Durham E-Theses

The ascending prayer to Christ: theodore Stoudite's defence of the Christ-ikwv against ninth century iconoclasm

Thorne, Gary Wayne Alfred

Author's Name: Gary Wayne Alfred Thorne

Thesis Title: The Ascending Prayer to Christ: Theodore Stoudite's defence of
the Christ-εἰκών against ninth century iconoclasm

Degree: PhD

Year: 2003

Abstract

Theodore Stoudite (759-826) was at the centre of a revival of patristic learning which equipped him to apply the weight of the Christian tradition to the Byzantine image controversy of the eighth and ninth centuries. In this recovery of the tradition Theodore discovered how the epistemological and ontological demands of both radical divine transcendence and divine active agency in the creative order are met in the incarnate Christ. He concluded that the liturgical expression of this developed theology requires the presence of the Christ-εἰκών.

The structure of this thesis reflects the single argument of the three-part Ἀντιρρητικοὶ κατὰ εἰκονομάχων (c. 816). *Antirr* I and II describe the content of the 754 and 787 Councils, revealing the causes of the theological impasse which prevented the resolution of the controversy. In *Antirr* I and II Theodore also establishes the ground for his argument in *Antirr* III by distancing the eighth century Christ-εἰκών from its function in former centuries as symbol, pure narrative painting and relic. Theodore defines its contemporary function as liturgical, devotional and doctrinal in character. Written in response to the 815 Council, *Antirr* III is Theodore's apology for this Christ-εἰκών as a legitimate object of προσκύνησις. The argument is established within the parameters of the tradition as Theodore carefully defends the circumscribability of Christ in accordance with Chalcedonian Christology.

My analysis of the *Antirr*, assisted by a reading of his letters, reveals that Theodore understands the Christ-εἰκών as playing a key role both in the ascetic struggle to free the mind from λογισμοί (distracting thoughts), and in the practice of θεωρία (contemplation) within the Liturgy. The liturgical, doctrinal and devotional Christ-εἰκών has become a revealed and formal means by which the worshipper receives a Dionysian ἀναγωγή (spiritual uplifting) to the divine presence.

The Ascending Prayer to Christ:
Theodore Stoudite's defence of the Christ-εἰκών
against ninth century iconoclasm

Gary Wayne Alfred Thorne

PhD Thesis
University of Durham
Department of Theology
2003

1 2 DEC 2003

Declaration

No part of the material offered in this thesis previously has been submitted for a degree in this or in any other university.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. Quotation and information derived from this thesis should be acknowledged.

This thesis does not exceed the maximum length allowable by the university.

Contents

Preface and Acknowledgments

Almost four decades ago I entered university as a child of the sixties, seeking pure form and beauty in a study of mathematics. Youthful impatience quickly turned my head in the direction of the Philosophy Department of Acadia University, Wolfville, Nova Scotia, where I was able to speak the language of the soul more immediately. I acknowledge the care and nurture of Professor Cornelius Kampe who first engaged me in philosophical thinking. My reading of Husserl and the development of his phenomenological method was the beginning of a reflection which has resulted in this thesis, indebted to that phenomenological bias towards 'seeing' and Husserl's *Vorstellen.* It was also at Acadia University that Dr. Roger Forsman introduced me to the thought of Austin Farrer which convinced me that an ancient metaphysics (Aristotle in this case) was not ancient at all.

This thesis was written while rector of a demanding inner-city congregation noted for its social outreach programmes, in Halifax, Nova Scotia. The beauty of the ancient liturgy (sung by one of the finest choirs in Eastern Canada) in an elegant building of international architectural significance, situated in an extreme economically and socially disadvantaged neighbourhood, urged me to attend urgently to the question of image and prototype. What role does the visible have in the shaping of the soul? How is contemplation of the divine assisted through external form? I am deeply grateful to the Parish of Saint George's for encouraging me to begin these studies five years ago, and for its prayerful support along the way. Only a congregation with an active prayer life and living within the tradition of the Church would be able to understand these studies as consonant with the obligations of my priesthood and as contributing to my pastoral ministry to them. My prayer is that this congregation will continue to give itself to the ascetic struggle and that their contemplation in the liturgy will lead not a few, but many, to ἡ θεοπτία.

I also acknowledge the support of the Chaplain General's Office, Canadian Armed Forces who recognized these studies as part of my continuing education as Military Chaplain. I am particularly indebted to two senior officers who especially encouraged me both

professionally and personally: Col Karl McLean, Senior Army Chaplain, Canadian Forces, and LCol Don Peterson, Chief of Staff, 36 Canadian Brigade Group.

The academic community which has gathered at Durham in recent years to study patristic spirituality, Byzantine ecclesiology and Orthodox theology, supported me in every way possible. Though my parish responsibilities allowed only infrequent visits to Durham, the remarkably humble, scholarly, liturgical and caring character of that predominantly Orthodox community taught me much more about divine contemplation than this thesis begins to indicate. These individuals include Father Andrey Kordochkin, The Reverend Dr. Adam Cooper, Dr. Augustine Cassiday and Serhii Hovorun. Mika Töronen, of the Saint John the Baptist Orthodox Monastery, Essex, began his doctoral studies at the same time as my arrival in Durham. I am more indebted to his care, kindness and patience with me than words can express. Such things are eternally written on my soul.

A simple alphabetical listing of the names of those who significantly encouraged me along the way or more directly contributed to this thesis is demeaning to them yet illustrative of how much I am indebted to others for every word of this work. Yet their names belong here. Colleagues, advisors, mentors, referees, readers and friends will know the unique ways they have made this small work possible and why their names appear here: Ann Ankers, Stephen Blackwood, Steven Burns, Jan Connors, Barry Craig, Robert Crouse, Paige Davidson, Paul Friesen, Dick Gallagher, Wayne Hankey, Susan Harris, Angus Johnston, Renata Kartsonis, Peter Kussmaul, Sarah and Marcus, Mary MacLachlan, Garth MacPhee, Jim McCorriston, David Olding, Margaret Parkinson, Chris Purcell, Neil Robertson, Henry Roper, Christopher Snook, and George Westhaver. Elaine MacInnis and Susan Cannon, librarians at the University of King's College, Halifax, successfully processed my hundreds of requests for inter-library loans patiently and without complaint.

Professor Andrew Louth has guided me every step along the way. His gentle yet exacting manner demonstrates how the throughly rigorous and demanding scholarship of an

inspired teacher is nothing other than the art of the cure of souls. This thesis in no way begins to reflect the enormity of Professor Louth's understanding of its subject matter. I give thanks for the opportunity of sitting at his feet these five years.

Finally, I pray for the soul of my mother who fell asleep in Jesus mid-way through my doctoral studies, and who promised to intercede for me in God's nearer presence. And I pray for the soul of my father who fell asleep in Jesus five weeks later, but who did not have to make such a promise since he lived in God's presence here on earth and whose constant intercession for his son simply continues on another shore.

In full knowledge of how small an offering this thesis is against the sacrifices they have made to allow me to write it, I dedicate this thesis lovingly to my son Andrew, my daughter Chelsea and to my wife Sandra. Their greater love is my blessing and strength.

List of Abbreviations

Works by Theodore primarily cited.

Antirr	Ἀντιρρητικοὶ κατὰ εἰκονομάχων, Migne *PG* 99.328-436
Antirr I	Migne *PG* 99.328-352
Antirr II	Migne *PG* 99.352-388
Antirr III	Migne *PG* 99.389-436
Fatouros	*Theodori Studitae Epistulae*
MC	*Magna Catechesis*
PC	*Parva Catechesis*

Works related to Theodore's life.

Vita A	*Vita Theodori Studitae A.* Migne *PG* 99.113-232
Vita B	*Vita Theodori Studitae B.* Migne *PG* 99.233-328

Other

BMGS	*Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*
BZ	*Byzantinische Zeitschrift*
CUP	Cambridge University Press
CH	*Celestial Hierarchy*
DOM	*De Opificio Mundi* (Philo)
DOP	*Dumbarton Oaks Papers*
EH	*Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* (Denys the Areopagite)
Ep.	Epistle
GOTR	*The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*
Iconoclasm	*Iconoclasm: Ninth Spring Symposium*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
Laudatio Platonis	*Laudatio Sancti Platonis Hegumeni* (Migne *PG* 99.804-49)
Mansi	*Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*
MGH	*Monumenta Germaniae Historica*
NPB	*Nova Patrum Bibliotheca* (A. Mai)
Nicée II	*Nicée II, 787-1987. Douze siècles d'images religieuses*
OCA	*Orientalia Christiana Analecta*
OCP	*Orientalia Christiana Periodica*
OUP	Oxford University Press

PG	*Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca.*
PL	*Patrologiae cursus completus. Series latina.*
QE	*Quaestiones et Solutiones in Exodum* (Philo)
QG	*Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesin* (Philo)
SC	Sources Chrétiennes
SP	*Studia Patristica*

INTRODUCTION

The Project

In his Bampton Lectures for 1948,[1] Father Austin Farrer gave preliminary indications of the possibility of a Christian discourse of images which would be both adequate to the mystery of the Incarnation and alive to the rigors of the epistemological and ontological demands of philosophy. He suggested that every effort to explain a reality behind the image, ultimately is nothing other than a quest to explain the reality of the image itself:

> ... in the case of supernatural divine revelation, nothing but the image is given to us as an indication of the reality. We cannot appeal from the images to the reality, for by hypothesis we have not got the reality, except in the form of that which the images signify.[2]

> The images are supernaturally formed, and supernaturally made intelligible to faith. Faith discerns not the images, but what the images signify: and yet we cannot discern it except *through* the images. We cannot by-pass the images to seize an imageless truth.[3]

Farrer's comments were meant to apply equally to natural (rational) and supernatural (revealed) images. 'Rational analogies are,' he says 'by contrast [with revealed], natural, but in being natural they come no nearer to being adequate.'[4] Rather,

---

[1] Farrer (1948).
[2] Farrer (1948), 58.
[3] Farrer (1948), 110.
[4] Farrer (1948), 95.

neither in revelation nor in rational theology can we point away from the image to that which the image signifies: in both we must be content to refer to the reality by understanding what the image tells us.[5]

In those Bampton Lectures, Farrer introduced a notion of 'apprehension' which has a crucial epistemological role to play in grasping divine activity and presence in and through the image.[6] And in his subsequent philosophical works Farrer was keenly aware of the limits imposed by such an epistemology as he continued to investigate the implications of this view that:

for our minds, a curtain hangs between the divine agency and its effect in us. We may be directly aware of the supernatural in the form of our own supernatural act: but we are not in the same way aware of the divine agency effecting it in us. Though the divine agent be nearer to our act than the fleshly body our act indwells, a subtle veil secludes him, of no thickness, yet impenetrably dark. Were it to rend, that would be the Day of Judgment, for we should see our Creator.[7]

Unfortunately, however, in his later works Farrer did not develop directly these wonderfully promising possibilities of an epistemology and ontology of the image, both natural and revealed. But he did leave sufficient clues to inspire others (like myself) to continue to seek such a science or logic of images. For example, to say that in the end we are left with images interpreting other images is not a problem for Farrer, for he defines theological activity as the discernment of the interrelatedness of a hierarchy of images by

---

[5] Farrer (1948), 94.
[6] Cf. Forsman (1983).
[7] Farrer (1948), 60.

2

which 'the principal images provide a canon to the lesser images'. Farrer cites an example of this theological activity in John's Gospel where the image of Christ as Judge of the world is a master image:

> The reduction of the lesser images to terms of the greater is a theological activity. ... If men are judged by seeing the face of God, they are judged, and their judgment is an additional truth to the truth of the vision, though now subordinated to it. St. John is not reducing everything to a confused simplicity. The images which he 'reduces' to terms of others no more disappear or lose their force, than do the whole body of images, when we remember that they are no more than images, and so reduce them to one ineffable simplicity of God's saving love. All is denied, and all is affirmed ...[8]

The 'subtle veil ... of no thickness, yet impenetrably dark' always remains for us in this life, even in the great image of the Incarnation. For Farrer, the chief image of the Christian faith is the cross (as it was, we shall see, for the iconoclasts in seventh and eighth century Byzantium), but for the iconophiles of that period, it was the devotional εἰκών of Christ himself. Regardless, Farrer's description of this central image of the Incarnation equally applies. Although the Incarnation fully reveals God's love for us in the Person of Jesus Christ, we know this only by faith,

> ... and therefore the veil remains. All we have to say is that the veil, however impenetrable, is not blank. It is painted with the image of God, and God himself painted it, and made it indelible with his blood, when he was nailed to it for us men and for our salvation. We know him through the image, and by faith.[9]

---

[8] Farrer (1948), 111.
[9] Farrer (1948), 61.

Farrer's language here initially suggests that he might well have something significant to contribute to the understanding of the Byzantine image controversy. The notions that the divine is 'apprehended' through and in the image, the inter-relatedness of supernatural images, and that scriptural exegesis and orthodox doctrine has to do with the proper ordering and establishment of a hierarchy of images, seem immediately to correspond to the concerns of the eighth and ninth century controversy. Generally speaking, however, this thesis would prove disappointing because Farrer's concern is with all types of images, and especially literary images. Rather, I have sketched Farrer's theory of images of his Bampton Lectures to help explain my approach to Theodore Stoudite in this dissertation. That is, I did not turn to a study of Theodore Stoudite in order to appreciate the devotional use of the icon by Eastern Christians, but to discover the epistemological and ontological grounds for the ultimate iconophile apology for the image, as they might be relevant to the general question of whether a science or logic of images is possible. Indeed, such an investigation might suggest images are the only object of our thought and the science of images is the only science possible.

Finally, the 1948 Bampton Lectures have led me to this study of the Byzantine image via a study of Philo[10] in which I sought to find an interpretative key or rational method which was employed by one of the most renowned allegorizers within the Platonic and Aristotelian tradition. On the one hand, the images of Scripture in Philo appear to be interpreted without regard for their literal or objective meaning, and thus Philo's exegesis seems a perfect example of the 'imaginative' allegorical approach to

---

[10] Thorne (1989).

Scripture which occasioned the disdain of twentieth century Biblical scholars.[11]
Goodenough writes of Philo's allegorical approach:

> ... the Biblical text is often, as Cohn[12] says, dismissed as ridiculous and absurd in its
> literal sense, and becomes a springboard up into psychology, politics, mysticism,
> ethics, metaphysics, theories of education, and a dozen other subjects which appear
> at first to be stirred together with a spoon.[13]

On the other hand, the eclectic Philo was also the transmitter of Pythagorean, Stoic, Platonic and Aristotelian thought to the Middle Platonist school which developed fully only a century or so after his death. So much does Philo take up this tradition that it has been suggested that Philo was not a serious exegete of Scripture at all, but that his intention simply was to present Greek philosophical ideas under the guise of a commentary to show that the Jewish faith contains the most profound Greek thought. Regardless, Philo certainly is thoroughly representative of the same ancient Greek philosophical tradition within which Farrer himself had looked to discover a metaphysics of causality and participation adequate to a theology of divine agency in the world. Given Philo's philosophical commitments, it seemed reasonable to expect a logic and coherence to his allegorical interpretation. Yet this was consistently denied by scholars, at least before the last quarter of the twentieth century.[14]

Fortunately, my search for the philosophical grounding of a logic of images in Philo was rewarded by the discovery of a single argument throughout the voluminous

---

[11] See Louth (1983), 96-131.
[12] L.Cohn was the editor with P. Wendland of the Greek text of Philo in six volumes, Berlin 1896-1915.
[13] Goodenough (1940), 56.
[14] See Thorne (1989).

Philonic commentary. I identified a continuous, sustained argument, highly structured and balanced, beginning with *De Opificio Mundi* (hereafter *DOM*), through the various individual treatises of The Exposition and The Allegory, and concluding with *Quaestiones in Genesin* (hereafter *QG*) and *Quaestiones in Exodum* (hereafter *QE*). The *DOM* establishes the philosophical principles which are systematically developed throughout the commentary. God is utterly transcendent, one and eternal, but he is active in the sensible creation via the mediation of the intelligible order:

> For God, being God, assumed that a beautiful copy would never be produced apart from a beautiful pattern, and that no object of perception would be faultless which was not made in the likeness of an original discerned only by the intellect. So when he willed to create this visible world he first fully formed the intelligible world [τὸν νοητόν] in order that he might have the use of a pattern wholly God-like and incorporeal in producing the material world as a later creation, the very image of an earlier, to embrace in itself objects of perception of as many kinds as the other contained objects of intelligence [νοητά].[15]

> ... universal Nature ... brings forth no finished product in the world of sense without using an incorporeal pattern [ἥτις ἄνευ ἀσωμάτου παραδείγματος οὐδὲν τελεσιουργεῖ τῶν ἐν αἰσθήσει].[16]

Thus the argument begins with the description of the 'master image', so to speak, which for Philo is that of the creation in the first three chapters of Genesis. Here is described how the causes of the intelligible reside in an undivided first cause, how the intelligible

---

[15] *DOM*, 16.
[16] *DOM* 130.

world serves as the model for the sensible, and how man must come to know his principle and Creator through the mediation of the Logos - the likeness of God himself which is nothing other than Divine Reason or the Word of God. The account of the fall of the human soul begins a comprehensive presentation of an anthropology, psychology and epistemology which ultimately shows how man can prepare himself through the purification of the senses and repentance, for the longed for union with God.[17] This ecstatic vision, however, leaves the senses and understanding behind as the soul sees the intelligible directly. Seeing and understanding become dull because the divine vision is not an activity of the soul, but a passivity which allows God to enter it and reveal Himself to it. Thus the soul only attains its true freedom when it is released from the body and returns to God in this ecstatic experience.[18] There can be no logical progression from the discrete and sensible to the universal and intelligible. Logic has only one starting point:

> In the same way God too is His own brightness and is discerned through Himself alone, without anything co-operating or being able to co-operate in giving a perfect apprehension of his existence. They do but make a happy guess, who are at pains to discern the Uncreated, and Creator of all from his creation, and are on the same footing as those who try to trace the nature of the Monad from the dyad, and whereas observation of the dyad should begin with the Monad which is the starting point. The seekers for truth are those who envisage God through God, light through light.[19]

---

[17] *QG* III.9. Quotations from *Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesin et Exodum* are from *Philo. Supplement I & II*, London: William Heinemann Ltd., and Cambridge Mass., Harvard University Press, 1961. The translation from the Armenian version of the original Greek is by R. Marcus.
[18] *QG* III.10: 'inasmuch as the mind is released from its evil bond, the body'.
[19] *De Praemiis et Poenis* 41, 42, 43.

