

THEODORA ANTONOPOULOU / PATRAS

PHOTIOS DEACON AND *SKEUOPHYLAX* OF THE HOLY
APOSTLES AND HIS ENCOMIUM ON ST LUKE THE EVANGELIST

The Photios under question here is a shadowy figure. Not more than a few lines altogether have been dedicated to him in the past in the handbooks of Byzantine literature and scholarly encyclopaedias. He has left, however, two sermons, which allow us to draw a rough portrait of him. The first text has long been published. It is an encomium on St Lucillianus and his companions (BHG 999), and was included in the *Acta Sanctorum*.¹ The second, which will be published here for the first time, is a long encomium on St Luke the Evangelist (BHG 993f).

THE DATE AND CAREER OF PHOTIOS

The two encomia by Photios were pointed out in K. Krumbacher's handbook of Byzantine literature, where A. Ehrhard included their author in his list of preachers who could not be dated.² Later on, he mentioned the text on Luke once again in his *Überlieferung und Bestand*, while describing codex Ambrosianus A 63 inf.³ Based on Ehrhard's remarks on the pre-Metaphrastian character of the Ambrosianus, H.-G. Beck noted that the author of the two encomia lived before Symeon Metaphrastes.⁴ Finally, following the line of thought of his predecessors, O. Volk dated Photios to the period before the tenth century, and added that the author was well acquainted with the rules of rhetoric.⁵

¹ AASS Iunii I (1695) 276–286.

² A. EHRHARD, *Theologie*, in: K. KRUMBACHER, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches (527–1453)*. Munich 1897, 176.

³ A. EHRHARD, *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche I–III*. Leipzig 1937–1952, esp. II, 130–131.

⁴ H.-G. BECK, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*. Munich 1959, 570; cf. 526, where the distinction of the *skeuophylax* Photios from the famous homonymous patriarch is noted.

⁵ O. VOLK, *Photios, Diakon*, *LThK* 8 (1999) 267.

Nothing is known of Photios from outside sources. Thus the manuscripts that contain his works provide valuable evidence for him. The aforementioned Ambrosianus A 63 inf. is, as far as one can judge, the *codex unicus* of the encomium on St Luke. The manuscript is of parchment measuring 328 × 250 mm, dates from the eleventh century, consists of 262 folios (– ff. 178–179), and is written in two columns of 25 lines.⁶ It contains twelve texts for September and October, and according to Ehrhard, it represents the first part of a hypothetical unique, ancient, pre-Metaphrastian Year-Panegyricon in three volumes, which was compiled in the first half of the tenth century at the earliest, since it contains a homily by the Emperor Leo VI.⁷ The encomium on Luke is contained on ff. 241r–260v and is mutilated at the end, but only a few lines of the final prayer appear to have been lost. It is followed by a fragment from the Metaphrastian Passion of St Ignatius the God-bearer (BHG 815); however, the relevant leaves (ff. 261–262, 2 cols., 30 ll.) do not belong to the original codex.⁸ The encomium on St Lucillianus and his companions is also contained in a unique codex, Vat. gr. 679, a large post-Metaphrastian non-menologic collection of the eleventh century (ff. 104r–113v).⁹

⁶ On the manuscript, see Ae. MARTINI–D. BASSI, *Catalogus codicum graecorum Bibliothecae Ambrosianae* II. Milan 1906, repr. Hildesheim–New York 1978, 894–895 no. 798; C. PASINI, *Inventario agiografico dei manoscritti greci dell’Ambrosiana* (*Subs. Hagiogr.* 84). Brussels 2003, 161–162 (with literature), who alone dates it to the thirteenth century; see also *Répertoire de réglures dans les manuscrits grecs sur parchemin. Base de données établie par J.-H. SAUTEL à l’aide du fichier LEROY et des catalogues récents* (*Bibliologia* 13). Turnhout 1995, 182, 210.

⁷ The other two volumes of the Panegyricon (“vormetaphrastisches Jahrespanegyrikon”) are represented by Sinait. gr. 504 of the 10th cent. and Paris. gr. 1197 of the 12th cent.; see EHRHARD, *Überlieferung* II, 130–134.

⁸ EHRHARD, *Überlieferung* II, 131, n. 1, thought that Photios’ text ended on f. 262v, while the editors of the Passion of St Ignatius did not know of the Ambrosianus; see F. X. FUNK–F. DIEKAMP, *Patres apostolici* II. Tübingen 1913, lxxviii–lxxx; the Passion is edited at 392, 3–394, 20. In the *Novum Auctarium* of the BHG the exact point of mutilation of Photios’ text is pointed out correctly.

⁹ In fact, the manuscript, which measures 335 × 240 mm, consists of two parts: 1) ff. 1–287, parch., 11th cent., 2 cols., 40 ll., and 2) ff. 288–309 (+ 295a), paper, 14th cent., 2 cols., 32 ll., also containing hagiographical and homiletic texts. See the descriptions in P. FRANCHI DE’ CAVALIERI and *Hagiographi Bollandiani*, *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum graecorum Bibliothecae Vaticanae*. Brussels 1899, 20–23; R. DEVRESSE, *Codices Vaticani graeci* III. Codices 604–866. Vatican City 1950, 135–139; EHRHARD, *Überlieferung* III, 799–800 (“nichtmenologische nachmetaphrastische Sammlung”). The AASS edition of the encomium on Lucillianus does not specify the Vatican manuscript which was used for it (“Ex Ms. Bibliothecae Vaticanae”), but no other manuscript in the Vatican Library appears to contain the text; see DEVRESSE, *Codices Vaticani graeci* III, 136.

The date of the Vaticanus and the Ambrosianus and the fact that the latter only contains pre-Metaphrastian texts provide the *terminus ante quem* for our author's life. Consequently, Photios flourished most probably before the mid-tenth century. On the other hand, a safe *terminus post quem* is provided by Photios himself, who explicitly refers to Antioch as Θεούπολις (encomium on Luke 106–107 ἡ Θεοῦ πόλις κληθῆναι εὐμοιρήσασα). This was the propitiatory appellation given to the city following the earthquakes of 526 and 528 AD that had caused extensive destruction and distress.¹⁰ Further clues provided by the encomia point to their composition in the period after Iconoclasm. In the epilogue of the text on Luke, just before it breaks off, the author prays to the Evangelist to keep under his protection “the emperors who in the orthodox faith venerate your icon” (475–476). Likewise in the epilogue of the text on St Lucillianus the veneration of his icon is explicitly mentioned, while the orthodox term σχετικῶς is used to describe the relative meaning of the veneration (286D).¹¹ Consequently, both encomia should most probably be dated within a century after the end of the state ban on holy images in 843. As for the mention in the sermon on Luke of more than one emperor, no guess at their identity can be made, since the author may either refer to the imperial family in general or, in case he implies the existence of co-emperors, he only describes the prevalent situation during the period in question. The emphasis on the saints' relics in both texts (Luke 415–416, 472–473; Lucillianus 286D) fits well in this framework, since Iconoclasts were rightly or not accused of a negative attitude towards relics.¹² In addition, Photios underlines that the Holy Spirit does not derive from any other source but the Father (Luke 220–221), a statement which presupposes the dispute over the *Filioque* and points to the ninth century at the earliest.

¹⁰ See G. DOWNEY, *A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest*. Princeton, N.J. 1961, 529–530, 582; and more recently, Antioch. The Lost Ancient City. Published on the Occasion of the Exhibition *Antioch: The Lost Ancient City* (ed. C. KONDOLÉON). Princeton, N.J.–Worcester, Mass. 2000, xiii (“Chronology”). For the sources on the name of the city, see also E. HONIGMANN, Θεούπολις, *RE* VI A1 (1936) 257 as well as I. THURN (ed.), *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia (CFHB 35)*. Berlin–New York 2000, 371 not only for Malalas' text but also for other relevant testimonies.

¹¹ For the passage in question, see below n. 56; for the term σχετικῶς and some examples of its usage by Iconophiles, see LAMPE'S *Patristic Lexicon*, s.v.

¹² See J. WORTLEY, *Iconoclasm and Leipsanoclasm: Leo III, Constantine V and the Relics*. *BF* 8 (1982) 253–279; also A. KAZHDAN, ‘Constantin imaginaire’. *Byzantine Legends of the Ninth Century about Constantine the Great*. *Byz* 57 (1987) 196–250, esp. 233–234 on the impact of the eighth- and ninth-century discussions on relics on the Constantinian legend.

This approximate dating of the author is indirectly confirmed by a passage in the encomium on Luke (143–148), where Photios speaks of and accepts the tradition (παράδοσις τις) concerning Luke's activity as a painter. According to this, he says, the Apostle painted coloured icons (ἐντυπώσασθαι χρώμασι) of the Virgin while she was still alive, as well as of Christ, which were particularly beautiful and had allegedly (φασί) survived. The tradition on the icons painted by Luke is perhaps an old one, but appears in the sources only from the eighth / ninth centuries.¹³ More specifically, a fragment *On the veneration of holy icons* that used to be ascribed to Andrew of Crete, but is of at least doubtful authorship,¹⁴ has been generally regarded as containing the first mention of Luke as a painter.¹⁵ A number of other texts likewise connected to the Iconophile circles also speak of the Luke icons of the Theotokos: the Life of Stephen the Younger, which claims to report a speech by the Patriarch Germanos I to the Emperor Leo III (incorporated by George the Monk in his Chronicle), the *Adversus Constantinum Caballinum*, an anonymous *Vita* of Theophanes, the *Letter of the Three Patriarchs to Theophilos*, and the pseudo-Damascene *Letter to Theophilos*.¹⁶ Of these texts the latter two, which contain practically

¹³ There is an extensive literature on Luke as a painter; see most recently M. BACCI, Il pennello dell'Evangelista: storia delle immagini sacre attribuite a san Luca (*Piccola Biblioteca GISEM* 14). Pisa 1998 and again id., With the Paintbrush of the Evangelist Luke, in: Mother of God. Representations of the Virgin in Byzantine Art (Benaki Museum, 20 October 2000–20 January 2001) (ed. M. VASSILAKI). Milan 2000, 79–89; also C. N. CONSTANTINIDES, Ἡ Διήγησις τῆς θαυματουργῆς εἰκόνας τῆς Θεοτόκου Ἐλεούσας τοῦ Κύκκου κατὰ τὸν ἐλληνικὸ κώδικα 2313 τοῦ Βατικανοῦ (*Πηγὴς τῆς ἱστορίας τῆς Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Κύκκου* 4). Nicosia 2002, 10–18.

¹⁴ CPG 8193; on its spurious character, see B. LAOURDAS, Ὁ ἅγιος Ἀνδρέας ὁ ἐν τῇ Κρίσει καὶ ἡ Κρήτη ἐπὶ εἰκονομαχίας. *Κρητικὰ Χρονικά* 5 (1951) 32–60, esp. 47–48; and most recently A. ΚΑΖΗΔΑΝ, A History of Byzantine Literature (650–850) (*National Hellenic Research Foundation. Institute for Byzantine Research, Research Series* 2). Athens 1999, 39 with previous literature.

¹⁵ See e.g. E. VON DOBSCHÜTZ, Christusbilder. Untersuchungen zur christlichen Legende (*TU* 18). Leipzig 1899, 269**–270** with n. 1; also 271** on the relevant passage by Theodore Lector (d. after 527) as a later insertion; H. BELTING, Bild und Kult. Eine Geschichte des Bildes vor dem Zeitalter der Kunst. Munich 1990, 70–72, esp. 71, n. 28; BACCI, Il pennello 90–91; id., Paintbrush 80.

¹⁶ Life of Stephen the Younger 9 (ed. M.-F. AUZÉPY, La Vie d'Étienne le Jeune par Étienne le Diacre [*Birmingham Byzantine and Ottoman Monographs* 3]. Aldershot–Brookfield, Vermont 1997, 99, 19–21); *Adversus Constantinum Caballinum* 6 (PG 95, 321C); Life of Theophanes BHG 1789, ed. C. DE BOOR, Theophanis Chronographia II. Leipzig 1885, 11, 13–14; Letter of the Three Patriarchs to Theophilos 7.5 (edd. J. A. MUNITZ *et al.*, The Letter of the Three Patriarchs to Emperor Theophilos and Related Texts. Camberley, Surrey 1997, 39, 5–11); Ps.-John of Damascus, Letter to Theophilos 4.a (edd. MUNITZ *et al.*, The Letter of the Three Patriarchs 149, 21–27). For a presentation

the same passage, show remarkable similarities with the passage in Photios' encomium. In the *Letter to Theophilos* the text runs as follows (I have underlined the words that occur in Photios too): Καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεσπέσιος <ἀπόστολος> καὶ εὐαγγελιστὴς Λουκᾶς, τὸν θεῖον καὶ σεβάσιμον χαρακτηρὰ τῆς πανάγου θεομήτορος Μαρίας ἔτι ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτῆς ζώσης ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ τὰς διατριβάς ποιουμένης ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ Σιών, ζωγραφικαῖς τε μίξεσι τὴν τῆς Πανάγου στήλην ἐν πίναξιν διεχάραξε, καὶ ὡς ἐν κατόπτρῳ τῇ μετέπειτα γενεᾷ ἐγκαταλειπὼς ... It should be noted that in none of the other texts examined do the words ἐν πίναξιν appear. Moreover, in all of its manuscripts the *Letter of the Three Patriarchs* reads ἐν πίνακι (l. 9). Without going into the problems of the provenance and dating of these two interrelated documents and their sections on icon-related miracles, suffice it to say that the *Letter of the Three Patriarchs* and the *Letter to Theophilos* constitute later versions of the same original *Letter of the Three Patriarchs to the Emperor Theophilos* (a. 836),¹⁷ of which, as it has been demonstrated, the story of Luke as a painter was an integral part.¹⁸ In fact, the plural for the icons of the Virgin in the afore-mentioned passage occurs in a very important, though fragmentary witness, a single folio at Tirana dating from the end

of recent views on these texts, see L. BRUBAKER–J. HALDON, *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era (ca 680–850). The Sources. An Annotated Survey (Birmingham Byzantine and Ottoman Monographs 7)*. Aldershot–Burlington, Vermont 2001, Part II. See also the relevant passage in George the Monk, ed. C. DE BOOR (correctionem curavit P. WIRTH), *Georgii Monachi Chronicon*. Stuttgart 1978, II, 741, 1–5. In the *Synax. eccl. CP.* for 18 October, ed. H. DELEHAYE, *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae. Propylaeum ad AASS Novembri*. Brussels 1902, 147, 14–15; 147–148, 37–38, the Venice *Menaea* of 1684, p. quā (see below n. 48), and the *Menologion* of Basil II, PG 117, 113C, there are only general references to Luke's painting activity.

¹⁷ See the summary of previous literature in BRUBAKER–HALDON, *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era* 279–280.

¹⁸ See H. GAUER, *Texte zum byzantinischen Bilderstreit. Der Synodalbrief der drei Patriarchen des Ostens von 836 und seine Verwandlung in sieben Jahrhunderten (Studien und Texte zur Byzantinistik 1)*. Frankfurt am Main 1994, lv, lxxvii f.; J. A. MUNITIZ's review of the latter in *BZ* 88 (1995) 162–165, esp. 165 (modifying his earlier views, on which see below in this note); and D. AFINOGENOV, *The New Edition of The Letter of the Three Patriarchs. Problems and Achievements. Σύμμεικτα* 16 (2003–2004) 9–33, esp. 29. For different views, which consider the section on the miraculous images, of which the story of the Luke paintings forms part, as an interpolation, see J. A. MUNITIZ, *Wonderworking Icons and the Letters to Theophilos*, in: *Conformity and Non-conformity in Byzantium* (ed. L. GARLAND) (= *BF* 24). Amsterdam 1997, 114–123, esp. 119–121; the introduction by J. CHRYSOSTOMIDES in MUNITIZ *et al.*, *The Letter of the Three Patriarchs* xxii–xxxviii; P. SPECK, *Ich bin's nicht, Kaiser Konstantin ist es gewesen (Ποικίλα βυζαντινά 10)*. Bonn 1990, 449–534; BRUBAKER–HALDON, *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era* 279–280.

of the ninth century.¹⁹ It can, therefore, be suggested that Photios had the original *Letter of the Three Patriarchs* in mind or at least a version close to the pseudo-Damascene text.

Nevertheless, the passage from the *Letter* was not the only text that Photios took account of, since when referring to the icons of Christ and the Virgin he clearly speaks of separate items, not of icons of the Theotokos with the Child Christ. Of the Iconophile texts mentioned above only one mentions or implies that Luke also made icons of Christ. This is the text attributed to Andrew of Crete, which could well have been known to Photios. It is noteworthy that like Photios, Ps.-Andrew also uses the plural when he speaks of icons of Christ and the Virgin.²⁰ The tradition reappears in other texts written or compiled from the ninth century onwards.²¹

It should, moreover, be underlined that for Photios Luke only used colours for his pictures, while there is no mention of the encaustic technique allegedly employed by the Apostle according to later developments of the story, which describe it as a combination of wax and colours.²² In

¹⁹ On the dating of this folio see J. A. MUNITIZ in MUNITIZ *at al.*, The Letter of the Three Patriarchs lxxxviii with literature. xcii. Its place in the manuscript tradition of the original *Letter* and its versions has been variously interpreted by scholars; for the folio as preserving a fragment of the original *Letter*, see GAUER, Der Synodalbrief xxxix. xlv. il. lxxvii (who takes note of the reading πινάξι for establishing the stemma; see *ibid.* xlv), and further, AFINOGENOV, The New Edition 24. 32; for a different view see MUNITIZ in MUNITIZ *at al.*, The Letter of the Three Patriarchs xci f., who however accepts the folio's close relationship to the original *Letter*.

²⁰ PG 97, 1304CD Λουκᾶν τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ εὐαγγελιστὴν ἅπαντες οἱ τότε εἰρήκασιν οἰκειᾶς ζωγραφῆσαι χεροῖ αὐτόν τε τὸν σαρκωθέντα Χριστόν καὶ τὴν αὐτοῦ ἄχραντον Μητέρα, καὶ τούτων τὰς εἰκόνας ἔχεν τὴν Ῥώμην εἰς οἰκειᾶν εὐκλειαν. Καὶ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις δὲ ἐπ' ἀκριβοῦς κείσθαι ταῦτα φασίν.

