regioni bizantine d'Italia dal VI all'XI secolo in *I Bizantini in Italia*, Milan, 139-426.

Camplani, A.1997. *L'egitto cristiano: aspetti e problemi in età tardo-antica*, Rome.

Carile, A. 1998. Santi aristocratici e santi imperatori in *Oriente cristiano e santità. Figure e storie di santi tra Bisanzio e l'Occidente*, S. Gentile (ed.), Milano, 35-44.

Carile, M.C 2006. Constantinople and the Heavenly Jerusalem?: through the imperial palace, 21st International Congress of Byzantine Studies, London. Accessed online via www.byzantinecongress.org.uk/paper/VII/VII.2_Carile.pdf (06/03/10)

Caro, R. 1972. *La homilética Mariana griega en el siglo V*,vol. 2, Dayton.

Cartlidge, D. R ; Elliott, J. K. 2001. *Art and the Christian apocrypha*, London.

Cecchelli, C. 1954. *Mater Christi, IV, La vita di Maria nella storia nella leggenda nella commemorazione liturgica (parte II- tomo III)*, Rome.

Cecchelli, C. 1946. *Mater Christi, I, Il 'Logos' e Maria*, Rome.

Chamberlain, G. L. 2007. *Troubled waters: religion, ethics and the global water crisis*, Lanham.

Charalampidis, C.P. 2007. La croce nell'iconographia bizantina fino al XIV secolo in *La croce: iconografia e interpretazione, secoli I-inizio XVI: atti del Convegno internazionale di studi, Napoli (6-11 dicembre 1999),* II, Naples, 79-98.

Chastel, A. 2001. *La geste dans l'art* , Paris.

Chatzēdakē, N. M. 1993. *Από τον Χάνδακα στη Βενετία: Ελληνικές Εικόνες στην Ιταλία - 15ος-16ος αι. Μουσείο Correr, Venetia, 17 Σεπτεμβρίιου-30 Οκτωβρίου 1993*, Athens.

Chatzedakes, M.1998. *Έλληνες ζωγράφοι μετά την Άλωση 1450-1830*,vol. 1, Athens.

Chatzedakes, M.1997. *Eureterio Vyzantinōn toichographiōn Ellados: Kythera*, Athens.

Chatzedakes, M. 1968. Icon painting from the twelfth to the sixteenth century in *Icons from South Eastern Europe and Sinai*, R.E. Wolf (trans.), London, XII.

Chatzedakes, M. 1967. *AD* 22, 16-33

Chatzedakes, M. 1952. Τοιχογραφίες στην Κρήτη, *KC* 6, 59-91

Chazal, G.; Bonovas, N.(eds) 2009. *Le Mont Athos et l'empire byzantin: tr��ors de la Sainte Montagne* , Paris.

Cecchelli, C. 1944. *La cattedra di Massimiano ed altri avorii romano-orientali*,Rome.

Chevalier, C. 1938. Mariologie de Romanos (490—550 environ), le roi des melodes, *RSR* 28, 48-71

Chirat, D. H. 1950. La naissance et les trois premiéres annés de la Vierge dans l'art byzantin, *Memorial J. Chaine*, Lyon, XX, 81-113

Chojnacki, S.1983. *Major themes in Ethiopian painting : indigenous developments, the influence of foreign models, and their adaptation from the 13th to the 19th century*,Wiesbaden.

Cholij, R. 2002. *Theodore the Stoudite: the ordering of holiness*, Oxford.

Christo, G. G. 2005. *The consecration of a Greek Orthodox church according to Eastern Orthodox tradition: a detailed account and explanation of the ritual Lewiston*, N.Y. ; Lampeter.

Cigaar, K. N. 1976. Une description de Constantinople traduite par un pèlerin anglais, *REB* 34, 211–63

Cleave, R. 1993. *The Holy Land: a unique perspective*, Oxford.

Colwell, E.C. 1935. The Fourth Gospel and Early Christian Art, *Jrel* 15, 191-206

Comings, J.B. 2005. *Aspects of the liturgical year in Cappadocia (325-430)*,N. Y. ; Oxford.

Connolly, R. H. 1913, Syriac Forms of proper names (review), *JTS 14*, 474-476

Connor, C.L. 1999. Female saints in church decoration of the Troodos mountains in Cuprus in *Medieval Cyprus: studies in art, architecture and history in memory of Doula Mouriki*, N. Patterson Ševčenko; C. Moss (eds), Princeton, N.J., 211-240.

Constantinides, E. C.1992. *The wall paintings of the Panagia Olympiotissa at Elasson in Northern Thessaly*, Athens.

Constantinou, S. 2005. *Female corporeal performances: reading the body in Byzantine passions and lives of holy women*, Uppsala.

Constas, N. 2002. Mark Eugenios in *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition*, C. G. Conticello and V. Conticello (eds), vol. 2, Turnhout, 411-476.

Constas, N.P. 2007. Symeon of Thessalonike and the Theology of the Icon Screen in *Thresholds of the sacred: architectural, art historical, liturgical, and theological perspectives on religious screens, East and West*, Sh. E.J. Gerstel (ed.), Washington, D.C., 163-184.

Constas, N. 1998. Life of St. Anthousa daughter of Constantine V, in *Byzantine defenders of images : eight saints' lives in English translation*, A.M. Talbot (ed.) Washington, D.C, 21-4.

Coon, L. 1977. *Sacred fictions: holy women and hagiography in late antiquity*, Philadelphia.

Cormack, R. 2007. *Icons*, London.

Cornu, G.1999. Les tissus d'apparat fatimides, parmi les plus somptueux le 'voile de sainte Anne in *L'Égypte fatimide. Son art et son histoire. Actes du colloque organisé à Paris les 28, 29 et 30 mai 1998*, M. Barrucand (ed.), Paris, 331-337.

Corrigan, K. A. 1992. *Visual polemics in the ninth-century Byzantine psalters*, Cambridge.

Da Costa-Louillet, G. 1961. Saints de Grece aux VIIIe, IXe et Xe siecles', *Byz* 31, 309 - 69

Cotsonis, J. 2005. The contribution of Byzantine lead seals to the study of the cult of saints (sixth-twelfth century), *Byz* 75, 383-497

Cothenet, E. 1988. Le Protévangile de Jacques: origine, genre et signification d'un premier midrash chrétien sur la Nativité de Marie, *ANRW* II.25.6, 4252-4269

Cré, L. 1893. Recherche et découverte Le tombeau de saint Joachim et de sainte Anne à Jerusalem, *RB* 2, 245-274

Croce, E. 1961. Anna, *BS* 1, Rome, 1269-1295.

Croke, B. 2007. Justinian under Justin: reconfiguring a reign, *BZ* 100, 13-56

Croke, B. 2005. Justinian's Constantinople in *The Cambridge companion to the Age of Justinian*, Cambridge, 60-86.

Crow, J. 2008. *The water supply of Byzantine Constantinople* London.

Cruz, J.C.1984. *Relics*, Indiana.

Csepregi, I. (no date). The theological other: religious and narrative identity in fifth to seventh century Byzantine miracle collections, 59-72. Accessed online via http://harvard.academia.edu/IldikoCsepregi/Papers/306126/The_theological_Other_Religious_and_narrative_identity_in_5-7th_century_Byzantine_miracle_collections (10/09/10)

Cunningham, M. B. 2006. 'All-Holy Infant ':Byzantine and Western views on the Conception of the Virgin Mary, *SVTQ* 50,127-148

Cunningham, M. B. 1998. Andrew of Crete: High-Style Preacher of the Eighth century in *Preacher and audience: studies in early Christian and Byzantine homiletics*, M. B. Cunningham; P.Allen.(eds),Leiden ; Boston, 267-294.

Cunningham, M. B. 1996. The sixth century: a turning-point for Byzantine homiletics? in *The Sixth century - end or beginning?*, P. Allen; E. Jeffreys (eds), Brisbane, 176-186.

Cunningham, M. B. 1995. Innovation or Mimesis in Byzantine sermons? in *Originality in Byzantine literature, art and music*,*1987 Nov : Columbus, OH)*, A.R.Littlewood (ed.) 67-80.

Cunningham, M. B. 1988.The mother of God in early Byzantine homilies, *Sobornost* 10, 53-67

Cunningham, M. B. 1983. *Andreas of Crete's Homilies on Lazarus and Palm Sunday : a critical edition and commentary*, Thesis (Ph.D.),University of Birmingham, Birmingham.

Ćurčić, S. 1991. Late Byzantine *Loca Santa.* Some questions regarding the form and function of Epitaphioi in *The Twilight of Byzantium: aspects of cultural and religious history in the late Byzantine empire : papers from the colloquium held at Princeton University 8-9 May 1989*, S. Ćurčić;D. Mouriki (eds), Princeton, N.J.,251-261.

Cutler, A. 1992. Pas oikos Israēl. Ezekiel and the politics of Resurrection in tenth-century Byzantium, *DOP* 46, 47-58

Dagron, G. 2003. *Emperor and priest: the imperial office in Byzantium*, J. Birrell (trans.), Cambridge.

Dagron, G. 1977. Le christianisme dans la ville byzantine, *DOP* 31,1-25

Dale, T. 2009. From ''Icons in space'' to space in icons: Pictorial models for public and private ritual in the thirteenth-century mosaics of San Marco in Venice in *Hierotopy: comparative studies of sacred spaces,* Moscow, 144-154.

Daley, B. E. 2001. "At the Hour of Our Death": Mary's Dormition and Christian Dying in Late Patristic and Early Byzantine Literature, *DOP* 55, 71-89

Danby, H.1933. *The Mishnah,* London.

Darling, J. K. 2004. *Architecture of Greece*, Westport, CT.

Davis, S. J. 2008. *The cult of Saint Thecla: a tradition of women's piety in late antiquity,* Oxford.

Day, J. 2007. *The Baptismal Liturgy of Jerusalem: Fourth- and Fifth - Century Evidence from Palestine, Syria and Egypt*, Aldershot.

Dechow, J. F, 1988. *Dogma and mysticism in early Christianity : Epiphanius of Cyprus and the legacy of Origen*, Macon, GA.

Delierneux, N. 2004. Littérature des hommes, biographie des «anges» : Quelques remarques d'hagiographie feminine (VIIIe-Xe siècle) in *Les Vies des Saints à Byzance. Genre littéraire ou biographie historique?*, P. Odorico, P. Agapitos (eds), Paris, 347-366.

Delooz, P. 1969. *Sociologie et canonisations*, Liège.

Demangel, R. ; Mamboury, E. 1939. *Le quartier des Manganes et la première région de Constantinople*, Paris.

Demetrokalles, G. 1986. *Ο Ἅγιος Νικόλαος Ιστιαίας Εὐβοίας*, Athens.

Demisch, H. 1984. *Erhobene Hände : Geschichte einer Gebärde in der bildenden Kunst*, Stuttgart.

Demus, O. 1991. *Die Byzantinische Mosaikikonen*, Vienna.

Demus, O. 1960.Two Palaeologan Mosaic Icons in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection, *DOP* 14, 87-119

Demus, O. 1949. *The mosaics of Norman Sicily*, London.

Demus, O. 1948. *Byzantine mosaic decoration: aspects of monumental art in Byzantium*, London.

El Denny, D. 1973. Some symbols in the arena chapel frescoes, *ABull* 55, 205-212

Depuydt, L.1993. *Catalogue of Coptic Manuscripts in the Pierpont Morgan Library*, Leuven.

Deshman, R.1989. *Servants of the mother of God in Byzantine and medieval art*, London.

Detlef, C; Müller, G. 1978. Grundzüge der Frömmigkeit in der Nubischen Kirche in *Études nubiennes : colloque de Chantilly, 2-6 juillet 1975,* Cairo, 210-224

Detoraki, M, 2002. Το βιβλικό υπόστρωμα της μαρτυρολογικής αγιολογίας στην πρώτη βυζαντινή περίοδο in *Γ΄ συνάντηση Βυζαντινολόγων Ελλάδος και Κύπρου 22 - 24 Σεπτεμβρίου 2000*, Rethymno, 29-31.

Dieten, J. L.Van 1972. *Geschichte der griechischen Patriarchen von Konstantinopel / (von) Jan Louis van Dieten, Cyril Mango, Peter Wirth. Tl 4, Geschichte der Patriarchen von Sergios I. bis Johannes VI., 610-715*, Amsterdam.

Dieterich, K. 1909. *Geschichte der Byzantinischen und Neugriechischen Literatur*, Leipzig.

Dijk, van A. 2001. Jerusalem, Antioch, Rome, and Constantinople: The Peter Cycle in the Oratory of Pope John VII (705-707), *DOP* 55, 305-328

Dinzelbacher, P. 1994. *Christliche Mystik im Abendland: ihre Geschichte von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des Mittelalters,* Paderborn.

Di Segni, L. The Onomastikon of Eusebius and the Madaba Map in *The Madaba map centenary 1897-1997: travelling through the Byzantine Umayyad period proceedings of the international conference held in Amman, 7-9 April 1997*, Jerusalem, 115-120.

Dolezal, M.L.; Mavroudi, M. 2002. Theodore Hyrtakenos ' Description of the Garden of St.Anna and the Ekphrasis of Gardens, in *Byzantine Garden Culture*, A. Littlewood;H. Maguire; J. Wolschke-Buhlmann (eds),Washington D.C., 105-158.

Dölger, F. 1961. *Paraspora: 30 Aufsätze zur Geschichte, Kultur und Sprache des byzantinischen Reiches*, Ettal .

Dominicus, B.1994. *Gesten und Gebärden in Darstellungen des Alten und Mittleren Reiches*, Heidelberg.

Donner, H. 1992. *The mosaic map of Madaba. An introductory guide*, Netherlands.

Donner, H. 1979. *Pilgerfahrt ins Heilige Land: die ältesten Berichte christlicher Palästinapilger (4.-7. Jahrhundert)*, Stuttgart.

Donner, H.1971.   Die Palästinabeschreibung des Epiphanius Monachus Hagiopolita, *ZDPV* 87, 42-91

Doresse, J.; Lanne, E.; Capelle, B. 1960. *Un temoin archaique de la liturgie copte de s. Basile par J. Doresse et E. Lanne; en annexe, Les liturgies "basiliennes" et saint Basile*, Louvain.

Downey, G 1960.*Constantinople in the age of Justinian*, Norman.

Downey, G. 1957. Nikolaos Mesarites: Description of the church of the Holy Apostles at Constantinople, *TAPhS* 47, 855-924

Downey, G. 1955. Earthquakes at Constantinople and Vicinity, A.D. 342-1454, *Speculum* 30, 596-600

Downey, G. 1950. Justinian as a Builder, *ABull* 32 , 262-266

Drandakes, N.B. 1995a. *Οι τοιχογραφίες της Μέσα Μάνης*, Athens.

Drandakes, N.B. 1995b. Σπαράγματα τοιχογραφιῶν ἀπὸ παρακκλήσια τοῦ Μυστρᾶ, *AE* 134, 1-28

Drandakes, N.B. 1991. Ο σπηλαιώδης ναός του Προδρόμου κοντά στα Χρύσαφα Λακωνίας της Λακεδαίμονος, *D.C.A.E* 15, 179-195

Drandakes, N.B. 1964. *Βυζαντιναί τοιχογραφίαι τῆς Μέσα Μάνης*, Athens.

Dräseke, J.1895. Der Mönch und Presbyter Epiphanios, *BZ* 4, 346-362

Dresken-Weiland, J. 2005. Die Kirche "Agia Solomoni" bei Komi tou Gialou: Wandmalerei auf Zypern aus der Zeit des Bildersturms J. G. Deckers, M.-E. Mitsou, S. Rogge (eds) in *Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte Zyperns von der Spätantike bis zur Neuzeit*, Münster, 41-59.

Drijvers, J. W. 2004. *Cyril of Jerusalem: bishop and city*, Leiden ; Boston, Mass.

Drijvers, J. W. 1992. *Helena Augusta: the mother of Constantine the Great and the legend of her finding of the true cross* .N. Y.

Drossogianne, F. A. 1998. Παλαιχριστιανικές τοιχογραφίες στην Εκατονταπυλιανή της Πάρου in *Η Εκατονταπυλιανή και η χριστιανική Πάρος, Πρακτικά επιστημονικού συνεδρίου (15-19 Σεπτεμβρίου 1996)*, 55-84.

Dubois, J.-D. 1994. La mort de Zacharie: mémoire juive et mémoire chrétienne, *REAug* 40, 23-38

Dufrenne, S.1970. *Les programmes iconographiques des églises Byzantines de Mistra*, Paris.

Dunn, G.2004. *Tertullian*, London; N.Y.

Durand, J. et al (eds). 1992. *Byzance: l'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises*, Paris.

Duval, N. 1999. Essai sur la signification des vignettes topographiques in *The Madaba map centenary 1897-1997: travelling through the Byzantine Umayyad period proceedings of the international conference held in Amman, 7-9 April 1997*, Jerusalem, 134-146.

Duval, Y. 1983. Les saints vénérés dans l'église Byzantine d'Afrique in *XXX Corso di cultura sull'Arte ravennate e bizantina*, *Seminario Giustinianeo,* Ravenna, 115-147.