In the last stage of his overall argument *QE* II, 52-123, Philo comments: 'That every sense-perceptible likeness has (as) its origin an intelligible pattern in nature, (Scripture) has declared in many other passages as well as in the present one.' He then describes Moses' ascent into the dense and thick cloud as teaching that the intelligible things cannot be seen directly by corporeal eyes, but rather:

> ... because the multi-symbolism of intelligible things is described through the clear vision of the eyes, (namely) how one who learns by seeing rather figuratively can, by attributing certain forms to certain symbols, achieve a correct apprehension of them.[20]

The notion of 'apprehension' reappears here, as in Farrer, but this time as the means whereby only those who have been given a vision of the divine are subsequently able to perceive the intelligible in the sensible image. The closing paragraphs of the argument describe the ability of the most particular sense-perceptible object (ἡ βραχυτάτη σφραγίς) to reflect and reveal the intelligible world of forms and ideas. Philo is commenting on Exodus 28.32b (LXX, καὶ ἐκτυπώσεις ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτύπωμα σφραγῖδος ἁγίασμα κυρίου, rendered by Philo as translated by Marcus from the Armenian version of *QE* 122 as 'Thou shalt express in it the expression of a seal-impression, "Holiness to the Lord." '):

> It pleases him that the incorporeal and intelligible substance should be unimpressed by itself and without shape but be formed and shaped by a seal-impression by the

---

[20] *QE* II 52.

Logos of the eternally Existent One. Excellently, therefore, has he represented the seal-impression as an 'impression', for there are expressed in them in part the forms which the patterns had.[21]

For this reason (the leaf) was in the front of the principal and sovereign (part) of the soul, to which the mind and the reason have been allotted, that the leaf was placed (as) a symbol of intelligible substance (and as) a likeness of the divine Logos and (as) an expressed seal-impression, (namely), the form of forms.[22]

In *De Migratione Abrahami* Philo commented on this verse as follows: 'The signet ... is the original principle behind all principles, after which God shaped or formed the universe, incorporeal, we know, and discerned by the intellect alone. (ἡ σφραγὶς ἰδέα ἐστὶν ἰδεῶν, καθ' ἣν ὁ θεὸς ἐτύπωσε τὸν κόσμον, ἀσώματος δήπου καὶ νοητή.)'[23] Thus the intelligible world is the impression stamped by the ἰδέα ἰδεῶν.

The sustained rigorous argument of the Philonic commentary betrays the limits of a logic of a downward series of emanations from the transcendent Monad to the Logos, to his two powers - creative power (called 'God') and royal power (called 'Lord'), then to the lesser propitious and legislative powers, before finally the world of intelligible ideas is created. This scheme allows a providence which protects the Monad from any taint of the finite, discrete and sensible world since the intelligible provides formal and final causes for the sensible realm, but not the efficient cause. Thus the sensible is seen to be an imitation of the intelligible but such that the correspondence can never be inferred from the sensible

---

[21] *QE* II.122.
[22] *QE* II.124. *Ibid.*
[23] *De Migratione Abrahami, Philo IV*, trans. F. Colson and G. Whitaker, London and Cambridge, Mass., (1958), 190, 191.

image itself. Prior knowledge of the intelligible is required to perceive the true meaning of the image and its proper relation to other images.

Philo's ontology and metaphysics is clearly inadequate to any quest for a science and logical hierarchy of images. For him, apprehension of the supernatural is not possible in and through the image itself. Further, Farrer's ongoing philosophical search for a metaphysics which explains the co-existence of several orders of efficient cause in the same action is denied, and thus the notion of a providence of divine agency in the created order is dissolved. Human and divine will cannot be seen to co-inhere in any eventuality. The divine can only be known when the finite images are left behind. Finally, the mediating Logos is imaged only in man's reasoning soul as it discovers itself and its maker in the sacred scriptures and in his contemplation of the rational movements of the heavens, and then attempts to become like its maker through the exercise of reason.

In our present investigation we leap to the end of the Patristic age to continue our search for a science or logic of images. In Theodore Stoudite (759-826) we expect not to discover a burgeoning fresh theology, but the ingathering and synthesis of the fruits of seven centuries of reflection upon another type of Logos (or at least the Logos embedded in the sensible as individual ὑπόστασις), the Person of Jesus Christ. In the meantime, Philo's logic has been developed and refined first by the Middle Platonists (beginning just one hundred years after Philo), and then by the Neoplatonists who continue to seek an epistemology and ontology which is adequate both to divine ineffability and finite images. This developing tradition is incorporated into, and sometimes part of, the Christian attempt to understand the implications of the Incarnate Word and can be observed clearly in the Oecumenical Councils' progressive definitions of the Person of Christ. All this

theological reflection reaches its definitive conclusion in Chalcedon (451AD) followed by the subsequent clarification of the two natures, two wills and two energies, in the following two centuries. By this time, the Church proclaims confidently that the epistemological and ontological demands of both radical divine transcendence and divine active agency in the creative order are met in the Incarnate Christ.

But even more than this, we turn to Theodore Stoudite because he attempts to apply the fulness of this theology precisely to the question of finite visible images, and particularly to the Christ εἰκών. An important aspect of my argument will be to describe this Christ εἰκών which is the subject of Theodore's apology. In the course of the argument it will become clear that this Christ εἰκών must be distinguished from symbol, pure narrative painting, and relic. Rather, the Christ-εἰκών uniquely follows from the fact of the Incarnation and its place and function within the Christian οἰκονομία is defined by its liturgical, devotional and doctrinal character. Taking up the riches of seven centuries of Christian thought, with this Christ-εἰκών before him, Theodore will address the same questions as Farrer and Philo with their attendant epistemological and ontological demands. Theodore will attempt to show (1) how the finite Christ-εἰκών is the imprint of the Incarnate and Risen Christ, (2) how the supernatural (intelligible) divine prototype is 'apprehended' through and in the finite Christ-εἰκών, and (3) how the offering of προσκύνησις through and in the Christ-εἰκών is received directly by Christ and becomes the giving of λατρεία to the Triune God. Finally, just as all of creation finds its source, unity and consummation in Christ, we shall discover if Theodore demonstrates how the Christ-εἰκών is Farrer's 'master image' which provides the interpretative key to the inter-relatedness and hierarchy of all finite images. I shall return to these themes in my

conclusion.

The Abbot Theodore

The argument of this thesis leaves little opportunity to give the reader an impression of the political and religious environment of Theodore's life before 815AD, the year of the second iconoclast Council which prompted the writing of the *Antirrheticus,* yet this background is crucial to an appreciation of his part in that theological crisis. The first evidence we have of Theodore's entering the image debate is in a letter to his uncle and spiritual father Plato (c. 810AD), but it was five years or so later (815) that all aspects of his life would be dominated by this controversy. At that time, he had already reached the age of fifty-five. The following brief survey of his times and life to 815 will provide the context for my consideration of the theological focus of his latter years.

The Constantinople in which Theodore was born in 759 was still the 'Queen' city of the Roman Empire, but of an ever decreasing and smaller Empire, constantly at risk both internally and externally.[24] Its buildings continued to show damage from the earthquake of 740, and its population had been significantly diminished by the great plague which followed within the decade. Nonetheless, Constantinople remained the centre of culture. Here was the seat of the emperor, the patriarch, the central bureaucracy and the army.

The seventh century had seen the Persian Empire collapse before the Arabs and the Byzantine Empire lose its eastern provinces. As the eighth century began, three of the historic five oecumenical patriarchships (Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria) were in Islamic

---

[24] These general comments about the political and religious situation in Constantinople 700-780 are uncontroversial and to be found in any modern history of Byzantium.

12

control. The emperor at the time of Theodore's birth in 759 was Constantine V (741-775)

who was generally successful in his ongoing resistance to his foes, including the constant

Bulgar attempts to overcome Thrace and the north Balkans. However, during his time

central and northern Italy, including Rome, were lost to the Lombards. This was

significant for the growing separation of Byzantium and the West which would climax in

the crowning of Charlemagne as emperor by Pope Leo III in 800. All in all, the entire

century had been one of struggle but not disastrous defeat. Constantine V's father,

Emperor Leo III, had begun the century by turning back the Arabs from the walls of

Constantinople. This was the second major Arab assault on Constantinople in fifty years,

and Leo's victory contributed to the decline of the Umayyad dynasty. Both Leo and

Constantine were constantly engaged with the Arabs in Asia Minor. With Leo III and

Constantine V began the line of Isaurians who were to prove themselves to be careful and

able administrators of the remaining Empire which they inherited. Their double success in

military and domestic matters also encouraged the general acceptance of their strong

iconoclastic religious views.

At Theodore's birth, iconoclasm had been the official policy of the empire for

more than thirty years. Leo III had issued his first edict against images around 726. When

Constantine V (741-775) succeeded his father, he intensified the efforts to enforce

iconoclasm.[25] His theological 'Inquiries' ($Πεύσεις$)[26] gives the entire image debate a new

Christological focus from which it would never turn back. He called an oecumenical

council in 754AD (hereafter '754 Council') attended by three hundred and thirty-eight

bishops which took up his Christological themes and concluded by forbidding the

---

[25] The debate about the reasons for this imperial adherence to iconoclasm does not concern us here.
[26] These fragments are preserved by the Patriarch Nicephorus and found throughout his *Antirr* I and II. (Migne *PG* 100.206-373).

production, erection or concealment of images. It pronounced the offering of προσκύνησις

to images to be idolatrous and prescribed punishment for the violation of these decrees.[27]

Leo IV (775-780) at first showed significant relaxation of iconoclastic policies, but a

palace intrigue[28] involving the smuggling of icons into the private quarters of his iconophile

wife Irene made him repent of his toleration. One of those implicated in the deed was

Theophanes who died during his punishment (the iconophiles involved had been flogged,

tonsured against their wishes, paraded in chains and briefly imprisoned) and immediately

became one of the few iconophile martyrs. Just over a decade earlier, near the end of his

reign, Constantine had provided the Church with the first and most notable iconophile

martyr in Stephen the Younger in 765. (Theodore was six years old.) A later *Vita* of

Stephen written in 808 was to become the model for iconophile hagiography.

Constantine V was also intolerant of monasticism, although there is no necessary

link between iconoclasm and anti-monasticism through these centuries. In the case of

Constantine V, however, Theophanes describes an intensifying persecution of both

monks and iconophiles as his reign continued.[29] The growth of his army was largely

funded from the confiscation of iconophile monasteries, and the knowledge of this fact

might have led to the extreme anti-monastic stance of the army during his reign. Leo IV

(775-780) discontinued the persecution of the monasteries and appointed several monks

as bishops.[30] On the other hand, he prevented prominent men from leaving the service of

the state and entering the monastic life. We have commented above how he used the threat

of being publicly tonsured and sent off to a monastery as a form of punishment. Many

---

[27] Mansi XIII. 328BC.
[28] For this account I follow Treadgold (1988), 5,6.
[29] Cf. Theophanes, 437-38, 446.
[30] Theophanes, 449.

theories abound which attempt to establish the link between imperial iconoclasm and the anti-monastic policies of these emperors.

Such was the temper of the times into which Theodore was born. Byzantium was officially both iconoclast and antimonastic. Nonetheless, his family was a wealthy, influential and well-connected Christian iconophile and pro-monastic family.[31] Theodore would grow up alongside the most influential families of Constantinople (his cousin on his mother's side would become the second wife of Constantine VI) and his own family was powerful enough to oppose quietly the official iconoclast and anti-monastic views. (At the time of Theodore's birth, his uncle Plato was heading off to Bithynia to become tonsured and enter the Symbols Monastery.) Of his father we know only that he held a post in the imperial treasury. Of Theodore's mother we are better informed both by a letter that Theodore wrote to her when she was ill (c.797-799)[32] and from his funeral oration (several years later) in which her piety (and her rejection of the superstition of her contemporaries!) is extolled.[33] Theodore had two brothers, Joseph and Euthymius, and a sister. *Vita* A[34] and B[35] briefly comment on Theodore's study in Grammar, Dialectic

[31] Sources for the details of his life include four main variants of Theodore's *Vita* as discussed by Fatouros (1991a) 3,4. Of the two *Vitae* in Migne (*PG* 99.114-327) the second is the shorter and more reliable, upon which the first is based. It is authored by Michael the Monk, a Stoudite and younger contemporary of Theodore. The text indicates that Nikolaos the Stoudite is dead and thus it must have been written after 868, i.e. at least forty-two years after Theodore's death. Other sources include his letters (Fatouros 1991a, 1991b); a description of the recent transfer of the remains of Theodore and his brother Joseph from Prinkipo to Constantinople in 844 (text in Van de Vorst, 1913, 50-61); his catechetical discourses (Migne 99.506-688; Cozza-Luzi 1905; Auvray 1891.); funeral orations on the Abbot Plato and on Theodore's mother Theoctista (Migne 99.804-849 and 884-901); *Vita* of Theodore's contemporaries including Tarasios, Nicephorus, Nicolas of Stoudios and others; his *Testamentum* or confession of faith and last directions to his monks (Migne 99.1813-1824); the account by Naukratios of the last days and death of Theodore (Migne 99.1824-1850). See also the general history of the times to 813 (the extent of our interest) rehearsed in Theophanes' *Chronographia* (de Boor 1883), English trans. Mango (1997). In this brief introduction to Theodore's life to 815 I have presented the most basic facts as generally known and repeated in such secondary sources as Gardner (1905), Fatouros (1991a), 1-20, Frazee (1981), Treadgold (1988), etc.
[32] Fatouros 6.
[33] Theodore tells us that she knew the entire Psalter by memory. Migne *PG* 99.885B.
[34] *Vita A*, Migne *PG* 99.117C.
[35] *Vita B*, Migne *PG* 99.237B.

('which those skilled in it call philosophy'), and Rhetoric, but it is impossible from these brief remarks to conclude the details of Theodore's early education. The scholars who do speculate differently on the content of Theodore's learning[36] (much of the debate stems from a scarcity of reliable sources about education in general at this time in Constantinople[37]) agree that Theodore received the best education available at the time, and might indeed have benefited from the beginnings of a brief 'humanist revival.' In his own letters Theodore sometimes presents himself as being well educated and often more trained in philosophy than his correspondents. He writes to his 'spiritual son' Severianos, quoting Eccl. 6,1-2, and forbidding him to speak about matters of theology:

ἔπειτα οὐδὲ τοσαύτη σοι εὐτεχνίας δογματικῆς ἐπιστήμη, ὡς εἰδέναι ἀκριβῶς φθέγγεσθαι, μήτε γραμματικῆς μήτε φιλοσοφίας ἀψαμένω ... ἰδοὺ ἀμαθαίνων οὐκ οἶσθα καὶ καλῶς ἐστιν ἐκεῖνο εἰπεῖν· εἶδον πονηρίαν ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον, ἄνδρα δόξαντα παρ' ἑαυτῷ σοφὸν εἶναι καί, ὃ τούτου χαλεπώτερον, παιδεύειν ἄλλους φιλονεικοῦντα.[38]

(Since your knowledge of dogma skill is not so great that you know how to speak in a precise manner, not having studied thoroughly either grammar or philosophy... Indeed, since you have not been taught, you do not know to speak elegantly that this is the case. There is an evil which I have seen under the sun, a man who was wise in his own eyes and, what is worse, striving to teach others.)

The sources are inconsistent in the details of his early life up to the time of his entering monastic life and until after the iconophile council of 787AD (hereafter 787

---

[36] See Fatouros (1991a), 6 n.24.
[37] See Moffat (1975), Lemerle (1986), Wilson (1983).
[38] Fatouros 445.