²¹ See the Νουθεσία γέροντος περὶ τῶν ἁγίων εἰκόνων, ed. M. B. MELIORANSKIJ, Georgij Kiprjanin i Ioann Ierusalimljanin (*Zapiski ist.-fil. fakulteta imp. S.-Peterburgskago universiteta* 59). St. Petersburg 1901, xxviii–xxx. xxxii (icon of the Virgin and a series of icons depicting scenes of the life of Christ and the Apostles); the Life of Michael the Synkellos 11 (letter from the Patriarch of Jerusalem to the Emperor Leo V) (ed. M. CUNNINGHAM, The Life of Michael the Synkellos [*Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations* 1]. Belfast 1991, 66, 10–14: text dependent on Ps.-Andrew of Crete, though the hagiographer implies one icon that depicted both Christ and the Virgin; see *ibid.* 148); Synax. eccl. CP. for 18 October, 147–148, 49–50, and 30 June, 783, 18–23 (icons of Christ, the Virgin and the Apostles); the Life of Theodore of Studios by Theodore Daphnopates (?), PG 99, 177C (icon of Christ alone), etc. On these texts, see briefly BRUBAKER–HALDON, Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era, Part II. On the Christ icons, see VON DOBSCHÜTZ, Christusbilder 277**, n. 2; cf. BACCI, Il pennello 92–93 with n. 170.

²² See VON DOBSCHÜTZ, Christusbilder 277**, n. 5–278**; also CONSTANTINIDES, Διήγησις 10, n. 22; already to be found in Symeon Metaphrastes, Comm. in Lucam, PG 115, 1136B κηϞ καὶ χροῦμασι βάρφας.

addition, from the end of the eleventh century onwards the icon of the Hodegetria, kept at the Monastery of Hodegon in Constantinople, was commonly attributed to the hand of Luke.²³ Photios, however, makes no connection to a specific icon. If he had known of the tradition on the Hodegetria or, for that matter, of any other icon attributed to Luke, he would have certainly mentioned it. The situation described so far is in conformity with the evolution of the legend of the painter Luke up to the tenth century. It is characteristic that in the saint's synaxarion (18 October and 30 June) the word φασί is used in the same context as in Photios' encomium.²⁴

Another point that can be considered here in connection with the dating of Photios is his contention that Jerusalem's ancient name was Salem, but its inhabitants renamed it after the "most sacred Temple" of Salomon (97–99 ἦν καὶ Ἱερουσαλήμ ὠνόμασαν οἱ ταύτης οἰκήτορες, τῷ ἐναπειλημμένῳ ἱεροτάτῳ ναῷ τὴν προσωνυμίαν ταύτην προσαρμόσαντες, Σαλήμ πρότερον προσαγορευομένην). The etymology of the name of the city was a matter of concern for the Byzantines, who advanced various theories on the subject, while in general accepting that the former name of the city was Salem. For the latter's etymology the reference text was Paul's explanation of Salem as peace (Hebr. 7, 2 βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ, ὃ ἐστὶν βασιλεὺς εἰρήνης), but the first part of the name caused more difficulties.²⁵ To the best of my knowledge, the explanation followed here as regards this first component makes its first appearance in the Chronicle of George the Monk, who allegedly quotes Cyril of Alexandria (in reality Eustathius of Antioch) on the prob-

²³ See C. ANGELIDI – T. PAPAMASTORAKIS, The Veneration of the Virgin Hodegetria and the Hodegon Monastery, in: *Mother of God* 373–387, esp. 377–378.

²⁴ See Synax. eccl. CP. 147–148, 49; 783, 18; VON DOBSCHÜTZ, *Christusbilder*, 275** and n. 1 with reference to R. A. LIPSIVS, *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden* II/2. Braunschweig 1884, repr. Amsterdam 1976, 357, n. 4–358. 361, n. 3, for the same wording in the Menaea, and *ibid.*, *Ergänzungsband*. Braunschweig 1890, repr. Amsterdam 1976, 84, for a manuscript synaxarion; see also the passage attributed to Andrew of Crete, above n. 20.

²⁵ See for example Eusebius, *Comm. in Ps.*, PG 23, 880D (ὄρασις εἰρήνης); John Malalas, *Chronographia* V 39 (112, 12–13 THURN: Σαλήμ – Ἰεβούς); *Chronicon Paschale*, ed. L. DINDORF, *Chronicon Paschale ad exemplar Vaticanum (CSHB)*. Bonn 1832, I, 156, 20–157, 4 (ὄρος + εἰρήνη); George the Monk, I, 103, 19–23; 244, 12–20 DE BOOR (ὄρος εἰρήνης); *Etym. Magnum*, ed. T. GAISFORD, *Etymologicon Magnum*, Oxford 1848, repr. Amsterdam 1962, 469, 26–28 s.v. Ἱερουσαλήμ: Σαλήμ ἐλέγετο πρότερον ἢ πόλις· ἔλθὼν δὲ Χριστὸς εἰς αὐτήν, ἐκλήθη Ἱερουσαλήμ, etc.; cf. also next note. The etymology of the name is far from certain; see for example P. WELTEN, *Jerusalem. I. Altes Testament. 1.1 Der Name*, *Theol. Realenzyklopädie* 16 (1987) 590.

lem of Melchizedek's descent (Hebr. 7, 3):²⁶ ἡ Σαλήμ, ... ἡ πολυθρόυλλητος Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐστίν, οὐδέπω τὸ ὄλον μὲν ὄνομα φέρουσα τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἐκ προσθήκης δὲ τὴν τῆς Ἱεροῦ μετὰ τῆς Σαλήμ προσλαμβάνουσα συλλαβὴν καὶ κατὰ συνάφειαν ὀνομασθεῖσα φερωνύμως Ἱερουσαλήμ, πῆ μὲν διὰ τὴν ἱερουργίαν τοῦ Μελχισεδέκ, πῆ δὲ διὰ τὴν τοῦ ἱεροῦ ναοῦ κατασκευὴν εἴληφε τὴν προσθήκην τῶν συλλαβῶν ὕστερον.²⁷ Was George the source of Photios? Possibly. If so, the composition of the encomium should postdate that of the Chronicle. The exact date of the latter has been a matter of dispute, the traditional dating of 866/7 having been replaced by after 871,²⁸ though an early date of 846–847 for its original version has recently been suggested.²⁹ On the other hand, Photios could have had access to George's source or an unknown text containing this piece of information.

The results obtained so far regarding the date of the encomium on Luke are crucial for judging an intriguing piece of information. In the *Novum Auctarium* of the BHG it is noted without any further reference that there is a Slavic version of the work, where it is attributed to Asterius of Amasea (probably 330/5–420/5 AD). Given that the encomium is much later than Asterius, this attribution cannot be upheld. If not a mere mistake, it can perhaps be explained away by the fact that Asterius wrote several homilies on the Gospel of Luke;³⁰ the translator or the copyist of his ex-

²⁶ The passage (George the Monk, I, 102, 7–103, 4 DE BOOR) was attributed to Eustathius with good reason by J. H. DECLERCK, *Eustathii Antiocheni, patris Nicaeni, Opera quae supersunt omnia* (CCSG 51). Turnhout-Leuven 2002, cccliii–ccclviii, cccexi–ccccxiii, and was re-edited *ibid.*, 176–177, as fr. 115c of the *Epistula ad Alexandrum Alexandrinum* (De Melchisedech). On the other hand, there survives another explanation by Cyril; see his *Glaphyra in Pentateuchum*, PG 69, 85B (ἐμπνεύεται γὰρ Ἱερουσαλήμ, ... Ὅρασις εἰρήνης, ἢ Μετέωρος θανάτου), which follows in the tradition of Eusebius; see previous note.

²⁷ George the Monk, I, 102, 18–103, 4 DE BOOR (= Eustathius of Antioch, fr. 115c, 11–18 [177 DECLERCK]). George's text is repeated in the *Chronicle of Joel*, ed. F. IADEVAIA, Gioele. *Cronografia Compendiaria*. Messina 1979, 49, 129–50, 1 (= I. BEKKER, *Ioelis Chronographia compendiaria* [CSHB]. Bonn 1836, 8, 17–20); a combination of earlier etymologies including the two explanations of Ἱεροῦ given by George the Monk is found in George Cedrenus, ed. I. BEKKER, *Georgii Cedreni Historiarum compendium* (CSHB). Bonn 1838–1839, I, 50, 1–5.

²⁸ See A. ΜΑΡΚΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, Συμβολὴ στὴ χρονολόγησι τοῦ Γεωργίου Μοναχοῦ. *Σύμμεικτα* 6 (1985) 223–231 with previous literature; repr. in *id.*, *History and Literature of Byzantium in the 9th–10th Centuries (Variorum)*. Aldershot–Burlington, Vermont 2004, no. VII.

²⁹ D. ΑΦΙΝΟΓΕΝΟΒ, The Date of *Georgios Monachos* Reconsidered. *BZ* 92 (1999) 437–447, esp. 444 ff.; *id.*, Le manuscrit grec *Coislin*. 305: La version primitive de la *Chronique* de Georges le Moine. *REB* 62 (2004) 239–246.

³⁰ See Homilies I and II in C. DATEMA, Asterius of Amasea. Homilies I–XIV. Leiden 1970, 7–15. 17–24; also Homilies XV and XVI as well as the surviving fragments of four more Homilies in C. DATEMA, Les homélies XV et XVI d'Astérius d'Amasée. *Sacris Erudiri* 23 (1978–1979) 63–93, esp. 69–93.

emplar could have used Asterius' name to lend more prestige and antiquity to a text whose real author was virtually an unknown.

The titles of the encomia on Sts Luke and Lucillianus are in fact the only evidence for the preacher's career. At the same time they constitute the main argument in favour of the identity of the author of the two texts, which is not contradicted by any internal or external evidence, by the dating of the texts and their manuscripts, or by the style employed, and has rightly been accepted by scholarship so far. According to the title of the encomium on Luke (1–2), Photios was a deacon and *skeuophylax* of the Church of the Holy Apostles, the famous church in the capital. Among the several persons named Photios from the period up to 867 none is known to have held this high office.³¹ In fact, no other *skeuophylax* of the Holy Apostles is recorded in the recently published list of *skeuophylakes* of the Early and Middle Byzantine periods (up to roughly 1081).³² This can be nothing but coincidence, since it appears that any church could employ its own *skeuophylax*,³³ while it was quite normal for the office in question to be held by deacons.³⁴ The deacon Photios is, therefore, the first known *skeuophylax* of the Holy Apostles. As such he would have mainly been responsible for the sacred property of his church while probably having a number of secondary duties as well.³⁵ The title of the encomium on Lucillianus explicitly attributes it to Photios the *skeuophylax* of the Holy Apostles. It thus confirms Photios' holding of this office, while providing a further piece of evidence for him by running as follows: Φωτίου τοῦ μακαριωτάτου σκευοφύλακος τῶν Ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων καὶ λογοθέτου ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν ἅγιον μεγαλομάρτυρα Λουκιλλιανὸν καὶ τοὺς τέσσαρας παῖδας.³⁶ Al-

³¹ See the recent *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit. Erste Abteilung (641–867)* (edd. R.-J. LILIE *et al.*) III. Berlin–New York 2000, nos. 6246–6254 for all the known people bearing the name Photios in the period concerned, including four bishops, two martyrs, and the Patriarch Photios, as well as a *basilikos vestitor* and *kommerkiarios* of Chaldea, and a *basilikos spatharokandidatos*, *asekretis* and *xenodochos* of the Xenon of Euboulos.

³² See B. A. LEONTARITOU, *Εκκλησιαστικά αξιώματα και υπηρεσίες στην πρόομη και μέση βυζαντινή περίοδο (Forschungen zur byzantinischen Rechtsgeschichte, Athener Reihe 8)*. Athens–Komotini 1996, 531–547, for the relevant list and the office of *skeuophylax* in general. Also J. DARROUZÈS, *Recherches sur les ΟΦΦΙΚΙΑ de l'église byzantine (Archives de l'Orient Chrétien 11)*. Paris 1970, 314–318; P. MAGDALINO–A.-M. TALBOT, *Skeuophylax*, *ODB* III, 1909–1910.

³³ LEONTARITOU, *Εκκλησιαστικά αξιώματα* 531–532; cf. 539.

³⁴ *Ibid.* 534.

³⁵ See above n. 32.

³⁶ According to the record in FRANCHI DE' CAVALIERI, *Catalogus* 21 no. 15. The Greek title was omitted in the *Acta Sanctorum* edition of the encomium, where one only reads "Auctore Photio Sceuophylace et Logotheta C.P."

though the office of a *skeuophylax* could be combined with other offices such as that of a notary or an *oikonomos*, none of the known *skeuophylakes* appears to have been a logothete as well.³⁷ From the sixth century onwards logothetes appear in the service of either the Church or the State. The first attestation for the Church of Constantinople dates from the beginning of the ninth century, but it appears that it pre-existed. The relevant passage comes from the Life of the Patriarch Nikephoros by Ignatios the Deacon and refers to the exceptional appointment by the Emperor Leo V of a patrician, who was named Thomas, to the offices of both the logothete of the Church and *skeuophylax*.³⁸ Thus Photios was most probably a logothete of the Church rather than the State and his name is also to be added to the relevant list as the second logothete of the Great Church known so far by name up to the eleventh century. In this capacity he could also have had some financial responsibilities.³⁹

THE ENCOMIUM ON ST LUKE

Photios' encomium begins with a lengthy rhetorical preface, where the author invites his audience to participate in the *panegyris*, reveals the identity of the Apostle whose feast day it is, and praises Luke at length while incorporating in the praise brief references to the saint's life (4–29). He then dwells upon the significance of the Third Gospel in some detail starting with a contrast between Matthew and Mark on the one hand and Luke on the other. Matthew composed his Gospel in order to remind of the events

³⁷ See the list in LEONTARITOU, *Εκκλησιαστικά αξιώματα* 542–547, e.g. nos. 9–10.

³⁸ Ed. C. DE BOOR, *Nicephori archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani Opuscula historica*. Leipzig 1880, 190, 15–18: ... τὰ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τὰ τῶν ἱερῶν σκευῶν ἀναθήματα ... On this passage and the ecclesiastical office of the logothete, see LEONTARITOU, *Εκκλησιαστικά αξιώματα* 302–304; cf. 533. On the identification of the patrician, whose name is not given by Ignatios, see P. J. ALEXANDER, *The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople*. Oxford 1958; repr. 2001, 133 and n. 5, drawing on the Scriptor incertus de Leone Armenio 358, 11 ff. (ed. I. BEKKER, *Leonis Grammatici Chronographia [CSHB]*. Bonn 1842); cf. C. MANGO with the collaboration of S. EFTHYMIADIS, *The Correspondence of Ignatios the Deacon. Text, Translation, and Commentary (CFHB 39)*. Washington, D.C. 1997, 6 and n. 25, suggesting that Thomas was an *oikonomos* rather than an “ecclesiastical logothete, whose early functions are unclear”.

³⁹ See LEONTARITOU, *Εκκλησιαστικά αξιώματα* 302–304; DARROUZÈS, *Offikia* 359, n. 3. In the *Taktikon Benešević* of the mid tenth century the logothete ranks second among the patriarch's officials; see N. OIKONOMIDÈS, *Les listes de préséance byzantines des IX^e et X^e siècles (Le monde byzantin)*. Paris 1972, 251, 25. After the twelfth century the holder of the office was responsible mainly for delivering sermons on feast-days and orations in the name of the patriarch; see DARROUZÈS, *Offikia* 359–362. This duty could hardly be applicable to Photios, since in his case no relevant indication exists.

those who had witnessed them or knew about them well, and thus omitted important stories, such as the one on the birth of John the Baptist and the Annunciation. Mark followed Matthew's example and his Gospel, which shows few differences from Matthew's, is likewise brief. However, since Luke's intended audience was the "nations", his narration was neither brief nor too extended, but he was careful to include those events of Jesus' life which the other Evangelists had omitted. It is noteworthy that Photios does not mention John's Gospel at all, the comparison being restricted to the Synoptic Gospels. There follows a list of passages which are found only in Luke, presented in the form of rhetorical questions that point out their meaning for the Christians: the announcement to Zachariah of the birth of John the Baptist, the Annunciation, the parables of the Lost Son, of the Rich Man and Lazarus, of the Rich Fool, and of the Publican and the Pharisee, the penitence of the harlot, the parable of the Good Samaritan, and the penitence of the criminal on the cross (30–90).

The encomium continues with a section on Luke's descent, birth-place, education and profession, as well as his inclusion among the Seventy disciples of Christ and his presence at Emmaus (91–163). At this point the narration is interrupted by the insertion of a long dogmatic passage (164–266). The Jews were the only people to venerate the One God, but they were incapable of understanding the full mystery of the Three Persons. There was, therefore, the need for the Second Person Himself to reveal the truth about the Trinity, so that any misunderstandings regarding It would be avoided. But even after the Incarnation heretical views on the Son and the Holy Spirit appeared, which Photios refutes by referring to the New Testament text. More specifically, these heretics, who are not named, considered the Three Persons as being of different substance, thus essentially returning to polytheism, since they spoke of the Son and the Holy Spirit either as having no source, or as being subordinate to the Father (191–194; 196–199). The problems posed here reflect Early Christian Christological and Trinitarian controversies, in which the church fathers argued for the consubstantiality of the three Persons, especially contrary to the views put forward by the various groups of Arians and the Pneumatomachians against the divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit. Photios particularly emphasizes the orthodox view that the Second and Third Person of the Trinity are distinct hypostases equal to the Father (208–242).

The excursus ends with Christ revealing the truth to the Jews and sending the Apostles to the nations. Then Photios takes up Luke's life again with a second mention of his election by Christ as one of the Seventy disciples, while he goes on to speak briefly of Luke's journeys with Paul, his missions after Paul's death, the writing of the Gospel, and his death

(267–292). The rest of the encomium is devoted to Luke’s praises by arguing for the Apostles’ superiority to Old Testament figures (Moses, Abraham) and to John the Baptist (293–316), and by applying to Luke various characterizations drawn mainly from the Old Testament (317–363). Furthermore, various images that have been metaphorically used for Christ Himself could be applied to His disciple as well (364–387); the latter is also compared to the angelic choirs (388–402) and declared to be Jesus’ family and friend (403–409). Photios underlines the human inability to express the saint’s magnitude, and blesses Constantinople for sheltering his relics, Constantine for their translation, and the Church of the Apostles for housing them (410–425). The encomium ends with a long supplication of the Evangelist to keep under his protection the faithful, the city, the state and the emperors (426–480). The final lines are missing.