Dvornik, F. 1958. The Byzantine church and the dogma of the Immaculate Conception in *Photian and Byzantine Ecclestiastical studies* 1974 (variorum), London, XVI (originally published) in The dogma of the Immaculate Conception : history and significance, E. D. O'Connor (ed.). Notre Dame, Ind., 87-112.

Dvornik, F. 1953.The Patriarch Photius and Iconoclasm in *Photian and Byzantine Ecclestiastical studies* 1974 (variorum), London,V, (originally published in) DOP 7,69-97.

Eastmond, A.1999. Narratives of the Fall: Structure and Meaning in the Genesis Frieze at Hagia Sophia, Trebizond, *DOP* 53, 219-236

Ebersolt, J. 1921. *Sanctuaires de Byzance : recherches sur les anciens trésors des églises de Constantinople*, Paris.

Ebersolt, J. 1910. *Le grand palais de Constantinople et le livre des cérémonies*, Paris.

Edwards, D. N.2004. *The Nubian past : an archaeology of the Sudan*, London.

Efthymiadis, St. ; Featherstone, J.M. 2007.Establishing a holy lineage: Theodore the Stoudite's funerary catechism for his mother (BHG 2422)," in M. Grünbart (ed.), *Theatron: rhetorische Kultur in Spätantike und Mittelalter*, Berlin,13-51.

Efthymiadis, S. 1996. The Byzantine Hagiographer and his Audience in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries in *Metaphrasis: Redactions and Audiences in Middle Byzantine Hagiography.* C. Høgel (ed.),Oslo, 59-80.

Efthymiadis, S. 1995. Notes on the correspondence of Theodore Studites, *Byz* 53, 141-163.

Ehrhard, A.1938. *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche: von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts*, vol.2, Leipzig.

Ehrhard, A.1937. *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche: von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts*, vol.1, Leipzig.

Ehrman, B.D. 2006. *Studies in the textual criticism of the New Testament*, Leiden ; Boston.

Ehrman, B.D. 1993. *The orthodox corruption of scripture: the effect of early Christological controversies on the text of the New Testament*, Oxford.

Elliott, J. K. 2008. Mary in the apocryphal New Testament in *The origins of the cult of Mary*, Ch.Maunder (ed.), Tunbridge Wells, 57-70.

Elliott, J. K. 2006. *A synopsis of the apocryphal nativity and infancy narratives*, Leiden.

Elliott, J. K. 1988. Anna's Age (Luke 2:36-37), *NT* 30, 100-102

Elsberg, H. A.; Guest, R. 1936. The Veil of Saint Anne, *BurM* 68, 140-147

Emereau, C. 1923. Ephraim, hymnographer, 'of Caria':, *EO* 22, 421.

Emmanuel, M. 2002. Παρατηρήσεις στις τοιχογραφίες της Αγίας Σοφίας στο Μυστρά in *Γ΄ συνάντηση Βυζαντινολόγων Ελλάδος και Κύπρου 22 - 24 Σεπτεμβρίου 2000*, Rethymno,113-5

Emmanuel, M. 1994. Hairstyles and Headdresses of Empresses, Princesses and Ladies of the Aristocracy in Byzantium, *D.C.A.E.* IZ΄, 113-120

Emmanuel, M. 1991. *Οι τοιχογραφίες του Αγ. Δημητρίου στο Μακρυχώρι και της Κοιμήσεως της Θεοτόκου στον Οξύλινθο της Εύβοιας*, Athens.

Van Esbroeck, M., 1990.Une homélie arménienne sur la dormition attribuée à Chrysostome (reptinted in) *Aux origines de la Dormition de la Vierge : études historiques sur les traditions orientales* (variorum) Aldershot,XII.

Van Esbroeck, M., 1988.Le culte de la Vierge de Jérusalem à Constantinople aux 6e-7e siècles (reprinted in) *Aux origines de la Dormition de la Vierge : études historiques sur les traditions orientales* (variorum) Aldershot,X.

Van Esbroeck, M. 1981. La diffusion orientale de la légende des saints Cosme et Damien in *Hagiographie, cultures et sociétés : IVe-XIIe siècles : actes du colloque organisé à Nanterre et à Paris, 2-5 mai 1979*, Paris, 61-77.

Eustratiades, S.1930. *Ή Θεοτόκος ἐν τῇ ὑμνογραφίᾳ,* Paris.

Evangelatou, M. 2006. Pursuing salvation through s body of parchment : Books and their significance in the illustrated homilies of Iakobos of Kokkinobaphos, *MS* 68, 293-284

Evagelatou, M.2003. The Purple Thread of the Flesh: The theological connotations of a narrative iconographic element in Byzantine images of the Annunciation *in Icon and Word: the power of images in Byzantium*, A. Eastmond & . James (eds), Aldershot, 261-279.

Evans (ed.), H, C. 2004. *Byzantium: faith and power (1261-1557)*, N.Y.;London.

Evans, H, C. Wixom, W. D. (eds).1997. *The Glory of Byzantium: art and culture of the Middle Byzantine era, A.D. 843-126*, N.Y.

Fabricius, U. 1956. *Die Legende im Bild des ersten Jahrtausends der Kirche : der Einfluss der Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen auf die altchristliche und byzantinische Kunst*, Kassel.

Von Falkenhausen, V. 1979. Monasteri e fondatori di monasteri a Constantinopoli tra Costantino Magno e Giustiniano I in *XXVI Corso di cultura sull'arte Ravenntate e Bizantina*, Ravenna, 151-5.

Fassler, M. 2000. Mary's Nativity, Fulbert of Chartres, and the Stirps Jesse: Liturgical Innovation circa 1000 and Its Afterlife, *Speculum* 75, 389-434

Fee, G. D. 1987. *The first epistle to the Corinthians*, Grand Rapids, Mich.

Ferrari, R. 2004. *Iconografia e arte cristiana*, vol. 1, Milano.

Finegan, J. 1969. *The archeology of the New Testament: the life of Jesus and the beginning of the early church*, Princeton.

Follieri, E. 1973. Il culto dei santi nell'Italia greca in *La chiesa Greca in Italia dall'VIII al XVI secolo*, vol. 2, Padua, 553-7.

Follieri, E. 1964. Problemi di innografia bizantina in *Actes du XIIe congrès international d' études Byzantines Ochride 10-16 Septembre 1961*, vol. 2, Beograd, 313-325.

Folda, J. 1996.The crusader period and the church of saint Anne at Sepphoris in *Sepphoris in Galilee: crosscurrents of culture*, Raleigh, 101-107.

Folda, J. 1995. *The art of the crusaders in the Holy Land, 1098-1187*, Cambridge.

Foss, C. 1987. St. Autonomus and His Church in Bithynia , *DOP* 41, Studies on Art and Archeology in Honor of Ernst Kitzinger on His Seventy-Fifth Birthday, 187-198

Fouracre , P. 1999.The origins of the Carolingian attempt to regulate the cult of saints in *The cult of saints in late antiquity and the middle ages : essays on the contribution of Peter Brown*, J. Howard-Johnston;P. A. Hayward (eds), 143-166, Oxford.

Forsyth, G. H. 1968.The Monastery of St. Catherine at Mount Sinai: The Church and Fortress of Justinian, *DOP* 22, 1-19

Freely, J. ; Çakmak, A.S.2004. *Byzantine Monuments of Istanbul*, N.Y.

Frend, W. H. C. 1972. *The rise of the Monophysite movement : chapters in the history of the Church in the fifth and six centuries*, London.

Frend, W.H.C.1967. Nubia as an Outpost of Byzantine Cultural Influence, *ByzSlav* 28, 319-326

Freytag, R. L. 1985. *Die autonome Theotokosdarstellung der frühen Jahrhunderte*, München.

Frigerio-Zeniou, S. 1998. *L'art "italo-byzantin" à Chypre au XVIe siècle : trois témoins de la peinture religieuse : Panagia Podithou, la Chapelle latine et Panagia Iamatike*, Venice.

Furlan, I. 1979. *Le icone bizantine a mosaico*, Milano.

Galatariotou, C. 1991. *The making of a saint: the life, times and sanctification of Neophytos the Recluse*, Cambridge.

Gambero, L.1999. Mary and the fathers of the church: the Blessed Virgin Mary in patristic thought, T. Buf Buffer (trans.), San Francisco.

Garland, L.1999. *Byzantine empresses: women and power in Byzantium, AD 527-1204*, London ; N.Y.

Gavrilovic, Z. 1980. Divine Wisdom as Part of Byzantine Imperial Ideology.Research into the artistic interpretations of the theme in Medieval Serbia.Narthex programmes of Lesnovo and Sopoćani, *Zograf* XI, 45-53

Geary, P.J. 1979. The ninth-century relics trade. A response to popular piety? in *Religion and the people, 800-1700, J. Obelkevich (ed.),* Chapel Hill, 9-19.

Georgopoulou, M. 1995. Late Medieval Crete and Venice: An Appropriation of Byzantine Heritage, *ABull* 77, 479-496

Geymonat, L.V. 2005. Stile e contesto: gli affreschi di San Zan Degolà a Venezia in *Venezia e Bisanzio: aspetti della cultura artistica bizantina da Ravenna a Venezia (V-XIV secolo)*, Venice, 513-580.

Gharib, G. [et al.] 1988. *Testi mariani del primo Millennio*, Rome.

Gharland, P.V.1921. *Le culte de Sainte Anne en Occident*, Quebec.

Gedeon, M. 1900. *Εκκλησίαι βυζαντιναί εξακριβούμεναι (κυρίως η Θεοτόκος των Κύρου), Συμπλήρωμα του Βυζαντινού Εορτολογίου*, Constantinople.

Georgopoulou-Verra, M.1977. Τοιχογραφίες του τέλους του 13ου αιώνα στην Εύβοια. Ο Σωτήρας στο Πυργί και η Αγία Θέκλα, *AD* 32, 9-38

Gero, S. 1988.Apocryphal Gospels: A Survey of Textual and Literary Problems, *ANRW* 2.25, 3969-3996.

Gero, S. 1973. *Byzantine iconoclasm during the reign of Leo III with particular attention to the oriental sources*, Lovain.

Gerstel, S. 2007. An alternate view of the late Byzantine sanctuary screen in *Thresholds of the sacred: architectural, art historical, liturgical, and theological perspectives on religious screens, East and West*, Sh. E.J. Gerstel (ed.), Washington, D.C.,135-162.

Gerstel, S. 1999. *Beholding the sacred mysteries: programs of the Byzantine sanctuary*, Seattle; London.

Gerstel, S. 1998. Painted Sources for Female Piety in Medieval Byzantium', *DOP* 52 , 89-111

Geva, J. 1993. Jerusalem - The Byzantine Period in *The New encyclopedia of archaeological excavations in the Holy Land*, vol.2, E. Stern (ed.), N.Y.

Giamberardini, G. 1974. *Il culto mariano in Egitto, vol 2, sec. VII-X*, Jerusalem.

Gibson, S. 2005. The pool of Bethesda in Jerusalem and Jewish purification practices of the second temple period, *PrOC* 55, 270-293

Giovannini, L. 1971. *Arts of Cappadocia*, London.

Gisel, P. 1996. Apocryphes et canon: leurs rapports et leur statut respectif. Un questionnement théologique, *Apocrypha* 7, 225-234

Gkiaouri, E. 1977. Ο ναός του Αγίου Νικολάου κοντά στο Γεράκι, *AD* 32, 91-115

Gkioles, N. 2004. Εικονογραφικά θέματα στην Βυζαντινή τέχνη εμπνευσμένα από την αντιπαράθεση και τα σχίσματα των δύο Εκκλησιών in *Θωράκιον, αφιέρωμα στην μνήμη του Παύλου Λαζαρίδη*, Athens, 263-281.

Gkioles, N. 2003. *Η Χριστιανική τέχνη στην Κύπρο,* Leukosia.

Gnuse, R.K. 1996. *Dreams and dream reports in the writings of Josephus: a traditio-historical analysis*, Leiden; N. Y.

Godlewski, W. 2001.Nubia, Egypt and Byzantium in *Perceptions of Byzantium and its neighbours (843-1261)*, O. Z. Pevny (ed.),168-181.

Godlewski, W.1992. Some remarks on the Faras cathedral and its painting, *JCoptS* 2,99-116

Gouma-Peterson, T. 1985. Narrative cycle of saints' Lives in Byzantine churches from the tenth to the mid-fourteenth century, *GOTR* 30, 31-41

Gouma-Peterson, T. 1983. Manuel and John Phokas and Artistic Personality in Late Byzantine Painting, *Gesta* 22, 159-170

Gouma-Peterson, T. 1978.Christ as Ministrant and the Priest as Ministrant of Christ in a Palaeologan Program of 1303, *DOP* 32, 197-216

Goussen, H. 1923. *Über Georgische Drucke und Handschriften. Die Festordnung und der Heiligenkalender des altchristlichen Jerusalems*, München.

Grabar, A.1984. *L'iconoclasme byzantin: le dossier archéologique*, Paris.

Grabar, A. 1968. *Christian iconography: a study of its origins*, London.

Grabar, A.1946. *Martyrium: recherches sur le culte des reliques et l'art chrétien antique*, 2 vols, Paris.

Grabar, A. 1945. Une fresque visigothique et l'iconographie du silence, *CahArch* 1, 124-128

Grabar, A. 1931. *La Sainte Face de Laon: le Mandylion dans l'art orthodoxe*, Prague.

Grabar, O. 1996. *The shape of the Holy. Early Islamic Jerusalem*, N.J.

Graef, H. 1985. *Mary: a history of doctrine and devotion*, London.

Griffith, S.1998. Palestine in the ninth century: Byzantine Orthodoxy in the world of Islam in *Byzantium in the ninth century: Dead or alive? Papers from the Thirtieth Spring*

Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Birmingham, March 1996, L.Brubaker (ed.) Aldershot, 181-194.

Grillmeier, A.1987. *Christ in Christian tradition, From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590-604). Pt.1, Reception and contradiction : the development of the discussion about Chalcedon from 451 to the beginning of the beginning of the reign of Justinian* , P. Allen; J. Cawte (trans.), London ; Oxford .

Grisar, H. 1899. *Analecta romana: dissertazioni, testi, monumenti dell'arte riguardanti principalmente la storia di Roma e dei papi nel medievo*, Rome.

Grosdidier de Matons, J. 1980-1. Liturgie et Hymnographie: Kontakion et Canon, *DOP* 34, 31-43

Grumel, V. 1958. *La chronologie*, Paris.

Grumel, V.1937. La Mariologie de Saint Jean Damascène, *EO* 40, 318-346

Guilland, R. 1969. *Études de topographie de Constantinople Byzantine,* Berlin; Amsterdam.

Gouillard, J. 1967. Le Synodicon de l'orthodoxie, *TM* 2, Paris.

Gwynn, D.M. 2007. From Iconoclasm to Arianism: The construction of Christian tradition in the Iconoclast controversy, *GRBS* 47, 225-251

Haddad, Y. Y.1985. *Women, Religion, and Social Change*, Albany, N.Y.

Haenchen, E. 1984. *A commentary on the Gospel of John, Chapters 1-6*, R. W. Funk (trans.); R. W. Funk ;U. Busse (eds), Philadelphia.

Hahnloser, H. R.1994. *La pala d'Oro*, Venice.

Hadermann-Misguich, L. 1975. *Kurbinovo: les fresques de Saint-Georges et la peinture byzantine du XIIe siècle*, Bruxelles.

Hägg, T. 1982. Some remarks on the use of Greek in Nubia in *Nubian Studies proceedings of the symposium for Nubian studies Selwyn College Cambridge 1978*, J.M. Martin (ed.), Warminster, 103-7.

Halbwachs, M.1941. *La topographie legendaire des Evangiles en Terre Sainte; etude de memoire collective*, Paris.

Hallensleben, H. 1963. *Die Malerschule des Königs Milutin: Untersuchungen zum Werk einer byzantinischen Malerwerkstatt zu Beginn des 14. Jahrhunderts*, Giessen.

Halkin,F.(ed.),1957. *Bibliotheca hagiographica graecae*,vol.3, Brussels.

Hamann-Mac Lean, R.1976. *Die Monumentalmalerei in Serbien und Makedonien : vom 11. bis zum frühen 14. Jahrhundert, vol.2,* Giessen.

Hamann-Mac Lean, R.1963. *Die Monumentalmalerei in Serbien und Makedonien: vom 11. bis zum frühen 14. Jahrhundert, vol.1,* Giessen.

Hamilton, B. 1977. Rebuilding Zion: The Holy places of Jerusalem in the twelfth century, *SCH* 14, 105-116

Hannestad, N. 1986. *Roman art and imperial policy*, Hojbjerg.

Hannestad, N. 1979. Rome-Ideology and Art. Some distinctive features in *Power and propaganda : a symposium on ancient empires*, M. T. Larsen (ed.), Copenhagen, 361-390.

Hatlie, P. 2006. The religious lives of children and adolescents in *Byzantine Christianity*, D. Krueger (ed.), Minneapolis, 182-200.

Hattersley-Smith, K. M. 1996. *Byzantine public architecture between the fourth and early eleventh centuries AD, with special reference to the towns of Byzantine Macedonia*, Thessalonike.

Haustein-Bartsch, E. 2007. Zu einer kretischen Bematur des 15. Jahrhunderts im Ikonen-Museum Recklinghausen. in *Byzantinische Malerei. Bildprogramme, Ikonographie, Stil ,* G. Koch (ed.), Wiesbaden, 91-108.