Council).[39] It seems that Theodore entered monastic life just after 780 when the iconophile and pro-monastic Irene began to rule the Empire as regent for her son Constantine. His mother's brother, Plato, was already an abbot of the Symbols Monastery in Bithynia. Plato had visited Constantinople perhaps during Leo's reign[40] and even more openly during the first part of Irene's regency. His spiritual charisma led many,[41] including Theodore's entire family, to renounce the secular life, give their riches to the poor and follow him to enter the monastic life in Bithynia.

In 781 Theodore entered the Symbols Monastery and two years later accompanied Plato to the Saccoudion Monastery where Plato became abbot. Both *Vitae* mention that Theodore was known to turn to the most menial tasks with enthusiasm, and that his humility soon was noted by all.[42] His exceptional gifts, piety and commitment to the coenobitic life led Plato to arrange for the patriarch Tarasios (784-806) to ordain him priest c.790.[43] Four years later Plato became gravely ill and arranged for Theodore, only thirty-five years of age, to become abbot.[44] When Plato recovered from his illness, he and Theodore shared the leadership of the Saccoudion Monastery. These were to be years of tremendous importance for Theodore as he gave himself wholly to the study of the lives of the Fathers and especially to the works of Basil the Great where Theodore came to

---

[39] The controversy in these centuries centred around three councils. The first two councils (in 754AD and 787AD) each claimed to be the authentic seventh oecumenical council whereas the third (815AD) supported the claim of the 754 Council. We refer to these councils by their dates as the 754 Council (iconoclast), the 787 Council (iconophile) and the 815 Council (iconoclast). It was only sometime after 843AD, the date when images were finally restored in the Orthodox Church, that the 787 Council was formally affirmed as the Seventh Oecumenical Council, sometimes referred to as the Second Council of Nicaea.
[40] *Laudatio Platonis*, Migne *PG* 99.808B, 810B, 820B-821D. Plato was another monk to whom Leo IV had offered a bishopric.
[41] See *Laudatio Platonis*, Migne *PG* 99.820C.
[42] *Vita A*, Migne *PG* 99.122D f.; Vita B,6.
[43] Described in Fatouros 38; see also *Vita B*, Migne *PG* 99.248AB.
[44] See *Vita B*, Migne *PG* 99.249B; *Vita A*, 133C; *Laudatio Platonis*, 828B f.

understand the principles of the monastic life.[45] In Saccoudion Theodore developed a Rule

and Penitential which was to have continuing influence for the renewal of monasticism. In

his *Testamentum*[46] to his monks, given during the final days of his life, of all the

theologians he could have referred to in the entire tradition, Theodore holds up the names

of Mark the Monk, the Abbot Isaiah, John Klimakos, Barsanuphios, John of Gaza,

Dorotheus of Gaza, Dositheos (disciple of Dorotheus), Sophronius and other witnesses

to the ascetic life.[47] Throughout his writings Theodore refers to many other coenobitic

saints, including Anthony,[48] Pachomios,[49] Sabas,[50] Arsenios,[51] Euthymios[52] and others.

Basil, as always, is singled out for special praise in the *Testamentum*.[53] On the other hand,

Cholij (2002) suggests that an analysis of Theodore's writings and monastic reforms

reveal a closer dependence upon other Fathers and especially Dorotheus of Gaza.[54]

Theodore would understand Dorotheus as a faithful disciple of Basil and not be bothered

by the distinction. The survival of both Dorotheus' Διδασκαλίαι and the Greek text of

Basil's *Rules* are due to ninth-century Stoudite efforts.

One of the foundational ideas upon which Theodore based his reform was the need

for monks to appreciate the history of the monastic and ascetic tradition through the lives

---

[45] *Vita B*, Migne *PG* 99.245A f. On the extent of the influence of Theodore's Rule and Penitential developed at Saccoudion, see Leroy (1958b).

[46] Migne *PG* 99.1814 - 1824.

[47] Leroy (1961b), 424 n.6, suggests the influence of Cassion on Theodore.

[48] Fatouros 420.

[49] Fatouros 149.

[50] Fatouros 149, 555.

[51] *PC* 4.

[52] Fatouros 500.

[53] Migne *PG* 31.1319 prints a scholium attributed to Theodore, defending the authenticity of *Constitutiones Asceticae*. The scholium itself is probably not authentic Theodore, but is a witness to a tradition which would link Theodore to Basil so intimately.

[54] 'St Basil ... was Theodore's most frequent cited authority, but a careful reading of his works shows that he was actually influenced, at least in matters of terminology and monastic organization, more by other Fathers. This is especially true of Dorotheos of Gaza, to whom Theodore seems to be most indebted. In fact, it is because of Theodore's enthusiasm for Dorotheos ... that Dorotheos found his way into the canon of Orthodox Byzantine monastic authorities.' Cholij (2002), 35,36.

of the Fathers. Perhaps Theodore attributed the decadence of the monastic life at the time to an ignorance of the ideals of the coenobitic life.[55] Theodore would assist in the acquisition of this learning by the regular catechizing of his community, at least several times a week. He advises, 'learn to know by reading the exploits of the holy Fathers, how great was their enthusiasm, how great was the bubbling of their spirit, what their struggles were and how, for these reasons, our good God glorified them.'[56] Theodore stressed that this learning was never to be for its own sake, but always with a view to more faithfully living a life of monastic obedience: 'At the tribunal of Christ it will be of no avail being well-learnt, well-spoken, knowing the texts by heart, being well-read. The Fathers in the *Gerontikon* were wise not because they knew much - some were quite uneducated. You can have studied much and yet still be eternally condemned.'[57] The significant point to note here is that the monks obviously were engaged in reading the Fathers, studying much, and learning the texts by heart, else such a warning and need to give direction to these pursuits would not be required.

In 795 Theodore and Plato became involved in issues far broader than the internal welfare of their monastic confederacy. They led a protest against the patriarch Tarasios and refused to participate in communion with him. In January of that year Constantine VI had persuaded his wife Maria to enter a convent and then was married by a priest Joseph (steward of St Sophia and abbot of Kathara Monastery) to Theodote (Theodore's cousin).[58] Tarasios had refused to forbid the tonsure (obviously against Maria's will), the

---

[55] *Vita B*, Migne *PG* 99.245 BC; *Laudatio Platonis*, Migne *PG* 99.824D.
[56] *PC* 89.226. Trans. by Cholij (2002), 35.
[57] *TC* I.60. 609, as referenced and translated by Cholij (2002), 35.
[58] These events are described in several sources including *Vita Tarasii* 15, 408-12 and Theophanes Chron. (469f. De Boor); Constantine's attempts to reconcile with Theodore and Plato, see Fatouros 4,5 and *Vita B, Migne PG* 253 B-C.

wedding (Maria was still alive and thus the marriage was adulterous), or to excommunicate Constantine VI after the wedding. Constantine made several efforts to reconcile with Plato and Theodore but they refused. In February 797 Constantine arrested Plato, Theodore and ten of their monks, and scattered the remaining one hundred or so monks from Saccoudion. Plato was imprisoned in the palace in Constantinople. Theodore and the others were beaten and sent into exile to Thessalonica. Bishops and abbots along the way and in Thessalonica were forbidden to greet them.[59]

In August of that same year Irene successfully plotted the downfall of her son and became sole Empress.[60] She released Plato from prison and recalled Theodore and the exiled monks to Saccoudion. Tarasios quickly deposed and defrocked Joseph[61] and wrote a letter of apology to Plato. Church unity was restored. More than this, many young people were drawn to the Saccoudion Monastery by the bold, virtuous and courageous actions of Theodore and the monks.[62]

Two years later, in 799, a series of Arab incursions made Irene fear for the safety of the monks of Saccoudion and she invited them to house the fifth century Stoudios Monastery within the walls of Constantinople.[63] The anti-monastic imperial stance during much of the eighth century had caused the Stoudite community to dwindle to only a few monks, at least according to the scholars who have reflected upon Theodore's life so as to highlight his accomplishments. Fatouros (1991a)[64] speculates that both Theodore and his

---

[59] See esp. Fatouros 1, 2, 3, 4, 5; later reflection in Fatouros 21, 22; but also *Laudatio Platonis*, Migne *PG* 99.832B-833A; Theophanes 470-471; Michael of Stoudios 248D, 253C-256C. See also Hatlie (1995).
[60] At least she could act as such. In the next two years Irene warded off the various expected challenges and conspiracies from Constantine V's sons and supporters, but by Easter 799 her position as Empress was well consolidated.
[61] *Vita B,* Migne *PG* 99.256D.
[62] *Vita B,* Migne *PG* 99.257C f.
[63] *Vita B,* Migne *PG* 99.257CD; *Vita A* 141B.
[64] Page 11. He seems to be following a suggestion of Dobroklonskij whose life work on Theodore in the first decades of the twentieth century remains authoritative for those who read Russian.

supporters not only welcomed the move to the capital but may in some way have used

the Arab threat as an excuse for the move to Constantinople[65] where Theodore could not

only expand his own community but also give a unity and stability to the network of

monastic communities around the capital and beyond.[66]

Having attended to the reading of the tradition in Saccoudion, Theodore continued

his patristic studies in Stoudios. The first seven years of his leadership(Plato formally

took an oath of obedience to Theodore when they arrived[67]) were to be tremendously

busy and productive for Theodore. As the monastery grew to between seven hundred and

one thousand monks, Theodore re-organized the community according to his continuing

refinement and adaptation of Basil's *Rules*.[68] Thus in Stoudios we find an emphasis both

on a practical asceticism and a communal life based on the submission of the will.[69] To

that end, as we have seen in Saccoudion, there was a determined interest in promoting the

study of the Fathers. The Stoudios Monastery included a school for novices, a workroom

for the copying of manuscripts, and an ever expanding library. Alfeyev (2000) cites a

prescription from the Stoudite 'Υποτύπωσις[70] which dictates that on certain days every

monk was expected to borrow a book from the library to read. This indicates that the

---

[65] After all, the Saccoudion monastery continued to survive and maintained close ties with Stoudios.

[66] As suggested by Leroy (1958b).

[67] *Vita B*, Migne *PG* 99.248D; *Laudatio Platonis*, Migne 99.836A.

[68] Cf. *Vita B*, Migne *PG* 99.261A-D. Michael the Monk indicates that his supporters compared him to Basil the Great (*Vita B*; Migne *PG* 99.236A).

[69] Hausherr (1935) describes the submission of the will to be the dominant theme in Theodore who acknowledges his dependence on Dorotheos in his *Testamentum* and elsewhere: 'La sainteté, pour Dorothée, comme pour Saint Basile et pour Saint Théodore Studite, consiste avant tout dans l'abnégation absolue de la volonté propre. ... Jadis on considérait le martyre comme la perfection la plus haute; rien n'est changé, sauf que le martyre consistera désormais dans l'obéisanse.' (133). Theodore wrote to his mother that in her obedient life in which she died to self, she too is a martyr: 'because you have engaged in the bloodless contests of martyrdom. (τοῖς τοῦ μαρτυρίου ἄθλοις ἀναιμωτί).' (Fatouros 6.37). This theme is explored in Hatlie (1996).

[70] Alfeyev (2000), 15. He cites 'Υποτύπωσις 26 (Migne *PG* 99, 1713AB) and see p. 15, n. 16. I follow Fatouros in the accepted opinion that the 'Υποτύπωσις as it appears in Migne was composed after Theodore's death, but that it faithfully describes the situation during his time as Abbot.

21

library contained at least as many books as the number of monks, i.e. between seven hundred and one thousand books. Regardless of the precise number of books available, it is clear that all of the Stoudite monks were expected to be thoroughly educated in the tradition of the ascetic Fathers. In this regard Alfeyev offers an interesting speculation that the Stoudios Monastery was one of the first urban monasteries to inaugurate a new kind of monasticism which was more open to lay people generally: 'They were no longer isolated communities: lay people attended monastic offices; monks had to carry out the spiritual direction of seculars, have intensive and constant contact with the life of the city, visit people and receive visitors.'[71] In the light of this new monastic mission, Alfeyev suggests that the emphasis on book learning for the Stoudites had a different emphasis than in previous times: 'early monks read books in a contemplative manner just to gain profit for their own souls, whereas the Studites were supposed to be able to bring profit to others, particularly to seculars who asked for spiritual direction.'[72]

The Stoudites introduced the more speedy minuscule or cursive script to the copying of manuscripts.[73] In general, Theodore continued the work begun at Saccoudion, expanding and revising his own works of monastic regulations (including the cycle of feasts and fasts), liturgical revision (Robert Taft writes of a 'new monastic synthesis' of Palestinian and Constantinopolitan forms of prayer accomplished by Theodore[74]), a

[71] Alfeyev (2000), 14.
[72] Alfeyev (2000), 16.
[73] The details of the introduction of the minuscule script by the Stoudites is uncertain. Perhaps it was introduced by Plato and Theodore who were used to this 'shorthand' script from their time in public office.
[74] 'One interesting aspect of this synthesis was the adaptation to a basically Palestinian structure of the prayers and litanies of the Constantinopolitan offices of vespers and matins found in the *Euchologion* of the capital. In these Studite monasteries the composition of new ecclesiastical poetry continued apace, and St. Theodore himself gave a large place to the new compositions in his adaptation of the Palestinian monastic offices. It is from this poetry that the *Oktoichos*, *Triodion*, and *Pentekostarion* were later formed. The first Studite *Typika* or liturgical ordos to govern their use were composed in the ninth or tenth century.' Taft (1993), 276. Ware (1978), 41 also acknowledges that the ninth century Stoudite monks gave the present structure to the Lenten Triodion and composed the greater part of its contents, Theodore himself composing the second canon for weekdays in Lent.

prepared daily catechesis to the monks (or at the very least, several times a week), and poetry (including the setting forth of the duties and privileges of all monks, from the abbot to the cook, in iambic verses). In a letter written in this time to Nicolas who has just been appointed abbot elsewhere, he advises that every matter be set against the standards of the Holy Fathers (οἱ ἅγιοι πατέρες).

Οὐ παραβῇς τοὺς νόμους καὶ κανόνας τῶν πατέρων, πρό γε πάντων τοῦ ἁγίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Βασιλείου.[75]
(Do not depart from the rules and canons of the Fathers, especially of the Holy Father Basil.)

The quest to become familiar with the whole tradition of the Fathers by means of the enterprise of collecting, copying and studying a vast quantity of theological texts for the monastic and liturgical reform of the Church would equip Theodore personally for his later huge contribution to the resolution of the image controversy, gaining the knowledge and spirit of the Fathers to produce a convincing iconophile theological apology within the tradition. In this apologetic we shall discover that his understanding of the tradition both provided the philosophical tools for his creative approach, but also determined the theological limits of the argument.

Significantly, from 806 until his death twenty years later, Theodore had little time and opportunity for uninterrupted study of the Fathers. These were years of political and theological struggle, and he spent most of this time in exile, deprived even of the opportunity to consult books.

---

[75] Fatouros 10.

In 802 Irene was deposed and Nicephorus (802-11) was crowned emperor. Upon the death of patriarch Tarasios in 806, the emperor Nicephorus refused to appoint the obvious choice of Theodore Stoudios (perhaps fearing the uncompromising character Theodore had demonstrated in his quarrel with Tarasios). As part of his broad consultation before the appointment, Theodore had made it clear that a layman would not be an acceptable choice.[76] When the emperor choose the obscure (though learned and pious) layman Nicephorus, he knew that the Stoudites would oppose him. Therefore he imprisoned Plato and Theodore for twenty-four days during which time in one week Nicephorus was tonsured, deaconed, priested and consecrated patriarch on Easter Sunday, 806.[77] The emperor then decided quickly that it was time to reward the former steward of St Sophia, Joseph of Kathara, for his services rendered to the emperor since the time he had been defrocked by Tarasios in 797. He arranged for the patriarch Nicephorus to call a synod of sixteen bishops which readmitted Joseph to the priesthood and restored his stewardship to St. Sophia.[78] Theodore's letters reveal the subsequent course of events beginning with his decision, along with Plato, not to protest publicly but rather quietly to avoid communion with the patriarch Nicephorus and any others who celebrated the eucharist with Joseph. Although the emperor was unaware of the form of this silent protest for some time, perhaps his appointment of Theodore's brother Joseph as archbishop of Thessalonica[79] was an olive branch to the Stoudites generally. When the form of the protest was finally made known to the emperor, he quickly ran out of patience, posted soldiers around the Monastery, and appealed to the Stoudites through

---

[76] Fatouros 16.
[77] *Laudatio Platonis*, Migne *PG* 99.837D-840A.
[78] *Vita B*, Migne *PG* 99.265C f.; Fatouros 21, 22, 24, 30, etc.
[79] See Fatouros 23.

bishops and monks. When this failed, the emperor transferred Theodore and his companions to the Monastery of Sts. Sergius and Bacchus near the palace. He had the patriarch hold a synod of bishops which decided that Joseph of Kathara had performed the marriage of Constantine VI under a dispensation (οἰκονομία) of St. Tarasios, and that this dispensation of a saint must be honoured. Theodore cried out, 'John the Baptist is dying! The Gospel is being abolished! That is no dispensation!' In the end the emperor concluded that he had no choice but to exile Theodore, Plato and Joseph to different islands near Constantinople, and to expel the monks from Stoudios.[80] In a letter written to pope Leo III from exile in 809, Theodore calls the January 809 synod both μοιχοσύνοδος (the adulterous synod) and αἱρετικὴν σύνοδον (an heretical synod).[81] More than two years later, just as he was leaving for his campaign against the Bulgars, the emperor brought all the exiled Stoudites back to Constantinople, ostensibly an act of clemency because of Plato's ill health, but more truly a general offer of reconciliation.[82]

When Nicephorus died in battle against the Bulgars, the new emperor, Michael Rhangabe, 811-813, made great efforts to repair the unity of the church. Joseph was returned as archbishop of Thessalonica and Theodore, Plato, and the other Stoudites returned to their Monastery. Joseph of Kathara was deposed again (he would be reinstated one last time by Leo V) and Patriarch Nicephorus apologized not so much for his own actions but for the late emperor's lack of discretion and heavy handedness in the affair. The new emperor looked to reconcile with Charlemagne by recognizing him as emperor. Michael, however, was a poor military leader and within two years had suffered

---

[80] An account of this period of exile is to be found in the letters, generally Fatouros 33 - 56. In letters 33 and 34 Theodore describes the situation to Pope Leo III.