The sermon on Luke was preached in the Church of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople on the day of the feast of the saint, as explicitly mentioned in the text. A couple of times the preacher refers to his audience (5, 92 the φιλέορτοι) and invites them to participate together in the feast (5–7 and 9–11). Photios praises “this” great and magnificent city (418–419 ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ λαμπροῦ καὶ μεγίστῃ πόλει and 472 τῆς πόλεως ταύτης), to which the relics of St Luke were translated (418–419), as well as “this” church (422 ὡς μακάριος δὲ καὶ οὗτος ὁ ναός), where the relics are kept (422–423),⁴⁰ the icon of Luke is venerated (476), and the panegyris celebrated (4–5; 477). Nothing else is said of the Church of the Apostles. The synaxis took place on 18 October according to the Synaxarion and the Typicon of the Great Church.⁴¹ The relics of Sts Luke and Andrew were translated to the Holy Apostles by the Emperor Constantius II in 357 AD, preceded the year before by those of St Timothy.⁴² However, in the text as it stands, Photios

⁴⁰ In his capacity as *skeuophylax*, Photios would have been responsible for the relics kept in the church; see DARROUZÈS, *Offikia* 317, n. 1.

⁴¹ See Synax. eccl. CP. 147, 12–13; 147–148, 34–35; J. MATEOS, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*. Ms. Sainte-Croix no. 40, X^e siècle. I. Le cycle des douze mois (*OCA* 165). Rome 1962, 70, 5–9; cf. R. JANIN, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l’empire byzantin*. Première Partie. Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat œcuménique. III. Les églises et les monastères. Paris 1969, 46.

⁴² See *Chronicon Paschale*, I, 542, 5–18 DINDORF; *Consularia Constantinopolitana*, ed. R. W. BURGESS, *The Chronicle of Hydatius and the Consularia Constantinopolitana*. Two Contemporary Accounts of the Final Years of the Roman Empire (*Oxford Classical Monographs*). Oxford 1993, 238; also JANIN, *La géographie ecclésiastique* 42; C. MANGO, *Constantine’s Mausoleum and the Translation of Relics*. *BZ* 83 (1990) 51–62, esp. 52 with n. 11. 56. Furthermore, see JANIN, *op. cit.* 43 on the redeposition of the relics of the three saints in the Holy Apostles in 550 AD, when the church was rebuilt by Justinian I, and

praises Constantine the Great for the translations (417–421). If this is a mistake, it could be interpreted as a simple scribal error, or be ascribed to a lapse of memory on the part of the author, or even a deliberate effort to attribute these acts to the venerable emperor rather than his Arian successor. On the other hand, there existed a tradition that actually made Constantine the person responsible for the translations of Luke and Andrew, as testified by Paulinus of Nola (d. 431) and three Latin consular lists, which date them to the year 336.⁴³ In Greek this tradition makes its explicit appearance in the tenth-century Chronicle of Symeon Logothete, where it includes Timothy,⁴⁴ whereas it was already implied by the church historian Socrates.⁴⁵ Photios' text, therefore, most probably represents this second version of the events.

The medieval Greek homiletic and hagiographical tradition on Luke is not particularly long. There are a number of mainly anonymous hagiographical texts, some of them still unpublished: prologues, hypotheses, *dormitiones* and Lives,⁴⁶ including the short Life in Hieronymus' *De viris*

p. 45 on the translation of the robes of Luke, Andrew and other Apostles to the same church at the end of the reign of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus. Had the latter event taken place close to the composition of the encomium, Photios would probably have mentioned or implied it.

⁴³ See G. DE HARTEL (ed.; editio altera supplementis aucta curante M. KAMPTNER), Sancti Pontii Meropii Paulini Nolani Carmina (*CSEL* 30). Vienna 1999, carmen XIX, vv. 321, 329; Fasti Vindobonenses priores et posteriores, and Barbarus Scaligeri, in TH. MOMMSEN (ed.), Chronica Minora saec. IV. V. VI. VII. Vol. I (*MGH Auct. Ant.* 9). Berlin 1892, 293; cf. H. DELEHAYE, Les origines du culte des martyrs (*Subs. Hagiogr.* 20). Brussels 1933, 55 with n. 4; G. DOWNEY, The Builder of the Original Church of the Holy Apostles at Constantinople. A Contribution to the Criticism of the *Vita Constantini* Attributed to Eusebius. *DOP* 6 (1951) 51–80, esp. 57 with nn. 17–18; M. WHITBY and Mary WHITBY, Chronicon Paschale 284–628 AD. Translated with notes and introduction (*Translated Texts for Historians* 7). Liverpool 1989, 33, n. 102.

⁴⁴ See Leonis Grammatici Chronographia 87, 19–21 BEKKER. The name of Constantine reappears in Cedrenus, I, 518, 8–10 BEKKER.

⁴⁵ h.e. I 40, 2 (ed. G. C. HANSEN, Sokrates. Kirchengeschichte [*GCS, N.F.* 1]. Berlin 1995, 91, 15–17).

⁴⁶ Published: BHG 156g-i (prologues to the Acts), 991a (hypothesis of the Gospel by Cosmas Indicopleustes), 991c (prologue to the Gospel), 991d (hypothesis of the Gospel by Theophylact of Ochrid), 991e (hypothesis or prologue to the Acts), 992 (*dormitio*), and 2149 (Life by Ps.-Dorotheus Tyrius); on the issue of the prologues and summaries, see for example B. BOTTE, Prologues et sommaires de la Bible, *Dictionnaire de la Bible. Supplément* 8 (1972) 688–692; J. REGUL, Die antimarcionitischen Evangelienprologe (*Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel* 6). Freiburg 1969.

Unpublished: BHG 990y (*dormitio*), 990z (*vita seu dormitio*), 992b–c (*dormitiones*, variations of the published BHG 992), 993g (*vita et passio*).

illustribus translated into Greek by Sophronius *interpres*,⁴⁷ as well as the saint's synaxarion.⁴⁸ Furthermore, the BHG also lists homilies by the following authors apart from Photios, not all of which have been published: Proclus (?), Ps.-Chrysostom, Hesychius of Jerusalem, Andrew of Crete, Procopios the deacon, Nicetas David Paphlago, and Philagathos Kerameus.⁴⁹ The number of homilies is, however, reduced by the fact that the first three texts have been proven to be variations of a single text which was composed between the first half of the fifth century and *ca* 800 AD, and is heavily dependent on Proclus of Constantinople, though its author was probably not Proclus himself but a later compiler.⁵⁰ A sermon on a number of Apostles that is contained in the "Ephraem Graecus" corpus only devotes to Luke a few lines of praise.⁵¹ This leaves us with just six homilies on Luke from the entire Byzantine period, of which only one is later than the tenth century. To these homilies should be added a Life by Symeon Metaphrastes, which is dependent on the encomium by Nicetas David.⁵² The interest of the hagiographers and preachers of the ninth and tenth centuries in Luke goes hand-in-hand with the rebuilding of the only church dedicated to the Evangelist in Constantinople by the Emperor

⁴⁷ BHG 991b; CPG 3635; O. VON GEBHARDT, *Der sogenannte Sophronius (TU 14, 1b)*. Leipzig 1896, 11–12 (PG 123, 684A–C).

⁴⁸ BHG 993h; *Synax. eccl.* CP. 147–148, 37–51; for other versions, see *ibid.* 147, 12–148, 17; also the Menaea for 18 October according to the Venice edition of 1684, p. *quá*, as cited by LIPSIUS, *Apostelgeschichten* II/2, 358, n. 2; and the *Menol. Basil.*, PG 117, 113CD; cf. LIPSIUS, *Apostelgeschichten* II/2, 358, n. 1.

⁴⁹ Published: Ps.-Chrysostom (BHG 993), ed. P. MEYER, *Zwei bislang ungedruckte Enkomien auf den Evangelisten Lukas. Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie* 16 (1890) 423–434, esp. 431–434; Hesychius of Jerusalem (BHG 993a; CPG 6586), ed. M. AUBINEAU, *Les homélies festales d'Hésychius de Jérusalem I–II (Subs. Hagiogr. 59)*. Brussels 1978–1980, esp. II, 936–950; Nicetas David (BHG 993c), cited here according to the most recent edition of the text by F. LEBRUN, *Nicéas le Paphlagonien. Sept homélies inédites*. Leuven 1997, 179–197 (with several mistakes).

Unpublished: Proclus (?) (BHG 992z; CPG 5871); Andrew of Crete (BHG 993d; CPG 8213); Procopios the deacon (BHG 993b); Philagathos Kerameus (BHG 993e).

⁵⁰ For a study of the relations among these texts, see the introduction to the edition of BHG 993a by AUBINEAU, *Les homélies festales d'Hésychius de Jérusalem* II, 902–935.

⁵¹ BHG 158; CPG 4061, ed. I. S. ASSEMANI, *Sancti Patris nostri Ephraem Syri Opera omnia* III. Rome 1746, 462C–470. The sermon consists perhaps of two separate works, of which the first is an encomium of the Apostles Peter, Paul, Andrew, Thomas, Luke and John; see D. HEMMERDINGER–ILIADOU, *Éphrem (Les versions. I–II), Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* 4 (1960) 814. This part could be pre-Iconoclastic since it makes no mention of Luke's painting activity, though it refers to him as a doctor and writer.

⁵² BHG 991; PG 115, 1129–1140. On its dependence on Nicetas, see E. PEYR, *Zur Umarbeitung rhetorischer Texte durch Symeon Metaphrastes. JÖB* 42 (1992) 143–155, esp. 146 ff.

Basil I.⁵³ After all, Luke was not only physically present in the capital through his relics, but he was also the New Testament writer who connected Christ's birth with Rome and its empire forever,⁵⁴ an issue especially apposite at a time when the Macedonian emperors aimed at the renewal of the empire.⁵⁵

The motive of the promotion of the cult of a saint who had special ties with Constantinople can also be discerned in the case of the encomium on Lucillianus. Its epilogue testifies that Photios delivered it on the feast of the saint, which was celebrated in the saint's church, where his relics were kept and his icon was displayed and venerated.⁵⁶ There was only one church dedicated to Lucillianus in the capital, about which we learn from the Synaxarion and the Typicon of Constantinople.⁵⁷ According to the same texts, on 3 June his feast was celebrated there, and the same was also the case for a second feast on 19 January.⁵⁸ Few hagiographical texts exist on this saint, who was said to have been martyred under Aurelianus together with four children who had willingly followed him to martyrdom. In fact, there are just four other such texts, all of them passions (BHG 998y, 999a–c), among which 998y is Photios' source.⁵⁹

⁵³ JANIN, La géographie ecclésiastique 311 with the relevant sources; also C. MANGO, Le développement urbain de Constantinople (IV^e–VII^e siècles) (*Travaux et Mémoires, Monographies* 2). Paris 1985, 58, n. 44.

⁵⁴ See F. DVORNIK, Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy. Origins and Background (*DOS* 9). Washington, D.C. 1966, esp. II, 585, 616; on the imperial ideology behind the translation of the relics of Timothy, Andrew and Luke, see id., The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew (*DOS* 4). Cambridge, Mass. 1958, esp. 138–140, 149–150.

⁵⁵ On the theme of the *renovatio imperii* under the Macedonians, see for instance P. OBO-RICO, La politica dell'immaginario di Leone VI il Saggio. *Byz* 53 (1983) 597–631.

⁵⁶ 286D ἡμᾶς τοὺς τῷ σῶ θείῳ τεμένει προστρέχοντας ἐποπτεύον, καὶ τὴν σὴν ἱερωτάτην πανήγυριν χαρμονικῶς ἐκτελοῦντας, καὶ θείας ταύτην ἁρμονίας καταγεραίροντας, τὴν τε κόνιν τῶν σὸν πολυάθλων λειψάνων κατασπαζομένους, καὶ τὴν πολυέραστον καὶ σεβαστὴν εἰκόνα σχετικῶς προσοικνουῦντας ...

⁵⁷ On this church, which was situated in the district of Oxeia, see JANIN, La géographie ecclésiastique 311–312; also the following note.

⁵⁸ Synax. eccl. CP. 725, 19–23; 728, 12–15, and 404, 44–405, 3 respectively; MATEOS, Typicon I, 302, 21–25 and 202, 17–20 respectively; JANIN, La géographie ecclésiastique, loc. cit. in previous note.

⁵⁹ As rightly suggested by H. DELEHAYE, Saints de Thrace et de Mésie. *AnBoll* 31 (1912) 161–300, esp. 234. All the passions have since been published; see the BHG and its *Novum Auctarium*. On Lucillianus and his companions, and the relevant dossier, see DELEHAYE, Saints de Thrace et de Mésie 232–235 (cf. id., *Origines* 236, n. 7); also F. HALKIN, Les deux passions inédites du martyr Lucilien. *AnBoll* 84 (1966) 5–28, esp. 5–7; repr. in id., *Martyrs grecs IIe–VIIIe s. (Variorum)*. London 1974, no. XIV.

The reason Photios gives for the composition of this unique encomium is that the saint and his companions appeared to him and saved the preacher from perishing.⁶⁰ But he also mentions in passing that some people whom he calls most dear to himself but does not name had ordered him to praise the saint.⁶¹ It is not coincidental that according to the hagiographical tradition Lucillianus and his companions were executed in the city of Byzantium and were thus among the very few local martyrs, historical or not, that the capital could boast.⁶² It thus appears that, with his encomium on Lucillianus, Photios and those who urged him to compose it set out to draw an indigenous martyr out of oblivion and promote both his cult and the capital's renown. To this purpose the preacher included a reference to the saint's relics in his church, of which we hear in some of the other texts on Lucillianus as well.⁶³ Photios found no imitators. Moreover, Lucillianus was left out of the Metaphrastian Menologion, which, however, also omits the two Constantinopolitan saints *par excellence*, Sts Acacius and Mocius.⁶⁴

As is obvious from the summary of the encomium on Luke given above, two sections are devoted to the Evangelist's life (91–163; 267–292).⁶⁵ In the following the information they provide will be presented and commented upon. According to Photios, who repeats a commonplace introduced by Eusebius, Luke was a native of Antioch.⁶⁶ The reference to Jerusalem as his ultimate place of origin should be interpreted not only metaphorically, given that the city was considered the spiritual homeland of all Christians, but also literally, since as will be explained later on in the text, Luke was

⁶⁰ 285D δέδεξο τόνδε τὸν ἐλάχιστον ἐκ λόγων πόνον τοῦ σοῦ οἴκετου, ὃν ἐκ θανατηφόρου λύμης καὶ φθοροποιοῦ κινδυνεύειν καὶ ἄλλυσθαι μέλλοντα, εὐσπλάγχχνως σὺν τοῖς παντοποθήτοις καὶ τρισμακαρίοις Παισὶν ἐπιφανεῖς διέσωσας ...

⁶¹ 276F ἄλλως τε καὶ τὸ τῶν φιλάτων ἐπίταγμα συνελθόν.

⁶² See DELEHAYE, *Saints de Thrace et de Mésie* 225–240.

⁶³ See *Passions* BHG 999a, 11–12 (ed. HALKIN, *Les deux passions* 18); BHG 999b, 12 (ibid. 28). Fragments of the two *Passions*, which are derived from BHG 998y, are contained in a manuscript of the 10th–11th cent.; see HALKIN, *Les deux passions* 6.

⁶⁴ On the exclusion of the latter two saints from Symeon's *Menologion*, see DELEHAYE, *Saints de Thrace et de Mésie* 225.

⁶⁵ On the traditions concerning Luke's life, see the classic work by LIPSIUS, *Apostelgeschichten* II/2, 354–371 (“Die Acten des Lukas”); *Ergänzungsband* 84–86.

⁶⁶ Eusebius, h.e. III 4, 6 (edd. E. SCHWARTZ – TH. MOMMSEN [2. unveränderte Auflage von F. WINKELMANN], *Eusebius. Die Kirchengeschichte* [GCS, N.F. 6, 1. *Eusebius Werke* II/1]. Berlin 1999, 192, 20), and id., *Quaestiones evangelicae*, PG 22, 961A; LIPSIUS, *Apostelgeschichten* II/2, 355; see also the so-called antimarcionite prologue (BHG 991c, probably of the first half of the fourth century), ed. REGUL, *Evangelienprologe* 16, 3; for its date ibid. 266.

a Jew by descent. This was a common inference drawn from the inclusion of Luke in the Seventy (or Seventy-two) disciples of Christ.⁶⁷ Photios then poses the question why Luke was born in Antioch, and suggests that this might have been the result of the dispersal of the Jews following one of the captures of Jerusalem. He supports his view by adducing the passage from the Acts which speaks of the various places of provenance of the Jews of the diaspora present in Jerusalem at the Pentecost, who according to Photios had gone there to celebrate the Passover.

Luke was, therefore, brought up in a pious environment and developed the four cardinal virtues to the extreme. As for his secular education, Photios continues, it can be deduced from its later manifestations: he was a rhetor, as demonstrated by his writings, a medical doctor, as explicitly stated by Paul, and a painter, as testified by tradition. Luke's medical profession was a *topos* derived from Coloss. 4, 14. He is referred to specifically as a rhetor by Ps.-Hesychius, while Nicetas and Symeon Metaphrastes suggest that he studied rhetoric;⁶⁸ the latter two even dwell extensively on his hypothetical curriculum.⁶⁹ The alleged painting activity of the Evangelist was commented upon above.

Then Photios argues that Luke, who was among those who expected the Messiah, came to Jerusalem either because he had heard of the teaching and miracles of Jesus, a supposition found in other texts too,⁷⁰ or during a pilgrimage to the city. He was subsequently elected by Jesus as one of His Seventy disciples, a story that had been introduced of old and had become a commonplace.⁷¹ After the Resurrection he was present at the apparition of Jesus at Emmaus, where he ate with Him, and listened to His

⁶⁷ See LIPSIUS, *Apostelgeschichten* II/2, 360; cf. below n. 71. Other versions speak of him as a pagan, e.g. a version of the *Synax. eccl. CP.* 147–148, 38–39 (converted by Paul); *Dormitio* BHG 992, 429, 14–15 MEYER.

⁶⁸ Rhetor: Ps.-Hesychius 9 (948, 17 AUBINEAU: ῥήτορα); Nicetas 5 (183, 7–8 LEBRUN); *Sym. Met.* 1129B.