Head, C. 1972. *Justinian II of Byzantium*, Madison ; London.

Heinzelmann, M. 1979. *Translationsberichte und andere Quellen des Reliquienkultes*, Turnhout.

Heldman- Eiseman, M. 1994. *The Marian icons of the painter Frē* Ṣeyon*: a study of fifteenth-century Ethiopian art, patronage, and spirituality*, Wiesbaden.

Hennessy, C. 2003. Iconic Images of Children in the Church of St Demetrios, Thessaloniki *in Icon and Word: the power of images in Byzantium*, A. Eastmond & . James (eds), Aldershot, 157-172.

Herbermann, C. G.(ed.) 1910. *The Catholic encyclopedia: an international work of reference on the constitution, doctrine, discipline, and history of the Catholic Church, v.8, Infamy-Lapparent*, London.

Herrin, J. 2006. Changing functions of monasteries for women during Byzantine Iconoclasm in *Byzantine women: varieties of experience, 800-1200*, L.Garland (ed.), Aldershot ; Burlington, VT,1-15.

Herrin, J. 1982. Women and faith in icons in early Christianity in *Culture, Ideology and Politics. Essays for Eric Hobsbawm*, R. Samuel; G. Stedman Jones (eds), London ; Boston, 56-83.

Herrin, J.2002. *Women in purple :rulers of medieval Byzantium*, London.

Herrin, J.2000.The imperial feminine in Byzantium, *Past and Present 169*, 3-35

Herrin J.1987. *The formation of Christendom*, N.J.

Herrmann-Mascard, N.1975. *Les reliques des saints : formation coutumie??re d'un droit,*Paris.

Hester, D. 1992. *Monasticism and spirituality of the Italo-Greeks*, Thessalonike.

Hetherington, P.1983. A purchase of Byzantine relics and reliquaries in fourteenth-century Venice, 1-31 reprinted in *Enamels, crowns, relics and icons : studies on luxury arts in Byzantium (variorum) 2008,* Aldershot,VII.

Hinterberger, M. 2005. Ο Ανδρέας Λιβαδηνός, συγγραφρέας/γραφέας λόγιων κειμένων, αναγνώστης/ γραφέας δημώδων κειμένων: ο ελληνικός κώδικας 525 του Μονάχου in *Κωδικογράφοι, συλλέκτες, διασκευαστές και εκδότες. Χειρόγραφα και εκδόσεις της όψιμης Βυζαντινής και πρώιμης Νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας, Πρακτικά συνεδρίου που πραγματοποιήθηκε στο Ινστιτούτο της Δανίας στην Αθήνα 23-26 Μαϊου προς τιμήν του Hans Eideneier και Arnold van Gemert*, D. Holton; T. Lentari;U. Moennig; P.Vejleskov (eds), Heraklio, 25-42.

Hirschfeld, Y.1992. *Judean desert monasteries in the Byzantine period*, New Haven ; London.

Holl, K. 1916. Die Schriften des Epiphanius gegen die Bilderverehrung Sitzungberichte der königlichen Preussiscen Akademie der Wissenschaften 11 (1916) 828–868, (reprinted in) *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte* II,1928 ,Tübingen.

Holthoer, R. 1993. Byzantine Egypt: Cultures in collision in *Aspects of late antiquity and early Byzantium* , Stockholm, 43-56.

Holum, K.G.1982. *Theodosian empresses: women and imperial dominion in late antiquity*, Berkeley ; London.

Honigmann, E. 1950. Juvenal of Jerusalem, *DOP* 5, 209-279

Hoppe, L. J.1999. *A guide to the lands of the Bible*, Minnesota.

Hörandner, W; Rhoby, A; Paul, A. (eds) 2009. *Byzantinische Epigramme in inschriftlicher Überlieferung, 1 Byzantinische Epigramme auf Fresken und Mosaiken*, Wien.

Horbury,W. 2003. The depiction of Judaeo-Christians in the Toledot Yeshu in *The Image of the Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature. Papers Delivered at the Colloquium of the Institutum Iudaicum, Brussels 18-19 November, 2001*, P. J. Tomson; D. Lambers-Petry (eds), Tübingen, 280-6.

Horn, C- Phenix, R.R. (trans.) 2008. *John Rufus: the Lives of Peter the Iberian, Theodosius of Jerusalem, and the Monk Romanus*, Leiden ; Boston.

Horn, C. 2006. *Asceticism and Christological Controversy in Fifth-Century Palestine : The Career of Peter the Iberian*, Oxford.

Horn, C.B. 2005. Frühsyrische Mariologie: Maria und ihre Schwestern im Werk Aphrahats des Persischen Weisen in *Die Suryoye und ihre Umwelt: 4. Deutsches Syrologen-Symposium in Trier 2004: Festgabe Wolfgang Hage zum 70. Geburtstag*, M. Tamcke (ed.), Münster, 313-332.

Horn, C.B. 2004. Empress Eudocia and the Monk. Peter the Iberian: Patronage, Pilgrimage, and the Love of a Foster-Mother in fifth-century Palestine, *ByzF* 28, 197-213

Horna, K.1903. Die Epigramme des Theodoros Balsamon, *WS* 25,165-217

Horner, T. 2004. Jewish Aspects of the Protoevangelium of James, *JECS* 12:3, 313–335

Horst, van der, P.W.1978. 'Seven Months' Children in Jewish and Christian Literature from Antiquity, *ETL* 54, 359-360.

De Grueneisen, W.1911. *A history of the Church of S. Maria Antiqua in Rome*, vol. 2, Rome

Hunt, H. 2004. *Tears of Contrition in the Writings of the Early Syrian and Byzantine Fathers*, Leiden ; Boston.

Hunt, L.-A. 1991. Art and Colonialism: The Mosaics of the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem (1169) and the Problem of "Crusader" Art, *DOP* 45, 69-85

Hunt, E. D. 1982. *Holy Land pilgrimage in the later Roman Empire*, AD 312-460, Oxford.

Husser, J.-M.1999. *Dreams and dream narratives in the Biblical world*, Sheffield.

Hussey, J. M. 1986. *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*, Oxford.

Huxsley, G. 1977. On the vita of St. Stephen the Younger, *BMGS* 18:1, 97-108

Ioannou, A. 1959. *Byzantine frescoes of Euboea, 1. Thirteenth and fourteenth centuries*, Athens.

Irmscher, J. 1992. *Encyclopedia of the early church*, V.1, A-M, Angelo di Berardino (ed.), Cambridge.

Jakobielski, S. 1982. Remarques sur la chronologie des peintures murales de Faras aux VIIIe et IXe siècles, in *Nubia Christiana I*, S. Jakobielski (ed.), Warsaw, 142-172.

James, L. 2006. …and the Word was with God: What makes Art Orthodox ? in *Byzantine orthodoxies : proceedings of the 36th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Durham, 23-25 March 2002*, A. Louth and A. Casiday (eds), Aldershot,103-110.

James, L.2004. Building and rebuilding: imperial women and religious foundation in Constantinople in the fourth to eighth centuries in *Basilissa: Belfast, Byzantium and beyond*, A. Hirst (ed.),v.1, Belfast, 50-64.

James, L.2003. Art and Lies: Text, image and imagination in the medieval world in *Icon and word : the power of images in Byzantium,* Aldershot, 59-71.

James, L. 2002. Dry bones and painted pictures: relics and icons in Byzantium' in *Eastern Christian Relics*, A. Lidov (ed.), Moscow, 45-55.

James, L.2001a. *Empresses and power in early Byzantium*, London;N.Y.

James, L. 2001b. Bearing gifts from the east: imperial relic hunters abroad in *Eastern Approches to Byzantium*, A. Eastmond (ed.),119-131.

Janin, R. 1975. *Les églises et les monastères des grands centres Byzantins : Bithynie, Hellespont, Latros, Galèsios, Trébizonde, Athènes, Thessalonique*, Paris.

Janin, R. 1969. *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantin.Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat oecuménique. Tome 3, Les églises et les monastères*, Paris.

Janin, R. 1964. *Constantinople byzantine: développement urbain et répertoire topographique*, Paris.

Janin, R. 1953. *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantin, par R. Janin. 1e ptie, Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat oecuménique. Tome 3, Les églises et les monastères*, Paris.

Janin, R. 1937. Etudes de topographie byzantine, *EO* 36, 129-156

Janin, R. 1936. Deuteron, Triton et Pempton, *EO* 35, 205-19

Jenkins, R .1954. The classical background of the scriptores post Theophanem, *DOP* 8 13-30, (reprinted in) *Studies on Byzantine history of the 9th and 10th centuries (variorum)*, IV, London : 1970.

Jeremias, J. 1966. *The rediscovery of Bethesda: John 5: 2*, Louisville.

Jerphanion, G. de. 1938. Les caractéristiques et les attributes des saints in *La Voix des monuments, Études d'archaéologie, Nouvelle série*, Rome; Paris, 297-321.

Jessop, L. 1999. Pictorial Cycles of Non-Biblical Saints: The Seventh- and Eighth-Century Mural Cycles in Rome and Contexts for their Use, *PBSR* 47 233-279

Johnson, S.F. 2007. Apocrypha and the literary past in late antiquity homilies in *From Rome to Constantinople : studies in honor of Averil Cameron*, H. Amirav; Bas ter Haar R.(eds), Leuven ; Dudley, MA ,47-66.

Goodson, C.J. 2008. Building for Bodies: The architecture of Saint Veneration in Early Medieval Rome in *Caput Urbium: The production, experience and reflection of Medieaval Rome*, É.Ó. Carragain; C.Neuman de Vegnar (eds), Aldershot, 51-80.

Jolivet-Lévy, C. 2001. Art chrétien en Anatolie turque: le témoignage de peintures inédites à Tatlarin in *Eastern Approches to Byzantium*, A. Eastmond (ed.),133-145.

Jolivet-Lévy,C. 1991. *Les églises byzantines de Cappadoce: le programme iconographique de l'abside et de ses abords*, Paris.

Jurgens, W. A. 1979. *The Faith of the Early Fathers*, vol. 3, Minnesota.

Kalavrezou, I. 2000. Η Παναγία ως μητέρα in *Μήτηρ Θεού. Απεικονίσεις της Παναγίας στη βυζαντινή τέχνη*, M.Vasilake (ed.), Milan, 41-5.

Kalavrezou, I. 1997. Helping hands for the empire: Imperial ceremonies and the cult of relics at the Byzantine court in *Byzantine court culture from 829 to 1204*, H. Maguire(ed.). Washington, DC, 53-80.

Kalavrezou, I. 1990. Images of the Mother: When the Virgin Mary Became "Meter Theou", *DOP* 44,165-172

Kalogeras, N. 2001. What do they think about children? Perceptions of childhood in early Byzantine literature, *BMGS* 25, 2-19

Kalokyres, K.D. 1980. *Meletēmata Christianikēs Orthodoxou archaiologias kai technēs*, Thessalonike.

Kalokyres, K. D. 1973. *Βυζαντιναί Εκκλησίαι της Ιεράς Μητροπόλεως Μεσσηνίας*, Thessalonike.

Kalokyres, K. 1972. *Η Θεοτόκος εις την εικονογραφίαν Ανατολής και Δύσεως*, Thessalonike.

Kalokyres, K. D. 1954. La peinture murale Byzantine de l'île de Crète, *KC* 8, 389-398

Kalopissi-Verti, S. 2007. Επιπτώσεις της Δ΄ Σταυροφορίας στη μνημειακή ζωγραφική της Πελοποννήσου και της Ανατολικής Στερεάς Ελλάδας έως τα τέλη του 13ου αιώνα in Η Βυζαντινή τέχνη μετά την Τέταρτη Σταυροφορία, Athens, 63-88.

Kalopissi-Verti, S. 2000. Zur Kirche der Hagia Anna auf der Insel Kea/Kyklades. Malerefragmente aus der Zeit Michaels VIII.Palaiologos (?) in *Lithostroton: Studien zur byzantinischen Kunst und Geschichte : Festschrift für Marcell Restle* ,131-141.

Kannengiesser, C. (ed.) 2004. *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis.The Bible in Ancient Christianity*, 2 vols, Brill.

Kaplan, K. 2002. L'ensevelissement des saints : rituel de création des reliques et sanctification à Byzance (Ve-XIIe siècles), *TM* 14, 319-332.

Karavidopoulos, I.D. 2000.Οι πληροφορίες των Απόκρυφων Ευαγγελίων για την Παναγία in *Μήτηρ Θεού. Απεικονίσεις της Παναγίας στη βυζαντινή τέχνη*, M.Vasilake (ed.) Milan, 67-76.

Karlin-Hayter, P. 1981. La mort de Théophano (10.11.896 ou 895) in *Studies in Byzantine political history : sources and controversies* (variorum), London, XI.

Karlin-Hayter, P. 1955-7. Vita S. Euthymii, *Byz* 25-27, 1-172,747-778

Kartsonis, A. D. 1986. *Anastasis: the making of an image*, N.J.

Kazhdan, A. P. 1999. *A history of Byzantine literature (650-850) in collaboration with Lee F. Sherry, Christine Angelidi*, Athens.

Kazhdan, A. P.; Talbot, A.-M., 1998. *Dumbarton Oaks Hagiography database*, Washington, D.C.

Kazhdan, A. P.; Talbot, A.-M. 1991-2. Women and Iconoclasm, BZ 84-85, 391-408 (reprinted in) *Women and Religious Life in Byzantium*,(variorum) Aldershot, 2001,III.

Kazhdan, A. P. 1990. Byzantine Hagiography and Sex in the Fifth to Twelfth Centuries

DOP 44, 131-143

Kelsey, M. T.1974. *God, dreams, and revelation*, Minneapolis, Minn.

Kenna, M. E. 1984. Icons in Theory and Practice: An Orthodox Christian Example, *HR* V. 24, 345-368

Kimbrough, S. T. 2002. Kenosis in the Nativity Hymns of Ephrem the Syrian and Charles Wesley in *Orthodox and Wesleyan spirituality*, S. T Kimbrough (ed.). Crestwood, 265-289.

Kiminas, D. 2009. *The Ecumenical Patriarchate: A History of Its Metropolitans With Annotated Hierarch Catalogs*, Rockville, MD.

King, A.A.1957. *Liturgy of the Roman Church*, London.

Kirchhainer, K. 2001. *Die Bildausstattung der Nikolauskirche in Thessaloniki: Untersuchungen zu Struktur und Programm der Malereien*, Weimar.

Kirwan, L.P.1994. Christianity in the central Sudan. The Byzantine mission and Nubian Alwa in C. Berger, G. Clerc; N. Grimal (eds), Hommages à Jean Leclant (Insitut Français d' Archéologie Orientale. Bibliothèquw d' Étude 106/2). Le Caire, (reprinted) in *Studies on the history of late antique and Christian Nubia*, XXII, Aldershot ; Burlington, Vt.

Kirwan, L.P.1982. Some Thoughts on the Conversion of Nubia to Christianity in *Nubian Studies proceedings of the symposium for Nubian studies Selwyn College Cambridge 1978*, J.M. Martin (ed.), Warminster, 142-145.

Kishpaugh, M. J. 1941. *The Feast of the Presentation of the Virgin Mary in the Temple: an historical and literary study* (Phd Thesis),Washington ,D.C.

Kitzinger, E. 2002. The Threshold of the Holy Shrine: Observations on Floors Mosaics at Antioch and Bethlhem in *Studies in late antique, Byzantine, and medieval western art*, London , 244-259.

Kitzinger, E. 1991.*The mosaics of St. Mary's of the Admiral in Palermo = Mosaici di Santa Maria dell'Ammiraglio a Palermo*,Washington, D.C

Kitzinger, E. 1966. The Byzantine Contribution to Western Art of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries, *DOP* 20, 25-47

Kitzinger, E.1958. Byzantine art in the period between Justinian and Iconoclasm in *Berichte zum XI. Internationalen Byzantinisten-Kongress München 1958*, München.

Klauser, T.1979. *A short history of the Western liturgy: an account and some reflections*, Oxford.

Klein, H. A. 2006. Sacred Relics and Imperial Ceremonies at the Great Palace of Constantinople in *Visualisierungen von Herrschaft: frühmittelalterliche Residenzen : Gestalt und Zeremoniell : internationales Kolloquium 3./4. Juni 2004 in Istanbul*, F. A. Bauer (ed.), Istanbul, *79-99.*

Klein, H. A. 2004 . Constantine, Helena and the Cult of the True Cross in Constantinople in *Byzance et les reliques du Christ. International Congress of Byzantine Studies (22nd : 2001 : Paris, France),* J. Durand;B. Flusin (eds), Paris, 31-60.

Kleinschmidt, B. 1930. *Die heilige Anna: ihre Verehrung in Geschichte, Kunst und Volkstum*, Düsseldorf.

Kleiss,W.1965. Neue Befunde zur Chalkopratenkirche in Istanbul, *IstMitt* 25,148-167

Klijn, A. F. J. 1992. *Jewish-Christian gospel tradition*, Leiden ; N.Y.