[81] Fatouros 33.

[82] *Laudatio Platonis*, Migne *PG* 99.841D-844A; Fatouros 453.

such defeat that he was forced to abdicate. The new emperor, Leo V, 813-820 was a determined and able leader. Unfortunately for the Stoudites and the iconophiles, he also was resolved to forbid the offering of προσκυνήσις to images.

From the enthronement of Leo V in 813 to Theodore's death in 826, his life was dominated by an active opposition to iconoclasm. Upon his return to Stoudios in 811 until the latter days of 814 Theodore enjoyed his last period of relative peace as resident Abbot at the Studious Monastery. In December 814 Theodore took the lead at a gathering of iconophiles which had been organized to dissuade the emperor from initiating iconoclastic policies. When the gathering gained an audience with the emperor, Theodore boldly told the emperor that he was subject to the church in matters of faith. The situation quickly worsened. At the beginning of Lent, 815 Patriarch Nicephorus resigned and was replaced by a lay court official, who was consecrated patriarch on Easter Day. Theodore's protest was a public procession of images around the Stoudios Monastery on the previous Sunday.[83] The new patriarch immediately convened the 815 Council to which Theodore was invited but did not attend, addressing the Council through a letter instead.[84] This 815 Council rejected the authority of the 787 Council and declared the 754 Council to be the true Seventh Oecumenical Council. Leo V quickly realized that Theodore would be unrelenting in his opposition to Leo's iconoclast programme and thus Theodore became one of the first targets of Leo's widespread persecution which continued to the end of his reign. In April 815 Theodore was imprisoned in a fort called Metopa in Bithynia. It is from there that he most likely wrote the *Antirrheticus*, his apology for the offering of προσκυνήσις to images, before being moved to Bonita in Asia Minor in the

---

[83] *Vita B*, Migne *PG* 99.285B; *Vita A*, Migne *PG 99*.186BC.
[84] Fatouros 71.

spring of 816.

This is the conclusion of our quick sketch of Theodore's life up to the beginning of his preoccupation with image theology in 815. The story of the concluding eleven years of his life will become clear enough in the remainder of this thesis, and especially in chapter three. But to understand better these later years, it is helpful to highlight the time of Theodore's second exile of two and one half years, 809 - 811. This period of exile had accomplished something far more significant for the coming post-815 troubles than Theodore or the Stoudites could have realized at the time. A general appreciation of the chronology and character of Theodore's writings is required to help us understand the importance of that second exile for his final banishment from his monastery, 815-826.

The Writings[85]

The primary texts for a consideration of Theodore's image theology are limited to the *Antirrheticus* (hereafter *Antirr*) and the letters. Where I do not specify, *Antirr* refers to the three *Antirrhetici* since I conclude that Theodore intends them to be three parts of a single treatise or argument. The early letters contain Theodore's initial expressions of image doctrine which are expanded in the *Antirr*. The later letters further clarify and develop these ideas. The *Parva Catechesis* (hereafter *PC*) and the three small theological works that relate directly to the question of images (*Refutation and Overturning of Impious Poems, Certain Problems of the Iconoclasts,* and *Seven Chapters Against the Iconoclasts*) offer supporting text but do not contribute substantially to the conceptions and arguments of the *Antirr* as developed by the letters. In the other writings judged to be authentic by Fatouros (1991a) Theodore does not address image theology: the *Magna*

---

[85] Fatouros (1991a), 21- 42 is the most reliable source.

Catechesis (hereafter *MC*), thirteen sermons including funeral eulogies for his mother Theoctista and for his uncle Plato, the *Testamentum* (his final address and instructions to members of the Stoudite community and confederacy), and much monastic and liturgical poetry.

The *Antirr* ('Αντιρρητικοὶ κατὰ εἰκονομάχων) is found in Migne *PG* 99.328-436, which is taken from J. Sirmond, *Sancti Theodori Studitae epistolae aliaque scripta dogmatica graece et latine*, Paris, 1696. There is no recent critical edition. I have used the Migne text. An English translation by Roth (1981) is coloured by her interpretative stance but for convenience I have used this translation throughout, making adjustments for the translation of such words as εἰκών and προσκύνησις. I have found very little speculation on the date of composition of the *Antirr*, but my argument will suggest that the *Antirr* is one complete work in three parts, written in response to the 815 Council. In a letter to the 815 sitting of iconoclast bishops, Theodore claims, 'But this is not the right time for a dogmatic explanation, which would easily persuade even a most dull person to look up to the splendours of the truth.'[86] The *Antirr* is Theodore's dogmatic explanation which he wrote within a year or so of the Council, probably while he was still in his first year of exile in Metopa in the Opsikian Theme, Bithynia. The dating of the *Antirr* not only involves a comparison with the dates of the letters associated with image theology, but also must take account of evidence found within the argument itself. This theme can best be addressed in this thesis after Theodore's general argument has been outlined and several conceptual notions have been introduced.

There are 564 known letters. Fatouros (1991a, 1991b) provides a critical text of 557 letters (the other seven are known by title only), plus introductions and summaries of

---

[86] Fatouros 71.

the letters, critical notes and commentaries, and a series of very useful appendae. Evidently copies of these letters were made before they were sent out and after Theodore's death they were collected into five books. Fewer than one half of these originally collected letters still survive. Most of the extant letters were written from exile after 815. Theodore models his style on the letters of St. Cyprian, St. Basil and St. Paul.[87] Whether Theodore is writing to a spiritual son, his spiritual father, a friend, pope, patriarch, synod, a monastery[88] or emperor, his letters are always personal in tone,[89] betraying an intensely learned, pious, humble and strong personality. Throughout, he is uncompromising in his passion for the cure of souls, the desirability of ascetic disciplines to be practised by all Christians, orthodox doctrine, and the health of the Church.

The letters are hugely important in what they reveal generally about the political, social, psychological, and ecclesial aspects of the iconoclastic controversy and persecutions, but we shall examine these letters only insofar as they assist in the understanding of Theodore's image theology. Of the 557 edited letters, fifty make mention or deal substantially with theological issues directly relating to the image controversy. These are Fatouros 15, 17, 57, 60, 64, 71, 157, 170, 183, 201, 221, 225, 255, 276, 301, 305, 314, 315, 361, 380, 384, 393, 408, 409, 411, 416, 417, 418, 422, 425, 427, 428, 430, 437, 445, 448, 463, 476, 477, 479, 480, 491, 492, 496, 499. 524, 528, 532, 546,

---

[87] Fatouros (1991a), 39, 40.

[88] A number of letters are written as formal catechesis to monasteries or to all exiled monks: cf. Fatouros 381, 382, 406, 410, 433, 457, 473, 480, 483, 488, 503.

[89] Hatlie (1999b) cites a number of precepts about the nature and duties of friendship which are found in Theodore's letters (he gives several examples from the letters for each characteristic): 'true friends were those who remained close despite absence, cared for your soul, came to your aid in time of need, stood by you during troubles when mere acquaintances turned their backs, shared your griefs and burdens as well as your joys, praised you, made you better and stronger, sought harmony with you and for you, turned a deaf ear to the blasphemies of your enemies, generally agreed with your point of view but corrected you in a mild manner when you were wrong, were friends to your friends and hostile to your enemies. The ideal friendship itself, according to Theodore, was grounded in faith, love (ἀγαπή) and virtue.' (139)

551.

In his dating of the letters, Fatouros compares his evidence and rationale with that of Dobroklonskij, the translator and interpreter of Theodore in his two-volume 1913-14 study in Russian. Fatouros often sees that Dobroklonskij has considered exhaustively the available textual and historical evidence and in these cases simply defers to his dating. I do not oppose any of Fatouros' conclusive datings but I do offer firm suggestions about several key letters to which he does not assign a conclusive date, including 17, 479 and 491. My argument for the dating of these letters, and their relation to the date of the writing of the *Antirr,* depends upon concepts which will be introduced in chapters one and two. For this reason I shall address the question of the chronology of the *Antirr* and the letters more fully in chapter three.

Letters which may be dated confidently on the basis of allusions to historical events and references to other letters include the following:

Date	Letter
809-11	57
815	71
815/16	157, 221
816	170, 183, 225, 255
816-18	201
816-19	314, 361, 384, 393, 408, 409
817/8	301, 315
818	305, 276, 380
819	411
821	417, 418, 422, 425, 430
821-26	60, 437, 445, 448, 477, 480, 499.524, 551

A number of letters are dated 'intuitively' by Fatouros, with no or very little evidence presented. These include:

815-26   428

821-26   463, 476 (post 428), 479, 492, 546, 528 (post 428)

The following letters are not dated by Fatouros: 15, 17, 64, 491, 496.

Fatouros gives no reason why he accepts the authenticity of the three theological treatises Ἔλεγχος καὶ ἀνατροπὴ τῶν ἀσεβῶν ποιημάτων (Migne *PG* 99.436-477), Προβλήματα τινα πρὸς εἰκονομάχους (Migne *PG* 99.477-485), and Κατὰ εἰκονομάχων κεφάλαια ἑπτά (Migne *PG* 99.485-497). He offers no critical information about these texts, other than that each was copied by Migne from Sirmond. Ἔλεγχος ... (*The Refutation and Overturning of Impious Poems*) considers poems of John Grammaticus, Ignatios, Sergios and Stephen, refuting them first in prose and then in ten poems.

In addition to Fatouros (1991a),[90] the detailed analysis of Cholij (2002),[91] should be consulted regarding the Μικρὰ Κατήχησις (*PC*) and Μεγάλη Κατήχησις (*MC*).[92] Cholij describes the different character of the two collections: 'The selection making up the *Parva Catechesis* was dictated by its liturgical use, and it achieved great popularity as a result. Its popularity also explains why Michael [the author of *Vita B*] speaks of it as the "first" book of the Catecheses, despite its later composition, between 821 and 826. ... The *Magna Catechesis* differs fundamentally from the *Parva Catechesis* only in belonging

---

[90] Fatouros (1991a), 21-25.
[91] Cholij (2002), 65-73.
[92] Cholij's study focuses on Theodore's contributions to the monastic life and these catechetical works are his primary sources.

31

to an earlier period of Theodore's abbacy.'[93] That these two sets of teachings were composed in such different venues, of course, determines their distinctive style and content. The *PC* was written by Theodore in exile to be read privately (albeit by many people): the teaching of the *MC* was delivered orally within the monastery setting when Theodore was still resident at Stoudios, and often deals with particular issues internal to the daily life of the monastic community. The more general nature of the teaching of the *PC* about the ascetic life explains why it has always had greater popularity both within the Stoudite community after Theodore's death, and up to our present day. All references and citations from the *MC* are Cozza-Luzi who published an edition of 77 catecheses in 1888 (in A. Mai, *NPB* 9.2, Rome) and another 34 catecheses in 1905 (in A. Mai, *NPB* 10.1, Rome). All references and citations from the *PC* are Auvray (1891). The translations borrowed from various secondary sources are not acknowledged when judged to be faithful to the original.

The Abbot in exile

I suggested above that Theodore's second period of exile (809-811) served as a precursor and 'training' for his final exile from 815 to his death in 826. Just as Theodore had adapted the *Rule* of Basil and the ascetical writings of so many of the Holy Fathers to the contemporary situation in Bithynia and Constantinople, so Theodore learned to be Abbot to a community of monks scattered by exile throughout the empire. As the 809-11 exile continued, Theodore mentions his regret that he had not understood sooner how effective his oversight by correspondence could be, and that he had wasted much time at the beginning of this exile. When he made this comment he did not know that he would have

---

[93] Cholij (2002), 66.

ample opportunity to apply the lessons learned from the whole of this second exile during a third yet more intensive and lengthy banishment from the Stoudios Monastery.

For example, during this second exile, fearful of his correspondence falling into imperial hands, Theodore developed a system of code (of which he makes use in his third exile) whereby the twenty four letters of the alphabet were attributed to various individuals and groups.[94] That this degree of caution was necessary is borne out in the third exile when some of his correspondence was intercepted and Theodore was punished with a severity which almost caused his death.[95] During this 809-11 period, Theodore disseminated catechetical teachings, responded to personal spiritual questions and concerns, answered theological queries, commented on the orthodoxy of various policies and proclamations of the emperor and patriarch, and generally encouraged the living of the ascetic life. In the next exile (from 815) caused by broader iconoclastic persecutions, such letters were sent not only to his Stoudite monks, but to many other lay iconophiles (men and women) who sought to know how to live faithfully during a time of persecution. As indicated above, most of the extant letters are from the later period, but the following is a passage from one of the few letters to have survived from the 809-11 exile. It is addressed to Naukratios,[96] Theodore's closest disciple and future successor:

> Again another imprisonment for you, beloved child, but again a gravestone for the evil-named heretics, to you however an increase of heavenly prizes and praises. So for them there is groaning and weeping, but for you rejoicing and thanksgiving. And are you not further tested by being again put under guard, just as gold is purified by

[94] Fatouros 41.
[95] *Vita* B, Migne *PG* 99.296A-297C.
[96] For both the translation and the suggestive interpretation of this passage I am indebted to Professor Louth.

33

fire in the furnace? You will be found, therefore, a sacred child and seen by the Lord Master to be pure and honest in everything, a truly valuable vessel, ready for every good work. Bear with long suffering the strangeness of your second imprisonment... but show me how He watches over you; for I think it will be a heavier burden than the first. But, nevertheless, whether thus or otherwise you, my child, stand nobly, easing the griefs with the great joy of your hopes and winning yourself solitude, the discovery of *apatheia* by looking to and being related to God who alone beholds you, despising and scattering the chaffy thoughts that enter in from the sower of tares at all times.

(...τὴν μόνωσιν, ἀπαθείας εὕρεσιν διὰ τῆς ἐπὶ μόνον τὸν ὁρῶντά σε θεὸν ἀποβλέψεώς τε καὶ σχέσεως, σκυβαλίζων καὶ λικμίζων τοὺς ἐπεισαγομένους ἀχυρώδεις λογισμοὺς παρὰ τοῦ τῶν ζιζανίων σπορέως ἑκάστοτε.)