⁶⁹ Curriculum: Nicetas 5 (181, 32–183, 28 LEBRUN); *Sym. Met.* 1129BC; cf. Eusebius, *Quaestiones evangelicae*, PG 22, 961A; LIPSIUS, *Apostelgeschichten* II/2, 360 with n. 3.

⁷⁰ *Synax. eccl. CP.* 147, 15–17; Nicetas 7–8 (185, 8–33 LEBRUN); *Sym. Met.* 1132A–C.

⁷¹ See Epiphanius, *Panarion*, *Christentum* 4, 4 (ed. K. HOLL, *Epiphanius I. Ancoratus und Panarion* (haer. 1–33) [*GCS* 25]. Leipzig 1915, 232, 8); further examples in LIPSIUS, *Apostelgeschichten* II/2, 356, n. 4; 359–360; cf. BACCI, *Paintbrush* 81; see also Nicetas 9 (187, 14–15) and 15 (195, 30–31 LEBRUN: one of the 70); *Menol. Basil.*, PG 117, 113C; cf. e.g. (γνήσιος μαθητῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ) *Synax. eccl. CP.* 147, 18–19; *Sym. Met.* 1132CD. In the antimarcionite prologue BHG 991c, ed. REGUL, *Evangelienprologe* 16, 4, he is a disciple of the Apostles.

words. In stating this Photios becomes an important witness to a tradition which in Greek surfaces at about his time.⁷²

Afterwards Luke undertook preaching, became a companion of Paul on his journeys and converted many. He composed his Gospel, which became his source of fame. As mentioned earlier on in the text (42–43), Luke did so inspired by the Holy Spirit, who dictated the Gospel to him. As for the extra stories that he offers, he perhaps heard them from the Lord Himself or interviewed His disciples (87–89; see Lk 1, 2).⁷³ Luke's authorship of the Acts is mentioned twice in passing (113–114; 235–236; cf. 139–140). His identification (28) with the anonymous brother of 2 Cor. 8, 18 is a commonplace.⁷⁴ According to our text, the Evangelist stayed with Paul until the latter's martyrdom,⁷⁵ a specification absent from some of the sources, which speak of Luke leaving Paul at Rome.⁷⁶ He went on to preach in "Gallia, Antioch and the surrounding lands". In mentioning Gallia, which had been inferred from 2 Tim. 4, 10 ff., Photios accepts the legacy of Epiphanius of Salamis.⁷⁷

The narration ends with Luke dying in peace at the age of eighty-four. His peaceful end at an advanced age is in fact the predominant tradition,⁷⁸

⁷² Nicetas 10 (187, 21–35 LEBRUN); Sym. Met. 1132D–1133A; also LIPSIUS, *Apostelgeschichten* II/2, 360 for further references to Greek and Latin authors. Nicetas 10 (187, 19–21); 11 (189, 1–3 LEBRUN), and Sym. Met. 1132D, 1133A mention that he was also present at the Passion, Ascension and Pentecost.

⁷³ Similarly in Sym. Met. 1133D: he was a witness himself, learned from other Apostles and was inspired by the Holy Spirit. According to other versions Paul dictated the Gospel to him; see Synax. eccl. CP. 147–148, 40; Menaea Iunii (as quoted from manuscripts by LIPSIUS, *Apostelgeschichten* II/2, 357, n. 4–358); cf. Sophronius *interpretes*, ed. VON GEBHARDT, *Der sogenannte Sophronius* 12, 18–20 (Paul and the other Apostles); Ps.-Dorotheus BHG 2149, ed. H. VON SODEN, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* I/1. Berlin 1902; Göttingen 1911, 307 (Peter for the Gospel, Paul for the Acts); Menol. Basil., PG 117, 113D (Peter for the Gospel).

⁷⁴ See LIPSIUS, *Apostelgeschichten* II/2, 354, 357, n. 3.

⁷⁵ Also in the antimarcionite prologue BHG 991c, ed. REGUL, *Evangelienprologe* 16, 4–5; Nicetas 13 (193, 18–24 LEBRUN).

⁷⁶ Synax. eccl. CP. 147–148, 41–42; Sym. Met. 1136C; Menaea Iunii (as quoted from manuscripts by LIPSIUS, *Apostelgeschichten* II/2, 357, n. 4–358).

⁷⁷ Epiphanius, *Panarion*, haer. 51, 11, 7 (ed. K. HOLL [2. bearbeitete Auflage hrsg. von J. DUMMER], *Epiphanius II. Panarion* (haer. 34–64) [*GCS* 31]. Berlin 1980, 263, 6–10); LIPSIUS, *Apostelgeschichten* II/2, 355–356; not in Synax. eccl. CP. 147–148, 42, Nicetas 13 (193, 25–36 LEBRUN), Sym. Met. 1136CD.

⁷⁸ See LIPSIUS, *Apostelgeschichten* II/2, 356–357, where also on the tradition on Luke's martyrdom; the latter version appears also in Nicetas 14 (195, 2–3 LEBRUN) and a version of the Synax. eccl. CP. 147–148, 44.

while the precise age mentioned here appears in other texts too.⁷⁹ Photios does not specify the Apostle's place of death.⁸⁰

The language of the encomium is not particularly difficult, but it contains a fair number of noteworthy words, as can be seen from the Lexicographical Appendix that follows. In addition, many quotations from and allusions to the Old and New Testaments are incorporated into the text, giving an especially appropriate flavour to the praise of a Biblical author. The syntax is quite straightforward, avoiding for the most part long complicated periods. In developing his encomium Photios employs the rhetorical techniques usual in panegyrics. He shows a special preference for metaphors, comparisons, rhetorical questions, anaphoras, *asyndeta* and *poly-syndeta*, whereas the use of other rhetorical figures such as alliteration and paronomasia also make their appearance. One notes the sudden apostrophe to the Apostle at the end of the text (415) after the preceding consistent use of the third person when referring to him. These stylistic features show off a rhetorical skill that we cannot overlook and which we already knew thanks to the published encomium on Lucillianus. The latter is somewhat different in style from the encomium on Luke in that it has a more narrative character, but this can be easily explained away by the narrative nature of its source. Even so, in the rhetorical preface Photios himself notes the encomiastic purpose of his work (276E ἐγκωμιάζειν, 276F εὐφημίας).

Photios is conscious of the encomiastic character of his text on Luke as well, to which he explicitly applies the word εὐφημία (231). He knows the rules that govern the praise of saints going back to the prescriptions of Menander, as clear from the narration of Luke's life, which starts with a question regarding his origins. He tries to make up for the lack of sufficient information on the subject of his praise by including in the account of his life information on Jerusalem and Antioch, a passage from the Acts on the Jews of the diaspora in Jerusalem as well as comments on it, a reference to the four cardinal virtues cultivated by the saint, and the dogmatic excursus mentioned above. Furthermore, he is in control of the structure of his text, as is evident from his comment at the beginning of a new section (94–95), where he speaks of the sequence of the speech (ἀκολουθίας) that is leading him to deal with Luke's life. Likewise he introduces the

⁷⁹ The same age appears in the antimarcionite prologue BHG 991c, ed. REGUL, Evangelienprologe 16, 6; Ps.-Hesychius 10 (948, 6 AUBINEAU); anonymous BHG 992, 430, 21 MEYER. Others prefer the age of eighty; see LIPSIVS, Apostelgeschichten II/2, 359 with sources; Ergänzungsband 86.

⁸⁰ On Luke's place of death (as a rule Thebes in Boeotia, but also Ephesus), see LIPSIVS, Apostelgeschichten II/2, 357–358; moreover, MANGO, Constantine's Mausoleum 59 f.

dogmatic excursus as such (164–165 ἐν συντόμῳ διηγήματι) and the comparisons in favour of Luke and the Apostles with the appropriate verb (293 συγκαρινόμενος). Moreover, it does not escape his attention that he has dwelled a bit longer on certain points than he should have. This is the case with the rather long rhetorical exposition on the stories offered by Luke alone (94–95) as well as with the long series of Biblical images applied to Luke in the form of rhetorical questions, at the end of which Photios expresses his worry about causing his audience's disgust at the excessive length of this sort of exposition (364–365). It turns out, however, that his concern rather lacks sincerity, since the series of Biblical images continues immediately afterwards, though no more in the form of rhetorical questions.

Our text was copied by a careful scribe, as can be deduced from the app. cr. Errors of accentuation such as ἀκτίνας (4 etc.), ἐν ἀκαρεῖ (297) etc., are, however, not recorded. The writing of διό, καθό as one word instead of two, and the use of the spiritus asper for ὀμίχλη follow the habits of the scribe. The form καθωράθη (438) is usual in Middle Byzantine Greek.⁸¹ The indication of the paragraphs has largely taken account of the division adopted in the manuscript.

LEXICOGRAPHICAL APPENDIX

The text published here for the first time offers a considerable amount of new or otherwise noteworthy lexicographical material. This includes words which are found neither in LSJ⁹ and Lampe (= L) nor in the recent LBG for the letters published so far (Α–παλιάνθρωπος), as well as words with meagre or late attestation, and meanings and forms of known words which are unrecorded in the aforementioned lexica. The Tgl as well as the lexica of DuC, Soph and Dem were also checked. The abbreviations used here are those of the LBG except for LSJ⁹ and its Suppl(ement).⁸²

⁸¹ See for example, Ps.-John of Damascus, Sermo de hypapante domini 7, 12; 8, 6 (ed. B. KOTTER, Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos V [*Patristische Texte und Studien* 29]. Berlin–New York 1988, 386. 388); Symeon the New Theologian, Hymn 13, v. 43 καθωράθης (ed. A. KAMBYLIS, Symeon Neos Theologos. Hymnen [*Supplementa Byzantina* 3]. Berlin–New York 1976, 93), etc.

⁸² At l. 400 I have deleted the word παναγιότητα as a gloss. It should be mentioned that the word παναγιότης is not recorded in LSJ⁹ and Suppl, L, Tgl, DuC, Soph; according to Dem it is applied to the patriarch of Constantinople, but no reference is given.

ἀνατλάω (284 ἀνέτλα): the present and imperfect tenses are not recorded in LSJ⁹; the LBG provides some examples from the ninth century onwards.

ἀνεπερέαστος (475): not in LSJ⁹, Suppl, L (see ἀνεπηρέαστος); the earliest example in the LBG dates from the eleventh century.

ἀνθρακώ (396 ἠνθρακωμένος): for the meaning see LBG and the examples provided there.

αὐτοφῶς (202): the lemma in LSJ⁹ and L is αὐτόφως, whereas the word is not included in the Suppl and LBG; the accent on the final syllable is well-attested, see Tgl, Soph, Dem and the TLG-E.

ἀφάντως (158): one example is given in L, whereas the earliest example in the LBG dates from the twelfth century.

βλαστηφορέω (358): new word; cf. the lemmata βλαστηφόρος and βλαστοφορέω in the LBG.

δαιμάινω (299 δαιμαίνουσιν): the meaning of “frighten” is not recorded; cf. δαιλαίνω, L s.v. A2.

διεξέλευσις (44): one example in LSJ⁹, while the earliest reference in the LBG is to the Suda.

ἐπισυναθορίζω (115 ἐπισυνηθορίζετο): see the examples in the LBG, where three out of the four works mentioned date from the tenth century.

θεόφογγος (361): for the meaning and the combination with σάλπιγξ see the example provided by the LBG (Hesychius of Jerusalem).

κατανεόω (387 κατανεώσαντες): one example in L; see the examples in the LBG.

μυσταγόγημα (333): only one author mentioned in L; see the examples in the LBG.

πανένθεος (433): new word.

πανεύδιος (431): not in LSJ⁹, Suppl, L; recorded in Tgl, Soph, Dem.

παρετομάζω (11 παρετομασθῶμεν): LSJ⁹ and L give one attestation each; word also recorded in Tgl, Dem.

πρωστήριος (394): only one attestation in L; word also recorded in Soph.

προσζημιόω (176 προσζημιούμενοι): for the passive, which is not recorded in LSJ⁹, Suppl, L, see Tgl.

πρωτόβαθμος (230–231): only one attestation in L concerning the Apostles Peter and Paul.

σηλιτευτής (26): not in LSJ⁹, Suppl, L; recorded in Dem.

συγκροτητής (26): not in LSJ⁹, Suppl, L; recorded in Soph.

συμμερίτης (284): only one example in LSJ⁹; word also recorded in Tgl, Dem.

σύμπονος (284): only one example is given in L for the meaning of “fellow worker”; cf. Tgl, Soph.

συναναπέτομαι (55 συναναπτήναι): only one example in L; word also recorded in Tgl, Dem.

ὑποστάτις, ἡ (203): LSJ⁹ (with Suppl) and L give one attestation each; word also recorded in Tgl, Soph, Dem.

Φωτίου διακόνου καὶ σκευοφύλακος
τῶν Ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων τῶν μεγάλων ἐγκώμιον
εἰς τὸν ἅγιον ἀπόστολον καὶ εὐαγγελιστὴν Λουκᾶν

Ἀποστολικὴ πανήγυρις ἐπέλαμψε σήμερον, τὰς ἀκτῖνας τῆς θείας χάριτος
5 ἀπαστραύπουσα καὶ πάντας τοὺς φιλεόρτους καταφωτίζουσα· διὸ δεῦτε προ-
θύμῳ καὶ ζεούσῃ καρδίᾳ πρὸς ταύτην ἐπειγόμενοι, τῆς ἐλλάμψεως μετασχεῖν
σπουδάσωμεν. Οὐ μόνον δὲ τοῖς ἀποστολικοῖς ἀμαρύγμασιν ὁ ταύτης ἕξαρχος
κατακεκόσμηται, ἀλλὰ γε καὶ τοῖς τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς συγγραφῆς προτερήμασι τὸν
10 ὠραϊσμόν προβάλλεται. Ὅθεν καὶ ἡμεῖς πρὸς πλείονα διέγερσιν ἑαυτοὺς συν-
τείναντες, τῆς παρ' αὐτοῦ μυστικωτάτης δωρεᾶς πλουσίαν τὴν ἀντάμειψιν
δέξασθαι παρετοιμασθῶμεν.

Τίς οὗτος; Ὁ τίμιος καὶ παμμέγιστος ἀπόστολος καὶ εὐαγγελιστὴς Λουκᾶς,
τὸ πανίερον τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ὄργανον, τὸ πάνσεπτον τοῦ σωτῆρος κατα-
γώγιον, ὁ ῥήτωρ τῆς χάριτος, ὁ τῶν ἀρρήτων μυστηρίων ἐμφανὴς λογογράφος,
15 ὁ τῆς ἀρρήτου οἰκονομίας ἀκριβῆς συγγραφεύς.

Λουκᾶς ὁ τῆς θεοπιστίας τῇ αἴγλῃ πελυρσευμένος, ὁ πνευματοκίνητον φέρων
γλῶσσαν, ὁ μεγαλοφωνότατος τῆς ἀληθείας κήρυξ.

Λουκᾶς τῶν ἀποστόλων τὸ κλέος, τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν ἡ δόξα, τῆς οἰκουμένης
τὸ καύχημα.

Λουκᾶς ὁ τὰ ζωηρὰνάματα τῆς τοῦ σωτῆρος διδασκαλίας ὀχρηγῶν διὰ τῆς
αὐτοῦ συγγραφῆς καὶ τὰς ἐκλιμπανούσας τῷ καύσῳ τῆς ἁμαρτίας τῶν ἀνθρώ-
πων ψυχὰς ἀναζωπυρῶν καὶ καταρδεύων, ὁ φίλτρον καὶ ἔρωτι τοῦ σωτῆρος
πανταχοῦ διαδραμῶν καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα τῆς εὐσεβείας καταγγείλας, ὁ τοῦ μεγάλου
20 Παύλου συνέκδημος καὶ συνεργάτης.

Λουκᾶς ὁ τῶν ἐθνῶν σαγηνευτὴς καὶ διδάσκαλος, ὁ ἔνθεος ἰατρὸς τῶν ψυχῶν
καὶ σωματίων, ὁ στηλι|τευτὴς τῶν ἀθέων δογμάτων, ὁ συγκροτητὴς τῶν εὐσεβῶν f. 242
δογμάτων, τὸ μυρίπνοον σκεῦος τῆς εὐωδίας τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, τὸ τοῦ
Χριστοῦ στόμα, ὁ συνομιλητὴς τοῦ σωτῆρος, „οὗ ὁ ἔπαινος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ“,
καθὼς μαρτυρῶν τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ, Παῦλος ὁ μέγιστος ἀνακέκραγεν.

30 Ματθαίῳ γὰρ τοῖς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις οὔσι κλητοῖς ἁγίοις τὴν εὐαγγελικὴν
συγγραφὴν ποιουμένων, καὶ τὴν ἔναγχος τοῦ σωτῆρος διδασκαλίαν εἰς ὑπόμνησιν
ᾧν ἤκουσαν καὶ εἶδον ἐκτιθεμένων, ἀναγκαιῶς ὁ συντετμημένος λόγος ἐδέησε, τὰ

e cod. Ambros. A 63 inf.

15 ἀκριβῆς συγγραφεύς cf. Lc. 1, 3 24 Παύλου συνέκδημος Synax. eccl. CP. 147, 20; 783,
11; cf. Nicet. Dav. Paphl. 13 (193, 12 LEBRUN); Sym. Met., PG 115, 1133C 25 ἰατρὸς
Coloss. 4, 14 28–29 2 Cor. 8, 18 30 τοῖς – ἁγίοις cf. Rom. 1, 7

26 στηλητευτὴς cod.

πλεῖστα παραλιμπάνοντι, ὧν τὴν εἶδῃσιν ἐναργεστάτην εἶχον, τὰ περὶ Ἰωάννου
 35 φημὶ τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ καὶ τῆς τοῦ Γαβριὴλ πρὸς τὴν πανάχραντον τοῦ Λόγου
 μητέρα μυστικωτάτης προσφωνήσεως. Ἄλλὰ μὴν καὶ Μάρκος τούτῳ κατακολου-
 θήσας, ἐν ὀλίγοις τισὶ τὴν παραλλαγὴν ποιησάμενος, σύντομόν τινα καὶ αὐτὸς
 τὴν ἰδίαν συγγραφὴν ἐνεδείξατο.

