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In the prologue to his famous Ἐγκυροφαία τῆς Ἰωάννου τῆς τέχνης (Hermeneia = The Painter’s Manual), the Athonite monk Dionysios of Fourna, longing to assert the authority of Byzantine iconographic tradition as a legacy of apostolic times, addresses his prayer to the Theotokos in these words: ‘Oh Mary Mother of God, St Luke, wishing he might clearly manifest to everybody the most holy affection he felt for Thy Highness beloved of God, realized that it was not sufficient to present Thy noblest Majesty with any of his most numerous spiritual gifts as an offering of first fruit, but that he, who had been such a careful eyewitness (οὖτός ότι), should carve and paint on panels with colours and gilded tesserae, by means of his pictorial skill, the admirable image, full-of-grace, of Thy appearance ...’.1

Father Dionysios had no doubt in identifying Luke as the originator of Christian pictorial art and the model of all Orthodox painters, and he recommended the utterance of this invocation to the Lord, who had been the Evangelist’s real inspiration: ‘Thou, who by means of the Holy Ghost has inspired Thy divine Apostle and Evangelist Luke to reproduce the appearance of Thy irreproachable Mother, holding Thee, as a Child, in Her arms and saying: “The grace of my son will be through me with them”’.2

When the Hermeneia was written, in the first quarter of the eighteenth century, the tradition concerning St Luke’s activity as a painter had been confirmed by a great many authors and was most probably known to Dionysios in the form of the liturgical ekolouthia included in the Great Menia of October and eventually included by Bishop Maximos Margounios in his 1620 edition of the Lives of the Saints, in which the following is written: ‘It is said that he executed by pictorial art with wax first one image of the holy Theotokos, holding in Her arms Our Lord Jesus Christ, and then another two; he showed them to the Mother of the Lord, [asking] whether She liked them: and it seems She said, “The grace of my son will go with them through me”, as well as with the images of the holy apostles and saints: and that good and devout and venerable work was spread by him (Luke) everywhere on earth’.3

In describing Luke as an eyewitness, however, Dionysios is echoing the earliest texts that shaped the legend, assigning to Luke his place as the person who executed the first portraits of the founders of the Christian faith and as the first Christian painter. Already in the pre-Ikonoclastic period, local traditions concerning authentic handmade reproductions of Christ and the Virgin Mary had appeared sporadically in the Christian East. For all that it may have appeared unorthodox in some Church Fathers’ eyes (St Augustine, for example, wrote that nobody knew the actual features of the Virgin’s face), there seems to have been a feeling that some minor person in the evangelical narration was likely to have recorded Christ’s or the Virgin’s outward appearance in works of art; if the Carpocratians, a gnostic sect that flourished in the third century, used to attribute the first images of Christ to Pilate, Orthodox Christians themselves soon spoke of a statue erected by the ἱερομορφοισσα, named Berenike, in Paneas, while the first version of the mandylion legend, the fifth-century Syrian Doctrina Addai, described how King Abgar of Edessa sent his painter and archivist, Ananias, to portray Christ’s face. At the end of the sixth century the Narratio de rebus Persicis, possibly a Greek translation of an earlier Syrian text, told how, before leaving
Bethlehem, the three Magi ordered a skilled young painter to portray the Virgin Mary with her Child and so execute the first Christian image, which was later installed, on their way back, in the main temple of the Persian capital.⁴

The importance of such traditions was recognized by Iconophiles in the eighth and ninth centuries, when they suggested that the existence of original ‘portraits’ of Christ and the Theotokos not only legitimized the Christian practice of painting and venerating sacred icons, but also testified to the reality of the Incarnation by reproducing the human appearance of the Lord. Modern scholars usually accept that images of the Virgin and Child were charged with doctrinal significance, in as much as they exhibited the paradoxical relation of a mother holding a child who is also her pre-eternal Creator; and, significantly, such an iconographic theme was later thought of as having played a role in the confusion of Nestorius during the Council of Ephesus, as we learn from the Russian abbot Daniel in 1107.⁵ Literary descriptions of the sacred personages’ outward features played a similar role, and, apart from that of the Virgin Mary in the Narratio de rebus Persicis itself, we encounter such prosopographical texts more and more frequently from the eighth century onwards. As stated in the list of miracles included in the ninth century Letter of the Patriarchs of the East to the Emperor Theophilus, the subjects of the iconographic tradition were based on the actual description of Christ’s earthly appearance, preserved by the apostles—who were eyewitnesses (οὐρώπων) and servants of the Logos—and transmitted by them to subsequent generations.⁶