Kluge,T.; Baumstark, A. 1915. Quadragesima und Karwoche Jerusalems im siebten Jahrhundert, *Oriens* 5, 201-233

Knipp, D. 1996. An 'Early Christian' Terraccota altar, *JWI* 59, 274-279

Koder, J. 1994. Justinians Sieg über Salomon in *Thymiama ste mneme tes Laskarinas Boura*, vol.1, Athens, 135-142.

Kofsky, A. 1997. Peter the Iberian. Pilgrimage, Monasticism and Ecclesiastical Politics in Byzantine Palestine, *LA* 47,209-222

Kondakov, N. P.2004. *Pamiatniki khristianskogo iskusstva na Afone*, Moscow.

Kondakov, N.P. 1929. *Die Russische Ikone*, II, Prague.

Kondakov, N. P. 1915. *Ikonografiia bogomateri*, St Peterburg.

Kostenec, J. 2004. The heart of the empire: the Great Palace of Byzantine emperors reconsidered in *Secular buildings and the archaeology of everyday life in the Byzantine Empire,* K. Dark (ed.), Oxford, 4-36.

Kotoula, D. 2006.The British Museum Triumph of Orthodoxy icon in *Byzantine orthodoxies : proceedings of the 36th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Durham, 23-25 March 2002*, A. Louth; A. Casiday (eds), Aldershot,121-130.

Kountoura-Galake, E.1996. *Byzantine clergy and society in the dark centuries* (in Greek), Athens.

Kraemer, C. J. Jr.; Lewis, N. 1938. A Divorce Agreement from Southern Palestine,

TAPA 69,117-133

Krause, J. H. 1863. *Deinokrates, oder Hütte, Haus und Palast, Dorf, Stadt und Residenz der alten Welt*, Jena.

Krautheimer, R.1980. *Rome : profile of a city, 312-1308*, Princeton.

Krueger, D. 2005. Christian piety and practice in the sixth century in *The Cambridge companion to the Age of Justinian*, Cambridge, 291-315.

Krüger, P. 1952. Die somatische Virginität der Gottesmutter im Schriftum Ephrem des Syrers in *Alma Socia Christi*, vol. 5, 46-86.

Ksydes, T. 1978. *Βυζαντινή υμνογραφία*, Athens.

Kubinska, J. 1974. *Inscriptions grecques chrétiennes. Faras, IV*, Warsaw.

Kuchenbuch, L.1991. Opus feminile.Das Geschechterverhaeltiniss im Spiegel von Frauenarbeiten im frueheren Mittelalter in *Weibliche Lebensgestaltung im frühen Mittelalter*, H.-W. Goetz (ed), Köln, 139-176.

Kühnel, B. 2006. The Holy Land as a factor in Chrisitan art in *Christians and Christianity in the Holy Land from the origins to the Latin Kingdoms*.O.Limour; G.G.Stroumsa (eds), Turnhout.

Kunstle, K.1928. *Ikonographie der christlichen Kunst*,vol.1, Freiburg im Breisgau.

Kyriazopoulos, V.D. 1981. The old churches on Kastron, Mykonos, *D.C.A.E.* 10, 199-222

Kurtz, E. 1897. Ein biographisches Monitum für den Verfasser des Aufsatzes 'Der Mönch und Presbyter Epiphanios', *BZ* 6, 214-7

Labarte, J.1861. *Le palais impérial de Constantinople et ses abords: Sainte-Sophie, le forum Augustéon et l'hippodrome, tels qu'ils existaitent au Dixième Siècle*, Paris.

Ladner, G. B. 1992. *Handbuch der frühchristlichen Symbolik: Gott, Kosmos, Mensch*, Stuttgart.

Lafontaine- Dosogne, J. 1995. Les themes iconographiques profanes dans la peinture monumentale Byzantine du VIe au XVe siècle in *Arte profana e arte sacra a Bisanzio*, Rome, 189-220.

Lafontaine-Dosogne, J. 1992. *Iconographie de l'enfance de la Vierge dans l'Empire byzantin et en Occident*, vol.1, Brussels.

Lafontaine-Dosogne, J. 1987. Pour une problématique de la peinture d'Église byzantine a l'époque iconoclaste *DOP* 41 *Studies on Art and Archeology in Honor of Ernst Kitzinger on His Seventy-Fifth Birthday*, 321-337

Lafontaine-Dosogne, J. 1979. L' évolution du programme decorative des églises de 1071 a 1261 in *Actes du XVe Congrès international d' études Byzantines, Athénes, Septembre 1976*, vol. 1 Athens, 291-329.

Lafontaine-Dosogne, J. 1975. Iconography of the cycle of the life of the Virgin in *The Kariye Djami. V.4, Studies in the art of the Kariye Djami and its intellectual background*, London,161-195.

Lafontaine-Dosogne, J. 1964. Iconographie de la Colonne A du Ciborium de Saint-Marc à Venise in *Actes du XIIe congrès international d'études Byzantines, Ochride 10-16 Septrembre 1961*, Beograd, 213-219.

Lagrange, Fr.M.-J. 1903. Le tombeau de saint Joachim et de sainte Anne à Jerusalem (review), *RB* 12 , 466-7

Lampe, G. W. H. 1961. *A patristic Greek lexicon*, Oxford.

Lanne, E. 1983. L'aqua e l'unzione nelle chiese orientali in *I simboli dell'iniziazione cristiana : atti del 1. Congresso internazionale di liturgia : Pontificio Istituto liturgico, 25-28 maggio 1982*, F. Giustino (ed.), Rome, 137-156.

Laird, M. 2004. *Gregory of Nyssa and the Grasp of Faith: Union, Knowledge, and Divine Presence*, Oxford.

Lasareff, V. 1938. Studies in the Iconography of the Virgin, *ABull* 20, 26-65

Lasareff, V. 1936.New Light on the Problem of the Pisan School, *BurM* 68, 61-73

Lasareff, V. 1935. The Mosaics of Cefalù, *ABull* 17, 184-232.

Lassithiotakis, K.1970. Εκκλησίες της Δυτικής Κρήτης, *KC* 22,180-250

Lathoud, D.1923. Le sanctuaire de la Vierge aux Chalcopratia, *EO* 23, 36-61

Laurent, V. 1956. La vie merveilleuse de saint Pierre d'Atroa , *SubsHag* 29, 65- 225

Lauxtermann, M. D.2003. *Byzantine poetry from Pisides to Geometres*, Vienna.

Leclercq, H. 1907. Sainte Anne, *DACL* vol.2, Paris, 2162-2174.

Ledit, J. H. 1976. *Marie dans la liturgie de Byzance*, Paris.

Lenski, N. 2004. Empresses in the Holy Land: The creation of a Christian Utopia in Late Antique Palestine in *Travel, communication and geography in late antiquity : sacred and profane*, L. Ellis; F. L. Kidner. (eds), Aldershot.

Leone, P.L.M. 1991. Nicephori Gregorae de sanctissima deiparae matovotate presentatione atque educatione oratio, *QCCCM 3*, 1-31.

Leveto, P.D. 1990. The Marian theme of the frescoes in S. Maria at Castelseprio, *ABull* 72 , 393-413

Lewis, N. 1939. On the Chronology of the Emperor Maurice, *TJP* 60, 414-421

Lidov, A. 2004. Leo the Wise and the miraculous icons in Hagia Sophia in *Οι ήρωες της Ορθόδοξης Εκκλησίας: οι νέοι άγιοι, 8ος-16ος αιώνας*, E. Kountoura-Galake (ed.), Athens, 393-427.

Lidov, A.1998. Heavenly Jerusalem: the Byzantine approach in *The real and ideal Jerusalem in Jewish, Christian, and Islamic art: studies in honor of Bezalel Narkiss on the occasion of his seventieth birthday*, Jerusalem, 340-353.

Lilie, R.-J. (ed.) 1999. *Die Patriarchen der ikonoklastischen Zeit : Germanos I.- Methodios I. (715-847)*, Frankfurt am Main ; N.Y.

Limberis, V. 1994. *Divine heiress: the Virgin Mary and the creation of Christian Constantinople*, London.

Limor, O. 2007.'Holy journey' Pilgrimage and Christian sacred landscape in *Christians and Christianity in the Holy Land: From the Origins to the Latin Kingdoms*. O. Limor and G. G. Stroumsa (eds) Turnhout, 312-353.

Limor, O.; Rubin, M. 1998. *Holy Land travels: Christian pilgrims in late antiquity*. (In Hebrew), Jerusalem.

Limor, O. 1998. The place of the End of the Days: Eschatological geography in Jerusalem in *The real and ideal Jerusalem in Jewish, Christian, and Islamic art : studies in honor of Bezalel Narkiss on the occasion of his seventieth birthday*, Jerusalem,13-22.

Linardou, K. 2004. *Reading two Byzantine illustrated books*. (Ph.D. Thesis), University of Birmingham.

Llewellyn, P. 1986. The Popes and the Constitution in the eighth century, *EHR* 101, 42-67

Lossky, V. 1957. *The mystical theology of the Eastern Church*, Cambridge ; London.

Lossky, V. 1950. Panagia in *The Mother of God. A symposium by members of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius*, E. L. Mascall (ed.), Westminster, 24-36.

Lössl, J. 2002. Hieronymus und Epiphanius von Salamis Über das Judentum Ihrer Zeit, *JSJ* 33, 411-436

Lourié, B. 2007. L'Histoire Euthymiaque : l'œuvre du Patriarche Euthymios/Euphemios de Constantinople (490–496, † 515), *WST* 20, 189-221

Louth, A. 2003. *Three treatises on the divine images*, Crestwood, N.Y.

Louth, A. 2002. *St. John Damascene : tradition and originality in Byzantine theology*, Oxford.

Louth, A. 2000. Palestine under the Arabs 650-750: The crucible of Byzantine Orthdoxy in *The Holy Land, holy lands, and Christian history : papers read at the 1998 Summer Meeting and the 1999 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, R.N. Swanson (ed.) Woodbridge,67-77.

Lowrie, W. 1947. *Art in the early church*, N.Y.

Lucey, S. 2004. Palimpsest Reconsidered: Continuity and Change in the Decorative Programs at Santa Maria Antiqua in *Santa Maria Antiqua al Foro romano : cento anni dopo : atti del colloquio internazionale, Roma, 5-6 maggio 2000* , Osborne, J.; Brandt, J. R.; Morganti, G.(eds), Rome, 83-95.

Lucey, S. 1999. *The Church of Santa Maria Antiqua, Rome: Contextual Study 6th–9th c.*,(Ph.D. Thesis), Rutgers University.

Luciani, R.1987. *Santa Maria in Trastevere,* Rome.

Lymberopoulou, A. 2007a. The painter Angelos and post-Byzantine art in *Locating Renaissance art*, vol. 2, C. M. Richardson (ed.), New Haven, Conn. ; London,175- 210.

Lymberopoulou, A. 2007b. Audiences and markets for Cretan icons in *Viewing renaissance art*, K. W.Woods, C. M. Richardson, , A. Lymberopoulou (eds), New Haven; London, 171-208.

Lymberopoulou, A. 2006. *The church of the Archangel Michael at Kavalariana : art and society on fourteenth-century Venetian-dominated Crete*, London.

Macrides, R. 1981. Justice under Manuel I Komnenos. Four Novels on Court business and murder in *Fontes minores*, vol. 4, D. Simon (ed.), Frankfurt am Main, 99-204.

Maderakis, S.N. 2002. Η βυζαντινή ζωγραφική στην Κρήτη γύρω στα 1300 in *Γ΄ συνάντηση Βυζαντινολόγων Ελλάδος και Κύπρου 22 - 24 Σεπτεμβρίου 2000,* Rethymno, 127-130.

Magdalino, P. 2007. Medieval Constantinople in Magdalino, P.1996. Constantinople Médiévale. Études sur l'évolution des structures urbaines, 7–117, Paris (reprinted) in *Studies on the history and topography of Byzantine Constantinople* , (variorum), Aldershot, I

Magdalino, P. 2004. L' église du Phare et les reliques de la Passion à Constantinople (VIIé /VIIIé-XIIIe siècles), in *Byzance et les reliques du Christ*. *International Congress of Byzantine Studies (22nd : 2001 : Paris, France),* J. Durand ; B. Flusin (eds), Paris, 15-30.

Magdalino, P. 2001. Aristocratic Oikoi in the tenth and eleventh regions of Constantinople in *Byzantine Constantinople : monuments, topography, and everyday life*, N. Necipoglu (ed.) Leiden; Boston, 53-69.

Magdalino, P. 1996. *Constantinople médiévale : études sur l'évolution des structures urbaines*, Paris.

Magdalino, P. 1993. *The empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143-1180*, Cambridge.

Magdalino, P. 1990. Church, bath and *Diakonia* in Medieval Constantinople, in *Church and people in Byzantium: Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies twentieth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Manchester, 1986*, R. Morris (ed.), Birmingham, 165-88

Magdalino, P. 1988. The Bath of Leo the Wise and the "Macedonian Renaissance" Revisited: Topography, Iconography, Ceremonial, Ideology, *DOP* 42, 97-118

Maguire, H. 2001.The Medieval floors of the Great Palace in *Byzantine Constantinople : monuments, topography, and everyday life*, N. Necipoglu (ed.) Leiden ; Boston,153-174.

Maguire, H. 2000. The cult of the Mother of God in Private in *Μήτηρ Θεού. Απεικονίσεις της Παναγίας στη βυζαντινή τέχνη*, M. Vasilake (ed.) Milan, 279-324.

Maguire, H. 1996. *The icons of their bodies: saints and their images in Byzantium*, Princeton, N.J.

Maguire, H. 1981. *Art and eloquence in Byzantium* , N.J.

Majeska, G. P.2002. Russian Pilgrims in Constantinople, *DOP* 56 ,93-108

Majeska, G. P. 1984. *Russian travelers to Constantinople in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries*, Washington, D.C.

Majeska, G. P. 1981. The Sanctification of the First Region: Urban Reorientation in Palaeologan. Constantinople in *Actes du XVe Congrès international d' études Byzantines, Athénes, Septembre 1976*, vol. 2 Athens, 359-365.

Maksimović, L. 2004 . Οι Άγιοι Σέρβοι βασιλείς in *Οι ήρωες της Ορθόδοξης Εκκλησίας: οι νέοι άγιοι, 8ος-16ος αιώνας*, E.Kountoura-Galake (ed.), Athens, 107-122.

Malmquist, T. 1979. *Byzantine 12th century frescoes in Kastoria : Agioi Anargyroi and Agios Nikolaos tou Kasnitzi* , Uppsala.

Mango, C. 2004. A fake inscription of the empress Eudocia and Pulcheria's relics of St. Stephen, *Nea Rhome* 1, 23-34

Mango, C. 2001. The shoreline of Constantinople in the fourth century in *Byzantine Constantinople : monuments, topography, and everyday life*, Leiden ; Boston,17-28.

Mango, C. 2000. Η Κωνσταντινούπολη ως Θεοτοκούπολη in M. Vassilaki (ed.) *Μήτηρ Θεού:Απεικονίσεις της Παναγίας στη Βυζαντινή τέχνη*, Athens,17-25.

Mango,C. 1998. The Origins of the Blachernai Shrine at Constantinople, in *Acta XIII Congressus Internationalis Archaeologiae Christianae, Split-Porecˇ (25 September–1 October 1994),* vol. 2, Vatican, 61–76.

Mango, C. 1995. The Water Supply of Constantinople, in *Constantinople and its Hinterland*, C. Mango, G. Dagron, et al. (eds), Aldershot, 9-18.

Mango, C.1993.The columns of Justinian and his successors (first publication) in *Studies on Constantinople* (variorum), Aldershot, X.

Mango, C.1986a. The Development of Constantinople as an Urban Centre in *The Seventeenth International Byzantine Congress, Main Papers* (New Rochelle, N.Y),117-136, reprinted in *Studies on Constantinople* (variorum) 1993, Aldershot, I.

Mango, C. 1986b. The fourteenth region of Constantinople in Studien zur spätantiken und byzantinischen Kunst F.W. Deichmann gewidmet, ed. O. Feld and U. Peschlow, Main (reprinted) in *Studies on Constantinople* (variorum) 1993, Aldershot, VIII.

Mango, C. 1986c. *The art of the Byzantine Empire 312-1453: sources and documents*, Toronto ; London.

Mango, C. 1985. *Le développement urbain de Constantinople (IVe-VIIe siècles)*,Paris.

Mango, C. 1977. The Liquidation of Iconoclasm and the Patriarch Photius in *Iconoclasm: papers given at the Ninth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Birmingham, March 1975*, A. Bryer ; J. Herrin (eds), Birmingham, 133-

140.

Mango, C . 1976. *Byzantine architecture*, N.Y.

Mango, C. 1975. The church of Sts Sergius and Bacchus at Constantinople and the alleged tradition of octagonal palatine churches, JOB 21 (1972),Wienna (reprinted) in *Studies on Constantinople* (variorum)1993, Aldershot,XIV.

Mango, C. 1969-70. Notes on Byzantine Monuments: Frescoes in the Octagon of St. Mary Chalkoprateia , *DOP* 23-24, 369-72

Mango, C. 1959b. *The brazen house: a study of the vestibule of the imperial palace of Constantinople*, Copenhagen.

Mango, C. 1959a. The Date of the Narthex Mosaics of the Church of the Dormition at Nicaea, *DOP* 13, 245-252

Mango, C 1958. *The homilies of Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople*,Cambridge, Mass.