Ὁ δέ γε τίμος καὶ λαμπρότατος Λουκᾶς ἔθνεσιν ἀναγραφόμενος τὴν σωτη-
 ριώδη συγκατάβασιν, τοῖς περιεργότερον ἐκ φιλοπράγμονος διανοίας ἀναζητοῦσι
 40 τὴν ἀκριβῆ τῶν πραγμάτων εἶδῃσιν καὶ τὴν ἄνωθεν παρακολουθήσασαν μυστι-
 κωτάτην καὶ σωτήριον εὐδόκησιν, πάντα μετὰ ἀκριβείας ἐκδιηγείσθαι κατεπέι-
 γεται, τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος αὐτῷ παροτρύνοντος καὶ ἀοράτως ὑπαγορεύον-
 τος· καὶ οὔτε τῇ συντομίᾳ τῶν λόγων τὴν τῶν ἀναγκαίων γνῶσιν παρέλιπεν, οὔτε
 45 τῇ τούτων σαφεῖ διεξελεύσει πρὸς μήκιστον τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν ἐξέτεινεν, ἀλλ' ὧν ἐν
 μνήμῃ κατέστησαν οἱ λοιποί, τούτων παραδρομὴν ποιησάμενος, τὴν τῶν παρα-
 λειφθέντων καὶ ὧν ἡ γνῶσις οὐκ ἀκερδῆς διεξαγωγὴν ἐν εὐκρινεῖ τῇ φράσει
 δεδήλωκεν. Ἐντεῦθεν ἐν μνήσῃ πολλῶν ἀξιαγάστων ἀκουσμάτων γινόμεθα καὶ
 τὴν αἴγλην τῆς σωτηρίου χάριτος ὑποδεχόμεθα.

Τίς γὰρ | τὸ τοῦ Γαβριὴλ πρὸς Ζαχαρίαν ἀκούων εὐαγγέλιον, καὶ ἐξ ὕψους f. 243
 50 ἐπίσκεψιν τοῦ ποιήσαντος πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέραν ταλαιπωρίαν, ἦν τῷ πτώματι τῆς
 παραβάσεως ὑπέστημεν, καθορῶν, οὐκ ἐλπίσι ῥώννυται σωτηρίας καὶ τὴν εὐ-
 σπλαγχνίαν καὶ ἀγαθότητα δοξάζει τοῦ πλάσαντος;

Τίς ὑπὸ παρθένου κυοφορούμενον τὸν πλάστην τῆς φύσεως ἐνωτιζόμενος καὶ
 τὴν τοσαύτην συγκατάβασιν διενθυμούμενος, οὐκ ἐκπλήττεται νοῦν καὶ διάνοιαν,
 55 καὶ ὅλως τῆς σαρκὸς τὸ βάρος ἀποτιθέμενος, συναναπτῆναι γλίχεται τῷ τὴν
 ἡμετέραν λαβόντι παχύτητα, ἢ ἐλκύση πρὸς τὸ ὕψος τῆς αὐτοῦ θεότητος;

Τίς τὴν τοῦ ἀσώτου παραβολὴν ἐννοοῦμενος, ἐν ἣ τὸ θεομὸν τῶν σπλάγχων
 ὁ πατὴρ τῶν οἰκτιρῶν πρὸς τοὺς ἐπιστρέφοντας ἐπιδείκνυσιν, οὐκ εὐθὺς μετ'
 60 ἐλπίδος ἀγαθῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀνατρέχει τὸν παρακρουσθέντα, καὶ οὐ τῶν ἀγκαλῶν
 ἀπεσκίρτησε, τὴν νεωτερικὴν διάθεσιν αὐτοῖς πλημμελήμασι καὶ πονηραῖς ἥδυ-
 παθείαις παρωθούμενος;

Τίς τὴν τοῦ σοβαροῦ πλουσίου καὶ τοῦ πένητος Λαζάρου διήγησιν ἐν νῶ
 περιστρέφων, καὶ τοῦ μὲν μαθὼν τὸ ὀλέθριον πέρας, τοῦ δὲ τὴν δι' αἰῶνος
 65 ἀνάπαυσιν, οὐ πρὸς ἐλεήμονα διάθεσιν τῶν πενήτων ἑαυτὸν παιδαγωγεῖ, τὴν διὰ
 τῆς ἀμειλίκτης γνώμης ἐπαγομένην διαδιδράσκων κόλασιν;

38 ἔθνεσιν ἀναγραφόμενος cf. BHG 991c, ed. REGUL, Evangelienprologe 16, 12; Ps.-Hesych.
 Hieros. 10 (950, 10 AUBINEAU) 39–42 cf. Lc. 1, 3–4 42–43 cf. BHG 991c, ed. REGUL,
 Evangelienprologe 16, 9; Introd. n. 73 49 Lc. 1, 8–20 49–50 ἐξ – ἐπίσκεψιν Lc. 1, 78
 50–51 πρὸς – ὑπέστημεν cf. Gen. 3 53 Lc. 1, 26–55 57 Lc. 15, 11–32 58 ὁ – οἰκτιρῶν
 2 Cor. 1, 3 62–64 Lc. 16, 19–31

Τίς τὴν ἄπληστον γνώμην τοῦ ἐτέρου πλουσίου διὰ τῆς παραβολῆς κατανοῶν καὶ τῆς ἀπευκτῆς ἐκείνης καὶ φρικώδους φωνῆς ἐπαίων, ἧς ἔτυχε παρὰ Θεοῦ, τῆς οἰκείας μοχθηρίας κομισαμένου τὰ ἐπίχειρα, οὐκ ἔξ ἀπλήστων τρόπων καὶ φαύλης προαιρέσεως μετακληθεὶς μεταδοτικὸν ἑαυτὸν παρέξει τοῖς χρήζουσι;

70 Τίς τὴν τοῦ τελώνου ταπεινὴν καὶ οἰκτρὰν δέησιν καὶ τὴν τοῦ φιλανθρώπου Θεοῦ πρὸς αὐτὸν δικαίωσιν μανθάνων, οὐ ταπεινοῖς ῥήμασι καὶ στεναγμοῖς ἐμπόνοις καὶ αὐτὸς | τῷ Θεῷ προσερχόμενος, τὴν διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας τελείαν f. 244 ἀποτιθέμενος, τὸν ἴλασμόν παρὰ τοῦ δικαιούντος ἐφίεται Θεοῦ κομίσασθαι;

75 Τὴν δὲ τῆς πόρνης κατελείουσαν ἄσχετον ὁρμὴν καὶ τὴν δι' αὐτῆς τρυγωμένην ἀντίδοσιν ἀφέσεως ὁ μυσταγωγούμενος, πῶς οὐχὶ καὶ αὐτὸς τάχιον προσδραμεῖται τῇ τῆς εὐσπλαγχνίας ἀβύσσῳ, ἵνα τὴν δωρεὰν ἀπαντήσῃ τῆς σωτηρίας;

80 Τίς τὴν τοῦ λησταῖς περιπεσόντος παραβολὴν καὶ ἐκ ταύτης δεσποτικὴν προτροπὴν ἀκούων, οὐ πάντως τὴν πρὸς τὸν πέλας εὐεργεσίαν ἐξασκήσαι προθύμως σπουδάσειεν, εἴπερ ἀντευεργετοῦντα τὸν Θεὸν ἐφευρεῖν βούλοιο;

Τῆς εὐγνωμοσύνης δὲ τοῦ ληστοῦ τὰ σεπτότατα διηγήματα πολλῶν ὄντως καρδίας μετέστρεψαν καὶ πρὸς σωτηρίαν μετήγαγον· οἷς γὰρ τις ἔνοχον ἑαυτὸν καθορᾷ πλημμελήμασι, τὰς εὐνώμονας τούτου φωνὰς προβαλλόμενος ἀντακουεὶ τῆς σωτηρίου ἀμοιβῆς τὴν ἀπόληψιν.

85 Ταῦτα πάντα παρεαθῆναι ἔμελλον καὶ λήθης βυθοῖς παραπέμπεσθαι, εἰ μὴ Λουκᾶς ὁ μεγαλοφωνότατος ταῖς ἑαυτοῦ συγγραφαῖς ἐνέταξε καὶ τὴν τούτων μυστικὴν διδασκαλίαν εἰς προὔπτον προσέθηκεν, ἔξ αὐτῶν ἴσως τῶν παναχράντων χειλέων ἀκούσας ταῦτα ἢ παρὰ τῶν προκριτῶν μαθητῶν ἐν ἐρευνῇ φιλοπόνῳ συλλεξάμενος, ὧν τῆς διηγήσεως οἱ τῆς εὐσεβοῦς πίστεως ἔρασταὶ κατατροφῶν-
90 τες, ἀθάνατον καρποῦνται τὴν ὠφέλειαν.

Ἄλλὰ πόθεν τὴν γένεσιν ἔχων καὶ ποίας πόλεως ἢ χώρας ὁρμώμενος ὁ ἀριπρεπέστατος Λουκᾶς ἀναδέδεικται, τάχα ἂν τις τῶν φιλεόρτων καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ πόθῳ λίαν ἐκκαίόμενος ἐπιζητήσειεν· τοῦτο δὴ καὶ διδάξαι προθυμηθῶμεν, εἰ καὶ παρεκβατικώτερον τοῖς λεχθεῖσιν ἐχρησάμεθα, τῆς ἀκολουθίας ἡμᾶς εἰς τοῦτον
95 τὸν λόγον ἀπαγαγούσης.

66–68 Lc. 12, 16–21 70–71 Lc. 18, 9–14 71 δικαίωσιν cf. Lc. 18, 14 73 ἴλασμόν cf. Lc. 18, 13 74–75 Lc. 7, 37–50 75 ἀφέσεως cf. Lc. 7, 47 78–79 Lc. 10, 30–37 78 λησταῖς περιπεσόντος Lc. 10, 30 81 Lc. 23, 40–43 85 λήθης βυθοῖς locus communis; cf. ex. gr. Greg. Naz., Or. 44, 1 (PG 36, 608A) (in novam Dominicam); Ignat. diac., Ep. 37, 57 (104 MANGO); Anna Comn., Alexias, prol. 1, 1, 9 cum app. font. et parall. (I 5 REINSCH-KAMBYLIS) 87–89 cf. Lc. 1, 2–3; Introd. n. 73

68 οἰκίας cod. 87 προὔπτον] sic cod. 95] ἀρχή in mg. habet cod.

100 Πατρίς μὲν τῷ τιμίῳ τούτῳ πρώτως καὶ κυρίως, | ἐξ ἧς καὶ τοῦ γένους ἔσχε f. 245
τὰ αὐχλήματα, ἢ λαμπροτάτη καὶ περιφανεστάτη Σιών, ἦν καὶ Ἱερουσαλήμ
ὀνόμασαν οἱ ταύτης οἰκήτορες, τῷ ἐναπειλημμένῳ ἱερωτάτῳ ναῶ τὴν προσ-
ωνυμίαν ταύτην προσαρομόσαντες, Σαλήμ πρότερον προσαγορευομένην. Γῆ πίων
καὶ λιπαρά, „γῆ ῥέουσα γάλα καὶ μέλι“ κατὰ τὴν Γραφήν· „γῆ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας“
ὀνομαζομένη, ἦν ὁ Θεὸς τοῖς ἐγγόνοις Ἀβραάμ ἐπηγγέιλαιτο.

105 Δευτέρα δὲ οὐ παρὰ πολὺ ταύτης λειπομένη, ἀλλ' ἐν τε μεγέθει καὶ κάλλεσι
κτισμάτων καὶ πλήθει λαῶν καὶ πολυτελείᾳ πλούτου καὶ ἀφθονίᾳ τῶν ἐπιτηδείων
ἀντερείζουσα. Τίς αὕτη; Ἡ μεγίστη καλουμένη Ἀντιόχεια, παρὰ μὲν τοῦ ἐπι-
φανοῦς Ἀντιόχου τοῦ καὶ δομήτορος τὴν προσωνυμίαν λαχοῦσα, εἰς μέγα δὲ
λαμπρότητος καὶ ὠραιότητος τῆ τῶν μετέπειτα φιλοτιμία βασιλέων ἀυξηθεῖσα, ἢ
110 Θεοῦ πόλις κληθῆναι εὐμοιρήσασα, ἐν ἧ πρώτον τὸ σεβάσιμον ὄνομα χριστιανῶν
κεχρημάτισται, ἐν ἧ τὴν ἐκλογὴν Βαρνάβα καὶ Παύλου τῶν ἀποστόλων τὸ πανά-
γιον Πνεῦμα πεποιήται. Πῶς δὲ τούτῳ πατρίς ὑπῆρξεν αὕτη, ἢ τοῖς ἀκριβῶς
διερευνησὶν ἐφεῖται νοεῖν, ἀκούσατε.

Ἦς αἰχμαλωσίαν πολλάκις τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ ὑποστάσης, οὐκ ἀπεικὸς δια-
σπαρῆναι τόποις διαφόροις τοὺς ἀνδραποδισθέντας, ὡς ἐντεῦθεν καὶ τοὺς
γεννήτορας τοῦ πανιέρου Λουκᾶ τῆ πόλει ταύτῃ κατοικῆσαι. Τοῦτο δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς
ἐν τῇ τῶν Πράξεων βίβλῳ ἐδήλωσεν, ὅτε κατὰ τὴν γενομένην τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύμα-
115 τος ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀποστόλους κάθοδον ὁ λαὸς ἅπας ἐπισυνθηροῖζετο καὶ τὰ μεγαλεῖα
τοῦ Θεοῦ παρὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἤκουον· „Οὐκ ἰδοῦ“ φησὶ „πάντες οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ
λαλοῦντες Γαλιλαῖοι; Καὶ πῶς ἡμεῖς ἀκούομεν ἕκαστος τῆ ἰδία διαλέκτῳ ἡμῶν,
ἐν ἧ ἐγεννήθημεν; Πάρθοι καὶ Μῆδοι καὶ Ἑλαμίται καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν
Μεσοποταμίαν, | Ἰουδαίαν τε καὶ Καππαδοκίαν, Πόντον καὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν, Φρυ- f. 246
120 γίαν τε καὶ Παμφυλίαν, Αἴγυπτον καὶ τὰ μέρη τῆς Λιβύης τῆς κατὰ Κυρήνην,
καὶ οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες Ῥωμαῖοι, Ἰουδαῖοι τε καὶ προσήλυτοι, Κρηῖτες καὶ Ἄραβες,
ἀκούομεν λαλούντων αὐτῶν ταῖς ἡμετέραις γλώσσαις τὰ μεγαλεῖα τοῦ Θεοῦ“.
Καὶ δῆλον ὡς οὗτοι πάντες οὐ τῆς τῶν ἐθνικῶν ὑπῆρχον μοίρας, εἰ καὶ ταῖς τῶν
ἐπιχωρίων ἐν οἷς κατόκουν ἐχρῶντο γλώσσαις, ἀλλὰ σπέρματα τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ
125 ἐτύγγανον, πρὸς ἣν καὶ ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ ἑορτῇ τοῦ Πάσχα ἀνήγοντο σχέσει τε τῆς
πατρίδος καὶ τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τῶν πατρῶν ἐθῶν τε καὶ νομίμων.

97–99 cf. Georg. Monach., I, 102, 18–103, 4 DE BOOR 100 Ex. 3, 8, 17 etc. 100–101
Hebr. 11, 9 101 ἦν – ἐπηγγέιλαιτο cf. Gen. 12, 7; 26, 3; 28, 13; Ex. 33, 1 etc. 107 cf.
Malalas XVIII 29 (371, 1–2 THURN) (Θεούπολις) et al. (v. app. font. et parall. ad loc.)
107–108 Act. 11, 26 108–109 Act. 13, 1–2 114–115 Act. 2, 1–4 115–116 cf. Act. 2,
11 116–122 Act. 2, 7–11 cum app. cr. 123–125 Act. 2, 5–6 126 πατρῶν ἐθῶν cf.
Ex. 23, 14–17; Deut. 16, 16; Lc. 2, 41–42; Ioh. 2, 23; 11, 55

99 ταύτη cod.^{a.corr.} 107 κλιθῆναι cod. 116 οὗτοί εἰσιν cod. 119 τὲ cod. 120 τὲ cod.
Κυρήνην cod. 121 Ἰουδαῖοι τὲ cod. 125 τὲ cod.

Εἰς φῶς τοίνυν προελθὼν τοῦ βίου καὶ τραφεῖς οὕτω καὶ παιδευθεὶς ἐν καλῇ ἀναστροφῇ καὶ φιλοθέῳ διαθέσει, τῆς μὲν ἠθικῆς καταστάσεως οὐδὲ ἐν εἶδος ὑπελείπετο τὸ ὅσον εἰς ἀρετὴν φέρει καὶ τὴν συμπαρομαρτοῦσαν κοσμιότητα, ὃ
 130 μὴ οὐχὶ σὺν ἐπιμελείᾳ πάσῃ διελήλυθε καὶ ὑπερακοντίσαι καλῶς ἐφιλονείκησε. Σωφροσύνην τε γὰρ φημι καὶ τὴν τοῦ σώματος καθαρότητα, συνεργῶ τῇ κατὰ τῶν παθῶν ἀνδρεία κεχημένος, τοσοῦτον ἐξήσκησεν, ὡς ἀγνείας ὅλον δειχθῆναι τέμενος, πράγματος οὐ πάνυ τοῖς τότε σπουδαζομένου. Φρονήσεως δὲ τῷ περιόντι καὶ δικαιοσύνη λαμπρυνόμενος, τοῖς τῆς θεοσεβείας ἐνετρούφα διδάγ-
 135 μασι. Διὸ καὶ αὐτὸς εἷς ἦν τῶν διψητικῶς τὴν ἔλευσιν προσδεχομένων τοῦ σωτήρος καὶ ταύτης οὐκ ἀπέτυχεν τῆς ἐφέσεως, τοῦ πλάστου προῖδομένου τὸν αὐτοῦ θεράποντα καὶ καιροῖς ἰδίους ποιησαμένου τὴν πρόσληψιν.