If we exclude a suspect and most probably spurious passage from the fifth-century writer Theodore Anagnostes,⁷ the first text to mention St Luke as the portrayer of Christ and the Virgin is the treatise On the veneration of holy icons, traditionally attributed to St Andrew of Crete, written shortly before the beginning of the Iconoclastic Controversies and most likely drawing on older traditions which only came, however, to have an officially-accepted literary formulation in the eighth and ninth centuries.⁸ This text, in stressing how the holy personages’ earthly features had been preserved both in images and literature, combines a reference to the Evangelist’s paintings with the citation of a passage attributed to the first-century historian Joseph Flavius: ‘Of the Evangelist and Apostle Luke all his contemporaries said that with his own hands he painted both Christ the Incarnated himself and his purest Mother, and their images are preserved in Rome, so it is said, with great honour; and in Jerusalem they are exhibited with meticulous attention. Joseph the Jew, too, says, that this was what the Lord looked like when he was seen by the people: with eyebrows that met, fine eyes, a large and prominent face, and great stature, as he was clearly seen when he spoke to the people; and the same can be said as to the reproduction (εἰκόνωσις) of the Mother of God, which we see also today and somebody calls “the Roman”⁹.”
Later iconophile texts gave greater and greater emphasis to the evangelist’s role as the initiator of Christian icon-painting: since his work had, like written sources, documented the actual appearance of Christ and Mary in the sacred images, which had preserved their memory through generation after generation and had, therefore, to be included among the most venerable traditions of the Church, going back to the apostles themselves: πατριαρχηγὸν διδασκαλία (teachings passed on by the Fathers). Most of the authors seemed to associate the value of the portraits executed by the evangelist with his literary activity: Patriarch Germanos, in a homily quoted by the ninth-century chronicler George the Monk, spoke of ‘an image of the most pure and still-living Mother of God’, which St Luke painted and sent, as a gift, to the Roman citizen Theophilus, that is, the mysterious dedicatee of both the Gospel and the Acts. Details such as this were then expanded in subsequent texts, such as the Oration against Constantine V and Stephen the Deacon’s Life of St Stephen the Younger.

These passages clearly suggest that a functional equivalence, or better a complementary role, was attributed to both sacred portraits and Holy Scripture since they actually witnessed Christ’s historical truth. Undoubtedly this conceptual association was, as scholars have often recognized, partly lexical in origin: the sources of this period often employed the verb ἴστορεῖν (to tell, to relate; cf. ἴστορία, history) to describe the act of executing images, while the term ζωγραφία itself, composed by ζωή (living being) and γράφειν (act of writing), suggested an interpretation of painting as a ‘description’ of its subject. In eighth- and ninth-century texts concerning Luke’s works, however, the most significant clue lies in the frequent employment of the term ὁμοται (eyewitness), which explicitly alludes to a passage in the prologue of the Gospel (Luke 1:1-4), where the evangelist, probably inspired by Hellenistic historiography and also by medical literature (such as Dioscorides’ De materia medica), asserts the reliability of his narration on the grounds that the information was supplied by ὁμοται and ‘servants of the Logos’.