In this passage, as a spiritual father and ἡγούμενος of the Studios Monastery, Theodore encouraged the Stoudite monk and reminded him that he is on the side of Christ. But more than this, the last section reads like a catechetical or teaching discourse that Theodore might have given if he were at the Stoudios Monastery. For example, the theme of the quest for true 'solitude' was always before the monk, as was the notion of striving for ἀπάθεια which any Stoudite monk would have known as a technical word for 'serenity' in the ascetic writings of the Fathers. A core concept of the ascetic life, Naukratios would have heard Theodore use this word often in his catechetical discourses at Stoudios and Theodore will continue to emphasize its central place in the catechetical discourses which he will send out during his final exile. For the monk, Theodore teaches, 'There is one repose then and one pleasure, to cleanse the soul and to look towards ἀπάθεια. And let us not grow despondent (verb form of ἀκηδία) when called to repose and the joy of

34

ἀπάθεια.'[97] Despondency (ἀκηδία) is the opposite of ἀπάθεια which is a freedom from the passions which quench the fire of our love for God. According to John Klimakos whom Theodore holds up to his monks as a witness to the ascetic life, the one who reaches ἀπάθεια is 'the one who keeps his soul before the face of the Lord, always reaching out to Him even before his strength.'[98] Dorotheos counseled that detachment from self-will leads towards ἀπάθεια: 'From detachment one comes with God's help to perfect ἀπάθεια (εἰς τελείαν ἀπάθειαν).'[99]

Another technical term of the ascetic tradition heavy with meaning and used in the above letter is that of λογισμοί in the phrase 'chaffy thoughts' (ἀχυρώδεις λογισμούς). *Logismoi* ('the thoughts') is a specialized term of an aspect of ascetic struggle with a long history in monastic literature. Naukratios and the other monks would have been well aware of its significance in the spiritual life both from their own reading and from Theodore's catechetical teaching in the Monastery.[100] It can refer directly to 'demons' or at least to the thoughts that have been set in motion by demons, through the passions. The catechetical writings of Theodore surviving from his third exile are full of warning about the destructive power of these λογισμοί. The devil 'torments us and flogs us by the attack of incessant λογισμοί.'[101] Theodore asks, 'Who is blind? One short-sighted through attachment to the passions. Who is captive? One led away by unseemly λογισμοί.'[102] He

---

[97] *PC* 60.
[98] Migne *PG* 88.1148B. Translation from *John Climacus: The Ladder of Divine Ascent*, 29. See also Ware's introduction to this volume where he quotes Diadochus of Photice (mid fifth century) as speaking of the 'fire of ἀπάθεια.' (32). Louth (1996) describes Maximus' understanding of ἀπάθεια as a 'purified love.' *Ambigua* 10.22a&b carry the same theme as we are highlighting in Theodore. See Migne *PG* 90.1148A-1149C; trans. Louth (1996) 120-122.
[99] *Instructions* I.20; *SC* 92.177; Migne *PG* 99.1636BC. Translation of Cholij (2002).
[100] Cf. *PC* 24.
[101] *PC* 10.
[102] *PC* 24.

warns: 'Let us not give in when we are struck by λογισμοί.'[103] We must be 'unsleepingly keeping watch over our thoughts, not opening the door to the passions, not giving place to the devil.'[104] Both Congourdeau[105] and Cholij[106] suggest that Theodore's listing of six 'spirits of malice' in *PC* 4 is based on the eight ἀκάρθαρτοι λογισμοί in Evagrius,[107] most likely known by Theodore in the form presented by John Klimakos.[108] Writing during an exile which involved numerous voyages in captivity, Theodore often uses nautical language in his letters and catecheses. After listing the six vices in *PC* 4 (lust, gluttony, avarice, despondency, dejection and pride), Theodore compares the one afflicted as someone caught in a storm at sea, seeking the cessation of the wind: 'For if they manfully shake off λογισμοί, they are filled with calm, having the Holy Spirit as the companion of their journey, as it is related of Saint Arsenios.' In another catechesis Theodore says succinctly, 'For what is the ascetic life but mastery of the passions, control of thoughts, and unrelenting wrestling against invisible foes.'[109]

Thus we see that Theodore's teaching in his letter to Naukratios in the 809-811 exile is typical catechesis, as if Theodore were resident in Stoudios, instructing his monks there. Indeed, it is as if, as Professor Louth suggests:

> the prison has become for Naukratios his monastery, there everything that he was
> striving for in the monastery will be worked out, there he is to learn that looking to
> God and being beheld by God is all that matters, there the struggle against the
> passions is still going on, and there he is given the solitude and the hardship that will

---

[103] *PC* 63.
[104] *PC* 53.
[105] Congourdeau (1993), 22, note 8.
[106] Cholij (2002), 214.
[107] *Evagrii de octo vitiosis cogitationibus ad Anatilium* 1, Migne *PG* 40.1272A.
[108] See Ware (1982), 62-66.
[109] *PC* 57.

help him to attain *apatheia*. For the monks, as it were, persecution can even be regarded as a blessing, for all it does is force upon the monk the detachment, solitude and hardship that are the very conditions the monk is seeking through the asceticism of the monastic rule![110]

Theodore's successful shepherding of his monks by correspondence during this, his second exile, prepared him for yet a greater challenge when, in 815, he was to be exiled for the third and last time and called upon again to maintain and nourish the persecuted church through his correspondence. During this final exile, however, Theodore was not just absent from his Monastery, but another Abbot of iconoclast leanings was immediately appointed by the emperor in his stead.[111] Theodore thus understood that his catecheses had to give spiritual direction to monks who might not enjoy the support of a community for a long time. Perhaps this is why Theodore dwells so much on the need to control λογισμοί. The normal means of controlling these λογισμοί were for the monk to make very frequent confession (ἐξαγόρευσις) either to his ἡγούμενος or spiritual father: 'There are numerous exercises of virtue; but of all of them not one is as necessary as that of ἐξαγόρευσις and perfect obedience.'[112] . In this ἐξαγόρευσις all distracting λογισμοί would be confessed - not just what the penitent judged to be bad or evil thoughts, but all trains of thought which were distractions from prayer. This would require an absolute trust in the ἡγούμενος or the spiritual father.[113] During these years of exile Theodore could not be the ἡγούμενος present to receive ἐξαγόρευσις from his monks. The significance of this for Theodore's sense of responsibility for the spiritual health of

---

[110] From unpublished notes of Professor Louth.
[111] Leontius, who had opposed Theodore's stance in the Joseph controversy. See Fatouros 333 and 381.
[112] *Oratio* XI, *Laudatio Platonis*, Migne *PG* 99.812D.
[113] For a general discussion see Hausherr (1990).

individual monks is made clear by the Stoudite 'Υποτύπωσις[114] which prescribes that each

monk make a daily ἐξαγόρευσις to the ἡγούμενος. The 'Υποτύπωσις was written after

Theodore's death, but it is thought to accurately describe the monastic rule during

Theodore's time as Abbot as well. Only under certain conditions and with special

permission could ἐξαγόρευσις be made to anyone other than the ἡγούμενος. In this time

of upheaval between 815-826 it is not even certain that any ἡγούμενος or spiritual father

would be available for all those who received his written catecheses. In such a case, the

established remedy for the elimination of λογισμοί and growth in ἀπάθεια was not

possible. Thus in these exceptional circumstances Theodore had to stress even more

greatly the need for these λογισμοί somehow to be brought under control. Perhaps we can

hear something of the frustration of an Abbot who directs his community by

correspondence in this catechesis written near the end of his life. Among the authorities

cited for the teaching contained in this catechesis, Theodore includes mention of

Dorotheos, Arsenios and Thaddaeus:

> My brothers and fathers, I would like to keep silent and I am forced to speak. To
>
> keep silent so as not to sadden you; to speak because of the commandment,
>
> 'Speak,' it is said, 'and do not be silent. I am with you.'[115] This was said, it is true,
>
> by the Lord to the apostle, but this word also applies to those who have the care of
>
> souls. ... Tell me, where do they come from, these arrogant words among you and
>
> the unreasonable acts that follow? Is this not because you conceal and do not
>
> disclose your evil thoughts? An evil thought is the beginning, the root of the errors
>
> we make; if one discloses it, it disappears with God's help. If it remains hidden, it
>
> gradually evolves into a work of darkness. And from that comes death, splits

[114] Migne *PG* 99.1704-1720.
[115] Acts 18.9.

between brothers, and so forth.'[116]

Finally, this discussion highlights an important aspect of Theodore's thought which must be remembered as I focus on the argument of the *Antirr* and the letters which pertain to image theology. It is clear that the theme of practical ascetic struggle or πρᾶξις is dominant in all his written catecheses and present in many letters during his third exile. These catecheses and letters were written at the very same time that Theodore is developing his image theology which is primarily connected with the practice of θεωρία (contemplation). The Christ-εἰκών will be shown to be liturgical, doctrinal and devotional in character. It is doctrinally defined primarily by its place within the overall decorative programme of the church interior which itself is largely determined by the cycle of feasts and seasons of the liturgical calendar, and it functions within the context of the spiritual logic of the Liturgy. The Christ-εἰκών thus is an aspect of the broader worship and prayer life of the Byzantine Christian, and it has a specific role in bringing the soul to achieve θεωρία. Deep in the ascetic tradition is the close and necessary relation of πρᾶξις and θεωρία. Πρᾶξις, at least initially, is a preparation and a leading into θεωρία. Theodore's teaching on θεωρία is clearly found in the collection of earlier catecheses delivered when he was resident in Stoudios: 'let us ascend the mountain of the Lord and contemplate with the eyes of the soul the joy of the promises of heaven,'[117] 'What is more beautiful and more delightful to the living God than the splendour of virtues and the purity of soul, the illumination of the intellect and the elevation of the mind to things above (ἐκλάμψεως νοῦς καὶ ἐπάρσεως πρὸς τὰ ἄνω διανοίας),'[118] 'let us look up to heaven above and

---

[116] This is from the penultimate catechesis in the *PC*, 133.
[117] *MC* 80.
[118] *MC* 35.

know the λόγος of creation. (βλέπομεν εἰς οὐρανὸν ἄνω καὶ γινώσκομεν λόγον κτίσεως.).'[119] Monks are to grow 'from splendour to spendour; contemplation to contemplation. (ἐκ λαμπρότητος εἰς λαμπρότητα καὶ ἐκ θεωρίας εἰς θεωρίαν.)'[120] In his later catecheses and letters written in exile, at the same time that he was developing his image theology, Theodore continued to remind the Stoudites of the purpose of πρᾶξις. Soon after the beginning of the exile, Theodore suggests to the monks who have taken refuge in the mountains that their sufferings and struggles will be their path to achieve contemplation:

> I praise (ὑμνῶ) your holy exile, I praise your homes in the mountains, because, even though you are suffering, nevertheless it is the work of God. Moses conversed with God on Mount Sinai, Elijah was worthy to see God, as much as is possible, on Mount Horeb. The most divine Jesus himself ascended the mountain so that he could pray most humanly. What does this mean? It seems to me that this is a symbol of the ascent of the soul to contemplation (σύμβολον τῆς κατὰ ψυχὴν ἀναβάσεως τὸ θεώρημα), for as the mountain overshadows according to the lowliness and hollowness of the plains, even so by proportion, the mind of the supplicant rises to God through the highest region (ὁ νοῦς τοῦ προσευχομένου ἄνεισι πρὸς θεὸν διὰ τοῦ μετεώρου τόπου.). Do you see, O beloved, what is the kind of elevated place in which you live? Let us remember this, even we sinners who live in such a humble region, as we share with you by flying high as the eagles of the Lord.[121]

---

[119] Papadopoulos-Kerameus (1904), 107.181, as cited by Cholij (2002), 219. I was unable to consult the rare Papadopoulos-Kerameus edition of the Magna Catechesis, published in 1904 in St. Petersburg.
[120] *MC* 61.
[121] Fatouros 393. 16-27.

In a reply to a recluse (c. 816-819) Theodore explained that the vision of God (ἡ θεοπτία) is only granted to those with a pure heart:

> To those who dwell in the common life (ἐν τῷ κοινῷ βίῳ) it is not possible that the eye of the understanding (ὁ τῆς διανοίας ὀφθαλμὸς) will be purified to such a degree that it is intent upon God without a barrier, the attachments of the flesh (τῇ τῆς σαρκὸς προσπαθείᾳ) making them see badly as if through some rheum. But to us who must renounce everything and who received the order to carry only the cross of Christ, seeing God is easy (εὐπετὴς ἡ θεοπτία); namely, not to think or consider anything except how to please God and to worship him with a pure heart, all carnal affections having been severed. (ἤγουν τὸ μηδὲν ἄλλο καὶ ἔχειν καὶ ἐννοεῖν ἢ τὸ πῶς εὐαρεστήσοιμεν τῷ Κυρίῳ καθαρᾷ καρδίᾳ λατρεύειν αὐτῷ ἐν ἀπορρήξει πάσης σχέσεως σαρκικῆς.)[122]

Finally, in a catechesis in which he reflects on the Feast of the Transfiguration, Theodore asks who is able to enjoy the ineffable presence of the Lord, as did Peter, James and John?: 'Who is worthy to attain that joy? Who else but one whose way of life is pure and undefiled? For since our God is pure, or rather the highest light, he comes to the pure...'[123] Πρᾶξις leads to θεωρία. Only the mind free from λογισμοί and the soul in the pure state of ἀπάθεια can know θεωρία. In another reflection on the Transfiguration, this time from a letter c. 818-819, Theodore brings together these themes:

---

[122] Fatouros 387. As in the quotation from Fatouros 409, this language is that of Denys the Areopagite, though not identified here. For those who experience ἡ θεοπτία see *EH* 4.8, Migne *PG* 3.481B; Ep. 8, Migne 3.1085A; 1097B. As well, Denys typically uses the language of worship and praise (here, λατρεύειν) in his description of the divine vision.

[123] *PC* 20.

41

'With the visible manifestation of God,' as the all-wise Dionysius says, 'we shall be filled in all-holy contemplation (ἐν πανάγνοις θεωρίαις ἀποπληρούμενοι), illuminating us (shining around us) with the glorious shining forth, as the disciples, at the divine transfiguration. For we participate by the mind free from passion and earthly things (ἐν ἀπαθεῖ καὶ ἀύλῳ τῷ νῷ μετέχοντες) in his intelligible illumination.[124]

In chapter four I shall quote this letter at greater length and it will be seen that Theodore is here speaking of a contemplation which is made possible by the Christ-εἰκών. The Christ-εἰκών plays a part both in the ascetic struggle to free the mind from λογισμοί and then ultimately as the means whereby θεωρία can be achieved. In my examination of the *Antirr* and the image letters which follows, the reader should keep in mind that the focused discussion of this thesis takes place within Theodore's understanding that the Christ-εἰκών has a specific place within the Christian notion of θεωρία, and that θεωρία can never be separated from πρᾶξις.

Theologia and Oikonomia

In addition to this well established Byzantine understanding of ascetical theology, it will be helpful in this introduction to describe briefly two other fundamental and universally assumed notions of Byzantine theology. The first is the distinction between θεολογία and οἰκονομία. Theodore's entire argument assumes that his opponents share a common understanding of these related terms. In the earliest writing we possess in which Theodore addresses the image question c.810, Theodore claims 'If this offering of προσκύνησις to the εἰκών of Christ (τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ Χριστοῦ) is taken away, then the very οἰκονομία

---

[124] Fatouros 409. 46-50.

of Christ is virtually destroyed.'[125] And in *Antirr* III.A.37 he insists that Christ must be circumscribed, 'unless the mystery of the οἰκονομία be a fantasy. (Εἰ μὴ ἄρα φαντασία τὸ τῆς οἰκονομίας μυστήριον.)' With this language, Theodore accuses the iconoclasts of a heresy which denies entirely the salvation of God offered in Jesus Christ. The accepted definition, already established by the time of the Cappadocians[126] to whom Theodore is so indebted, is that θεολογία is the consideration of the Godhead in and of itself, and that οἰκονομία is the working out of God's purpose in the world, through His Son. Theodore articulates the difference in a bit of catechesis to a convert during his third exile:

> For this is the true faith of Christians, according to the dogma of theology (τὸ τῆς θεολογίας δόγμα), to believe in the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, in whom the baptized have their perfection: God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Spirit, (in one God and not three/ yes, because there is one divinity, not divided into three hypostases, but divinity is contemplated indivisibly wholly in each person. The summing up of the confession turns out to be a paradox: God is said to be in each, yet there is one God), but then again there is the dogma of the oikonomia (τὸ τῆς οἰκονομίας) which is to believe that the word became flesh, that is to say that one of the Holy Trinity was born of the immaculate Virgin Mary, remaining what he had been, unchanging and coeternal God as with the Father, taking up our nature by his birth through the virgin in the Holy Spirit. And he is wholly God and wholly man, bearing wholly and without defect in him the natures of each (τὰ τῶν ἑκατέρων φύσεων) out of which he is composed (ἐξ ὧν συνετέθη), thus he is said to be very God and very man in the properties of one hypostasis (ἐν

---

[125] Fatouros 57.
[126] Cf. Gregory Nyssa *Contra Eunomium libri* 3.1.131-2, 3.3.61-62; Gregory Nazianzen *Orationes* 30.8; Basil *Contra Eunomium* 2.2-3, 2.22.

43

μιᾷ ὑποστάσει τὰ ἰδιώματα) ...[127]

Thus far the iconoclasts would agree, perhaps with the exception of the phrase 'in the properties of ...' in the final phrase.[128] For three hundred years the Church had been working out the implications of the Chalcedonian definition of the two natures in the one hypostasis. How are the full properties of each nature expressed in the one hypostasis? By the eighth century it has come to an agreement that this one Lord Jesus Christ had two natures, two wills, and two energies. But how does Christ express these human and divine natures 'without confusion, without change, without division, without separation...'? Is there a 'theandric activity' which avoids monoenergism, in which the one Person of Christ acting with integrity does human things divinely and divine things humanly?[129] These are the continuing questions of the οἰκονομία: how God acts in human history in the Person of his divine Son to save us. Although these questions are not answered merely by acknowledging the distinction of θεολογία and οἰκονομία, nevertheless the continuing attempt to answer these questions must maintain this distinction. In fact the distinction itself was first introduced into Christian thinking in the fourth century, during the Arian controversy, precisely to establish a clarity of thought concerning the divinity of Christ. What can be said about Christ as God in relation to the other members of the Holy Trinity is a matter of θεολογία. What can be said about Christ as Saviour in relation to the world and the human soul is a matter of οἰκονομία.

Theodore accuses the iconoclasts of violating this principle. As Theodore is

---

[127] Fatouros 463.

[128] This is close, but not quite the language of Chalcedon which declares 'the property of both natures is preserved and comes together into a single person and a single subsistent being.' See Tanner (1990), 86, 87.