Mango, C 1952. The date of the Anonymous Russian Description of Constantinople in BZ 45 (reprinted) in *Studies on Constantinople* (variorum) 1993, Aldershot, XXI.

Mango, C; Ševčenko, I.1978. Some Recently Acquired Byzantine Inscriptions at the Istanbul Archaeological, Museum, *DOP* 32, 1-27

Mango, C; Ševčenko, I.1973. Some churches and monasteries on the Southern shore of the sea in Marmara, *DOP* 27, 235 – 277

Mango, C. 1972. *The art of the Byzantine Empire 312-1453 : sources and documents,* Toronto ; London.

Mango, M.M. 2001.The porticoed street at Constantinople in *Byzantine Constantinople : monuments, topography, and everyday life*, Leiden ; Boston, 29-53.

Mantas, A. G. 2001. *To eikonographiko programma tou hierou vēmatos tōn Mesovyzantinōn naōn tēs Helladas (843-1204)*, Athens.

Manton, L. 2004. *Aspects of the Sakli Church Frescos in relation to its Mandylion and that of the Goreme Chapel 21* access via http://www.shroud.com/pdfs/n60part4.pdf (09/09/10)

Maraval P. 2004. Comment s'est constituée une <<identité pèlerine>> chez les chrétiens des premiers siècles in *Identités pèlerines : actes du colloque de Rouen, 15-16 mai 2002*, C. Vincent (ed.), Rouen,19-29.

Maraval, P.1985. *Lieux saints et pèlerinages d'Orient. Lieux saints et pèlerinages d'Orient histoire et géographie, des origines à la conquête arabe*, Paris.

Marçais, G.; Wiet, G. 1934. Le Voile de sainte Anne d'Apt, *MonPiot,* 43,177-194

Mare, W. H. 1987.*The archaeology of the Jerusalem area*, MI.

Marini-Clarelli, M.V.1996. La controversia nestoriana e i mosaici dell' arco trionfale di S. Maria Maggiore in *Bisanzio e l'Occidente : arte, archeologia, storia : studi in onore di Fernanda de' Maffei*, C.Barsanti [et al.] (eds), Rome, 323-344.

Markus, R.A. 1979. Carthage-Prima Justiniana-Ravenna: An aspect of Justinian's Kirchenpolitik, *Byzantion* 49, 277-302

Mathews, T. F.; Mango, C. 1973. Observations on the Church of Panagia Kamariotissa on Heybeliada (Chalke), Istanbul with a Note on Panagia Kamariotissa and Some Imperial Foundations of the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries at Constantinople, *DOP* 27,115-132

Mathews, T. F.1971. *The early churches of Constantinople: architecture and liturgy* ,PA.

Mathews,T. F.; Dandridge, E.P. 2004. The ruined reliquary of the Holy Cross of the Great Lavra, Mt.Athos in *Byzance et les reliques du Christ. International Congress of Byzantine Studies (22nd : 2001 : Paris, France),* J. Durand ;B. Flusin (eds), Paris,107-122.

Mathieu, X.1861. *De la Dévotion à Sainte Anne ... ou du culte que l'on rend à ses reliques dans l'ancienne cathédrale d'Apt en Provence*, Apt.

Mauss, Ch.1888. *La Piscine de Bethesda à Jérusalem*, Paris.

Mavroudi, M. V. 2002. *A Byzantine book on dream interpretation : the Oneirocriticon of Achmet and its Arabic sources*, Leiden.

Medea, A. 1938. Mural paintings in some cave chapels of Southern Italy, *AJA* 42, 17-29

Meimaris,Y. 1986. *Sacred names, saints, martyrs and church officials in the Greek inscriptions and papyri pertaining to the Christian Church of Palestine*, Athens.

Meinardus, O.1970. A Study of the Relics of Saints of the Greek Church, *Oriens* 54, 130-278

Melicharová, P.2007. Crown, Veil and Halo. Confronting Ideals of Royal Female Sanctity in the West and in the Byzantine East in Late Middle Ages (13th-14th century), *Byz* 78, 315-344

Mercati, S. G.1970. *Collectanea Byzantina*,vol. 2, Rome.

Mercenier, F. 1975. *La prière des églises de rite byzantin. 1, La prière des heures = Hōrologion*, Gembloux.

Meredith, A.1999. *Gregory of Nyssa*, London.

Mergiali-Sahas S. 2001. Byzantine emperors and holy relics. Use, and misuse, of sanctity and authority, *JÖB* 51, 41-60

Meulen , J. van der , 1967. Recent Literature on the Chronology of Chartres Cathedral, *ABull* 49, 152-172

Meyendorff. J. 1976. *Byzantine theology: historical trends and doctrinal themes*,N.Y.

Meyendorff, J. 1968. Justinian, the Empire and the Church, *DOP* 22, 43-60

Meyer, M. 2007. The Window of Testimony. A Sign of Physical or Spiritual Conception? in *Interactions. Artistic Interchange between the Eastern and Western Worlds in the Medieval Period*, C. Hourihane (ed.), Philadelphia, 244-59.

Michałowski, K.- Jakobielski, S.1974. *Faras: wall paintings in the collection of the National Museum in Warsaw*, Warsaw.

Michałowski, K. 1970. Open problems of Nubian art and culture in the light if the discoveries at Faras in *Kunst und Geschichte Nubiens in christlicher Zeit. Ergebnisse und Probleme auf Grund der jüngsten Ausgrabungen*, E. Dinkler (ed.), Recklinghausen,11-28.

Michaud, J. 1999. Cult des reliques et épigraphie .L'exemple des dédicaces et des consecrations d'autels in *Les reliques: objets, cultes, symboles: actes du colloque international de l'Universite?? du Littoral-Co??te d'Opale, Boulogne-sur-Mer, 4-6 septembre 1997*,Turnhout,199-212.

Mikragiannanites Gerasimos 1958. Κατάλογος χειρογράφων κωδ. Κυριακου Αγίας Αννης, *EEBS* 28 ,87-192

Milburn, R. 1988. *Early Christian Art and Architecture* , Aldershot.

Milik, T. 1959. Le rouleau de cuivre de Qumràn. Traduction et commentaire topographique, *RB* 66, 321-I557

Miller, T. S. 2003. The *orphans of Byzantium: child welfare in the Christian empire*, Washington, D.C.

Miles, G.C. 1964. Byzantium and the Arabs: Relations in Crete and the Aegean Area, *DOP* 18, 1-32

Millet, G. 1969. *La peinture du Moyen Age en Yougoslavie (Serbie, Macédoine et Monténégro)*, vol.4, Paris.

Millet, G. 1962. *La peinture du Moyen Age en Yougoslavie (Serbie, Macédoine et Monténégro)*, vol. 3, Paris.

Millet, G. 1957. *La peinture du Moyen Age en Yougoslavie (Serbie, Macédoine et Monténégro)*, vol.2, Paris.

Millet, G. 1954. *La peinture du Moyen Age en Yougoslavie (Serbie, Macédoine et Monténégro)*, vol.1, Paris.

Millet, G. 1936. *Byzantine Painting at Trebizond*, London .

Millet, G. 1910. Monuments byzantins de Mistra, Paris.

Millingen Van, A. 1899. *Byzantine Constantinople: the walls of the city and adjoining historical sites*, London.

Mimouni, S.C. 2002. La concept d' Apocryphicité dans le Christianisme ancien et médiéval. Réflexions en guise d'introduction in *Apocryphicité : histoire d'un concept transversal ayx religions du livre*, Turnhout,1-30.

Mimouni, S.C. 1998. *Le judéo-christianisme ancien: essais historiques*, Paris.

Mimouni, S. C.1995. *Dormition et assomption de Marie: histoire des traditions anciennes*, Paris.

Miranda S., 1965. *Les grand palais des empereurs Byzantins*, Mexico.

Mitsani, A.D. 2000. Monumental painting in the Cyclades during the thirteenth century, *D.C.A.E.* v. ?,93-122

Miyatev, K. 1961. *The Boyana murals*, Dresden.

Van Moorsel, P. N.1987. La signification des icons dans le sanctuaire des églises coptes in *Nicee II (787-1987) Douze siecles d'images religieuses, Actes du Colloque international Nicée II tenu au Collège de France, Paris les 2, 3, 4 octobre 1986*, F. Boespflug; N.Lossky (eds), Paris, 209-218.

Van Moorsel, P. N.1975. *The central church of Abdallah Nirqi*,Leiden.

Morello, G.1990. *Splendori di Bisanzio: testimonianze e riflessi d'arte e cultura bizantina nelle chiese d'Italia*, Milano.

Morey, C. 1929. Notes on East Christian Miniatures, *ABull* 11, 4-103

Mordtmann, A.D. 1892. *Esquisse topographique de Constantinople*, Lille.

Mouriki, D. 1985. *The Mosaics of Nea Moni on Chios,* Athens.

Mouriki, D. 1980-1. Stylistic trends in monumental painting of Greece during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, *DOP* 34, 77-124

Mouriki, D. 1969. Η Παναγία και οι Θεοπάτορες: Αφηγηματική σκηνή ή εικονιστική παράσταση, *D.C.A.E.* 5, 31-52

Mouriki, D. 1968. Four unexamined scenes of the life of Mary in Perivleptos of Mystras (in Greek) , *AE*,1-6

Mouterde, R. 1959. Cultes antiques de la Coelésyrie et de l'Hermon, *MUSJ* 36, 53-87.

Moutsopoulos, N.K.; Dimitrokalles, G. 1981. *Γεράκι, οι εκκλησίες του οικισμού*, Thessalonike.

Moutsopoulos, N.K.1967. *Καστοριά. Η Παναγία η Μαυριώτισσα*, Athens.

Mulder, O. 2003. *Simon the High Priest in Sirach 50: an exegetical study of the significance of Simon the High Priest as climax to the Praise of the fathers in Ben Sira's concept of the history of Israel*. Leiden ; Boston.

Mullett, M. 2010. Representing Byzantine Society in *The Athens Dialogues - An International Conference on Culture and Civilization. November 24-27 / 2010, Athens.* Accessed online via http://athensdialogues.chs.harvard.edu/cgi-bin/WebObjects/athensdialogues.woa/wa/dist?dis=73 (11/07/11)

Müller-Wiener, W.1977. *Bildlexikon zur Topographie Istanbuls : Byzantion-Konstantinupolis-Istanbul bis zum Beginn des 17. Jahrhunderts*, Tübingen.

Munitiz, J. 1998. Anastasios of Sinai, Speaking and writing to the people of God *Preacher and audience: studies in early Christian and Byzantine homiletics*, M. B. Cunningham and P.Allen.(eds), Leiden ; Boston, 227-245.

Murphy-O' Connor, J. 1980. *The Holy Land: An Oxford Archaeological Guide from Earliest Times to 1700*, Oxford.

Murray, P.; Murray, L. (eds) 1998. *The Oxford companion to Christian art and architecture*, Oxford.

Murray, R.S.J 1982.The characteristics of the earliest Syriac Christianity in *East of Byzantium : Syria and Armenia in the formative period*, N. G. Garsoïan, T. F. Mathews, R. W. Thomson, (eds) Washington, D.C.,3-16.

Muthmann, F. 1975. *Mutter und Quelle: Studien zur Quellenverehrung im Altertum und im Mittelalter*, Basel.

Naredi-Rainer P. von; Limpricht, C.1994. *Salomos Tempel und das Abendland : Monumentale Folgen historischer Irrtümer*, Köln.

Nau, F. 1901. Lettre de Jacques d'Édesse sur la généalogie de la Sainte Vierge, *ROC* 6, 512-531

Nautin. P. 1963.'Epiphanios of Salamis', *DHGE*, vol.15, 618-631.

Neff, A. 1999. Byzantium Westernized, Byzantium Marginalized: Two Icons in the Supplicationes variae, *Gesta* 38, 81-102

Negev, A. Gibson, S.2001. *Archaeological encyclopedia of the Holy Land*, N.Y. ; London.

Nelson, R. S. and Collins, K. M.(eds) 2006. *Holy image, hallowed ground: icons from Sinai*, L. A.

Der Nersessian, S. 1965. A Psalter and New Testament Manuscript at Dumbarton Oaks, *DOP* 19,153-183

Der Nersessian, S. 1944. Some aspects of Coptic painting in *Études byzantines et arméniennes : Byzantine and Armenian studies*, (originally published in Coptic Egypt : papers read at a symposium held under the joint auspices of New York university and the Brooklyn museum, February 15, 1941, in connection with the exhibition, Paganism and Christianity in Egypt, shown at the Brooklyn museum, January 23 to March 9, 1941 , 1944, Brooklyn, 43-50), Louvain, 185-191.

Der Nersessian, S. 1941. Pagan and Christian Art in Egypt: An Exhibition at the Brooklyn Museum, *ABull* 23, 165-167

Der Nersessian, S. 1940-1. Remarks on the Date of the Menologium and the Psalter Written for Basil II (reprinted) in *Etudes byzantines et armeniennes*, Louvain, 113-128.

Nicol, D. 1994. *The Byzantine lady: ten portraits, 1250-1500*, Cambridge.

Nicol, D. 1970. The confessions of a Bogus Patriarch: Paul Tagaris Palaiologos, Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem and Catholic Patriarch of Constantinople in the fourteenth century, Journal of Ecclesiastical History 21, 204-205 (reprinted in)

Byzantium: its ecclesiastical history and relations with the western world, (variorum), London, IX.

Nicolaïdès, A. 1996. L'église de la Panagia Arakiotissa à Lagoudéra, Chypre: Etude iconographique des fresques de 1192, *DOP* 50,1-137

Nikolaou, K. 2005. *The woman in the middle Byzantine period. Social models and everyday life in the hagiographical texts* (in Greek), Athens.

Nikolopoulos, G. P. 1958. Ὕμνοι (Κοντάκια) σωζόμενα εις χειρόγραφα της Βαλλικελιανης Βιβλιοθήκης της Ρωμης, *EEBS* 28 , 286-323

Nilsson, M. P. 1961. *Greek folk religion*, N.Y.

Nixon, V. 2004. *Mary's mother : Saint Anne in late medieval Europe*, University Park, Pa.

Nocent, A. 2000. Christian initiation from Catechumenate to Eucharist in *Handbook for Liturgical Studies: Liturgical Time and Space*, A.J. Chupungco (ed.), vol.4, Minnesota, 5-28.

Nordhagen, P.J 2000. Constantinople on the Tiber: The Byzantines in Rome and the iconography of their images in *Early medieval Rome and the Christian West : essays in honour of Donald A. Bullough*, Leiden : Boston,113-134.

Nordhagen, P.J. 1987. Icons Designed for the Display of Sumptuous Votive Gifts *DOP* 41, Studies on Art and Archeology in Honor of Ernst Kitzinger on His Seventy-Fifth Birthday, 453-460

Nordhagen, P.J. 1978. S. Maria Antiqua: the frescoes of the seventh century, *ActaIRNorv* 8, Rome.

Nordhagen, P.J. 1968. The Frescoes of John VII (A.D. 705-707) in S. Maria Antiqua in Rome, *ActaIRNorv* 3, Rome.

Nordhagen, P. J. 1965. The Mosaics of John VII (705–707 A.D.), *ActaIRNorv* 2, 121–66

Norton, P. 2007. *Episcopal elections 250-600: hierarchy and popular will in late antiquity*, Oxford.

Oberhelman, S.M. 2008. *Dreambooks in Byzantium: six oneirocritica in translation, with commentary and introduction*, Aldershot ; Burlington, VT.

Orlandi, T. 1997. Letteratura copta e christianesimo nazionale egiziano in *L'Egitto cristiano : aspetti e problemi in etá tardo-antica*, A. Camplani (ed.) Roma, 39-120.

Orlandos, A.K .1938. Τα Βυζαντινά μνημεία της Καστοριάς, Ο Άγιος Στέφανος, *ABME* 4, 121-124

Orlandos, A.K .1936. Ο Άγιος Νικόλαος της Ροδιάς, *ABME 2*, 138-147

Orlandos, A.K. 1930. *Monuments byzantins de Chios. II, Planches*, Athens.

Omont, H.1902. *Missions archéologiques française en Orient aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles.* Vol. 2 , Paris.

Omont, H. A. 1896. *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum graecorum Bibliothecae nationalis parisiensis*, Paris.

Osborne, J. 1996. *Early Christian and medieval antiquities. V. 1, Mosaics and wallpaintings in Rome*, Rome.

Ostrogorski, G. 1964. *Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Bilderstreites*, Amsterdam.

Ousterhout, R. 2006. Sacred Geographies and Holy Cities: Constantinople as Jerusalem in *Hierotopy: The Creation of Sacred Space in Byzantium and Medieval Russia*, A. Lidov (ed.), Moscow, 98-116.

Ousterhout, R. G.2000. Contextualizing the Later Churches of Constantinople: Suggested Methodologies and a Few Examples, *DOP* 54, 241-250

Ousterhout, R. 1998. Flexible geography and transportable topography in *The real and ideal Jerusalem in Jewish, Christian, and Islamic art: studies in honor of Bezalel Narkiss on the occasion of his seventieth birthday*, Jerusalem, 393-404.

Ousterhout, R.G.1995. The Virgin of the Chora: An image and its contexts in *The Sacred image East and West*, R. Ousterhout; L. Brubaker.(eds), Urbana, 91-109.