The care with which Luke describes the Saviour’s deeds and words from his birth onwards sufficed for him to be treated as an actual eyewitness of evangelical times, as the treatise On the veneration of holy icons and other texts repeated with some insistence (although the Nicaean fathers, during the iconophile Council of 787, avoided referring to him). This view based on the distinctive literary characteristics of Luke’s texts clashed with the relatively sparse and confused biographical information about him: Holy Scripture only tells us that he was a doctor (born in Antioch according to Eusebius of Caesarea) who followed the Apostle Paul when he travelled through Bithynia, Macedonia and Palestine and to Rome (AD 50-58), and Early Christian writers did not agree about his life and deeds. Although the third-century Codex Muratorianus asserted that Luke had never seen Christ, Epiphanius of Salamis made him one of the 70 or 72 apostles, and Gregory of Nazianzus,
followed by Symeon Metaphrastes and later authors, identified him with one of the pilgrims at Emmaus. Some traditions have it that after St Paul's death Luke was active in Boeotia and Achaia, where, according to Jerome, he had written his Gospel and the Acts; other texts, such as the Apostolic Constitutions, made reference to his journey to Egypt, where he had ordained the second Bishop of Alexandria. His death would have occurred when he was 84 years old, in Thebes of Boeotia (sometimes confused with Thebes of Egypt), whence Emperor Constantios (Constantine's son), translated his relics to the church of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople, in 357.\textsuperscript{14}

Once the Byzantine Church had, in response to the threat of Iconoclasm, accepted and legitimized the tradition concerning the archetypal icons executed by St Luke, authors asserted that, besides being a physician, the evangelist had also been a painter (\textgamma\gamma\epsilon\omicron\gamma\omicron\alpha\omicron\omicron\omicron\zeta). The twinning of these professions probably did not sound too odd to ninth-century people: both physicians and painters were artisans and worked with their hands, the former needing paintings and miniatures as a means of transmitting pharmaceutical knowledge and the latter, as R. Cormack has argued,\textsuperscript{15} needing to draw on medical literature because of their professional interest in colouring agents and other natural substances. Liturgical writers had absolutely no reservations about including in their texts explicit references to St Luke's training in the pictorial arts: the Menologion of Basil II, where we encounter his akolouthia of 18 October in its basic form, described him as 'a physician by trade and a painter',\textsuperscript{16} while the Synaxarion of the Constantinopolitan Church recorded that he had been 'a physician by trade and a great expert in the art of painting'.\textsuperscript{17}

In his own Menologion, summing up earlier texts, Symeon Metaphrastes worked out a more detailed account of St Luke's virtues and deeds, which constituted a model for all later authors. The evangelist's authoritativeness was established by pointing out the depth of his learning: educated in the best schools of Greece and Egypt, he had learnt Syrian and Hebrew, studied grammar, rhetoric and philosophy, mastered medicine and explored all the fields of ancient knowledge, before he heard of Christ's teachings and left his native town, Antioch, in order to join him in Palestine. As he had later become an actual eyewitness to the Resurrection of the Saviour at the Supper with him and Cleophas at Emmaus, he was introduced to the other apostles and started to preach throughout the desert-filled lands of the East, then he joined Paul in his journeys round the Mediterranean sea. The primary result of his activity and of his time spent with Christ's first disciples was the writing of the Gospel and the Acts, which so vividly described the mystery of the Incarnation; but, as Metaphrastes observed, he also deserved praise because 'by employing wax and colours [i.e. by encaustic technique], he first passed on, in the form of an icon honoured still today, the pattern (\textomicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron) of Christ's Incarnate nature, as well as the image of the woman who bore Him and gave him his Incarnate nature, for he thought that those would not be satisfied, who wished to see an image and pattern that was the fruit of great affection'.\textsuperscript{18}