Τῆς δὲ γε τῷ βίῳ συμβαλλομένης παιδείσεως ἐν τρισὶ ταύταις ἐπιστήμαις τὴν γυμνασίαν ἐπεδείξατο. Πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ εἰ καὶ τις ἄλλος, προφανῶς ἐν ταῖς ἑαυτοῦ
 140 συγγραφαῖς γνωρίζεται, καὶ τοῦτο πᾶς τις τῶν πιστῶν | ὁμολογεῖ καὶ κατατίθεται. f. 247 Ἱατρικῆς δὲ μαθημάτων ἐν πείρᾳ πλείστη γενόμενος, καὶ πρὸς αὐτοῦ τοῦ παμμάκαρος Παύλου φαιδρῶς ἀνακηρύττεται. Φιλοτιμία δὲ φύσεως πρὸς εὐ-
 145 φυΐαν ἐπιρροεπῶς ἐχούσης, καὶ τὸ ζωγραφεῖν προσεκτήσατο. Οὕτω γ' οὖν καὶ παράδοσις τις πρὸς ἡμᾶς κατελήλυθεν, οὐ ψευδομένην τὴν φήμην ἔχουσα, τῆς παναχράντου Θεοτόκου τὴν θεῖαν μορφήν ἐν πίναξιν, ἔτι ζωῆς αὐτῆς, ἐντυ-
 150 πώσασθαι χρώμασιν· ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ πάντων ἡμῶν σωτήρος καὶ δεσπότης Χριστοῦ, ἧς καὶ μέχρι νῦν φασι διαμένειν, τὴν φιλοτεχνίαν εἰς κάλλος ἐνδεικνυμένας.

Εἴτε τοίνυν τῆς θείας καὶ ἀφράστου καὶ σωτηρίου ἐπιδημίας ἐκ τῶν ἀπείρων καὶ μεγίστων τεραστίων πανταχόσε φημισθέντων ἐν ἀκοῇ γενόμενος, εἴτε καὶ αὐτὸς κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον ἔθος εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἀνελθὼν, δεσποτικὸν γίνεται θήραμα καὶ τῆς ἐφέσεως τὴν ἀπόλαυσιν δέχεται καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐκλέγεται καὶ τοῖς ἑβδομήκοντα μαθηταῖς συντάσσεται.

Ἀμέλει, μετὰ τὴν φρικτὴν καὶ θεῖαν ἀνάστασιν Χριστὸς ὁ πάντων ποιητὴς καὶ
 155 δεσπότης αὐτῷ προσουπαντᾶ καὶ συνοδοιπόρος γίνεται καὶ συνόμιλος δείκνυται καὶ συνέστιος καθίσταται καὶ τὰς περὶ αὐτοῦ προορήσεις ἀμέσως ὑπανοίγνωσι καὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ δυνάμεως τὴν δόξαν ἐμφανίζει καὶ ἑαυτὸν ὅστις εἶη γνωρίζει διὰ τῆς φοβερᾶς καὶ παραδόξου ἀφαντώσεως.

Τοιοῦτος καὶ τοσοῦτος τὴν ἀρετὴν ὁ παμμακάριστος καὶ πανεύφημος ὑπῆρχε
 160 Λουκᾶς, ὃς τῇ τετρακτίῳ τῶν γενικῶν ἀρετῶν καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς συμπεριλαβῶν, εἰς

131–134 cf. Plato, *Leges* 631c, 964b etc. 136–137 τοῦ – θεράποντα cf. Ps. 138, 3 141–142 Coloss. 4, 14 143–148 cf. Ps.-Andr. *Cret.*, *De sanctarum imaginum veneratione*, PG 97, 1304CD 143–146 cf. Ps.-Ioh. *Damasc.*, *Epistula ad Theophilum* 4.a (149, 21–27 MUNITZ et al.) 151 v. supra 126 154–158 *Lc.* 24, 13–32 160 v. supra 131–134

147 ἄς] sc. εἰκόνας φασι cod. 156 προορήσεις cod.

τοσοῦτον περίοπτον καὶ περιφανὲς ἀνῆλθεν ὕψος, ὡς καὶ θεοπτίας ἀξιοθῆναι καὶ εὐαγγελιστῆς τῆς θείας καὶ ἐνσάρκου οἰκονομίας Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἀναδειχθῆναι.

165 Ἄλλ' εἰς ἀρχὴν τὸν λόγον ἀγαγόντες, τὴν κατάστασιν τῶν τότε πραγμάτων ἐν συντόμῳ διευ|κρινήσωμεν διηγήματι. f. 248

Ἦν ὅτε ζόφου καὶ σκοτομῆνης τὰ πάντα πεπλήρωτο καὶ δεινὴ νύξ ἀθεΐας πᾶν ἔθνος καὶ πᾶσαν φυλὴν ἐπεσκίαζε καὶ τὸ γένος τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπώλλυτο τοῦ πλάσαντος ἀγνοίας καὶ δημιουργήσαντος, δαμιόνων ὀλεθρίων τὴν τῷ δεσπότη προσήκουσαν λατρείαν καὶ προσκύνῃσιν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς μετενεγκόντων καὶ τῆς 170 εὐθείας τῶν προσκυνούντων κατορχουμένων.

Μία δὲ φυλὴ καὶ γλῶσσα μόνη, τῶν Ἰουδαίων, λείψανον ἐφρούρει τῆς πρὸς τὸν κτίστην γνώσεως, ἐκ Μωσέως παραλαβοῦσα δι' ἐγγράφου νομοθεσίας τὴν συντήρησιν. Ἀλλὰ καὶ οὗτοι, ὅσοι μὲν διὰ ῥαστώνης τὴν τοῦ βίου πορείαν ἐποιοῦντο καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσι συναναμίγνυντο καὶ τῆς τούτων μετελάμβανον κακίας, 175 οὐκ αὐτοὶ τοὺς ἐξηπατημένους μεταβαλεῖν ἰσχύοντες, ἀλλ' ὑπ' αὐτῶν τάχιστα τὸ εὐσεβεῖν προσζημιούμενοι· ὅσοι δὲ τὸν παραδοθέντα νόμον θεογνωσίας, ἀπαράτρωτον διατηρεῖν ἐνόμιζον, ὑπερκύπτειν τῷ πάχει τοῦ γράμματος μὴ δυνάμενοι, αὐτοῦ που ταῖς χθαμαλαῖς περὶ τὸ θεῖον ἐννοίας ἐγκατέμενον, πρὸς τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας φῶς ἀνατείνειν τὴν διάνοιαν ἐξαπονοῦντες.

180 Διὰ τοῦτο μοναρχία μὲν αὐτοῖς ἐσέβητο, ἀλλ' εἰς στενὸν κομιδῇ τὰ τῆς θεότητος περιεγράφετο, μονοπρόσωπον αὐτὴν καὶ εἶναι καὶ γνωρίζεσθαι διανοούμενοις. Ἔδει δὲ ποτε τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας φῶς ἀναλάμψαι καὶ μίαν καὶ σύμφωνον δοξολογίαν καὶ προσκύνῃσιν παρὰ τε τῶν ὑπερκοσμίων καὶ ἀοράτων δυνάμεων καὶ τῶν ἐγκοσμίων τῷ Θεῷ προσαχθῆναι, ἐδεῖτο δὲ τοῦτο, μόνης τῆς αὐτοαληθείας τὴν ἀκριβῆ χειραγωγίαν καὶ ἀσφαλῆ ὁδηγίαν πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἀληθῶν 185 κατανόησιν ὀρέξαι δυναμένης, ἵνα τῶν μὲν εἰς πολυθεϊαν παρατραπέντων ἢ πλάνη κατάδηλος γένηται τῷ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀληθινοῦ καὶ φύσει Θεοῦ γνω|ρίσματι, f. 249 τοῖς δὲ τῆς μοναρχίας τὴν λατρείαν κατέχουσιν τὸ τῆς Τριάδος μυστήριον ἐκφανθῇ, καιροῖς ἰδίους πρὸς τὸ τέλειον ἀναγομένοις τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως. Οὐ γὰρ ἦν 190 ἀσφαλὲς τοῖς εἰς πολυθεϊαν πολλάκις ἐκτρεπομένοις τὸν περὶ τῆς Τριάδος εἰσάγεσθαι λόγον, ἵνα μὴ τῷ τρισσῷ τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐκτραχυνόμενοι καὶ ἐκφύλους οὐσίας τῶν προσώπων ιδιότητος ὑπολαμβάνοντες οὐδὲν ἦττον πάλιν πρὸς τὸ πολύθεον καταφέροιντο σέβας, ἢ ἀνάρχους καὶ ἀντιθέτους ταύτας νομίζοντες ἢ βαθμούς τινας καὶ ὑπερβάσεις καὶ ὑποβάσεις θεότητος ἀναπλάττοντες.

161 v. supra 154–158 172–173 Ex. 31, 18; 32, 15–16; 34, 28 182 cf. Ioh. 1, 9; 1 Ioh. 2, 8 184–185 αὐτοαληθείας cf. Ioh. 14, 6 191–192 ἐκφύλους οὐσίας cf. Cyril. Alex., ex. gr. De sancta trinitate dialogus iii, 465cd (20–22 DE DURAND) (contra Arianos) 193 ἀνάρχους – ἀντιθέτους cf. Constit. Apost. VI 8, 2, 9–10 (II 316 METZGER) (contra Marcionitas) 194 v. infra 197–198

185 τὴν] τῆς cod. ἀσφαλεῖ cod.

195 Καὶ τί θαυμαστόν, εἰ τοῖς πάλαι τοῦτο πρόσαντες ἐδόκει καὶ οὐκ ἐχώρει
 τούτων ἢ ἀκοῇ τῶν ἀληθῶν τὴν μῆσιν – ὅπου γε καὶ μετὰ τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας
 ἀνακήρυξιν τινὲς τῶν εὐσεβῶν δογμάτων μηδὲν φροντίσαντες, τῆς ἰσοθέου τιμῆς
 τὸν Υἱὸν καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα στερησαί τετολμήκασιν, πρὸς ὁμωνυμίαν θεότητος
 καταφεύγοντες καὶ τὴν τῆς οὐσίας ταυτότητα ἀπαρνούμενοι –, τῷ δὲ τοῦ ἑνὸς
 200 προσορήματι τὴν ἀκριβῆ τέως ὁμολογίαν φυλάττοντες, τὸ πολύαρχον καὶ πολύ-
 θεον τῆς ἑλληνικῆς θεοπλαστίας ἀποφεύγειν;

Διὰ δὴ τοῦτο, τὸ ἄχρονον φῶς καὶ αὐτοφῶς, ἡ ζωὴ τῶν ζώντων καὶ αὐτοζωή,
 ἢ τῶν ὄντων ὑποστάτις καὶ αὐτοαλήθεια, ἢ ἐνυπόστατος σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ, αὐτὸς
 ὁ Λόγος καὶ Υἱός, ὁ τῆς πατρικῆς οὐσίας χαρακτήρ, ἢ ἀπαράλλακτος εἰκὼν τῆς
 205 δόξης τῆς θεϊκῆς, ἀσώματος ὢν τὸ πρόσθεν καὶ ἀπρόσιτος, σωματικὸν περιβλήμα
 φορεῖ, ἵνα εὐπρόσιτος τοῖς σαρκοφόροις γένηται ὡς ὁμοίῳ τῷ ἀνομοίῳ προσ-
 τρέχουσι, καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀνακαλυφθῆ τὰ διδάγματα.

Καὶ τέως μὲν πρὸς τοὺς τὴν μοναρχίαν σέβοντας, ὡς ἐγγυτέρω τῆς ἀληθοῦς
 ὄντας δόξης, αὐτοπρόσωπον τὴν διδασκαλίαν ἐφαπλοῖ, Πατέρα μὲν ἑαυτοῦ τὸν
 210 κατὰ φύσιν Θεὸν ἐπιδαί|κνύς, ἑαυτὸν δὲ γνήσιον Υἱὸν καὶ φυσικὸν γέννημα τοῦ f. 250
 τοιούτου Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦτο πολυτρόπως πιστούμενος, ἔκ τε τῆς ἐνεχθείσης αὐτῷ
 οὐρανόθεν πατρικῆς φωνῆς, „Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδό-
 κησα· αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε“, καὶ ἔκ τῶν παραδόξων καὶ θαυμαστῶν τερατουργημάτων
 ὧνπερ ἐπετέλει, μὴ δεήσειώς τινος ὡς πρὸς μείζονα δεόμενος, αὐτοδυνάμῳ τε καὶ
 215 παντοδυνάμῳ θελήματι καὶ προστάγματι τὰς θεοσημείας ἐργαζόμενος, εἰ καὶ
 ταύτας ἀναφέρειν ἐδόκει τῷ Πατρὶ πρὸς ἔμφασιν τῆς φυσικῆς ἰσότητός τε καὶ
 συγγενείας καὶ τοῦ μὴ δοκεῖν ἀντίθεός τις εἶναι καὶ τῆς πρώτης ἀρχῆς ἀπερ-
 ρωγῶς.

Πάλιν δὲ καὶ τὴν τοῦ Πνεύματος γνῶσιν τρανοτέραν εἰσήγαγε, φανερώς τῇ
 220 ἰσοτιμίᾳ τῶν ἔργων Θεὸν καὶ αὐτὸ διατρανώσας, οὐκ ἄλλοθεν τὴν ἀρχὴν
 κεκτημένον ἢ ἐκ τῆς πατρικῆς προβαλλόμενον ὑπάρξεως. „Εἰ γὰρ ἐν Πνεύματι
 Θεοῦ“ φησὶ „ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια“. „Τῷ δὲ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον“ αὐθις
 „βλασφημήσαντι οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται“, δηλονότι „ἢ βλασφημία, οὔτε ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι
 οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι“. Καὶ πάλιν· „Τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας ὃ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς
 225 ἐκπορεύεται“. Καὶ τὸ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ ἐνύπαρκτον δηλῶν ἔλεγε· „Πέμψω
 ὑμῖν ἄλλον Παράκλητον“. Καὶ πάλιν· „Ἐρωτήσω τὸν Πατέρα καὶ ἄλλον Παρά-

198–199 πρὸς – καταφεύγοντες cf. Greg. Naz., Or. 29, 13, 22–26 (204 GALLAY) (contra Eunomi-
 mium) 202 φῶς Ioh. 8, 12 ζωὴ Ioh. 14, 6 ζώντων cf. Mt. 22, 32; Mc. 12, 27; Lc. 20,
 38 203 αὐτοαλήθεια v. supra 184 σοφία – Θεοῦ ex. gr. 1 Cor. 1, 24, 30 204–205 ὁ²
 – θεϊκῆς cf. Hebr. 1, 3 212–213 Mt. 17, 5; Mc. 9, 7 cum app. cr.; Lc. 9, 35 cum app. cr.
 216 cf. Ioh. 5, 36; 10, 25, 38; 14, 11; 15, 24; Lc. 11, 20 221–222 Mt. 12, 28 222–223
 Τῷ – ἀφεθήσεται Lc. 12, 10 223–224 Mt. 12, 31–32; cf. Mc. 3, 29 224–225 Ioh. 15, 26
 225–226 Ioh. 15, 26 et 14, 16 226–227 Ioh. 14, 16–17 cum app. cr.

197 τινὲς] sic accent. cod. 202 διαδὴ cod. 214 τὲ cod. 220 αὐτῷ cod.

κλητον δώσει ὑμῖν, ἵνα μένη μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας“. Καὶ πάλιν· „Ὅτ' ἂν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὀδηγήσει ὑμᾶς εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν“.

230 Καὶ τοῦτο σαφῶς ἐκ τοῦ Κυρίου ἀκούσαντές τε καὶ μαθόντες ὁ τε πρωτό-
βαθμος τῶν ἀποστόλων Πέτρος καὶ ὁ νῦν ἡμῖν εἰς εὐφημίαν προκείμενος Λουκᾶς,
ὁ μὲν Ἀνανίαν διελέγχων φησί· „Διὰ τί ἐπλήρωσεν ὁ σατανᾶς τὴν καρδίαν σου,
ψεύσασθαί σε τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον; Οὐκ ἐψεύσω ἀνθρώποις ἀλλὰ τῷ Θεῷ“, καὶ
παρακατιών, „Τί ὅτι συνεφω|νήθη ὑμῖν πειράσαι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον;“ f. 251
235 θαυμάσιος Λουκᾶς τὰ περὶ τὸν Κανδάκη ἐνουῦχον διηγούμενος, οὕτως σαφῶς
ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσι διαγορεύει· „Εἶπε δὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα“ τὸ ἅγιον „τῷ Φιλίππῳ· Πρόσ-
ελθε καὶ κολλήθητι τῷ ἄρματι τούτῳ“. Καὶ πάλιν ἐν ἑτέροις· „Λειτουργούντων
δὲ αὐτῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ νηστεούντων, εἶπε τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον· Ἀφορίσατε δὴ
μοι τὸν Βαρνάβαν καὶ τὸν Παῦλον εἰς τὸ ἔργον ὃ προσκέκλημαι αὐτούς“. Καὶ
240 πάλιν· „Οὗτοι μὲν οὖν ἐκπεμφθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος“.