Ousterhout, R.G. 1990. *The Blessings of pilgrimage*,Urbana.

Ovadiah, A. 1999.The churches of Jerusalem on the Madaba mosaic map in *The Madaba centienary.1897-1997,Travelling through the Byzantine Umayyad period, Proceedings of the international conference held in Amman,7-9 April 1997*, Jerusalem, 252-254.

Pace, V. 1982. Pittura Bizantine nell'Italia meridionale in *I Bizantini in Italia*, Milan, 427-496.

Palachkovsky, L.1953. L'influence des schismes sur la vénération des saints in *Atti dello VIII Congresso internazionale di studi bizantini: Palermo 3-10 aprile 1951*, vol.2, Rome, 37-9.

Palmer, P. F. J. 1953. *Mary in the Documents of the Church*, London.

Panayotidi, M. 2006. Η προσωπικότητα δύο αρχόντων της Καστοριάς και ο χαρακτήρας της πόλης στο δεύτερο μισό του 12^{ου} αιώνα in *Dōron : timētikos tomos ston kathēgētē Niko Nikonano*, G. Karadedos (ed.),Thessalonike, 157-167.

Pani Ermini, L. 1998. Spazio cristiano e culto dei santi orientali a Roma. in *Oriente cristiano e santità: figure e storie di santi tra Bisanzio e l'Occidente*, S. Gentile (ed.), Milan;Rome.

Panselinou, N.1992. Τοιχογραφίες του 13^{ου} αιώνα στην Αργολίδα. Ο ναός των Ταξιαρχών και ο Άγιος Ιωάννης ο Θεολόγος, *D.C.A.E.* 16, 155-165

Papadaki-Ökland, S. 1966. *AD* 21, 430-5

Papadopoulou, B. N. 2007. Άρτα. Οι βυζαντινές τοιχογραφίες της μονής Κάτω Παναγιάς, *Byzantina* 27, 369-398

Papageorgiou, A. 1969. Η παλαιοχριστιανική και Βυζαντινή αρχαιολογία και τέχνη εν Κύπρω κατά τα έτη 1967-8, *ΑπΒ,* 280-90

Papamastorakis, T. 2003. The empress Zoe's tomb in *The empire in Crisis (?) Byzantium in the eleventh century (1025-1081)*, Athens, 497-511.

Papanikola-Bakirtze; Hunt, D.Sir; Loizides, E. 2004. D. *Colours of Medieval Cyprus : through the medieval ceramic collection of the Leventis Municipal Museum of Nicosia*, Nicosia

Papastavrou, H. 2007. *Recherche iconographique dans l'art byzantin et occidental du XIe au XVe siécle : l'Annonciation*, Venice.

Papazotos, T. 1995. *Βυζαντινές εικόνες της Βέροιας*, Athens.

Papazotos, T. 1994. *Η Βέροια και οι ναοί της(11ος-18ος αι) : Ιστορική και αρχαιολογική σπουδή των μνημείων της πόλης*, Athens.

Parani, M. G. 2005. Representations of Glass Objects as a Source on Byzantine Glass: How Useful Are They?, *DOP* 59,147-171

Parker, D.C., Taylor, D.G.K.,Goodacre, M.S. 1999. The Dura-Europos Gospel harmony in *Studies in the early text of the Gospels and Acts: the papers of the First Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, Atlanta,192-228.

Parker, S. T. 1999.An Empire's New Holy Land: The Byzantine Period, *NEA* 62, 134-180.

Parry, K.1996. *Depicting the Word: Byzantine iconophile thought of the eighth and ninth centuries*, Leiden.

Pasquini Vecchi, L.1995. Elementi orientali-costantinopolitani nelle decorazioni a stucco di S. Vitale in *Ravenna, Costantinopoli, Vicino Oriente , XLI Corso di Cultura sull'Arte Ravennate e Bizantina*, Ravenna, 187-206.

Pasierb, St. J. 1987. L'image entre l'Orient et l' Occident: les status d;un sunode polonaise port-tridentin in *Nicee II (787-1987) Douze siecles d'images religieuses*, *Actes du Colloque international Nicée II tenu au Collège de France, Paris les 2, 3, 4 octobre 1986* , F. Boespflug; N. Lossky (eds), Paris, 345-354.

Paspates, A.G.1893.The *great palace of Constantinople*, W.Metcalf (trans.), Paisley; London.

Passarelli, G. 2007. *Creta tra Bisanzio e Venezia*, Milan.

Patlagean, É. 1991. Remarques sur la diffusion et la production des apocryphes dans le monde byzantin, *Apocrypha* 2, 155-163

Patrich, J. 2006. Early Christian Churches in the Holy Land in *Christians and Christianity in the Holy Land from the origins to the Latin Kingdoms*. O.Limour; G.G.Stroumsa (eds), Turnhout, 355-399.

Patrich, J. 2001. *The Sabaite heritage in the Orthodox Church from the fifth century*, Leuven.

Patrich, J. 1990. The cells (Ta kellia) of Choziba,Wadi El-Qilt in *Christian archaeology in the Holy Land, new discoveries : essays in honour of Virgilio C. Corbo*, OFM,G.C. Bottini, L. Di Segni, E. Alliata (eds), Jerusalem, 205-225.

Peers, G.2004. *Sacred shock: framing visual experience in Byzantium*, Pa.

Peers, G. 2001. *Subtle bodies: representing angels in Byzantium*, Berkeley; London.

Peeters, P.1920.Un nouveau manuscrit arabe du récit de la prise de Jérusalem par les Perses, en 614, *AB* 38, 137-47

Pelekanides,S. 1973.*Καλλιέργης, όλης Θετταλίας άριστος ζωγράφος*. Athens.

Pelekanides, S.M. ; Chatzidakis, M. 1985. *Καστοριά,* Athens.

Pelikan, J. Jan 1996. *Mary through the centuries: her place in the history of culture*, New Haven ; London.

Peltomaa, L.M.2001. *The image of the Virgin Mary in the Akathistos hymn*, Leiden ;

Boston

Penkova, B. 2000. Die sogenannten "bulgarischen Grabkirchen" : Funktion und Dekoration in *Byzantinische Malerei: Bildprogramme, Ikonographie, Stil*, G.Koch (ed.),Wiesbaden, 245-256.

Pentcheva, B. V.2007. Epigrams on icons in *Art and text in Byzantine culture*, L.James (ed.), Cambridge, 120-138.

Pentcheva, B. V.2006. *Icons and power: the Mother of God in Byzantium*, Pa.

Peretto, L.M. 1954. La Mariologia del Protovangelo di Giacomo, *Marianum* 16, 228-265

Petersen, W. L. 1984. *The Diatessaron and Ephrem Syrus as sources of Romanos the Melodist*, Utrecht.

Petrides, S. 1904. Spoudaei et Philopones, *EO* 7, 341-8

Petrides, S. 1900-1. Le Spoudaei de Jérusalem at de Constantinople, *EO* 4, 225-231

Photopoulos, D ; Delevorias, A. 1997. Η *Ελλάδα του Μουσείου Μπενάκη.* Athens.

Pianalto, A. 1999. *Martyrs, cults and water in the early Christian world (with a focus on Thessaloniki, Corinth and Philippi)*, (PhD Thesis) University of Birmingham, Birmingham.

Piatnitskiĭ, Y. (ed.) 2000. *Sinai, Byzantium, Russia : Orthodox art from the sixth to the twentieth century*, London.

Pietri, C. 1981. Donateurs et pieux établissements d'après le légen-dier romain in *Hagiographie, cultures et sociétés, IVe-XIIe siècles : actes du colloque organisé a Nanterre et à Paris (2-5 mai 1979)*,435-453.

Pierre, M.-J.; Rousée, J.-M. 1981. Sainte-Marie de la Probatique: Etat et orientation des recherches, *PrOC* 31, 23-42

Pignon, F.(ed.) 1863. *Annales du Commissariat général de la Terre Sainte à Paris. (L'Ancienne Église de Sainte-Anne à Jerusalem: Étude historique par A. Bassi.)*, Paris.

Pinch, G. 2004. *Egyptian mythology: a guide to the gods, goddesses, and traditions of ancient Egypt*, Oxford, N. Y.

Pitarakis, B. 2006. *Les croix-reliquaires pectorales byzantines en bronze*, Paris.

Pitarakis, B. 2005. Female piety in context: understanding developments in private devotional practices in *Images of the Mother of God: perceptions of the Theotokos in Byzantium*, M. Vassilaki (ed.), Aldershot, 153-166.

PMB 2006. http://www.pbw.kcl.ac.uk/pbw/apps/ .

Podskalsky, G. 2006. Il metodo narrativo-encomiastico nelle omelie mariologiche e christologiche di Giovanni di Damasco in *Giovanni di Damasco: un padre al sorgere dell'Islam : atti del XIII Convegno ecumenico internazionale di spiritualità ortodossa, sezione bizantina, Bose, 11-13 settembre 2005*, Magnano, 229-239.

Pomerantseva, N. 1982. The iconography of the Christian painting in Nubia (Frescoes of Fras VIII-X cent. A.D.) in *Nubian Studies proceedings of the symposium for Nubian studies Selwyn College Cambridge 1978*, J.M. Martin (ed.), Warminster, 198-207.

Pratsch, T. 2005. *Der hagiographische Topos: griechische Heiligenviten in mittelbyzantinischer Zeit*, Berlin.

Pratsch, T.1998. *Theodoros Studites (759-826) zwischen Dogma und Pragma : der Abt des Studiosklosters in Konstantinopel im Spannungsfeld von Patriarch, Kaiser und eigenem Anspruch*, Frankfurt am Main.

Prawer, J. 1975. Jerusalem in Crusader days in *Jerusalem revealed: archaeology in the Holy City, 1968-1974*, R. Grafman (trans.), Jerusalem, 102-8.

Pringle, D. 2007. *The churches of the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem: a corpus. V. 3, Thecityof, Jerusalem*, Cambridge; N. Y.

Pullan, W. 1993. Mapping time and salvation : Early Christian pilgrimage to Jerusalem in *Mapping invisible worlds*, G. D.Flood (ed.), Edinburgh, 23-40.

Rapp, C. 2005. *Holy bishops in late antiquity: the nature of Christian leadership in an age of transition*, Berkeley, Calif.; London.

Rapp, C. 1998. Comparison, Paradigm, and the Case of Moses in Panegyric and Hagiography in *The Propaganda of Power,* M. Whitby (ed.), Leiden, 277- 298.

Rapp, C. 1995. Byzantine Hagiographers as Antiquarians, Seventh to Tenth Centuries, *ByzF* 21, 31-44

Rassart-Debergh, M. 1996. Littérature apocryphe et art copte, *Apocrypha* 7, 253-9

Réau, L.1958. *Iconographie de l'art chrétien 3, Iconographie de saints. 1*, Paris.

Réau, L.1957. *Iconographie de l'art chrétien 2, Iconographie de la bible. 2 Nouveau testament*, Paris.

Redgate, A. E. 2000. *The Armenians*, Oxford ; Malden, Mass.

Reinink, G.J. 1992. The romance of Julian the apostate as a source for seventh century Syriac apocalypses in *La Syrie de Byzance à l'Islam : VIIe-VIIIe siècles : actes du colloque international Lyon - Maison de l'Orient méditerranéen, Paris - Institut du monde arabe, 11-15 Septembre 1990*, P. Canivet, J.-P. Rey-Coquais (eds), 75-86.

Restle, M.1967. *Byzantine wall painting in Asia Minor*, 3 vols, Recklighausen.

Reuss, J. 1957. *Matthäus-kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, Berlin.

Rice, T. 1965. *Constantinople. Byzantium-Istanbul*, London.

Rice, D. T.1959. *The art of Byzantium*, London.

Rigo, A. 2009. Un autore spirituale sconosciuto del X secolo: Luca Adialeiptos, *Byz* 79, 306-359

Ringrose, K. M. 2003. *The perfect servant: eunuchs and the social construction of gender in Byzantium*, Chicago ; London.

Robert, A; Macalister S.1977. *A Century of Excavation in Palestine*, London.

Robertson, N.1983. Greek Ritual Begging in Aid of Women's Fertility and Childbirth, *TAPA* 113, 143-169

Rodley, L.1985. *Cave monasteries of Byzantine Cappadocia*, Cambridge.

Roller. D. W. 1998. *The building program of Herod the Great*, Berkeley ; London.

Ronan, M. V. 1927. *S. Anne: her cult and her shrines*, London.

Roquet, G. 1991.La « réception » de l'image et du texte à motifs d'apocryphes dans les chrétientés d'Egypte et de Nubie : quelques apercus, *Apocrypha* 2, 181-215

Rorem, P.1993. *Pseudo-Dionysius: a commentary on the texts and an introduction to their influence*, N.Y. ; Oxford.

Rösch, G. 1978. *Onoma basileias: Studien zum offiziellen Gebrauch der Kaisertitel in spätantiker und frühbyzantinischer Zeit*, Wien.

Rosenqvist, J. O. 2005. Byzantine Trebizond: A provincial literary landscape in *Byzantino-Nordica 2004. Papers presented at the international symposium of Byzantine studies held on 7-11 May 2004 in Tartu, Estonia (Acta Societatis Morgensternianae 2*; Tartu, 29-51.

Ross, L. 1996. *Medieval art: a topical dictionary*,Westport, Conn.

De Roten, P. 2005. *Bapteme et mystagogie: enquete sur l'initiation chretienne selon s. Jean Chrysostome*, Münster.

Rouan, M.F.1981. Une Lecture 'iconoclaste' de la Vie d'Etienne le Jeune", *TM* 8, 415-436

Rousée, J.-M. 1965. L' église Sainte-Marie de la probatique. Chronologie des sanctuaires à Sainte-Anne de Jérusalem d'après les fouilles récentes in *Atti del VI Congresso internazionale di archeologia cristiana: Ravenna, 23-30 settembre 1962*, Città del Vaticano, 169-176.

Rousée, J.-M. 1962. Jérusalem (Piscine probatique), *RB* 69, 107-9

Rubin, M. 2009. *Mother of God: a history of the Virgin Mary*, London.

Ruggieri,V.1991. *Byzantine religious architecture (582-867): its history and structural elements* , Rome.

Ruh, K. 1990. *Geschichte der abendländischen Mystik v.1, Die Grundlegung durch die Kirchenväter und die Mönchstheologie des 12. Jahrhunderts*, München.

Russell, P. 2000. Ephraem the Syrian on the utility of language and the place of silence *JECS* 8:1, 21-37

Russo, E.2006. La presenza degli artefici greco-costantinopolitani a Roma nel VI secolo, *JOAI* 75, 243 – 297.

Safran, L. 2011. Deconstructing Donors, *WJKg* 54 (forthcoming)

Safran, L. 2005. *Language Choice* in the Medieval Salento: A Sociolinguistic Approach to Greek and Latin Inscriptions in Zwischen Polis, Provinz und Peripherie : Beiträge zur byzantinischen Geschichte und Kultur, 853-882.

Sahas, D. J.1986. *Icon and logos: sources in eighth-century iconoclasm: an annotated translation of the Sixth Session of the Seventh Ecumenical Council (Nicea, 787), containing the Definition of the Council of Constantinople (754) and its refutation*, Toronto.

Safran, L. S. 1997. *Pietro at Otranto: Byzantine art in south Italy*, Rome.

Sansterre, J. M. 1983. *Les moines grecs et orientaux à Rome aux époques byzantine et carolingienne (milieu du VIe s.-fin du IXe s.),vol. 1, Texte*, Brusells.

Sansterre, J. M. 1987. À propos de la signification politico-religieuse de certaines fresques de Jean VII à Sainte Marie Antique, *Byzantion* 57, 434-440

Saradi, H. 1994. Cursing in the Byzantine notarial acts: a form of warranty, *Byzantina* 17, 441-553

Sarris, P.2006. *Economy and society in the age of Justinian*, Cambridge .

Sartre, M.1985. *Bostra: des origines à l'Islam*, Paris.

Savage, M. 2008. The interrelationship of text, imagery and architectural soace in Byzantium in *Die kulturhistorische Bedeutung byzantinischer Epigramme: Akten des internationalen Workshop (Wien, 1.-2. Dezember 2006)*, Wien, 101-111.

Sawyer, D.1996.*Women and religion in the first Christian centuries*, London.

Schaumkell, E. 1893. *Der Kultus der heiligen Anna am Ausgange des Mittelalters*. Freiburg; Leipzig.

Schick, R. 1995. *The Christian communities of Palestine from Byzantine to Islamic rule . A historical and archeological study*.N.J.

Schiller, G.1966. *Ikonographie der christlichen Kunst*,vol.1,Gütersloh.

Schmaus, M.; Grillmeier A.; Scheffczyk L.; Seybold, M. (eds) 1971. *Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte. Christologie, Soteriologie, Ekklesiologie, Mariologie, Gnadenlehre. Von der Reformation bis ins 19. Jahrhundert, vol. 3, Faszikel 4 Mariologie*, Freiburg ; Basel;Vienna.

Schneider, H.1999. Karolingische Kirchen- und Liturgiereform- Ein konservativer Neuaufbruch in *799: Kunst und Kultur der Karolingerzeit: Karl der Grosse und Papst Leo III. in Paderborn : Paderborn vom 23. Juli bis 1. November 1999*, II, Heidelberg, 772-781.