[129] See Louth (1996), 54-62, 171-179 re. Maximus' interpretation of Dionysius' fourth letter in the light of the Christological divisions of the time.

concluding his entire argument in *Antirr* III.C.15, the iconoclasts challenge that John 4.24 teaches that any offering of προκύνησις to Christ ('since he is God' - ἐπείπερ Θεὸς) in an εἰκών is idolatry. ('God is Spirit and those who offer him προκυνήσις must offer him προκυνήσις in spirit and in truth.') This accusation is put into the mouth of the iconoclasts to provide Theodore the opportunity to suggest that the root of the iconoclast heresy is that its proponents 'do not recognize how different the doctrine of the οἰκονομία (τὸ τῆς οἰκονομίας [δόγμα]) is from that of θεολογία (τὸ τῆς θεολογίας δόγμα).' The saying about offering προκυνήσις in spirit and in truth belongs to θεολογία, but the offering of προκυνήσις to the Incarnate Christ in the εἰκών belongs to the principle of the οἰκονομία (τῆς οἰκονομίας λόγος).[130] Christ was both God and man.

Theodore was familiar with Basil's *Contra Eunomium*[131] in which Basil takes up and corrects Eunomius' subordinationist interpretation of Acts 2.36, 'God has made (ἐποίησεν) him [Jesus] both Lord and Christ.' According to Basil, Luke was not making a statement of θεολογία about the nature of the relations within the Godhead, but rather was describing God's activity within the created order (οἱ τῆς οἰκονομίας λόγοι). Thus the Scripture does not deny the eternal divinity of the Son. Eunomius simply was not careful enough with distinguishing θεολογία from οἰκονομία. In a like fashion, in *Seven Chapters against the Iconoclasts*, Theodore refutes an iconoclastic interpretation of an alleged quotation from Gregory Nazianzen.[132] The quotation is not cited accurately, but if this is written during his exile Theodore might be recollecting from memory both the quotation and the interpretation by the iconoclasts. The attempted quotation is very

---

[130] This seminal passage near the conclusion of the apology continues in a way which will suggest how the offering of προκυνήσις to the εἰκών of Christ overcomes the distinction of οἰκονομία and θεολογία.
[131] Theodore quotes from *Contra Eunomium* in *Antirr* II.44.
[132] Cf. Demoen (1997), 79.

45

likely from *Oration* 28.7, which is the Theologian's second theological oration, and reads: πῶς γὰρ σεπτόν, εἰ περιγραπτόν (for how would it [i.e. the Godhead] be holy, if it could be circumscribed?) The refutation of the iconoclast interpretation is simply to point out that he has failed to maintain the essential distinction between θεολογία and οἰκονομία:

> Οὐ μὴν περὶ οἰκονομίας προΰκειτο λέγειν. Ἄλλος γὰρ λόγος θεολογίας, καὶ ἕτερος οἰκονομίας, ἐν οἷς οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ ἔστι δογματίζειν.[133]
>
> (This has not been said concerning the οἰκονομία. There is one principle of θεολογία and another of οἰκονομία: according to the principle of θεολογία the maxim is valid, according to the principle of οἰκονομία it is not.)

In this same oration of Gregory Nazianzen to which Theodore refers, Gregory has already made use of a citation from Plato, 'To conceive God is difficult, but to describe him is impossible.'[134] Gregory suggests that a truer expression would be, 'To describe God is impossible, but to conceive him even more impossible.'[135] Perhaps it is this text of Gregory which Theodore has in mind at the very beginning of the argument of the *Antirr*[136] when he makes an extreme statement regarding the difficulty of speaking of matters of θεολογία. Theodore is cautioning against any attempt to describe the content of θεολογία or to make any statement about the Godhead at all.

Ὅτι μὲν ἀπερίληπτον τὸ θεῖον καὶ ἀπερίγραπτον, προσθήσω δ'ὅτι καὶ ἄπειρον

---

[133] Migne *PG* 99.496D-497A.
[134] *Oration* 28.4 citing Timaeus 28C. Migne *PG* 36.28C. See Winslow (1979) 28, 29.
[135] Of course Gregory Nazianzen here generally follows the theme in Origen that Plato did not sufficiently defend the incomprehensibility of the divine nature. Origen, *Celsus* 7.36-45.
[136] *Antirr* I.2.

46

καὶ ἀόριστον καὶ ἀσχημάτιστον, καὶ ὅσα διὰ τῆς ἀφαιρέσεως τῶν ἅπερ οὐκ ἔστι, λέγεται παντί που δῆλον. ... Καὶ ὅσον μὲν κατὰ τὸ τῆς θεολογίας δόγμα, οὐχ ὅτι περιγραφῆς ἢ καταλήψεως εἶδος ἐξευρίσκειν, ἄπαγε· τοῦτο γὰρ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ἐπινοίας ἐφεύρεμα· ἀλλ᾽ οὐδ᾽ ὅτι ποτὲ ἔστιν ἴσμεν τὸ Θεῖον, ἢ ὅ τί πέρ ἐστιν, ὡς αὐτὸ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ ἐπίσταται μόνον.

(It is obvious to all that the Godhead is incomprehensible and uncircumscribable, and I add boundless, limitless, formless, and whatsoever else through the removal of [properties by privation] the Godhead is not...And in regard to the doctrine of theology, so far from inventing some kind of circumscription or comprehension of form (perish the idea! for this was an invention of pagan thought), we do not even know that the Godhead exists at all, or what sort of thing it is, as it alone understands about itself.)

Thus only the language of α-privative, or apophatic, language can be used in relation to θεολογία. But we must not make a hasty assumption from this relationship of θεολογία and apophatic language that therefore cataphatic language must be appropriate to the οἰκονομία. Theodore immediately goes on to correct such a notion:

Ἐπεὶ δὲ δι᾽ ἄκραν ἀγαθότητα εἰς ἀνθρωπείαν φύσιν ἐλήλυθε, γενόμενος καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς ὁ εἷς τῆς Τριάδος· καὶ γέγονε τῶν ἀμίκτων μίξις, καὶ τῶν ἀκράτων κρᾶσις, ἤτοι τοῦ ἀπεριγράπτου πρὸς τὸ περιγεγραμμένον· τοῦ ἀπείρου πρὸς τὸ πεπερασμένον· τοῦ ἀορίστου πρὸς τὸ διωρισμένον· τοῦ ἀσχηματίστου πρὸς τὸ εὐσχηματισμένον· ὃ καὶ παράδοχον·

(But because of His great goodness one of the Trinity has entered human nature and become like us. There is a mixture of the unmixed, and a compounding of that which is not able to be combined: that is, of the uncircumscribable with the circumscribed, of the boundless with the bounded, of the limitless with the definite,

47

of the formless with the well-formed, which is paradoxical.)

The language appropriate to the Person of Jesus Christ is paradoxical[137] - both apophatic
and cataphatic. The iconoclasts are convinced that the portrayal of Christ in an εἰκών
denies the apophatic nature of Christ, and thus the saving οἰκονομία. The iconophiles are
equally convinced that the denial of the Christ εἰκών negates the way that Christ has come
to save us, and rejects the precious cataphatic language of the saving οἰκονομία. The
solution to this dilemma will lie in Theodore's understanding of the devotional εἰκών
which, like Christ himself, must be spoken of in both apophatic and cataphatic language at
the same time. Both Christ and his devotional εἰκών provide the bridge from the
οἰκονομία to θεολογία.

Theodore's understanding of tradition

In his humility Theodore would very often express his unworthiness to be abbot, yet he
makes one exception: 'whatever ill anyone may speak of me, let him do so, for he speaks
truth, with one sole exception: I am no heretic.'[138]

The notion of heresy for Theodore was linked with that of tradition, which is the
other notion which colours the whole of middle Byzantine theology. As with the concept
of θεολογία/οἰκονομία Theodore shared a general understanding of tradition with his

contemporaries on both sides of the debate, but gave it his own refinement in the course
of the argument. All parties on all sides of all the controversies in the seventh to ninth

---

[137] Just as the confession of the Trinity is described by Theodore to be a paradox in Fatouros 463, as
already noted.
[138] *MC* 12, p 81. Cited by O'Connell (1972), 200.

48

centuries sought to be true to the authoritative tradition of Scripture as interpreted and lived by the Fathers and the saints (as recorded in their exegetical, doctrinal and devotional writings, in the *Vita* of the saints, and even monastic canons and *Rules*), as articulated in the ὅρος and canons of the six oecumenical councils, and as passed down in the divine liturgy (including the creeds). This tradition conveyed divinely revealed truth that was changeless and timeless. Theodore speaks for the spirit of the age when he distinguishes the character of this truth from that of heretical distortions:

Ὁ μὲν τῆς ἀληθείας λόγος μονοειδής τις ὢν καὶ ἀκράδαντος τὴν φύσιν, οὔτε γνωμικαῖς διαιρέσεσιν, οὔτε χρονικαῖς ἀλλοιώσεσιν ὑποβάλλεσθαι πέφυκεν· ἀεὶ γάρ ἐστι τὰ αὐτὰ δοξάζων τε καὶ πρεσβεύων ὡς πάσης ὑφέσεώς τε καὶ προσθέσεως ἐξηρημένος. Ὁ δὲ τοῦ ψεύδους μῦθος, ἅτε πολυσχιδὴς καὶ μυριόγνωμος τυγχάνων, ἐξ ἄλλων τε εἰς ἄλλα μεταπίπτων, πῇ μὲν τοῦτο πρεσβεύει, πῇ δὲ ἕτερον ἀντιδοξάζει, καὶ ἵσταται ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ οὐδαμῇ οὐδαμῶς, τοῖς τῆς ἀλλοιώσεως τε καὶ τροπῆς νάθεσιν ὑποβαλλόμενος.[139]

(Because the word of truth is single and unshakable by nature, it is not subject to divisions of opinion or changes with time; for it is always holding and proclaiming the same doctrines, since it is free from all subtraction or addition. The fables of falsehood, however, because they are fragmented and diverse in opinion, always shifting from one position to another, proclaim one thing now, then hold the opposite, and never stand still in the same place, since they are subject to the pressures of variation and change.)

In *Antirr* II.47,48 the iconoclast offers to bring forward 'more authoritative texts from the holy Fathers' which forbid the erection of an εἰκών. The iconophile speaker replies that

---

[139] Preface to *Antirr* II, Migne *PG* 99.352C.

these cannot be authentic texts from saintly Fathers 'but from heretical interpolators; otherwise they would agree with the inspired Fathers.' The tradition was judged to have an integrity which should not be compromised. We shall see that this demand of total consistency and theological agreement within the tradition would lead to a way of doing theology which threatened to prevent the resolution of the image debate altogether.

Innovation was thought to be the mother of heresy. As John of Damascus states the purpose of his *Fount of Knowledge*, 'I shall offer nothing of my own, but shall summarize, as succinctly as I can, what proven teachers have formulated.'[140] So Theodore likewise describes a treatise he has written: 'I have introduced no thought of my own in the entire work, but only to gather and collect [the teachings and precepts] of the holy Fathers.'[141] (μηδὲν ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ συντάγματι φρόνημα εἰσκεκομικὼς ... ἢ μόνον τὸ ὑφεῖναι καὶ συνάψαι τὰ τῶν θείων πατέρων.) The Damascene had pointed to Galatians 1.8: '...if anyone announces to you another gospel than that which the catholic church has received from the holy apostles, Fathers, and councils, and has guarded until now, do not listen to him ... If an angel or an emperor announces to you a gospel other than the one you have received, close your ears.'[142] Likewise, Theodore points to the same scriptural text (a favourite of Theodore's) in his *Refutation of Iconoclastic Poems*, describing true doctrine as 'the excellence of the apostles, the foundation of the Fathers, the keys of the dogmas, the standard of orthodoxy' and declaring that anyone who contradicts this doctrine 'even if an angel from heaven', is to be excommunicated and anathematized. Immediately after the 'heretical' synod of January 809 which Theodore interprets as overturning the tradition of the church, he writes: 'How

---

[140] Migne *PG* 94.525A.
[141] Fatouros 43.16-19.
[142] *Orations on the Images* 2.6, Migne *PG* 94.1288, as quoted by Pelikan (1974), 9.

can any man living in the flesh, if he wavers and introduces innovations, especially such innovations as these, be other than alienated from God.' (Καὶ πῶς ἄνθρωπος πᾶς ἐν σαρκὶ ὤν, σαλεύων καὶ καινοτομῶν, καὶ μάλιστα τοιαύτας καινοτομίας, οὐκ ἀλλότριος θεοῦ;)[143] The Council *in Trullo* (692), part of the Sixth Oecumenical Council, is cited several times in his letters and in the *Antirr*. It cautions bishops in their teaching.

> It is necessary for those who preside over the churches ... to teach all the clergy and people ... collecting out of divine Scripture the thoughts and judgments of truth, but not exceeding the limits now fixed, nor varying from the traditions of the God-fearing Fathers. But if any issue arises concerning Scripture, it should not be interpreted other than as the luminaries and teachers of the Church have expounded in their writings; let them [the bishops] become distinguished for their knowledge of patristic writings rather than for composing treatises out of their own heads.[144]

Tradition was the agreed authority for both iconophiles and iconoclasts. The 754 Council, 787 Council and 815 Council each in turn pleaded that their ὅρος and canons were entirely derivative from the orthodoxy of the previous six oecumenical councils.[145] In the *Antirr* the iconoclast demands that the iconophile prove his case 'by bringing together testimonies from various Fathers'.[146] When Theodore reasons a point, the iconoclast retorts, 'You have proved by artificial logic ... but you have not proved it by indisputable witnesses.'[147]

---

[143] Fatouros 36.80-1.
[144] Canon 19, cited by Meyendorff (1984).
[145] In Fatouros 24 (808) Theodore challenges the claim that Joseph's reinstatement was accomplished by council authority, 'Sir, a council does not consist simply in the gathering together of bishops and priests, no matter how many there are. ... A council occurs when, in the Lord's name, the canons are thoroughly searched out and maintained.'
[146] *Antirr* II.28, Migne *PG* 99.373B.
[147] *Antirr* II.36, Migne *PG* 99.376D.

Within this shared commitment to tradition as authoritative, however, it seems to me that Theodore and the Stoudites in general had a more lively and present sense of tradition than did the iconoclasts. When Theodore quotes from Sophronius' *Miracles of the Martyrs Cyrus and John*, and from the *Synodicon* of Theodore of Antioch (actually Theodore of Jerusalem, 745-67)[148] he is challenged because these 'are recent, and not among the ancient Fathers, they cannot be accepted as authoritative witness.' Obviously for the iconoclast, a fixed canon of ancient orthodox authors had been established as authoritative. In this way of thinking, the fifth century view as expressed by Vincent of Lérins that tradition is the discernment of what the Church has always affirmed: '*quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est*'[149] sends one back to the past to gather authoritative texts. This sense of tradition is that of an objective fixed body of dogma and sayings which is an external standard by which the present church is guided and judged.

In response to this approach, Theodore presents another concept of tradition which is more urgent and present. He suggests that current teachers must be judged in relation to the tradition and if they do not follow 'Basil and the other inspired Fathers', then they are not to be accepted. On the other hand, these current teachers should be accepted as part of the authoritative tradition, if they meet certain conditions.

> But if their words are consistent and equivalent, not only those who are remembered for speaking two hundred years ago, but also anyone up to the present time who may say the same, should be both accepted by the Church of God and numbered for his true teaching with the holy apostles themselves, not merely with the later

---

[148] This *Synodicon* was read into the proceedings of 787. See Mansi 12.1135-46.
[149] Vincent of Lérins, *Commonitorium* 2, Migne *PL* 50.640.

52

inspired teachers. In this regard listen to the *Acts of the Holy Confessor Maximus*, ... there is a great swarm of texts available from both ancient and recent authorities (χρήσεων τῶν τε πάλαι καὶ νεωστὶ)...[150]

The authoritative tradition of the church includes Maximus Confessor in the seventh century and Theodore of Jerusalem in the eighth century.

Theodore taught his Stoudite monks that they were at present living the tradition of the Church. The greatest privilege of the Stoudite life is to pass along to following generations the orthodox faith of the church, together with the monastic rule.[151] The tradition is not something that belongs to the past, but it is embodied in the Church (the church as the visible 'body of Christ', and not an invisible entity is a recurrent theme for Theodore), in the monastic communities, and indeed in every baptized Christian who is faithful to the teachings, canons and sacraments of the Church. In the Stoudite efforts to order their lives according to ancient monastic rule, to progress in the spiritual life according to the inspired teachings of the ascetic Fathers, to worship in the liturgical tradition as inherited, and to collect, copy and study the writings of the Fathers and their *Vita*, the Stoudites lived the tradition.

In living this tradition, the Stoudites were not looking backward. Rather, the rule of Basil, particularly as interpreted by Dorotheus of Gaza, was much enhanced and refined by Theodore. Theodore was wise enough in the ascetic tradition to have understood the principles of that tradition which he adapted to the new urban monastic mission. As well, Theodore and other Stoudites in the ninth century made significant

---

[150] *Antirr* II.40, Migne *PG* 99.381AB.
[151] See *Laudatio Platonis*, Migne *PG* 99.845.