Δέδεικται τοίνυν σαφῶς ἡ ἐνυπόστατος αὐτοῦ ὕπαρξις καὶ τὸ ἰδιαῖον τοῦ
χαρακτῆρος καὶ τὸ αὐτοκέλευστον τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ τὸ ἰσότημιον τῆς φύσεως.
Ταύτης τοίνυν τῆς τρανεστάτης γνώσεως διδάσκαλος ἡμῖν γέγονεν αὐτὸς μόνος
ὁ Κύριος. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ καθαραῖς ἐννοίαις τὴν περὶ τῆς Τριάδος ἔλλαμψιν ἐδέξαντο
245 προφηταί, Λόγον Θεοῦ καὶ Πνεῦμα διαγορεύοντες, ὡς „Τῷ Λόγῳ Κυρίου οἱ
οὐρανοὶ ἐστερεώθησαν, καὶ τῷ Πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ πᾶσα ἡ δύναμις
αὐτῶν“, καὶ „Ἀπέστειλε τὸν Λόγον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἴασατο αὐτούς“, καὶ „Τὸ Πνεῦμά
σου τὸ ἅγιον μὴ ἀντανέλῃς ἀφ' ἡμῶν“, καὶ „Πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ, οὗ εἶνεκεν
ἔχρισέ με“, καὶ τὰ τοιοῦτότροπα, ἀλλ' οὐπω τρανὴν τὴν τούτων ἰδιοῦπόστατον
250 ὕπαρξιν εἰσηγήσαντο, διὸ καὶ πολλοῖς ἀνυποστάτων ὀνομάτων φαντασία λελό-
γιστο. Μόνῳ γὰρ τῷ ἀπαραγράπτῳ διδασκάλῳ τοῦτο ἀποκεκλήρωτο, τὸ τὴν
γνώσιν τῶν τοιούτων δι' ἑαυτοῦ ἐμφανίσαι καὶ τὴν ἀληθῆ τῆς θεότητος λατρείαν
καὶ προσκύνησιν τοῖς πιστοῖς χαρίσασθαι. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἀναφωνῶν πρὸς τὸν
Πατέρα ἔλεγε· „Πάτερ, δόξασόν σου τὸν Υἱόν, ἵνα καὶ ὁ Υἱός σου δοξάσῃ σε“.
255 Καὶ πάλιν· „Ἐγὼ σε ἐδόξασα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς“. Καὶ πάλιν· „Ἐφανέρωσά σου τὸ
ὄνομα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις“. Οὐ γὰρ δὴ καθὸ Θεὸς ἐλέγετο, τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐφα-

228–229 Ioh. 16, 13 cum app. cr. 232–233 Διὰ – ἅγιον; Act. 5, 3 233 Act. 5, 4 234
Act. 5, 9 cum app. cr. 235 Act. 8, 26–40 236–237 Act. 8, 29 237–239 Act. 13, 2
(ubi τὸν Βαρναβᾶν καὶ Σαῦλον) 240 Act. 13, 4 cum app. cr. 245–247 Ps. 32, 6 247
Ps. 106, 20 247–248 Ps. 50, 13 (ubi ἀπ' ἐμοῦ) 248–249 Is. 61, 1; Lc. 4, 18 250–251
πολλοῖς – λελόγιστο cf. Greg. Naz., Or. 6, 22, 14–17 (176 CALVET-SEBASTI) (contra Sabellium);
v. etiam LAMPE, Patristic Lexicon, s.v. ἀνυπόστατος B3b 254 Ioh. 17, 1 cum app. cr. 255
Ioh. 17, 4 255–256 Ioh. 17, 6

238 ἀφορήσατε cod.

νέρωσεν ἑαυτόν – ἦν γὰρ καὶ αὕτη καὶ πρὸ τούτου τῆς κλήσεως ἡ γνῶσις –, ἀλλ’
ὅτι | ὁ ἦν οὐκ ἐγινώσκετο, δηλονότι Πατήρ.

f. 252

260 Αἰτεῖ τοίνυν καὶ αὐτὸς ὡς φυσικὸς Υἱὸς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις γνωσθῆναι, ἵνα τῆς
ἰσοτιμίας γνωσθείσης τῆς φύσεως, μία καὶ ἡ αὐτὴ προσκύνησις ἀδιστάκτῳ γνῶμη
καὶ βεβαία καρδιά διὰ τῆς ἐν Πνεύματι λατρείας παρὰ πάντων προσφέρεται.
Οὕτω μὲν οὖν πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείως τῇ μοναρχίᾳ διακειμένους ἡ τῆς ἀληθείας πηγὴ
καὶ ἄβυσσος τῆς σοφίας, τῆς θεοσεβείας τὴν διδασκαλίαν εἰσηγήσατο· πρὸς δὲ
265 τοὺς πόρρω ταύτης ἀποκλίνοντας καὶ δαμονικαῖς ἀπάταις ὑπαγομένους οὐκ
αὐτοπρόσωπον μὲν τὴν διδασκίαν ἐμποδίζει, τῇ δὲ τῶν αὐτῶ μαθητευσάντων πρὸς
αὐτοὺς ἀποστολῇ πρὸς τὴν ἀληθῆ θεογνωσίαν ἐπανάγειν εὐδοκεῖ.

Διὰ τοῦτο χορὸς μαρτύρων ἐκλέγεται, οὐκ ἐν δώδεκα μόνοις τὴν περιγραφὴν
συγκλείων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ἀλλήλοις ἑβδομήκοντα τὸ ἐπίσημον παραδεικνύων, ἵνα
πρὸς τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἐθνῶν πολυπληθὴς καὶ ὁ διδασκαλικὸς ἀριθμὸς γνωρίζοιτο
270 καὶ μὴ ἀποκναίειν ἔχοιεν οἱ ὀλιγοστοὶ τῷ ἀριθμῷ τοῖς ἀμετρήτοις ἔθνεσιν
ἀντιπαραβαλλόμενοι· καὶ τοῦτο καὶ αὐτὸς παραδηλῶν ὁ Χριστός, „Ὁ μὲν θερι-
σμός“ ἔλεγεν „πολύς, οἱ δὲ ἐργάται ὀλίγοι“, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς.

Ταύτης οὖν τῆς τιμίας καὶ θαυμαστῆς ἐκλογῆς μέρος γίνεται καὶ Λουκᾶς ὁ
περίοπτος, αὐτὸν ἐκλεξαμένου τοῦ τὰ κρύφια τῶν καρδιῶν γινώσκοντος καὶ
275 προορωμένου τὸ αὐτοῦ καθαρὸν τε καὶ εἰλικρινὲς καὶ πρὸς τὸ κήρυγμα περι-
σπούδαστον τε καὶ περιδέξιον. Ὅς δεξιότητι φύσεως ἀναλαμβάνει τὸν λόγον καὶ
συγχειροτονεῖται Παύλῳ καὶ συγκοινωνεῖ τῆς ἀποδημίας καὶ συναγωνίζεται
τούτῳ καὶ τὸ ζέον τῆς προθυμίας ἐνδείκνυται καὶ πολλοῖς αἴτιος καθίσταται
σωτηρίας, λόγῳ μὲν εὐσταθεῖ καὶ ῥοιζηδὸν χεομένην τὴν τῆς πλάνης ἀνακαλύπτων
280 περιπέτειαν, ἔργῳ δὲ θαυμασιῶν, τὴν βεβαίωσιν τῆς θείας γνώσεως | ἐπιδει-
κνύμενος. Εὐαγγελικὴν δὲ συγγραψάμενος ἱστορίαν, ἐν ταύτῃ τὸ κλέος ἔσχε μέγα
καὶ τοῖς πρώτοις συντέτακται καὶ τοῖς μεῖζοσι συγκατείλεκται.

f. 253

Μέχρι μὲν οὖν ὁ παμμέγιστος Παῦλος τῷ βίῳ περιῆν καὶ τοὺς ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ
κινδύνους ἀνέτλα, σύμπονος οὗτος καὶ συμμερίτης τῶν ἀναγράπτων πόνων καὶ
285 τοῦ κηρύγματος ἦν. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ὁ μέγιστος Παῦλος τὸν εὐκλεᾶ δρόμον τελέσας,
πρὸς Θεὸν μαρτυρικῶς ἐξελέλυθε, τῆνικαδὲ Λουκᾶς τὰς τε Γαλλίας καὶ αὐθις
τὴν Ἀντιόχου καὶ λοιπὰς γεινιαζούσας χώρας τε καὶ πόλεις περιελθὼν καὶ
στηρίξας ἐν τῇ πίστει, τὸν ἐπίλοιπον ἐπεβίω χρόνον ἐν ἀταράχῳ γαλήνῃ, καὶ
οὕτως εἰς βαθὺν γῆρας ἔληλακώς – μέχρι γὰρ που τῶν ὀγδοηκοντατεσσάρων ἐτῶν
290 φασὶ τὴν ζωὴν παρατείνειν –, πρὸς τὸν ἴδιον ἀπῆρε διδάσκαλον, ταῖς ἀποστολι-
καῖς χορείαις συσκηνοῦμενος καὶ ταῖς τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν ὑπεροχαῖς συναριθ-
μούμενος.

262 cf. Ioh. 14, 6 265–266 Mt. 28, 19 268 Lc. 10, 1 271–272 Lc. 10, 2; Mt. 9, 37
274 τοῦ – γινώσκοντος Ps. 43, 22 277 cf. Coloss. 4, 14; 2 Tim. 4, 11; Philem. 24

268 an ἄλλοις legendum? Cf. Lc. 10,1 ἐτέρους 269 πολυπλήθης cod. 270 ἀμετρίτοις cod.
280 ἔργον cod. 290 φασὶ cod.

Τίσιν οὖν τῶν πάλαι συγκρινόμενος, οὐχὶ τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν ψῆφον ἀπενεγκάμενος εὐρεθήσεται; Ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ οἶμαι τινα ἐφευρεῖν ἰσοστάσιον. Ἄλλον
 295 μὲν γὰρ ἄλλον ἢ ἴσον ἢ ὑπερβάλλοντα κατὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν τάχα ἂν οὐ χαλεπὸν τινα καταμαθεῖν, ἀποστόλου δὲ ἑνὸς πάντες ἐλάττους. Κἂν γὰρ θεοπτίαν εἵπης τὸν Μωσέα προβαλλόμενος, θεόπτας καὶ τούτους εὐρών καὶ οὐκ ἐν ἀκαρεῖ τῆς ὥρας, ἐν ἐπιτάσει δὲ πλείστον ἡμερῶν, τὸ μείζον τούτοις προσημαρτυρήσεις. Κἂν τὴν
 300 εἰς τὸν ἀπόρητον ἐκεῖνον γνόφον παρείσδυσιν, κἂν τὴν δεμαίνουσαν ἀστραπὴν καὶ τὴν ἀπρόσιτον λαμπηδόνα, ἀντιθεῖς τὴν κατὰ πρόσωπον ὀμίλιαν καὶ συνεστίασιν τὸ κρεῖττον τούτοις ἀποκληρώσεις. Κἂν τὴν τῆς Τριάδος δεξιώσιν Ἄβραάμ, τὸ μέγιστον αὐχμημα, καὶ τούτους εὐρήσεις διὰ τῆς τοῦ Υἱοῦ παραδοχῆς
 305 Πνεύματος. Κἂν ἀρετῆς ὑπεροχῆ, κεκτημένους εὐρήσεις καὶ τόσῳ μᾶλλον, ὅσῳ τῇ οὐσιώδει ἀρετῇ μαθητευθῆναι τούτοις ἐξεγένετο. f. 254

Ἄλλως τε καὶ τοῖς σκιδέσειν οἱ πρότερον ὀμιλοῦντες καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας πόρρω καθιστάμενοι, πόθεν τὸ τέλειον εἶχον; Οὗτοι δὲ τῆς ὑψηλῆς νομοθεσίας δεξάμενοι τὴν ἀκρίβειαν, ἀσφαλεῖς ἐργάται τῶν θεοπισθέντων γεγονάσι. Τεκμήριον δὲ τοῦ λόγου Ἰωάννης, τὸ μείζον εἶναι τῶν προφητῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ σωτῆρος μαρτυρούμενος.
 310 Εἰ δὲ μείζοσιν ἀγῶσι καὶ δυνάμεσιν ἤπερ Ἰωάννης οὗτοι κεκόσμηνται, πῶς οὐκ ἀσύγκριτον τὴν ὑπεροχὴν τοῖς προλαβοῦσιν εἰκότως ἀπολήφουσι;

Οὕτως δείκνυται καὶ ὁ νῦν εὐφημούμενος τοῖς μὲν λοιποῖς ἀποστόλοις τὸ ἴσον ἀποφερόμενος – οὐδεμία γὰρ τούτοις πρὸς ἀλλήλους σύγκρισις διὰ τε τὸ θατέρου θάτερον οἰκειοῦσθαι καὶ διὰ τὴν τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριτος ἐξ ἴσου μετάληψιν,
 315 ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὸ ἀνελλιπὲς τῆς τῶν ἀρετῶν τελειότητος –, τῶν δὲ πάλιν πολὺ τὸ ὑπερανεστηκὸς ἐπιδεικνύμενος.

Τί οὖν τοῦτον καλέσαντες, ἐπάξιον αὐτῷ προσηγορίαν ἐπενέγκομεν; Οὐρανὸν προσαγορεύσομεν; Οὐ ψευσόμεθα, ἔχοντες συνήγορον καὶ τὸν προφήτην Δαυῖδ λέγοντα· „Οἱ οὐρανοὶ διηγοῦνται δόξαν Θεοῦ“, καὶ „Εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἐξῆλθεν ὁ φθόγγος αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς τὰ πέρατα τῆς οἰκουμένης τὰ ῥήματα αὐτοῦ“. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ τισι δοκεῖ πρὸς τὸ πρόχειρον ἀφορῶσι, τὸ εὐάρμοστον καὶ εὐτακτον τοῦ ἀψύχου κόσμου τὸν προφήτην αἰνίττεσθαι, καθάπερ στόματι τὴν ὄψιν προβαλλόμενον εἰς τὴν τοῦ Ποιητοῦ κατανόησιν, ἀλλὰ πολλῶ κρεῖττον ἐννοεῖν δεῖ ὅτι πνευματικῇ ὁράσει οὐ τὴν τῶν ὄντων ἐπίσκεψιν ὁ προφήτης, ἀλλὰ τὴν
 325 τῶν μελλόντων κατανόησιν προανεφώνει καὶ προανεκήρυττεν, εἰ|περ αὐτῷ τὸ τῆς προφητείας ὡς προφητείας ἀξίωμα διεδείκνυτο. f. 255

296–297 Ex. 33, 23 298–299 Ex. 20, 21 299–300 Ex. 19, 16, 18 301–302 Gen. 18
 309 Mt. 11, 11; Lc. 7, 28 319 Ps. 18, 2 319–320 Ps. 18, 5 321–325 cf. Greg. Nyss.,
 Contra Eunomium II 224 (I 290, 25–291, 8 JAEGER); Athanas. Alex., Expos. in Ps., PG 27,
 124B

294 οἶμαι τινα cod. 295 χαλεπὸν τινα cod. 297 προβαλλόμενος cod. ἀκαρεῖ cod. 309
 μείζον cod. 322 κόσμου] conieci, ἀν(θρώπου) cod. 323 προβαλλόμενος cod.

Ἡλιον προσείπομεν; Ἀληθεύσομεν· τῷ γὰρ ἡλίῳ τῆς δικαιοσύνης προσπελάσας καὶ τῆς ἀκτίστου φωταυγείας τὸ σέλας δεξάμενος, καθάπερ ἥλιος καὶ αὐτὸς τὰς ἀκτῖνας ἅπασιν ἐφήπλωσε τῆς αὐτοῦ διδασκαλίας καὶ ἀπὸ περάτων ἕως περάτων τῆς οἰκουμένης τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς αὐτοῦ συγγραφῆς ἢ ἀνάρρησις κηρύττεται.

Βροντὴν ὀνομάσομεν; Οὐκ ἀπεικίτως εἶπομεν· καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸς ὡς υἱὸς βροντῆς ἐβρόντησε τῷ κόσμῳ τὰ οὐράνια μυσταγωγήματα κατὰ τὸν εἰπόντα προφήτην· „Φωνὴ τῆς βροντῆς σου ἐν τῷ τροχῷ“.

Ἄστραπὴν εἶπομεν; Αὐτόθεν ἢ ἀπόδειξις· „Ἐφαναν“ γὰρ „αἱ ἀστραπαὶ“ αὐτοῦ „τῆ οἰκουμένη“.

Ἄλλὰ νεφέλην; Καὶ γὰρ τοὺς τῆς ἀγνοίας τῷ φλογμῷ κατατηχομένους ἐπισκιάσας, τὸν ὄμβρον τῆς πίστεως ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς ἐξέχεε καὶ ἀνάκτησιν ἐδωρήσατο θείαν.

Καὶ κιβωτὸν ἔνδον ἔχουσαν τὸ μάννα κατονομάσομεν; Οὐ διαμαρτησόμεθα τῆς προσηγορίας· τί γὰρ ἡ ἄψυχος μέγα ἔφερε κιβωτός, ἢ προτύπωσις ἐδεικνυτο τῶν ἀληθῶν; Οὗτοι γὰρ ἀληθινὰ καὶ ἔμψυχοι κιβωτοί, οἵτινες τὸ ἀληθινὸν καὶ ἅγιον μάννα, τοῦτ’ ἔστι τὴν οὐράνιον καὶ ἀδαπάνητον τροφήν, ἐν ταῖς ἑαυτῶν περιέφερον ψυχαῖς, κεχρυσωμέναις τῇ θείᾳ καὶ φωτιστικῇ λαμπηδόνι τοῦ Πνεύματος.

Κρατῆρα; Καὶ γὰρ τῆς ἐνθέου σοφίας τὰ νάματα κεράννυσι τοῖς πιστοῖς, ἀπολυτρούμενος τῆς διαβολικῆς τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων μέθης.

Ἄρχοντα; Δαυῖδ προανεφώνει· „Καταστήσεις αὐτοὺς ἄρχοντας ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν“.

Θησαυρόν; Καὶ τίς ἡμῖν τοιοῦτον πλοῦτον ἀναφαίρετον καταλέλοιπεν, ὡς οὗτος τὴν εὐαγγελικὴν αὐτοῦ συγγραφὴν;

Ἴππον; „Ἐπεβίβασας εἰς θάλασσαν τοὺς ἵππους σου“, προφήτης ἄλλος f. 256 προανεκήρυττεν. Καὶ πάλιν ὁ αὐτός· „Ὅτι ἐπιβήσῃ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἵππους σου, καὶ ἡ ἵππασία σου σωτηρία“.

Ἄρμα; „Τὸ ἄρμα τοῦ Θεοῦ μυριοπλάσιον, χιλιάδες εὐθηνούντων“.

Ποταμόν; „Ἐπῆραν οἱ ποταμοὶ φωνὰς αὐτῶν“· καὶ γὰρ ὡς πηγῆς ζωηροῦτου προχεόμενοι, τὰς ὑποδεξαμένας ψυχὰς τὸν σπόρον τῆς πίστεως καταρδεύοντες, βλαστηφορεῖν παρέσχον τῶν ἀρετῶν τὴν εὐκαρλίαν.

Στῦλον; Καὶ γὰρ τῆς σοφίας ὁ οἶκος, εἶπουν ἢ ἐκκλησία, ὑπ’ αὐτῶν κατέχεται τε καὶ διαβαστάζεται.