The full and final characterization of St Luke as the first portrayer of the Incarnate Christ would only later result in the production of iconographic representations in which he was painting the Virgin and Child: though a miniature in an eleventh-century manuscript in Jerusalem (Greek Patriarchate, MS Taphou 14, fol. 106v), which represents the young skilled painter of the Narratio de rebus Persicis as a bearded man, may be reminiscent of an already widespread scheme, we encounter the first occurrences of this subject, both in Byzantine and Western traditions, only in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{19} On the other hand, the literary glorification of St Luke's pictorial practice stimulated the emergence of cult-icons worshipped as autograph works by the evangelist. It was not by chance that, in about the eleventh century, the first images attributed to him made their appearances almost simultaneously both in Constantinople and Rome (Pls 38 and 39), the two patriarchal sees, which were competing for supremacy while magnifying their own apostolic origins. Already in the eighth or ninth century the Armenian Church had managed to delineate its own distinct cult-space by working out the legend of the Hogenak Vank icon, which, although paraphrasing the traditions about St Luke, attributed the execution of the Virgin's portrait to another evangelist, St John; some time after, probably in the tenth century, a
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Georgian legend laid claim to evangelical roots for the local Church by speaking of an acheiropoietos icon made by the Virgin herself and donated by the Apostle Andrew to the village of Astkveri, on the Mtvari river.\textsuperscript{20}

In Constantinople, the attribution of the icon in the Hodegon monastery to St Luke (first recorded in an eleventh-century Latin text in Tarragona, Spain, which was based on a now lost Greek source) was probably the final outcome of its more and more intense involvement in imperial symbolism and ceremonies, which exalted this image as the palladium of the city and the basileis, and as one of the most precious relics of Christendom.\textsuperscript{21} In my view, it is likely that, apart from such other factors as the association of the monastery with the Greek Patriarchate of Antioch (the evangelist’s native town), its very renown as a miracle-working and prophetic image may have suggested Luke’s authorship, since it manifested the embodiment of the supernatural grace granted by the Virgin herself (according to the Letter of the Patriarch) to her first portraits. As the Hodegetria cult managed to provide the Christian Empire with a distinctive reminder of its apostolic roots and very soon came to attract the attention of Latin and Russian pilgrims, alternative traditions made their appearance in Rome, as we learn from texts composed before the Schism of 1054 concerning the ancient icons of Santa Maria in Tempulo and the Lateran Sancta Sanctorum. In virtue of the biographical data provided by the evangelist’s works, the Roman See could boast of Luke’s actual stay in the city during his journeys as a member of Paul’s entourage; the passage in the treatise attributed to St Andrew of Crete concerning the two icons painted by St Luke, which was preserved in the papal city and had been known to western culture from the mid-twelfth century onwards, provided, in the form of an assertion by the authoritative Church Father, John of Damascus, a solid argument for Rome’s claims to apostolic priority.\textsuperscript{22}

The Byzantines, however, had a quite different outlook. The evangelist had lived in their own domain, in the ancient Greek-speaking area of Achaia. He had probably been the first Bishop of Thebes, before dying at a great age: in his long stay in Greece he had most probably composed both the Gospel and the Acts, and had, similarly, brought the authentic portraits of the Virgin and Child there with him and executed further copies. Since Luke’s relic had been translated to Constantinople in early times, the capital’s most ancient and thaumaturgic icons, rescued from iconoclastic persecutions, could be regarded as autograph works by the evangelist; taking the Hodegetria as their own model, other sacred images, such as the Blachernitissa, the Virgin in the Chalkoprateia church, etc., were described by pilgrims as icons painted by St Luke.

Outside the imperial city, analogous attributions are mainly known from the Palaiologan period onwards, although even as early as the twelfth century an icon that was attributed to St Luke, being an exact reproduction of the Hodegetria, was venerated in the Palestinian Orthodox monastery of Our Lady of Kalamon on the River Jordan (the present-day Dair Hajla).\textsuperscript{23} As com-
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pared with the Holy Land, Greek centres had fewer opportunities for advancing historical grounds in demonstration of their lawful ab antiquo possession of original sacred portraits; nonetheless, the first claims made their appearance where connections with Luke's life were better documented. In the fourteenth century the monastery of Mega Spilaion near Kalavryta in Achaia, as we learn from a chrysobull of Emperor John Kantacuzenos (1341-1359), had gained widespread renown on account of an image whose attribution to the evangelist was probably made as a direct consequence of his stay in that area, where, according to Gregory of Nazianzus and Jerome, he had even written his Gospel. The icon (Pl. 40), which still survives today, is a rare object, probably dating from the eleventh century, on which the half-length Virgin and Child is executed in moulded wax painted in colour: its very unusualness may suggest that the veneration of the Megaspiliotissa was partly occasioned by a misunderstanding of Symeon Metaphrastes's and other authors' description of Luke's encaustic technique (ἐν κόχλοι και χρώματοι, by wax and colours).24