53

contributions to liturgical enhancement and revision, both in the writing of texts and poetry and in the ordering of the offices and Triodion especially, as mentioned above. In his regular catechesis Theodore would translate the insights of the received ascetic writings into practical advice for his community and for the individual monks under his care. In the very same way, Theodore the Stoudite defends his creative apology for the εἰκών by arguing that part of the very tradition of the Church requires that its divinely received, timeless and changeless doctrine must be articulated in fresh ways in the developing οἰκονομία. In this spirit he admits that the precise expression of his image theology cannot be found in the prior tradition, but it is nonetheless part of the tradition. In a letter written near his death Theodore summarizes some aspects of his image theology and concludes: 'Thus, O man of God, is the truth as it has been taught by the apostles and prophets and God-inspired Fathers, *even if not in these very words*, but through the truth of a careful examination of their sayings.'[152]

In contrast to this commitment to be true to the spirit of the tradition, in *Antirr* II.7 the iconoclast represents a view of tradition that sees it as a closed set:

ἀπαράδεκτος ὁ λόγος· μὴ παραλαμβανόμενος ἡμῶν τῇ κατὰ πίστιν ὁμολογίᾳ.
(your statement cannot be accepted, because it is not included in the traditional confession of our faith.)

In his study of Leontius of Jerusalem, Gray (1989) suggests that this attitude can be found as early as the sixth century:

---

[152] Fatouros 463.

The ponderous weight of the imagined past - possessed of a perfect, seamless theology, the achievement of irreproachable and holy Fathers who spoke with but a single voice - made it impossible to conceive of oneself as living still in their age.[153]

On the contrary, in response to the iconoclast, Theodore describes a living tradition which requires that the expression of orthodox doctrine be constantly refined:

> Many teachings which are not written in so many words, but have equal force with the written teachings, have been proclaimed by the holy Fathers. It is not the inspired Scripture but the later Fathers who made it clear that the Son is consubstantial with the Father, that the Holy Spirit is God, that the Lord's mother is Theotokos, and other doctrines which are too many to list. If these doctrines are not confessed, the truth of our worship is denied. But these doctrines were confessed at the time when need summoned them for the suppression of heresies which were rising up against the truth. So after all how is it surprising, although it is not written that Christ is the prototype of His εἰκών, if the times now require this to be said in opposition to the growing iconoclast heresy, since the truth is so clearly evident?[154]

The challenge for such an understanding of tradition as expressed here is precisely that challenge which was taken up by the church in its first six centuries. Through its developing exegesis, liturgy, creeds, six oecumenical councils, resulting canons, and theology, it set the limits of discourse and gave increasing definition to orthodox θεολογία and οἰκονομία. The eighth and ninth centuries are generally characterized as having left behind this lively sense of a developing tradition which, under the guidance of the Holy

---

[153] Gray (1989), 35.
[154] *Antirr* II.7, Migne *PG* 99.356CD.

Spirit, articulated the implicit truths of the faith already present in Scripture. These subsequent centuries, rather, are thought to represent a more narrow backward looking to a tradition which is fossilized in the past, and associated with the growth of florilegia and 'theology by snippet'. I shall examine these claims in due course in my argument, but it is important to note before we begin that at the very least, Theodore and the Stoudite community saw themselves as participants in, and contributors to, a living tradition. Their calling was to live and speak that tradition faithfully in whatever new ways their circumstances required: in their monastic rule, in their ascetic life, liturgically, and doctrinally.

Approach and structure of this dissertation

Citing I. Hausherr as 'an authority on Theodore'[155] Cholij (2002) promotes Hausherr's views that 'even if Theodore had studied texts of the Fathers *in extenso*, he seems to have taken little note of context and is interested only in the conclusions and the way they are expressed.'[156] Cholij continues, 'Certainly this "lazy" way of doing theology was commonplace during the period.'[157] Cholij, following Hausherr, is speaking of the phenomenon which we shall describe below as 'argument by florilegia' which is a theological reflection based on established florilegia and not on the reading and understanding of complete texts. But then Cholij makes two revealing admissions. First, he concedes that Hausherr supports his negative assessment of Theodore's theological

---

[155] But surely not an authority on Theodore's theological writings; about which Hausherr wrote very little and it seems that Cholij has read even less. As Cholij suggests, Hausherr is exceptional when placing Theodore in the context of the monastic ascetic tradition, cf. Hausherr (1935); but he never claims, as far as I know, to have given proper attention to his theological works. Authors who have considered Theodore as a theologian have much more positive appraisals of his theological abilities. See Grumel (1921), Ladner (1953), Meyendorff (1970), Schönborn (1976), and Pelikan (1990).

[156] Hausherr (1926), 16 as found in Cholij (2002), 25.

[157] Cholij (2002), 25.

method by citing only one example where Theodore takes a quotation out of its original context. It is the quotation long established in iconophile florilegia, Basil *De Spiritu Sancto* 18.45. Hausherr points out that in the original context Basil's text was part of the trinitarian argument about the divine nature of the Son, whereas Theodore uses it quite differently as part of his defence of images. Second, Cholij admits that Theodore's theological writings such as the *Antirrhetici*:

> ... would *prima facie* seem to evidence critical and analytical powers and an ability to elaborate sophisticated argumentation when required to do so. However these arguments were taken from a stockpile of Aristotelian arguments developed by iconophiles since the Second Council of Nicaea. To this author, they do not evidence any original *creative* thinking.[158]

This dissertation will argue against both Cholij's assertions. First, it will show that Theodore intentionally broke away from any dependence upon established florilegia. In the case of Hausherr's reference to the Basil quotation we will show specifically how Theodore was exceptional in the latter eighth and ninth century polemic in recognizing the broader textual context of this passage. In fact, Hausherr and Cholij are mistaken in their interpretation of the passage. Although Basil does speak of the Son as being a natural image of the Father in the Basil passage, Basil's overall argument has to do with the honour which passes from the image of the Emperor to the Emperor himself. In fact, Theodore will recognize all this, and will go on to use the Basil passage in yet another way. To maintain the integrity both of Basil's original argument, and his own, Theodore

---

[158] Cholij (2002), 25. Italics by Cholij.

will make a subtle but significant shift in the prefix of the verb. Far from dependence upon an isolated and disconnected piece of florilegium, or being careless in the reading of the Basil passage in its fuller context, Theodore analyses and makes use of the passage with precision and insight.[159] Theodore's broad appreciation and understanding of the full texts of the theological and ascetic tradition, exceptional for that period, equipped him to produce an apology for the offering of προσκύνησις to the Christ-εἰκών which ended the unproductive cycle of proof-texting that had long stalemated the image debate.

Second, I hope to show that Theodore fully intends *Antirr* III to be seen as a creative argument within the tradition. In *Antirr* I and II Theodore builds the foundation for this argument by carefully indicating just why such a creative use of the theological tradition is required to resolve the controversy. Cholij does not give any authority or reference for his claim of a 'stockpile of Aristotelian arguments developed by iconophiles since the Second Council of Nicaea,' but I suppose he is thinking generally of the well-known yet purely speculative suggestions of Alexander (1958b) almost fifty years ago. Putting aside his failure to offer any support for the existence of such a 'stockpile of Aristotelian arguments' (Alexander himself offered no substantial evidence), Cholij's inability to see any original *creative* thinking in Theodore's *Antirr* and other theological writings is, of course, a matter of perception and judgment. I hope that the careful analysis of the *Antirr* in this thesis will make Theodore's theological creativity more apparent.

My consideration of Theodore's image theology takes the form of an analysis of the argument of Theodore's *Antirr*, assisted primarily by a reading of his letters which

---

[159] In *Antirr* II.24-26 Theodore sets up an exchange whereby the iconoclast brings Hausherr's charge against the iconophile that Basil's example was a reference to a natural and not an artificial image. The iconophile response answers the objection.

specifically address image theology. I will conclude that Theodore intends *Antirr* III to be an apology for the Christ-εἰκών and thus to contribute to the final resolution of the iconoclastic controversy. Modern and current scholarship has not recognized the unique character and significance of the argument of *Antirr* III within eighth and early ninth century theological discourse.

The *Antirr* as a whole is not a sustained philosophical argument independent of the tradition of the Church. Rather, in a general way *Antirr* I and II systematically present the various arguments of the theological debate of the controversy up to and including the Iconoclastic Council of Saint Sophia (815). *Antirr* III is Theodore's separate, independent argument. *Antirr* I and II are unique among the writings of this period in that they show forth the full strength of both sides of the controversy. The theological arguments of the iconoclasts are not diminished in the interests of partisan debate, nor made into a straw man to be easily knocked over. Rather, in these first two *Antirr* Theodore genuinely rehearses, in a general way, the historical progression of the theological controversy as it developed conceptually in two stages: from its beginning to the Council of Nicaea (787), and from 787 to 815.

Theodore offers this remarkably balanced presentation of the debate in *Antirr* I and II not because he wants to be fair to both sides. He feels the iconoclast position is entirely heretical and he clearly and consistently insists on the truth of the iconophile position. Yet Theodore subtly concludes that the actual theological debate has become unresolvable within the assumed categories of both sides, preventing even the possibility of a convincing theological justification of images. In *Antirr* I and II Theodore demonstrates the limitations of the current method of 'argumentation by florilegia' of the

seventh and early eighth century so that the character and strength of his positive argument in *Antirr* III can be seen to resolve the resulting stalemate. Although both iconoclasts and iconophiles ultimately appeal to the same authoritative tradition, the reasoning of each side begins from a different selection of pre-determined patristic texts. The two opposing compilations of patristic texts are set against one another in such an external fashion that the greater logic which provides the conceptual context and essential meaning of these texts has been lost. I will suggest that the theological tools and philosophical analysis available to the seventh and eighth century Byzantine church were insufficient to resolve this apparent contradiction within the tradition.

Theodore overcomes this impasse through a fresh conceptual approach which depends upon a re-reading of the tradition, both theological and philosophical[160], beyond the current established florilegia. His leadership in inaugurating the Stoudite tradition of a broad patristic education for monks gave him the resources to accomplish this. The conclusions of his extensive reading of the tradition as applied to the image question are presented in *Antirr* III. Theodore's extant letters (most of which were written after the *Antirr*) help identify the doctrinal sources, clarify and refine the concepts, provide commentary, and develop the argument of *Antirr* III.[161]

In the most general terms, *Antirr* I considers the iconoclastic charge that images are

---

[160] Theodore's recovery of the Platonic philosophy, as interpreted by Aristotle and his commentators, is part of the authoritative tradition for him. He identifies logic and grammar as useful tools when applied properly to the theological tradition. For example, in his preface to *Antirr* III he indicates that his argument will employ Aristotelian logic but within limits of the tradition which he calls the 'power of truth'. Tradition governs the proper use of syllogism (and Aristotelian thought in general): Συλλογισμοῖς δέ τισι χρήσομαι πρὸς τὴν τοῦ λόγου ὑπόθεσιν, οὐχ ἔχουσι μὲν ἔντεχνον τὴν πλοκὴν κατὰ τὴν Ἀριστοτελικὴν τεχνολογίαν, εἴτ' οὖν φλυαρίαν· ἁπλοϊκωτέρῳ δὲ φθέγματι, τῷ κράτει τῆς ἀληθείας ἐρηρεισμένοις. (I shall use some syllogisms to present the subject of my treatise, not indeed with the technical artifice of the Aristotelian system (or rather silliness), but with a simpler form of expression, relying on the power of truth.) Migne *PG* 99.389A.

[161] In these letters there is a refinement and articulation of the concepts found in the *Antirr*. It is misleading simply to suggest, as Damian (1993), that in the letters 'what he usually says is a reiteration of the arguments of his *Refutations against iconoclasts*.' (105).

idols and the accusation that images are the result and indicator of Christological heresy; *Antirr* II considers the iconoclastic charge that the offering of προσκύνησις to the εἰκών of Christ is an abomination of worship; *Antirr* III is a positive argument which shows that these are not separate but identical questions which are resolved by a proper understanding of the relation of εἰκών to prototype.

Chapter one of this thesis outlines the structure of the *Antirr* and shows how the theological debate about images in the eighth and ninth centuries was an extension of the Christological controversies of the fifth through seventh centuries. Both iconophiles and iconoclasts sought to reflect and faithfully to endorse Chalcedonian Christological definitions. Each side promoted a particular redaction of the Chalcedonian formula as it had been received and understood in the eighth century,[162] but ultimately this shared conceptual framework reduced the debate to a question of the use of images as legitimate theurgy within Chalcedonian orthodoxy. The iconoclasts feared that the theological climate of the previous two centuries had tended to overemphasize the humanity of Christ such that His divinity is denied. For them the Christ-εἰκών is an instance of an imbalance which violates the orthodox interpretation of the Chalcedonian definition of the person of Christ, resulting in Christological heresy. The eighth and early ninth century iconophile response was largely a defensive reaction to the substantial Christological arguments of the iconoclasts. Yet the motivation of both iconoclasts and iconophiles is to preserve and promote the defined orthodox Chalcedonian dyophysite doctrine.

Chapter one also indicates the relation of the Councils of 754 (Hieria), 787

---

[162] Both sides were confident that they were faithful to the tradition. Almost a century after the 787 Council, Photius comments that the iconoclasts were convinced that the tradition of the Church was contrary to images, 'accusing us of introducing daring innovations into apostolic teaching'. See Mango (1958), Homily 17.286-296.

(Nicaea) and 815 (St. Sophia) as each attempts to define the tradition with respect to images. Theodore agrees that the 787 Council faithfully confirmed and declared the tradition with respect to images, *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est*. Yet the definition of the 787 Council did not resolve the controversy. It did not provide theological justification for its claims, and although it is not the role of a Council to do so, nevertheless at some stage the doctrine declared by each Council must be theologically grounded.[163] After the 787 Council the attachment to iconoclastic sentiments remained strong and fertile for the ascendancy of Leo V in 813, at least partially because that positive theology of the image still had not appeared. Because the iconoclastic bishops of the 815 Council did not feel that there had been a fresh theological challenge to iconoclasm since 754 (including 787), they were content simply to review and approve the arguments of 754, slightly amending them to reflect the current emphasis in iconoclast thought. They gathered as a Council apparently only to re-establish the 754 Council as the legitimate Seventh Oecumenical Council. I will suggest that, in reality, the intention of the 815 Council was deeper, and that it sought to articulate a view of images which would

---

[163] The 754 Council itself is remarkable in the large amount of theological argument it advances. As suggested to me by Professor Louth, this is likely a sign of its anxiety about being able confidently to present itself as affirming *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est*. Parry (1996) does not understand this feature of the 754 Council to be a deviation from council tradition and, assuming that Councils are meant to engage in theological debate, unjustly criticizes 787 as 'doing less than justice to iconoclast theology as presented in the *Horos* of 754' (134). The 787 Council understood its role to condemn the heresy of the past and to declare established doctrine which it presents as having been confirmed in the tradition. He writes: 'The thing that strikes one on reading the refutation is its ...reliance on patristic authority, and its failure to grasp the arguments of the other side. What it lacks in theological precision it more than makes up for with legend, hagiography and quotation ... it leaves several holes in the [theological] defence it constructs against iconoclasm.' (Parry 1996, 134-5). Although Parry fails to see that the authority of the tradition is discovered precisely in the hagiography and dependence upon the previous Councils and Fathers in general, his assessment is typical. Beck (1969) writes of the 787 Council, 'Both the handling of the *ratio theologica* and especially that of the proof from tradition were appallingly inadequate. ... The manner of using the Old Testament would scarcely have obtained the approval of a single Church Father of the seventh century. ... In the demonstration of the Church's tradition all possible legends and miracle stories made a significantly deeper impression than the well stated skeptical remarks of the older Fathers, who were either not considered at all or were easily pushed aside. ... In the history of theology the discussions of this synod mark the nadir for the Eastern Church.' (35).

be acceptable to the Frankish court, the papacy, and Byzantium.

The bulk of Theodore's theological writing was a response to the 815 Council. In the *Antirr,* Theodore suggests that although he judges that the history of the devotional, liturgical and teaching life of the church sufficiently substantiates the claims of the 787 Council,[164] the specifically theological defence of offering προσκύνησις to the Christ-εἰκών had been inadequate and thus permitted the confidence of the 815 Council and the subsequent outbreak of iconoclasm under Leo V.[165] Completing his summary of the theological controversy to 815, Theodore concludes *Antirr* II with the clear implication that the force of the iconoclast position remained unanswered.

Having shown the limited character of the eighth century iconophile arguments and the equal strength of the iconoclast arguments in my first chapter, I go on in chapter two to indicate two important lessons that Theodore learned from his close review of the controversy to 815. First, he concludes that the iconoclast arguments had prospered from the lack of clear definition of the subject matter of the debate: the Christ-εἰκών. Second, he came to see that the evidence of the florilegia was equally weighty on both sides of the issue and that appeal to florilegia would never achieve a definitive theological resolution to the controversy. In addressing these issues in *Antirr* II Theodore determined to define more closely the character of the Christ-εἰκών under discussion, and concludes *Antirr* II

[164] He concludes *Antirr* II: 'For evidence, moreover, that we have received from the Apostles themselves and have preserved up to the present time the tradition of erecting the image of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the Theotokos, and of any of the saints - raise your eyes, look around, and see everywhere under heaven, throughout the sacred edifices and the holy monuments in them, these images depicted and necessarily venerated in the places where they are depicted. Even if there were no dogmatic reason nor voices of inspired Fathers to uphold both the erection and the veneration of images, the prevailing ancient tradition would be sufficient for confirmation of the truth' (388CD).