327 Mal. 3, 20 330 ἕως – οἰκουμένης Ps. 71, 8 332–333 cf. Mc. 3, 17 334 Ps. 76, 19
335–336 ibid. 337–338 νεφέλην ... ἐπισκιάσας cf. Ex. 40, 35; Mt. 17, 5; Mc. 9, 7; Lc. 9, 34
νεφέλην ... ὄμβρον cf. Lc. 12, 54 340 Hebr. 9, 4; Ex. 16, 33 342–343 cf. Ioh. 6, 31.
49–50 344 κεχρυσωμένας cf. ibid. 346 Prov. 9, 2 348–349 Ps. 44, 17 350 cf. ex.
gr. Mt. 6, 20; 13, 44; Lc. 12, 33 352 Hab. 3, 15 353–354 Hab. 3, 8 355 Ps. 67, 18
356 Ps. 92, 3 357 cf. Mt. 13, 3, 8; Mc. 4, 3, 8; Lc. 8, 5, 8 359 Prov. 9, 1

Σάλπιγγα θεόφθογγον; Καὶ γὰρ τῆ εὐσήμεν καὶ πολυήχηφ φωνῆ πανταχοῦ διέδραμε καταγγέλλον τὸ σωτήριον κήρυγμα.

Θεός; „Ἐγὼ εἶπα θεοὶ ἐστε“ καὶ Ὑμᾶς οὐ λέγω φίλους, ἀλλὰ ἀδελφούς.

Ἄλλὰ τί μοι κατὰ μέρος ἐκλέγειν τὰς λέξεις καὶ τῷ μήκει τὰς τῶν ἀκουόντων ἀηδίζειν ψυχάς;

Ὡσπερ γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πολλοῖς καὶ διαφόροις ὀνόμασι τοῦτον καλοῦμεν, πρὸς τὴν ποικίλιαν τῶν ὀνομάτων καὶ τὴν τοῦ πράγματος ἰσόρροπον ἔμφασιν ἐν ἐνὶ ὑποκειμένῳ τὴν ἀρμόζουσαν καὶ κατάλληλον ὀνομασίαν τῆ πολυωνυμία προσάπτοντες – θύραν καὶ βακτηρίαν καὶ σταγόνα καὶ μαργαρίτην καὶ ἄρτον καὶ ποιμένα καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα προσαγορεύομεν –, οὕτως ἔστιν ἰδεῖν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν προκειμένων· πρὸς γὰρ τὴν ὑποκειμένην ἐργασίαν δέδωκε καὶ αὐτὸς τοῖς μαθηταῖς τὴν ὀνομασίαν ἐπιφέρεισθαι.

Δένδρον ζωῆς ὁ Χριστὸς εἴρηται, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἂν ἁμάρτοι τις καὶ τοῦτον δένδρον ζωῆς καλῶν, ἐκ τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς μυήσεως τὸν καρπὸν προβαλλόμενον.

Πύλη σωτηρίας Χριστὸς κέκληται· δι’ αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἡμῖν ὁ οὐράνιος χῶρος τὰς πύλας ἀναπετάννυσιν. Ἀλλὰ καὶ οὗτος ἀρμόζουσαν δέξαιτο τὴν προσηγορίαν ταύτην, πύλη σωτηρίας ὀνομαζόμενος· διὰ γὰρ τῆς αὐτοῦ | διδασκαλίας τὴν πρὸς σωτηρίαν ἄγουσαν πύλην ἀναπεπταμένην εὐρίσκομεν. f. 257

Μύρον Χριστὸς κατωνόμασται· „Μύρον“ γὰρ φησι „ἐκκενωθὲν ὄνομά σοι“, τὴν οἰκουμένην εὐωδιάζον ἄτμοις τῆς θεότητος. Ἀλλὰ καὶ οὗτος μύρον προσηκόντως λεχθήσεται, ὡς εὐωδία τοῦ Πνεύματος ὑπάρχων καὶ τὴν ὁσμὴν διαπνέων τῆς τῶν θαυμάτων χάριτος.

Ἄμπελον ἑαυτὸν ὁ Χριστὸς προσωνόμασεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἐξαρτήσεως τὴν συμφυῖαν δεικνύς, κλήματα τούτους ἀπεφίγητο.

Γεωργὸν τὸν Πατέρα τὸν ἴδιον ἐκάλεσεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τούτοις τὴν προσωνυμίαν ταύτην ἐχαρίσατο· τῆ γὰρ τῶν πόνων αὐτῶν γεωργία τὰς κεχερωσμένας τῶν ἀνθρώπων ψυχὰς κατανεώσαντες, τῆς θεογνωσίας τὸν σπὸρον ἐγκατέθετο.

Τολμήσει δὲ ἄρα προῖων ὁ λόγος καὶ τοῖς ἀύλοις καὶ ἄσωμάτοις τοῦτον εἰκότως προσαρμόσαι.

Χερουβὶμ γὰρ εἰ καλέσομεν, τὴν ἐκ πλήθους γνώσεως τούτῳ προσάπτοντες προσηγορίαν, οὐκ ἀποτευξόμεθα τῆς μυήσεως· τῷ γὰρ πλήθει καὶ αὐτὸς τῆς πνευματικῆς ἐπιστήμης ἐκ τῆς μωραίνουσης ἑλληνικῆς σοφίας πολλοὺς ἀπαλλάξας, τὴν θείαν καὶ μυστικὴν γνῶσιν ταῖς αὐτῶν ψυχαῖς ἐνεφύτευσε.

361 1 Cor. 14, 8–9 363 Ps. 81, 6; Ioh. 10, 34 cf. Ioh. 15, 15; etiam Mt. 12, 49–50; Mc. 3, 34–35; Lc. 8, 21 etc. 369 θύραν Ioh. 10, 1–2. 7. 9 βακτηρίαν Ps. 22, 4; Ier. 1, 11 σταγόνα Ps. 71, 6 370 μαργαρίτην Mt. 13, 46 ἄρτον Ioh. 6, 32–35. 48–51 ποιμένα Ioh. 10, 11. 14–16 373–374 Prov. 11, 30 375 cf. Mt. 7, 13–14; Lc. 13, 24 cum app. cr. 375–376 cf. Ps. 23, 7. 9 379 Cant. 1, 3 cum app. cr. 383–384 Ioh. 15, 5 385 Ioh. 15, 1 385–386 cf. Mt. 21, 41; Mc. 12, 9; Lc. 20, 16 390. 394. 399 v. Ps.-Dion. Areop., De coel. hier. VI 2 (26, 13–21 HEIL–RITTER) 390 ibid., VII 1 (27, 8 HEIL–RITTER)

395 Σεραφίμ τὴν πρηστήριον δύναμιν ἐν τούτῳ μεταφέρομεν; Πρόδηλος ἡ ἀλήθεια· τῷ γὰρ πυρὶ τῆς ἀϋλου θεότητος ἀναχαλκευθεὶς τὴν διάνοιαν, καὶ τῇ μεθέξει χρηματίσας ὅλος ἠνθρακωμένος – „Ἄνθρακες“ γὰρ φησι ὁ ψάλλον „ἀνήφθησαν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ“ –, πᾶσαν εὐκατάπρηστον ὕλην ἀθειᾶς καὶ κακίας εἰς τέλος ἀπετέφρωσαν.

400 Θρόνον καλέσομεν; Τί δὲ παρίστησιν ἡμῖν ἢ τοῦ θρόνου προσηγορία ἢ πάντως τὴν μόνιμον ἀνάπαυσιν τοῦ θεοῦ {παναγιότητα}; Ὁ δὲ οὐ τοιοῦτος; Ποῦ γὰρ ἐν γηγενέσιν ἐπαναπεπαυμένον οὕτως ἐφευρήσομεν τὸ θεῖον ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις;

Καὶ τί ἔτι λέγω; Φίλος κέκληται Χριστοῦ· „Υμεῖς“ γὰρ | φησι „φίλοι μου f. 258 ἔστε“.

405 Υἱός· „Ἄντι τῶν πατέρων σου ἐγενήθησαν οἱ υἱοί σου“.

Ἀδελφός· „Ἀπαγγελῶ τὸ ὄνομά σου τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου“.

Μήτηρ, πατήρ· „Τίς“ γὰρ „ἔστι μήτηρ καὶ“ πατήρ „μου“, ἀλλ’ ἢ πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με, τῇ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀναβάσει τὴν φιλοτιμίαν τῶν καλλίστων ἐρασιζόμενος.

410 Τίνα τοίνυν ἐπάξιον ὕμνον τῷ πολυῦμνῆτῳ ἀποστόλῳ τε καὶ εὐαγγελιστῇ προσενέγκωμεν; Τίνι φιλοφροσύνῃ τοῦτον δεξιωσόμεθα; Ποίοις ἄνθεσι ἐγκωμίων τοῦτον στεφανώσομεν; Ποίαις εὐφημίαις τοῦτον καταγεραίρομεν; Ὅντως ἀτονεῖ βρότειος νοῦς, τὴν ὑπερκειμένην ὀρῶν τῶν αὐτοῦ κατορθωμάτων μεγαλειότητα.

415 Ὡς μακαρία ὄντως ἡ Κωνσταντινούπολις, ἢ τὸ σὸν πανίερον καὶ τίμιον λείψανον κατέχειν εὐμοιρήσασα.

Μακάριος δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς Κωνσταντῖνος, ὁ πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις αὐτοῦ μεγίστοις κατορθώμασι καὶ τοῦτο προσθεὶς, τὸ μετενεγκεῖν ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ λαμπρᾷ καὶ μεγίστῃ πόλει τὰ σά τε καὶ τῶν ἀοιδίμων Ἀνδρέου τε καὶ Τιμοθέου παναγιώτατα λείψανα καὶ μέγιστον ἀνάθημα παρασχεῖν εἰς ἀσφάλειάν τε καὶ φυλακὴν αὐτῆς καὶ συντήρησιν.

425 Ὡς μακάριος δὲ καὶ οὗτος ὁ ναὸς καὶ ὄντως ὑμῶν ἐπάξιος, ὁ τὴν τριαδικὴν ὑμῶν συνέλευσιν ὑποδεξάμενος, ἐν ᾧ τῶν θαυμάτων τὰς ἀκτῖνας τοῖς προσιούσιν ἐπανατέλλοντες καὶ τὰ μύρα τῆς ὑμῶν προχέοντες χάριτος, σωτηρίαν ἀκήρατον παρῄχετε.

394 *ibid.*, VII 1 (27, 6–7. 18 HEIL–RITTER) 396–397 Ps. 17, 9 399–400 Ps.-Dion. Areop., De coel. hier. VII 1 (28, 11–12 HEIL–RITTER) 403–404 Ioh. 15, 14 405 Ps. 44, 17 406 Hebr. 2, 12; cf. Ps. 21, 23 407–408 Mt. 12, 48. 50; Mc. 3, 33. 35 (Lc. 8, 21) (ubi μήτηρ καὶ ἀδελφοί) 408 τὸ – με Ioh. 4, 34; 5, 30; 6, 38–39

394 πρηστήριον *cod.* 400 παναγιότητα] *delevi* 404 ἔστε] *sic accent. cod.* 410 τὲ *cod.* 417 *recte* Κωνσταντίου

Ἄλλ' εἰ καὶ τὸν ὕμνον ἐπάξιον προσάγειν ἀδυνατοῦμεν, τῆς γε πρὸς σέ
δεήσεως καὶ ἰκεσίας, ὃ μύστα τῶν ἀπορρήτων τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνεκφράστων
μυστηρίων, οὐκ ἀπορήσομεν. Ἰκετεύομεν τοίνυν.

430 Ὡς κυβερνήτης ἐμπειρότατος διάσωσον ἡμᾶς ἐκ τρικυμίας καὶ ζάλης τῶν
βιωτικῶν περιστάσεων.

Ὡς λιμὴν πανεύδιος εἰσάγαγε ἡμᾶς εἰς ὄρμον σωτήριον, ἐν ᾧ τοῖς γενομένοις
ἀσφα|λῆς συντήρησις πέλει καὶ φόβου παντὸς ἀλλοτριώσις. f. 259

435 Ὡς χειραγωγὸς πανένθεος κατεύθυνον ἡμᾶς πρὸς κατοικίαν τὴν οὐράνιον,
ἀνακουφίζων καὶ ὑπερέτους ποιῶν τῶν σκανδάλων τοῦ πονηροῦ, ὑφ' ὧν
ἀλισκόμεθα τῇ ῥαθυμίᾳ κρατούμενοι καὶ κατάβρωμα γινόμεθα τῆς τούτου
πανουργίας καὶ δολιότητος.

Ὡς ὁδηγὸς σωτήριος ὁδήγησον ἡμᾶς πρὸς ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον, δι' ἣν καὶ Θεὸς
ἄνθρωπος γέγονε καὶ παθὼν ἐν μετοχῇ καθωράθη καὶ θανάτου πείραν ἔλαβεν,
ἵνα ταύτην παράσχη τοῖς ἀδιστάκτῳ γνώμῃ τούτῳ προστρέχουσιν.

440 Ὡς φύλαξ στερρότατος φύλαξον ἡμᾶς ὑπὸ τὴν σκέπην τῆς σῆς χάριτος,
λυτρουόμενος ἐκ πάσης βλάβης ἐναντίας καὶ κακώσεως.

Ὡς φωταγωγὸς ἀειλαμπέστατος λάμπρυνον τὰς ἡμῶν καρδίας τῇ αἴγλῃ τῶν
σῶν θαυμασίων καὶ ἀπέλασον τὴν ὀμίχλην καὶ τὸν ζόφον τῶν παραπτώσεων.

445 Ὡς ποιμὴν ἱερώτατος ποιμανον ἡμᾶς ἐν τῇ ζωηφόρῳ πόᾳ τῶν δεσποτικῶν
προστάξεων καὶ εἰσέλασον ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν μάνδραν τῆς θεϊκῆς ἀγαθότητος.

Ὡς ἰατρὸς δοκιμώτατος θεράπευσον ἡμῶν τὰ πάθη καὶ τὰ ἄρρωστήματα,
πᾶσαν σηπεδόνα καὶ λύμην ἀποδιώκων καὶ παρέχων εὐεξίαν τὴν εἶτε νοητὴν καὶ
ψυχὰς ἀποκαθαίρουσαν εἶτε καὶ αἰσθητὴν καὶ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῖς σώμασιν
ἐμφαίνουσαν.

450 Ὡς διδάσκαλος βέλτιστος στηρίξον ἡμᾶς πρὸς γνῶσιν ἄπταιστον τῆς ἀλη-
θείας, ἵνα μὴ τῇ τῶν καλῶν καὶ προσηκόντων ἀγνωσίᾳ διαμαρτάνοιμεν πρὸς τὴν
τῶν ὀφειλόντων κατανόησιν.

455 Ὡς εὐαγγελιστὴς ἱερώτατος διάνοιξον ἡμῶν τὰ ὄπτα τῆς καρδίας πρὸς
ἐνήχησιν τῶν σῶν ἀγνωστάτων λόγων, δι' ὧν τὰ εὐαγγέλια κοιμούμεθα τῆς αἰωνίου
βασιλείας.

Ὅρεξον χεῖρα τοῖς κειμένοις, | ἐπίκουρος γενοῦ τοῖς καταπονουμένοις, f. 260
ἀντιλήπτῳ φάνηθι τοῖς κινδυνεύουσιν, ὑπερασπίξου τοῖς ἐν ἀνάγκαις, τῶν
πονηρῶν πνευμάτων τὰς καταγίδας διάλυσσον τῇ αὔρᾳ τῆς δυνατωτάτης
ἰσχύος.

460 Τοὺς ἐν ἁμαρτίαις κατεχομένους καὶ ἔτι τῷ δελέατι τούτων ὑποσυρομένους,
τῇ σῇ κραταιοτάτῃ πρεσβείᾳ ἐπιγνώμονας τῆς οἰκείας ἐλαττώσεως ἀνάδειξον καὶ
πρὸς ἐπιστροφὴν μεταποίησον.

446 v. supra 25

428 ἰκετεύομεν cod.

Τοῖς ἐν μετανοίᾳ καὶ δάκρυσι τὴν τῶν οἰκείων σφαλμάτων ἐπιζητοῦσι
 465 συγχώρησιν καὶ σὲ προβαλλομένοις μεσίτην πρὸς εὐσπλαγχνον Κύριον ταχεῖαν
 παράσχου τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν.

Τοῖς ἐν πολιτείᾳ ἐναρέτῳ τὴν ἑαυτῶν ζωὴν διανύουσι συμμαχίαν δίδου
 σωτήριον.

Ἐκτεινον τὰς σὰς ἀγιοτάτας χεῖρας ὑπὲρ ποιμνῆς, ἣν πολλοῖς συνεστήσω
 470 πόνοις, ἣν πολλαῖς διδασκαλίαις ἐμνηστεύσω τῷ δεσπότη, ἣν τῷ βρώματι τοῦ
 ζωτικῆς ἄρτου διέθρεψας, καὶ ἣν τῷ πόματι τοῦ σωτηρίου αἵματος ἐπότισας.

Δεήθητι ὑπὲρ λαοῦ τοῦ πίστει θερμῇ καὶ πόθῳ πρὸς σὲ καταφεύγοντος.
 Πρόστηθι τῆς πόλεως ταύτης τῆς σοὶ ἀνακειμένης καὶ τὸ σὸν κληρωσαμένης
 475 εὐκλεῶς τίμιον λείψανον. Διάσωσον ταύτην ἀπήμονα πάσης ἀλλοφύλου καὶ
 βαρβαρικῆς κακονοίας. Ἐξελοῦ ταύτην ὀργῆς θεηλάτου καὶ κακώσεως. Στερέω-
 480 σον τὸ βασίλειον κράτος καὶ ἀνεπερέαστον διαφύλαξον. Συντήρησον βασιλεῖς
 τοὺς ἐν ὀρθοδόξῳ φρονήματι τὴν σὴν ἀσπαζομένους εἰκόνα καὶ ψυχῆς ἀγαλλι-
 σαι τὴν σὴν τιμῶντας πανήγυριν.

Ἐχεις πρὸς Θεὸν ἀπαραίτητον παρησίαν, καὶ οὐκ ἀμφιβάλλομεν, ἔχεις
 480 δύνειμιν ἀνυπέρβλητον, ἔχεις ἰσχὺν ἀκαταμάχητον ὡς μαθητῆς τοῦ σωτῆρος, ὡς
 ἀπόστολος ἱερός, ὡς κῆρυξ παγκόσμιος, ὡς εὐαγγελιστῆς μεγαλοφ[ν]ότατος