Significantly, a precious cult-image of this sort, which competed with the Hodegetria in renown, made its appearance in the monastery that was enlarged by the Despots of the Morea to celebrate the Frankish rulers' defeat in the Peloponnesse, so that there was to its veneration self-evidently a political aspect. In the same period, probably, although the first source dates from 1399,25 there was an analogous phenomenon in Latin-ruled Athens: exploiting in all likelihood an existing tradition, the Frankish, Catalan and, later, Florentine dukes, had promoted the public worship of an ancient icon, attributed to the evangelist, in a side-chapel of the city's cathedral, that is the Parthenon, rededicated to the Virgin of Athens. According to subsequently documented traditions concerning the Panagia Soumela — the palladium of the Greek Empire of Trebizond in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries26 —, the Atheniotissa had been painted by St Luke during his stay in Thebes, whence it had been transferred to Athens in the fourth century. Similarly, the 'political' promotion of St Luke's icons in public worship was, from the Late Middle Ages on, one of the hallmarks of Russian cults, where legends describing their transfer from the Byzantine East are frequently disguised the tsars' awareness of the historic legacy of Constantine's Empire.27

Especially after the Fall of Constantinople and the destruction of the Hodegetria by Mehmet II's janissaries in 1453, a great many images all over the Christian world attempted to equal it in renown and even to claim identity with it: the emergence of cults such as those of the Madonna di Costantinopoli in Italy or the Konstantinopel'skaja in Russia may well illustrate such a process; even in Ottoman Constantinople, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Dominican church of Pera claimed to have preserved in it the ancient city palladium.28 Attributions to the evangelist became, step by step, more widespread and can still be encountered as far away as Ethiopia and even among Malabar Christians in southern India.

On the other hand, however, the increasing number of 'originals' by St Luke soon made it evident that there was a need for a new reading of the ancient traditions concerning his activity as a painter. As early as the Late Middle Ages some traditions clearly stated that only three icons were true-to-life portraits approved and blessed by the Virgin herself, and that these should be distinguished, because of their greater preciousness, from those painted by St Luke after Mary's Metastasis. In the fourteenth century, the 'Egyptian Virgin' in the Greek quarter of Attalia (in Turkish-ruled Pamphilia) was praised as the first of these, the others being the Hodegetria and an icon in Rome;29 afterwards, however, analogous claims were made in relation to different famous cult-images.

When, in 1422, the Cypriot hieromonk, Gregory of Kykkos, wrote the narrative concerning the miraculous icon preserved in his monastery — the famous Kykkotissa — he managed to link together former traditions of the Greek Orthodox world.30 In his curious telling of it, the Virgin Mary, acknowledging Luke's wonderful talent, asked him for a portrait that was to be transmitted to subsequent generations; having received a fine panel from the angel Gabriel, the evangelist reproduces her in the Hagiosoritissa scheme, but the Virgin Mary does not approve it, as she wants the Christians to see her as a mother. Luke goes back to the angel and receives two pan-
els ‘not cut by human hands’, where he reproduces the Theotokos first as the aristerokratous (with a Crucifixion on the back face), then as a dexiokratous. Mary welcomes them with joy and invokes God’s grace on them: ‘The grace of my Son be with you! And if anyone will honour these icons as much as Myself, he will have both spiritual and material salvation: in fact, I transfer to these sacred images the grace I received from my Son’.