Schreiner, P.1971. Eine unbekannte Beschreibung der Pammakaristoskirche (Fethiye Camii) undweitere texte zur Topographie Konstantinopels, *DOP* 25, 217-248

Schneider, A.M. 1951. Die Blachernen, *Oriens* 4, 82-120

Schneider, A.M.1939. Deuteron und Melantiastor, *BNJ* 15, 181- 86

Scholz, C. 1997. *Graecia sacra: Studien zur Kultur des mittelalterlichen Griechenland im Spiegel hagiographischer Quellen*, Frankfurt am Main.

Scholz, P. O. 1985. Bemerkungen zur Ikonologie der Theotokos in *Acts of the second international congress of Coptic study Roma , 22-26 September 1980*, T.Orlandi, F.Wisse (eds), Rome, 323-338.

Schorch,S.2003. "Die Propheten und der Karneval: marzeach - maioumas - maimuna", *VT* 53.3, 397-415

Schreiner, P. 1989. Eine Obituarnotiz über eine Frühgeburt, *JÖB* 39, 209-216

Schreckenberg, H.; Schubert,K. 1992. *Jewish historiography and iconography in early and medieval Christianity*, Assen.

Schweinfurth, P.1965. *Die Fresken von Bojana: ein Meisterwerk der Monumentalkunst des 13. Jahrhunderts*, Mainz.

Sciarra, B. 1970. Affreschi nella chiesa di S.Anna a Brindisi, *NapNob* 101-3

Seipel, W. 2002. *Faras: die Kathedrale aus dem Wüstensand: Kunsthistorisches Museum, 23. Mai bis 15. September 2002*, Milan.

Selwyn, E. C. 1911. The feast of Tabernacles, Epiphany, and Baptism, *JTS* 12, 225-249

Setton, K. M. 1969. *A history of the Crusades, vol.2, The later Crusades, 1189-1311*, K. M. Setton; R. L.Wolff;H. W. Hazard (eds), Madison ; London.

Ševčenko, N. P. 1998. Canon and Calendar: The Role of a Ninth-Century Hymnographer in Shaping the Celebration of the Saints in *Byzantium in the ninth century : dead or alive? : papers from the Thirtieth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Birmingham, March 1996*, L.Brubaker (ed.) Aldershot,101-114.

Ševčenko, N.P.1983. *The life of Saint Nicholas in Byzantine art*, Torino.

Ševčenko, I. 1977. Hagiography of the Iconoclast period in *Iconoclasm: papers given at the Ninth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Birmingham, March 1975*, A. Bryer ;J. Herrin (eds), Birmingham 113-132.

Shahid, I. 1999. The Madaba Mosaic Map Revisited. Some New Observations on its Purpose and Meaning in *The Madaba centinary.1897-1997,Travelling through the Byzantine Umayyad period, Proceedings of the international conference held in Amman,7-9 April 1997,* 147-154.

Sheviakova, T. S. 2004. *Nereditsa: monumental'nye rospisi t͡serkvi Spasa na Nereditse*, Moscow.

Showmaker, S.J. 2008. Epiphanius of Salamis, the Kollyridians, and the early Dormition narratives: The cult of the Virgin in the fourth century, *JECS* 16:3, 371-401

Shoemaker, S.J. 2008.The cult of the Virgin in the fourth century: a fresh look at some old nad new sources in *The origins of the cult of Mary*, Ch. Maunder (ed.), Tunbridge Wells,71-87.

Shoemaker, S.2002. *Ancient traditions of the Virgin Mary's dormition and assumption* , Oxford.

Shoemaker, S.J. 2001. Rethinking the "Gnostic Mary": Mary of Nazareth and Mary of Magdala in Early Christian Tradition, *JECS* 9:4, 555–595

Sinclair, T. A. 1989. *Eastern Turkey: an architectural and archaeological survey*, vol.2 London.

Sinclair, T. A. 1987. *Eastern Turkey: an architectural and archaeological survey*, vol.1 London.

Sinkewicz, R.E. 2002. Gregory Palamas in *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition* , C. G. Conticello and V. Conticello (eds),vol. 2, Turnhout, 131-188.

Skarlatos, D.V. 1890. *Η Κωνσταντινούπολις*, Athens.

Skarsaune, O.; Hvalvik, R. 2007. *Jewish believers in Jesus: the early centuries*, Peabody, Mass.

Skawran, K. M. 1982. *The development of Middle Byzantine fresco painting in Greece*, Muckleneuk.

Skhirtladze, Z. 1998. Canonizing the Apocrypha: the Abgar Cycle in the Alaverdi and Gelati Gospels In *The Holy Face and the Paradox of Representation*, Kessler, H. L.; Wolf, G. (eds), Bologna, 69-93

Skrobucha, H. 1965. *Kosmas und Damian*, Recklinghausen.

Smith, K. 2000.Old saints, new cults: Roman relics in Carolingian Francia in *Early medieval Rome and the Christian West : essays in honour of Donald A. Bullough*, Leiden : Boston ,317-339.

Smyrnakes, G.1988.*Το Ἅγιον Ὅρος,* Καρυές Αγίου Ὅρους.

Snee, R. 1998. Gregory Nazianzen's Anastasia Church: Arianism, the Goths, and Hagiography, *DOP* 52, 157-186

Sode, C. 2004. Creating new saints: the case of Michael the Synkellos and Theodore and Theophanes Graptoi in *Οι ήρωες της Ορθόδοξης Εκκλησίας: οι νέοι άγιοι, 8ος-16ος αιώνας*, E. Kountoura-Galake (ed.), Athens, 177-189.

Sophronios, 1937. Ταμεῖον Ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ποιήσεως, *E Ph* 36, 9-30,236-248,285-299,479-496

Sophronios, 1940 . Ταμεῖον Ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ποιήσεως , *E Ph* 39, 132-149, 270-287,414-433

Soteriou, G. 1958. *Εικόνες της μονής Σινά*, vol.2, Athens.

Soteriou, G. 1956. *Εικόνες της μονής Σινά*, vol. 1, Athens.

Spatharakis, I.2005. *The pictorial cycle of the Akathistos hymn for the Virgin*, Leiden.

Spatharakis, I.2001. *Dated Byzantine wall paintings of Crete*,Leiden.

Spain, S. 1979 . "The Promised Blessing": The Iconography of the Mosaics of S. Maria Maggiore, *ABull* 61, 518-540

Spier J.1993. Medieval Byzantine Magical Amulets and their Tradition, *JWI* 56, 25-62

Spiteris, Y. - Conticello, C. G. 2002. Nicola Cabasilas Chamaetos in *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition*, C. G. Conticello and V. Conticello (eds), vol. 2, Turnhout, 315-395.

Stamoules, C.A. 1989. *Η Θεοτόκος κατά τον Κύριλλο Αλεξανδρείας* (Ph.D. Thesis), Thessalonike.

Stefanescu, I. D. 1928. *Contribution a l`Étude des Peintures Murales Valaques*, Paris.

Stempvoort, van P. 1964.The Protevangelium Jacobi: The Sources of its Theme and Style and their bearing on its date in *Studia Evangelica 3, Papers presented to the Second International Congress on New Testament Studies held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1961*, F.L. Cross (ed.), Berlin, 410-426.

Steppa, J.- E. 2005. *John Rufus and the World Vision of Anti-Chalcedonean Culture*. Piscataway, NJ.

Stevenson, J. 1978. *The catacombs: rediscovered monuments of early Christianity*, London.

Stojaković, A. 1964. Une contribution a l'iconographie de l'architecture peinte dans la peinture médiévale Serbe in *Actes du XIIe congrès international d'études Byzantines, Ochride 10-16 Septrembre 1961*, Beograd, 353-362.

Stökl Ben Ezra, D. 2003. *The impact of Yom Kippur on early Christianity : the Day of Atonement from Second Temple Judaism to the fifth century*, Tübingen.

Strange, J. 2003. Herod and Jerusalem: The hellenization of an oriental city in *Jerusalem in ancient history and tradition*, London 97-113.

Stratos, A.N. 1980. *Byzantium in the seventh century*, vol. 5, Justinian II, Leontius and Tiberius, 685-711, Amsterdam.

Stroumsa, G.G. 1989. Religious Contacts in Byzantine Palestine, *Numen* 36, 16-42

De Strycker, É.1980. Die Griechischen Handschriften des Protevangeliums Jacobi in *Griechische Kodikologie und Textuberlieferung* ,D. Harlfinger (ed.), Darmstadt, 576-612.

De Strycker, É ; Louvain, S.J. 1964. Le Protévangile de Jaxques. Problèmes critiques et exégétiques in *Studia evangelica 3, Papers presented to the Second International Congress on New Testament Studies held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1961,* F.L. Cross (ed.), 339-359.

Strzygowski, J. 1893. *Die byzantinischen Wasserbehälter von Konstantinopel*, Wien.

Styger,P. 1914. Die Malerian in der Basiika des hl. Sabas auf dem kl. Aventin in Rom, *RQ* 28, 49-96

Szövérffy, J.1979. *A guide to Byzantine hymnography*, Brookline.

Stylianou, A.- Stylianou, J. A. 1964. *The painted churches of Cyprus*, Nicosia.

Sullivan, D.2003. A Byzantine Instructional Manual on Siege Defense: The *De Obsidione toleranda.* Introduction, English Translation and Annotations in *Byzantine authors : literary activities and preoccupations : text and translations dedicated to the memory of Nicolas Oikonomides*, Leiden; Boston, 139-266.

Taft, R. 1980-1. The Liturgy of the Great Church: An Initial Synthesis of Structure and Interpretation on the Eve of Iconoclasm, *DOP* 34 , 45-75

Taft, R. 1975. *The Great Entrance*, Rome.

Talbot, A. M. 2008. Hagiography in *The Oxford handbook of Byzantine studies,* E. Jeffreys ; J. Haldon ; R. Cormack (eds), Oxford, 862-871.

Talbot , A.-M., 2002. Pilgrimage to Healing Shrines: The Evidence of Miracle Accounts, *DOP* 56, 153-173

Talbot, A.M. 1998. St. Anthousa of Mantineon in *Byzantine defenders of images: eight saints' lives in English translation*, Washington, D.C,13-20.

Talbot , A.-M.,1997. Women in The Byzantines, G.Cavallo (ed.) Chicago,IL,117-143 (reprinted) in *Women and Religious Life in Byzantium*,(variorum) Aldershot, 2001,I.

Talbot , A.-M., 1994a. Epigrams of Manuel Philes on the Theotokos tes Peges and Its Art, *DOP* 48, 135-165

Talbot , A.-M. 1994. The posthumous miracles of St.Photeine AB 112,85-104 (reprinted in) Women and Religious Life in Byzantium,(variorum) Aldershot, 2001,VIII.

Talbot , A.-M., 1994b. Byzantine women, Saint's lives and social warfare *in Through the eye of a needle: Judeo-Christian roots of social welfare*,E. Albu Hanawalt; C.Lindberg (eds), Kirksville, Mo.,105-122.

Talbot, A.M.1996. Life of St. Theodora of Thessalonike in *Holy Women of Byzantium: Ten Saints' Lives in English Translation*, A.M.Talbot (ed.), Washington, D.C ,159-237.

Talbot, A.-M.,M. 1984. Old age in Byzantium, *BZ* 77, 267–78

Talbot, R.1968. *The church of* Haghia sophia at Trebizond, Edinburgh.

Taylor, J. E.1993. *Christians and holy places: the myth of Jewish-Christian origins*, Oxford.

Taylor, J. E.1990. The Phenomenon of Early Jewish-Christianity: Reality or Scholarly Invention?, *VC* 44, 313-334.

Taylor, M. D. 1980 −1981. A Historiated Tree of Jesse, *DOP* 34, 125-176

Testa, E. 1962. *Il Simbolismo dei giudeo-cristiani*, Jerusalem.

Teteriatnikova, N. 2000. Design of the double sanctuary screen in the Tokali kilise, Cappadocia in The *iconostasis, origins - evolution - symbolism*, A. Lidov (ed.) Moscow, 188-122.

Teteriatnikov, N. 1996. *The liturgical planning of Byzantine churches in Cappadocia*, Rome.

Themelis, T.P.1931. Τὰ Μηναία ἀπὸ τοῦ ια' μέχρι τοῦ ιγ' αἰῶνος, *E Ph 30,* 287-312, 348-387, 520-566

Thierry, N. 2002. *La Cappadoce de l'antiquité au Moyen Âge*, Belgium.

Thierry, N. 1996. L'iconographie capadocienne de l'affront fait à Anne d'après Ie Protévangile de Jacques, *Apocrypha* 7, 261-272

Thierry, N.1994. *Haut moyen-âge en Cappadoce : les églises de la région de Çavuşin*, Paris.

Thierry, N.1975a. Etudes Cappadociennes.Region du Hasan Dagi complemenmts pour 1974, *CahArch* 24, 183-9

Thierry, N.1975b. L'art monumental byzantin en Asie Mineure du xie siècle au xive, *DOP* 29, 73-111

Thierry, N.; Thierry, M. 1963. *Nouvelles eglises rupestres de Cappadoce, region du Hasan Dagi*, Paris.

Thierry, N.; Thierry, M .1958a. Eglise de Kizil-Tchoukour, chapelle iconoclaste, chapelle de Joachim et d'Anne, *MonPiot* 50,105-146

Thierry, N.; Thierry, M .1958b. Iconographie inédite en Cappadoce. Le cycle de la Conception et de L'enfance de la Vierge a Kizil-Tchoukour in *Akten des XI. Internationalen Byzantinistenkongressen München*, Munich, 620-3.

 Thunø, E. 2002. *Image and relic: mediating the sacred in early medieval Rome*, Rome.

Tikkanen, J.J. 1913. *Zwei gebärden mit dem Zeigefinger* , Helsingfors.

Tinnefeld, F. 2002. Georgios Gennadios Scholarios in *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition* , C. G. Conticello and V. Conticello (eds), vol. 2, Turnhout, 477-550.

Tomadakes, E. 1971. *Ιωσήφ ο Υμνογράφος, βίος και έργον*, Athens.

Toniolo ,E.M. 1971. *Alcune Omelie mariane dei sec. x-xiv:Pietro d'Argo, Niceta Paflagone, Michelle Psellos e Ninfo Ieromonaco*, Rome.

Toniolo, E.M. 1974a. Sull' ingresso della vergine nel santo dei santi.Una finale inedita di omelia bizantina, *Marianum* 36, 101-5

Toniolo, E.M. 1974b. Omelie e catechesi mariane inedite di neofito il Recluso (1134-1220 c.) *Marianum* 36,184-315

Topping, E.1976. The Apostle Peter, Justinian and Romanos Melodos, *BMGS* 2,1-15

Tougher, S. 1997. *The reign of Leo VI (886-912) : politics and people*, Leiden.

Tourta, A. 2008. The Byzantine heritage in painting after the fall of Constantinople in *From the Incarnation of Logos to the Theosis of Man. Byzantine and Post-Byzantine icons from Greece*, Athens, xxv-xxx.

Trigg, J. W.1998. *Origen*, London.

Tsafrir, Y. 1999.The Holy City of Jerusalem in the Madaba Map in *The Madaba map centenary 1897-1997: travelling through the Byzantine Umayyad period proceedings of the international conference held in Amman, 7-9 April 1997*, Jerusalem,155-163

Tsangadas, B. C. P. 1980. *The fortifications and defence of Constantinople*, Colo. ; N. Y.

Tsirpanlis, C.N. 1979. Career and writings of Nicolas Cabasilas, *Byzantion* 49,414-427

Tsironis, N. 2005. From poetry to liturgy: the cult of the Virgin in the Middle Byzantine era in *Images of the Mother of God: perceptions of the Theotokos in Byzantium*, M.Vassilaki (ed.), Aldershot, 91-102.

Tsironis, N. 1998a. Historicity and Poetry in ninth-century, Homiletics: the homilies of patriarch Photios and George of Nicomedia in *Preacher and audience: studies in early Christian and Byzantine homiletics*, M. B. Cunningham and P.Allen. (eds), Leiden; Boston, 295-316.

Tsironis, N. 1998b. *The Cult and the Lament of the Virgin Mary in the Iconoclastic Period*, (Phd Thesis, unpublished), University of Oxford.

Tsitouridou-Turbié, A. 2000. Remarques sur le programme iconographique de l'église du Christ Sauveur à Veroia in *Byzantinische Malerei. Bildprogramme, Ikonographie, Stil*, G. Koch (ed.), Wiesbaden, 337-344.

Tsitouridou, A. 1986. *Ο ζωγραφικός διάκοσμος του Αγίου Νικολάου Ορφανού στη Θεσσαλονίκη - Συμβολή στη μελέτη της Παλαιολόγειας ζωγραφικής κατά τον πρώιμο 14ο αιώνα*,Thessalonike.

Underwood, P. A.1975. Some Problems in Program and Iconography of the Ministry Cycle, in *Studies in the art of the Kariye Djami and its intellectual background*, vol. 4, London, 243-302.

Underwood, P. A.1967. *The Kariye Djami. the mosaics vol.2, Plates 1-334*, London .