Some years later, Luke moves to Egypt, where he starts living as a monk. From there he sends the first icon to Attalia as a gift. The second one was later rediscovered by Constantine and transferred to Constantinople into the Hodegon monastery, while the third one was donated to Athens as a reward for the great scholars who lived there. In short, Gregory excluded Rome from the holy places which preserved icons by St Luke, while attaching great importance to the three most famous icons in the Greek Orthodox world: the Hodegetria, the Atheniotissa, and the Egyptian. But what about his own icon, the Virgin of Kykkos? He inferred that, as a monk, the evangelist continued to paint a great number of Marian images, so giving birth to the Christian practice of icon-painting.

This great number was later estimated to be 70 or 72, being equivalent to that of the apostles after Christ’s Ascension. In Ottoman-ruled Greek lands, several monasteries claimed to preserve such minor manifestations of Luke’s devout art: for example, those of Proussos in Evrytania (Pl. 41), Iviron (Pl. 42), Philotheou (Pl. 43), and Chilandari on Mt Athos, Machairas, Chrysorhogiatissa, Trodotissa, and the Chrysaliniotissa of Nicosia in Cyprus (Pl. 44), etc. As monastic institutions became real strongholds both of Orthodox worship and Greek language and culture, the frequent attribution of sacred icons to St Luke constituted a devotional topos, strengthening the inner cohesion of local communities; as miracle-working objects, they protected their believers from a hostile world, whilst their very ancientness itself asserted their possessors’ uninterrupted observance of the traditions inherited from their Byzantine past. The devotion of common people to such icons was so strong that Moslem individuals living in their communities also got into the habit of honouring them—which was interpreted as a further demonstration of their great spiritual value. Greek folklore has sometimes preserved local variants of St Luke’s legend: in Naxos, for instance, it is said that the evangelist painted 72 icons—36 reproducing the Virgin and Child and 36 the Mother of God alone—blessed as works transmitting God’s grace. The numerological value of the number three is here adjusted to the islanders’ perspective: the most venerated icons of Naxos—the Glykophiloisa, the Ayia, and the Argokoliotissa—are attributed to St Luke, the last one being praised as a gift of the Theotokos herself to the island.31

It is worth noting that the Greek War of Independence in 1821 did not interrupt this process. On the contrary, there was a burgeoning of new shrines, which, not infrequently, were embellished by icons attributed to the evangelist. In those same years, after the visions seen by the holy nun, Pelagia, the inhabitants of Tinos celebrated the excavation of an Early Byzantine building and the subsequent discovery of an ancient icon reproducing the Annunciation. This event was welcomed as a miracle by everyone in newly independent Greece and the Greek diaspora: a sumptuous shrine was erected on the site and the sacred image, which soon manifested its thaumaturgic powers by protecting an English ship during a terrible storm, came to be viewed as an autograph by St Luke, and even as one of the three true-to-life portraits of the Virgin Mary.32

Ancientness, thaumaturgic qualities, powerful associations with communal and cultural (or, broadly speaking, ‘political’) symbols, may be considered to be frequent features of the sacred icons that, according to local traditions, were painted by the evangelist’s skilled and God-inspired hand. Such traditions are so deeply rooted in the cultural history of Orthodox Greeks that they are still alive today among believers, even though ecclesiastical writers may sometimes be dubious of the truthfulness of some attributions. In any case, we can undoubtedly share the sentiments expressed in the following words by the nineteenth-century abbot, Kyrillos Kastanophylis, when he was writing about the history of the sacred icon venerated in the monastery of Proussos: ‘Does it matter, however, if it is not certain that the Proussiotissa icon is one of those painted
by the Apostle? Were these the only ones to receive grace? Besides, we see so many others, which are not the work of the Evangelist Luke, but which perform miracles. And then, even if this icon is not one of those the Apostle Luke painted, that should not concern us, since it lessens neither our faith nor our reverence for Her."

1 The title of this essay repeats that of my monograph Bacci 1998. I provide here a summary of it, although focusing more specifically on the history of St Luke’s images in the Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Greek-speaking world. References will be restricted to few essential works; a more complete bibliography will be found in the aforementioned book.
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