Underwood, P.A. 1950. The Fountain of Life in Manuscripts of the Gospels, *DOP* 5, 41-138

Van Ginkel, J. J. 1996. *John of Ephesus: a monophysite historian in sixth-century Byzantium*, Groningen.

Vantini, J. 1970. *The excavations at Faras: a contribution to the history of Christian Nubia*, Bologna.

Vassilaki, M. 2007. Η Κρήτη υπό Βενετική κυριαρχία. Η μαρτυρία των μνημείων του 13ου αιώνα in *Η βυζαντινή τέχνη μετά την Τετάρτη σταυροφορία. Η Τετάρτη σταυροφορία και οι επιπτώσεις της (Διεθνές Συνέδριο, Ακαδημία Αθηνών, 9-12 Μαρτίου 2004)*, Athens, 31-41.

Vassilaki, M.1989. A Cretan Icon of Saint George, *BurM* 131, 208-214

Vassilakis-Mavrakakis, M. 1982.Western influences on the fourteenth century of Crete,

JÖB 32.5, 301-311.

Vassilakis-Mavrakakis, M. 1981. Ο ζωγράφος Άγγελος Ακοτάντος: το έργο και η διαθήκη του (1436), *Thēsaurismata* 18, 290-8

Velkova-Velkovska, E. 2001. The liturgical year in the East in *Handbook for Liturgical Studies: Liturgical Time and Space*, A.J. Chupungco (ed.), vol.5, Minnesota, 157-176.

Velkova-Velkovska, E. 2000. Blessings in the East in *Handbook for Liturgical Studies: Liturgical Time and Space*, A.J. Chupungco (ed.), vol. 4, Minnesota, 383-390.

Velmans, T ; Korać, V.; Suput, M. 1999. *Rayonnement de Byzance*, Saint-Leger-Vauban;Paris

Velmans, T.1995. Valeurs sémantiques du Mandylion selon son emplacement ou son association avec d'autres images in *Studien zur byzantinischen Kunstgeschichte: Festschrift für Horst Hallensleben zum 65. Geburtstag* ,B. Borkopp, B. Schellewald, L.Theis (eds), Amsterdam,173-184.

Verhelst, S. 2006. The liturgy of Jerusalem in the Byzantine period in *Christians and Christianity in the Holy Land: From the Origins to the Latin Kingdoms*. O. Limor and G. G. Stroumsa (eds) Turnhout, 421-462.

Viller, M. 1937. Anne (sainte), *DSAM* 1, Paris, 672-3.

Vincent, L.-H. ; Abel, F.M. 1922. *Jérusalem: recherches de topographie, d'archéologie, et d'histoire*, vol. 2, Paris.

Vincent, L.-H 1904. La crypte de Sainte-Anne a Jerusalem, *RB* 1,228-241

Voicu, J. S. 2007. La croce negli apocrifi in *La croce : iconografia e interpretazione, secoli I-inizio XVI: atti del Convegno internazionale di studi, Napoli (6-11 dicembre 1999),* I, Naples,119-126.

Vokotopoulos, P. 1995.*Βυζαντινές εικόνες,* Athens.

Volbach,W.F.1976. *Elfenbeinarbeiten der Spätantike und des frühen Mittelalters*, Mainz am Rhein.

Walter, C. 2006. *The iconography of Constantine the Great, emperor and saint*, Leiden.

Walter, C. 2002. *The warrior saints in Byzantine art and tradition*, Aldershot.

Walter, C. 2000. Saints of the Second Iconoclasm in the Madrid Scylitzes in *Pictures as language : how the Byzantines exploited them*, London, 366-382.

Walter, C. 1997.The apotropaic function of the victorious Cross, *Byz* 55, 193-220

Walter, C. 1986. Christological themes in the Byzantine marginal Psalters from the ninth to the eleventh century (reprinted) in *Prayer and power in Byzantine and Papal imagery* (Variorum) 1993, Aldershot , IX.

Ward-Perkings, J.B.; Goodchild, R.G. 2003. *Christian monuments of Cyrenaica*, J. Reynolds (ed.), London.

Ware, K. 1964. *The Orthodox Church*, Harmondsworth.

Warland, R. 2000. Deesis - Emmanuel – Maria. Bildkonzepte kappadokischer Höhlenkirchen des 13. Jahrhunderts in *Byzantinische Malerei. Bildprogramme - Ikonographie - Stil. Symposion in Marburg vom 25.-29. 6. 1997*, G. Koch (ed.): Wiesbaden, 365-386.

Weigel, T. 2000. *Le colonne del ciborio dell'altare maggiore di San Marco a Venezia : nuovi argomenti a favore di una datazione in epoca protobizantina*,Venice.

Weiss, Z. ;Netzer, E.1996a. Hellenistic and Roman Sepphoris - the archaeological evidence in *Sepphoris in Galilee: crosscurrents of culture*, Raleigh, 29-37.

Weiss, Z. ; Netzer, E. 1996b. Sepphoris during the byzantine period in *Sepphoris in Galilee: crosscurrents of culture*, Raleigh, 81-9.

Weitzmann, K. 1970. Some remarks on the sources of the fresco painting of the Cathedral of Faras in *Kunst und Geschichte Nubiens in christlicher Zeit. Ergebnisse und Probleme auf Grund der jüngsten Ausgrabungen*, E. Dinkler (ed.), Recklinghausen, 325-346.

Weitzmann, K.1966a. Various Aspects of Byzantine Influence on the Latin Countries from the Sixth to the Twelfth Century, *DOP* 20,1-24.

Weitzmann, K.1966b. Icon Painting in the Crusader Kingdom, *DOP* 20,49-83

Weitzmann, K.1955.On some icons of the seventh century in *Late classical and mediaeval studies in honor of Albert Mathias Friend, Jr*, Kurt Weitzmann, S. Der Nersessian (eds), Princeton.

Wellesz, E.1962. *A history of Byzantine music and hymnography*, Oxford.

Wenger, A. 1955. *L'assomption de la T.S. Vierge dans la tradition Byzantine du VIe au Xe siècle : études et documents*, Paris.

Weyl Carr, A. 1995. Cyprus and the devotional arts of Byzantium in the era of the crusades, *DOP* 49, 339-357

Wharton-Epstein, A. 1998. *Art of empire: painting and architecture of the Byzantine periphery : a comparative study of four provinces*, University Park ; London.

Wharton-Epstein, A. 1980. Middle Byzantine Churches of Kastoria: Dates and Implications, *ABull* 62, 190-207

Wharton-Epstein, A.1975. The 'Iconoclast' churches of Cappadocia in *Iconoclasm: papers given at the Ninth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Birmingham, March 1975, 103-11.*

White, L. M .2000. Architecture: the five first centuries in *Early Christian World,* 2 vols., Routledge, 693-746.

Wiet G.1935. Tissus et tapisseries du Musée Arabe du Caire, *Syria* 16, 278-290
accessed online via
http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/syria_00397946_1935_num_16_3_3841 (06/03/10)

Wilken, R.1992. *The land called holy: Palestine in Christian history and thought*, New Haven, Connecticut .

Wilkinson, J. 2002. *Jerusalem pilgrims before the crusades*, Warminster.

Wilkinson, J. 1978. *Jerusalem as Jesus knew it: archaeology as evidence* ,London.

Willoughby, H. R. 1950. Representational Biblical Cycles: Antiochian and Constantinopolitan, *JBL* 69, 129-136

Wilpert, J. 1916. *Die römischen Mosaiken und Malereien der Kirchlichen bauten vom IV bis XIII. Jahrhundert*, vol. 2 Freiburg im Breisgau.

Witakowski, W.1993. Syrian Monophysite propaganda in the fifth to seventh centuries in *Aspects of late antiquity and early Byzantium*, Stockholm, 57-66.

Withrow, W. H. 1888. *The catacombs of Rome and their testimony relative to primitive Christianity*, London.

Wolf, R.H. W. 2004. *Mysterium Wasser: eine Religionsgeschichte zum Wasser in Antike und Christentum*, Göttingen.

Wortley, J. 2005. The Marian Relics at Constantinople *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 45, 171–187

Wortley, J. 2004. Relics of 'the friends of Jesus' at Constantinople in *Byzance et les reliques du Christ. International Congress of Byzantine Studies (22nd: 2001 : Paris, France),* J. Durand et B. Flusin (eds), Paris,143-158.

Wortley, J. 1982. Iconoclasm and Leipsanoclasm: Leo III, Constantine V and the relics, *ByzF* 8, 253-279

Wright, D.F. 2004. From 'God-Bearer' to 'Mother of God' in the later Fathers in *The Church and Mary*, R.N.Swanson (ed.) Studies in church history 39, Woodbridge, 22-30.

Wybrew, H. M. 1997. *Orthodox feasts of Christ and Mary: liturgical texts with commentary*, London.

Xanthaki, T. 2010. Ο ναός της Αγίας Άννας στο Ανισαράκι Κάνδανου: Ο κύκλος της Αγίας, οι αφιερωτές, η χρονολόγηση, *D.C.A.E.* 31, 71-86

Xanthaki, T. 2009. Ο Θεομητορικός κύκλος στον ναό της Παναγίας Ανισαράκι Κάνδανου: Εικονογραφικές ιδιαιτερότητες *D.C.A.E.* 30, 187-196

Xanthaki, T. 2008. Ο Θεομητορικός κύκλος στον ναό της Αγίας Ματρώνας στην Κίμωλο, *D.C.A.E.* 29, 169-184

Xanthaki, T. 2007. Τρεις σκηνές από τον θεομητορικό κύκλο σε τμήμα εικόνας από την Κίμωλο, *D.C.A.E.* 28, 203-211.

Zabkar, L. V. 1963. The Eparch of Nubia as king, *JNES* 22 , 217-9

Zamberlan, N. 2000. *Maria "Regina"nel mistero di Cristo e della Chiesa .La tradizione patristica*, (PhD Thesis), Padova.

Zervou Tognazzi, I. 1990. Deesis. Interpretazione del termine nell' iconografia bizantina, *Milion*, II, 391–41

Zetterholm, M. 2003. *The Formation of Christianity in Antioch: A Social Scientific Approach to the Separation between Judaism and Christianity*, London;N.Y.

Zoepfl, F.1927. *Der Kommentar des Pseudo-Eustathios zum Hexaemeron*, Münster.

Xyngopoulos, A.1964. *Οι τοιχογραφίες του Αγίου Νικολάου Ορφανού Θεσσαλονίκης*, Athens.

Xyngopoulos, A.1953. *Η ψηφιδωτή διακόσμηση του ναού των Αγίων Αποστόλων Θεσσαλονίκης*, Thessalonike.

ILLUSTRATIONS

List of illustrations

Fig. 1 The Probatike (Sheep Pool) before the sixth century, Jerusalem. (After Avi-
        Yonah 1975:10).

Fig. 2 The Probatike (Sheep Pool) before the sixth century, Jerusalem. (After Cleave
        1993:149).

Fig. 3 The church of the Paralytic and the Probatic Pool, fifth century, Jerusalem.
        (After Vincent and Abel 1922: pl.LXXV).

Fig. 4 The church of Mary (upper right) and its arrangement according to the church.
        of the Paralytic and the Probatic Pool (bottom), sixth century, Jerusalem. (After
        Vincent and Abel 1922: pl.LXXV)

Fig. 5 Churches of St Anna in Constantinople: 1. Deuteron 2. Pege
        3. Chalkoprateia 4. Palace 5. Hodegetria. (map after Müller-Wiener 1977:21)

Fig.6 The churches of Anna in the Deuteron and the church of the Blachernai,
        Constantinople (map After Müller-Wiener 1977:21)

Fig. 7 Reconstruction of the rooms of the Great Palace in Constantinople around the
        vestiary of the Augusta by Labarte. (After Labarte 1861:pl. III)

Fig. 8 Reconstruction of the rooms around the vestiary of the Augusta by Paspates.
        (After Paspates 1893)

Fig. 9 Reconstruction of the rooms around the vestiary of the Augusta by Vogt.
        (After Vogt 1935)

Fig. 10 Reconstruction of the rooms around the vestiary of the Augusta by Miranda
        in Guilland's book. (After Guilland 1969)

Fig. 11 Inventory of Saint Angelo in Pescheria, eighth century, Rome. (After Grisar
        1899: 174)

Fig. 12 The three-mother depiction, eighth century, Santa Maria Antiqua, plan. (After
        Lucey 2004:85)

Fig. 13 The Three-Mothers, eighth century, Santa Maria Antiqua, Rome. (After
        Croce 1961 :1271)

Fig. 14 Anna with the Virgin, eighth century, Ekatontapylianē, Paros. (After
        Drossogianne 1998:75 fig. 4)

Fig. 15 St Anna, eighth century, Cathedral of Paul, Faras. (After **Michałowski** and

Jakobielski 1974: 77)

Fig. 16 Cathedral of Paul, Faras, plan. (After Jakobielski 1982:148)

Fig. 17 Psalters, chapel 28 Bawit, seventh century, Egypt. (After Grabar 1945:126

fig.4)

Fig. 18 Anna and Mary enthroned, tenth century, Cathedral of Faras.   (After

Kubińska 1974:fig.55)

Fig. 19 Anna and Mary, tenth century, Crypt of St. Christina, Carpignano.(After

Safran 2012)

Fig. 20 Kizil Tchoukour, Mariological cycle, late ninth or beginning of the tenth

century, Cappadocia. (After Thierry and Thierry 1958a:125)

Fig. 21 (detail of fig. 20)

Fig. 22 Anna denies to wear the royal-band, late ninth or beginning of the tenth

century, Kizil Tchoukour, Cappadocia. (After Thierry and Thierry

1958a:124, fig.12)

Fig. 23 St Anna, church of Peter and Paul, ninth century, Cappadocia. (After

Thierry 1994:pl. 159c)

Fig. 24 St Anna, first quarter of the thirteenth century, Ali-Reis, Cappadocia. (After

Jolivet-Lévy 1991:pl.124, fig.3)

Fig. 25 St Joachim, first quarter of the thirteenth century, Ali-Reis. Cappadocia.

(After Jolivet-Lévy 991:pl.124,fig.2)

Fig. 26 Joachim and Anna, Borradaile triptych, 988, Constantinople, detail. (After

Rice 1959:fig.105)

Fig. 27 Chapel 33, first half of the eleventh century, interior, Göreme, Cappadocia.

(After Jolivet-Lévy 991:pl.9)

Fig. 28 St Anna,Chapel 33, first half of the eleventh century, Göreme, Cappadocia.

(After Thierry 1975b:114, fig. 10)

Fig. 29 St Anna,Chapel 33, first half of the eleventh century, Göreme, Cappadocia.

(After Restle 1967: fig. 299)

Fig. 30 St Anna, tenth or eleventh century, church of St. Niketas, Cappadocia.(After

Thierry 1994: fig. 76b)

Fig. 31 Tagar, chapel of St Theodore, 1080, interior, view towards the East. (After
    Restle 1967: 355)

Fig. 32 Tagar, chapel of St. Theodore, 1080, interior, apse view. (After Restle 1967: 359)

Fig. 33 St Joachim, twelfth century, Martorana, Sicily.(After Kitzinger 1991:fig. 90)

Fig. 34 St Anna, twelfth century, Martorana, Sicily.(After Kitzinger 1991: fig.91)

Fig. 35 Joachim and Anna frame Mary who holds Christ, thirteenth century, Hagia
    Sophia, Trebzond.(After Talbot 1968:pl.29fig.B)

Fig. 36 The Nativity of Mary, twelfth century, Kokkinabaphos homilies,
    Constantinople. (After Linardou 2004: pl.19)

Fig. 37 Mary glorified by her parents, twelfth century, Kokkinabaphos homilies,
    Constantinople.(After Linardou 2004:pl. 29)

Fig. 38 The Annunciation to St. Anna, fourteenth century, Chora, Constantinople,
    detail.(After Underwood 1967: fig. 85)

Fig. 39 The Nativity of Mary, fourteenth century, Chora, Constantinople. (After
    Underwood 1967: fig.87)

Fig. 40 St Anna holding Mary, fourteenth century, Chora, Constantinople. (After
    Underwood 1967: fig. 179)

Fig. 41 St Joachim, fourteenth century, Chora, Constantinople. (After Underwood
    1967: fig. 180)

Fig. 42 St Helen, St Joachim, St Anna holding Mary, twelfth century, Kurbinovo
    (After Hamann-Mac Lean 1976:pl.39.fig.C)

Fig.43 St. Anna, 1199, Nereditsa. (After Sheviākova 2004:76 fig. 30)

Fig.44 St. Joachim,1199, Nereditsa.(After Sheviākova 2004:106 fig. 70)

Fig. 45 Sts Joachim and St. Anna framing Mary and Christ, 1259, Boyana, Bulgaria.
    (After Miyatev 1961: 92 no 39)

Fig. 46 detail of fig. 45. (After Schweinfurth 1965:55 fig.480)

Fig. 47 Joachim and Anna in medallions framing Mary with Christ, 1381, Russian
    icon. (After Kondakov 1929:pl.13)

Fig. 48 Joachim and Anna holding Mary with donors,1313-4, Studenica.   (After
    Lafontaine-Dosogne 1992: pl. XXV)

Fig. 49 St. Anna holding Mary, 1313-4, Studenica.(After Millet 1962:pl.70 fig. 2)

2007: fig 135)