[165] In the light of Theodore's hesitations to accept the 787 Council, it is curious to note that the synod of 843 called by the patriarch Methodius to prepare a liturgical celebration of the restoration of images, made no reference to the 787 Council. Walter (1988) comments, 'Only a century after it took place was the second Council of Nicaea, like poor Malvolio, to have greatness thrust upon it, probably by the patriarch Photius. It was added to the six preceding oecumenical councils in his letter to the Bulgarians of about 866.' (23).

63

with a clear description of the problem of the use of florilegia in the controversy. Both accomplishments prepare the reader for the theological argument of *Antirr* III. Written in direct response to and within three years of the 815 Council, the distinctive character of the argument of *Antirr* III becomes clear as we briefly compare its theological method with that of Nicephorus'῎Ελεγχος καὶ 'Ανατροπή, a contemporary and more lengthy response to the 815 Council. Although the῎Ελεγχος also attempts to use the recovery of Aristotelian categories to contribute a crushing blow to the theological presentation of the 815 Council, it fails to achieve its purpose because it remains within the conceptual framework of the eighth and early ninth centuries. Compared with Theodore's *Antirr* III, it is a much more direct refutation of 815 beginning with a sentence by sentence refutation of the Council's definition followed by a comprehensive refutation of the iconoclastic florilegium of the 815 Council. I shall describe Theodore's recovery of the tradition as more comprehensive in content and method. *Antirr* III offers a creative legitimization of the Christ-εἰκών by a fresh theological argument dependent upon a careful re-reading of the tradition.

In chapter three I introduce the argument of *Antirr* III with a few remarks concerning its historical context. I point to evidence in the texts of the letters and the *Antirr* which determines the relation of several key letters to the *Antirr* and completes the chronology of the letters begun in this introduction.

The final chapter follows the order of the four part argument of *Antirr* III. Theodore grounds his argument in a Christological analysis which comprises more than one half the length of the *Antirr* III. The following three parts work out the implications of that Christology for image doctrine. I suggest that Theodore's understanding and

64

innovative application of the notion of ὑπόστασις within the image controversy is his outstanding and definitive contribution to the debate. Theodore establishes a relation of Christ-εἰκών to Christ based on the identity of hypostatic likeness which guarantees the one indivisible offering of προσκύνησις to both Christ and his εἰκών. The role of the Christ-εἰκών as a revealed and necessary aid to Christian θεωρία has been shown. Theodore concludes *Antirr* III with remarkable and compelling implications about the Christ-εἰκών and its essential place in the Christian οἰκονομία.

Theodore's *Antirr* III is a distinctive contribution to developing Christian doctrine. It successfully provides the long-awaited theological argument to justify the claims of the 787 Council and demonstrates that the Christ-εἰκών protects and promotes the Chalcedonian orthodoxy which the iconoclasts themselves had claimed to champion. Theodore's argument depends upon the application of his understanding of the philosophical and theological insights of the tradition to the image controversy.[166]

Having set forth my intention, let me indicate what this study is not. First, it is not about images in general, in eighth and ninth century Byzantium. I do not sift the sources to speculate on the historical reasons for the growth of the εἰκών in the centuries prior to Theodore's time. Nor do I explore the role of the saint in the spiritual life of Byzantium. The psychological processes within the viewer and user of the image is peripheral to my interest. Rather, the current authorities in these matters will be consulted only as it is important to understand the eighth and ninth century theological apologetic

---

[166] This view is a reversal of the consensus of much of modern scholarship which had interpreted the stage of the controversy up to 787 to be the more philosophically vigorous. In this widely held interpretation, the controversy after 787 was described as "already spiritually exhausted" (F.I. Uspenski, as quoted by Vasiliev 1932, 380), of "epigonenhafte Impotenz" (Ostrogorsky), and scholastic: '...in these later stages of the controversy the philosophical and theological arguments were subsidiary to the appeal to authority.' Martin (1930), 190. Alexander (1953) inspired a reconsideration of these assumptions although we disagree with his opinion that Nicephorus and not Theodore was the champion of the latter stage of the controversy.

for the εἰκών.

Second, I make no speculation about the future of Theodore's argument and whether it was available, understood or influential post-843. That it played a crucial role in the resolution of the debate in the first third of the ninth century is sufficient to claim its continuing significance for the Church. I do not assume that the present-day theological understanding and apology of icons in Eastern Orthodoxy share Theodore's understanding. Contemporary discussions of icons generally seem not to appreciate Theodore's theological commitments and concerns.

Third, although I consider only the purely theological argument of Theodore's *Antirr* III, I do not suggest thereby that the theological debate is the primary force determining the unfolding events of these centuries.[167] Nor is my exclusive focus on the theological argument in the eighth and ninth centuries a claim as to its importance in the origin of Byzantine Iconoclasm. It is beyond the scope of my argument to investigate the extent to which theological concerns were interwoven with political, social, psychological, ecclesial, anti-monastic, Islamic, economic and possibly even military influences and

---

[167] Hatlie (1999) has recently cautioned that the iconoclastic controversy might be overstated as the controlling phenomenon of all political, social and ecclesial life in these centuries. 'The tendency to make Iconoclast reforms the central if not exclusive concern of the age is one that many have succumbed to, not merely in their examination of religion and society, but also in such areas as the economy, internal politics and international relations.' Hatlie welcomes indications of what he hopes will be a shift away from the axiom, 'Iconoclasm is everything, and everything is Iconoclasm.' In this regard he points to Speck (1978), 63-72 who shows that many Byzantines traveled seemingly effortlessly between iconoclast and iconophile circles.

motives as the cause and driving force of the controversy.[168] Regardless of the role of the

theological debate in either the prompting or reversing of specific imperial iconoclastic

policy and persecutions from time to time, the theology of the image which was achieved

in the eighth and ninth centuries remains a defining contribution to the emerging

theological, devotional and liturgical life of the Eastern Church. Contrary to Cholij's claim

that there is nothing creative to be discovered in Theodore's theology, I shall argue that

Theodore's *Antirr III* is a creative achievement of that Middle Byzantine theology.[169]

Throughout this thesis 'εἰκών' is translated 'image' and the two words are used

interchangeably. Εἰκών is used in the primary texts to refer both to image in general and to

the specific type of image which I describe in chapter two. There I introduce the notion of

a liturgical, doctrinal and devotional εἰκών which is fully developed by the eighth and

ninth century and becomes the subject of the image debate. From that point on I continue

to use image and εἰκών interchangeably with the exception that I use εἰκών consistently in

---

[168] There are many summaries of the various twentieth century interpretations of the origins of Byzantine Iconoclasm. The boundless speculation in the secondary literature is fueled by the small number of primary sources which make any comment at all about the origins of Iconoclasm. Neither the *Short History* of Nicephorus (Mango 1990), nor the *Chronicle* of Theophanes (Mango 1997) tell us much about the origins of the controversy. The acts of the 787 Council preserves a letter of the patriarch Germanus of Constantinople to Bishop Thomas of Claudiopolis, written about 724, in which Germanus suggests that Thomas was led to his iconoclasm through Jewish and Islamic influence (Mansi XIII.109B-E, 124D-E). The acts of the 787 Council also include two other letters of Germanus, to Constantine of Nacolia and to his metropolitan John of Synnada (Mansi XIII.100ff), and a report of the Anatolian bishops (Mansi XIII.197ff), all of which establish a causal connection between Islamic and Jewish-Islamic iconoclasm. Fifty years after the 787 Council, the patriarch Nicephorus, in his third *Antirrheticus*, agrees with the Anatolian bishops who in the 787 Council attributed the cause of iconoclasm to be the edict of the caliph Yazid II against the images (Migne *PG* 100.529C). Stephanos Diaconus, in his *Vita S. Stephani Iunioris* (c. 808), tells us that St. Stephen, martyr under Constantine V, attributed the origin of iconoclasm to the Greeks, the Jews, the Syrians and the heretics (Migne *PG* 100.1116B). After a survey of only a few of the scholars who take up but one of these numerous theories and assign the sources of Byzantine iconoclasm to Islam, Hadadd (1982) simply but accurately sums up the present status of the overall origins debate: 'The literature is extensive, often interesting and quite inconclusive' (302 n.1).

[169] Although he does not consider Theodore's theological arguments (which leads him to misrepresent the overall argument of the *Antirr*), Afinogenov (1996) in fact suggests that after 787 Theodore is the only iconophile committed to a strictly theological apology. Afinogenov suggests that Nicephorus regards Iconoclasm as primarily an imperial heresy to be confronted both politically and by a strict adherence to the dogmas already advanced in 787. On the other hand, Afinogenov claims that for Theodore, Iconoclasm is 'an ordinary heresy, to be confronted with purely theological arguments' (608).

the term Christ-εἰκών, and to refer to the established εἰκών of the Theotokos or of a saint which is the subject of the debate. For convenience and clarity I do not change the form of the noun εἰκών with the appropriate case ending required by its use in the sentence. For example, I use the nominative singular 'εἰκών' even when the plural is called for.

CHAPTER ONE

The Structure of Theodore's *Antirrheticus*

Initial questions of the integrity of the *Antirrheticus*

A reading of Theodore's *Antirr* immediately raises questions of the nature and intention of the overall treatise. The individual prefaces to the chapters indicate that the three chapters are designed to be a single argument, but the overall structure and integrity of the treatise is obvious neither in content nor argument. Particularly problematic is the relation of *Antirr* III to the previous chapters. The sustained argument in *Antirr* III begins with 'Αἱ κοιναὶ ἔννοιαι πᾶσιν ἐξ ἴσου ὡμολόγηνται' (common ideas which are universally accepted) and concludes with the unity of προσκύνησις of Christ and his εἰκών 'κατὰ τὸ ταυτὸν[170] τῆς ὑποστατικῆς ὁμοιώσεως' (according to the identity of hypostatic likeness). Unlike *Antirr* I and II, *Antirr* III does not represent a direct and obvious response either to the historical issues of the debate, the contemporary stage of argument of the controversy, or the style of theological debate within the controversy. It shows no evidence of dependency upon an established florilegia and includes only one direct reference to the authoritative Fathers. This sustained independent argument without direct reference to the authority of privileged texts within the tradition is an anomaly in the literary works of the entire image controversy and begs explanation of its relation not only to the previous two chapters of the *Antirr*, but more generally to eighth and ninth century

---

[170] τὸ ταυτόν is a variant (Cod. regius) to τὸ αὐτόν .

iconophile literature.

Further questions about the integrity of the *Antirr* are prompted by the observation that the ideas promoted by the orthodox iconophile in *Antirr* I are often different in character from those presented within the argument of *Antirr* III. In addition, *Antirr* I takes care to refute iconoclast positions which are said in *Antirr* II no longer to be currently held. How is this explained within a single treatise?

The three chapters do not embrace a consistent style, but proceed by means of a literary form specific to each. *Antirr* I is a series of answers to the typical eighth century ἀπορίαι of 'heretics' to the possibility of the περιγραφή of Christ and the consequent τὴν κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα σχετικὴν προσκύνησιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ (offering of relative προσκύνησις to Christ in the εἰκών). *Antirr* II reverses the order and this time a 'heretic' (singular) has an opportunity to respond to the typical claims, questions and objections of the orthodox iconophile position (anti-ἀπορίαι). *Antirr* III is a tightly structured theological argument in four parts. It begins with a positive statement of Christology which is then applied to the image question guided by the cautions of the most difficult ἀπορίαι which can be brought to bear on his argument from within the tradition.

In *Antirr* I Basil is the only Church Father referred to or quoted.[171] *Antirr* II proceeds by reference to and quotation of many Church Fathers. *Antirr* III refers to no Church Father directly other than to Basil's *De Spiritu Sancto* 18.45.

Although the diverse character and content of the three chapters of the *Antirr* have been noticed by several scholars in the twentieth century, the absence of a sustained analysis of the *Antirr* has prevented an appreciation of its structure and the logic of its

---

[171] *De Spiritu Sancto* 18.45 is quoted twice and two passages from Basil's homilies are cited.

argument. Even the obvious indications of this logic given by Theodore himself in the individual prefaces have been missed. I shall now briefly suggest how these prefaces indicate the relation of the three chapters whilst maintaining the integrity of the *Antirr*.

In his preface to *Antirr* I [172] Theodore states his intention to supplement his previous inadequate treatment of the heresy in an earlier work he calls ὁ Στηλιτευτικός[173], by reviewing the entire iconophile argument:

τὰς συστατικὰς ἀποδείξεις περὶ τῆς προκειμένης ὑποθέσεως ἀνελιττόμενος καὶ συμφοπίζων.

(proving the component parts concerning the overall design [of the argument] set before one, explaining them and bringing them together.)

The ὁ Στηλιτευτικός may be a reference to Fatouros 57 which Theodore had written most likely during his second exile, 809-811.[174] In both Fatouros 57 and throughout the *Antirr* Theodore makes it clear that he is turning to the theological issues

---

[172] Migne *PG* 99.328D-329B.
[173] 'denunciatory invective' following Lampe (1961).
[174] Fatouros 57, 164-168. In this letter he refers to other writings on this subject which have not survived. Whether the ὁ Στηλιτευτικός is Fatouros 57 or one of the theological works referred to in that letter, we can assume that Fatouros 57 is typical of Theodore's theological reflections prior to the 815AD Council.

only hesitantly,[175] and because the inadequate theological response to iconoclast theology was significantly interfering with the ability of devout Christians to exercise ascetic practices both within and without the monasteries.[176] In Fatouros 57 Plato cannot be asking Theodore for a statement of right belief concerning images, because Plato had participated in the 787 Council and accepted its ὅρος as fully authoritative. Rather, Plato seeks an answer to the iconoclasts who continue to promote their heresy, and a reasoned account why it is necessary to offer προσκύνησις to the holy εἰκών of Christ.[177] This request goes beyond the decrees of the 787 Council which did not offer a rationale for its claims that the offering of προσκύνησις to the prototype through the εἰκών was not idolatrous, and that the honouring or dishonouring of the εἰκών passes over (διαβαίνει) to the prototype. The question of the necessity of offering προσκύνησις to the Christ-εἰκών

---

[175] See Theodore's introduction to this letter (Fatouros 57, 10-17): ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀπὸ χρόνου πολλοῦ ἐπεζήτησέ σου ἡ ἁγιωσύνη δοῦναί με λόγον, πῶς δεῖ τὴν σεπτὴν Χριστοῦ εἰκόνα προσκυνεῖν (οὐκ ἀγνοοῦσα, ἀλλὰ βουλομένη κἀντεῦθεν τὸν ἄλογόν μου λόγον κινεῖν), τηνικαῦτα μὲν οὐκ ἐξεγένετό μοι ἀποκριθῆναι, νυνὶ δὲ ἐπιμνησθεὶς δέον ἡγησάμην τὸ ἐνταλθέν μοι ἐφ' ὅσον οἱόν τέ ἐστι τῇ συνεργίᾳ τῶν ἱερῶν σου προσευχῶν ἀποπληρῶσαι, εἰ καὶ ὅτι ἄλλοθί που περὶ τοῦδε αὐτοῦ τάχα ἱκανῶς ἐξεῖπον.(Indeed for a long time your holiness has asked me to give the reason why it is necessary to offer προσκύνησις to the holy icon of Christ [not that you are unaware, but you wish to arouse me from that silence into reasoning]. At that particular time I was not allowed to answer but now, turning my attention to it, it is right that I likewise take the lead in some fashion through my cooperation in the fulfillment of your holy prayers, even if perhaps elsewhere I have spoken out sufficiently concerning this matter.) The opening lines of both *Antirr* I and III make it clear that tradition and not theological argument is the sole or primary authority for Theodore, and he regrets having to enter the theological arena. In a letter written by Theodore before he began his theological writing, he thinks it adequate to point to the dogmas contained in the canons and constitutions of the church to convince the monk Basil that the Stoudites are not schismatics: 'ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ ἄλλως ἐν πολλοῖς ἁμαρτήμασι τυγχάνομεν, ὅμως ὁμόσωμοι αὐτῆς καὶ τρόφιμοι μετὰ τῶν θείων δογμάτων καὶ τοὺς κανόνας αὐτῆς [τῆς ἐκκλησίας] καὶ διατυπώσεις γλιχόμενοι φυλάττεσθαι...Εἰς ἑαυτοὺς οὖν γενώμεθα, ὦ ἀδελφέ, καὶ ἀπίδωμεν πρὸς τὸ φῶς τῆς ἀληθείας, καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν κανόνων ὥσπερ καὶ τῶν δογμάτων ἐγκρατεῖς φαινοίμεθα....(Although our sins are many, nevertheless we are of one body with the Church; we are its children and the children of its divine dogmas; and we strive to keep its canons and constitutions.... Let us be true to ourselves, brother, and let us look to the light of the truth and of the sacred canons, so that we may appear also to be keepers of the dogmas.)' Fatouros 28.27-29, 135-137.

[176] In this first preface Theodore points out that the heresy was 'frightening unstable souls by its empty noise. (πτόησιν ταῖς ἀστηρίκτοις ψυχαῖς ἐνιζάνουσα διὰ τῆς κενοφωνίας).' Migne *PG* 99.329A.

[177] 'ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀπὸ χρόνου πολλοῦ ἐπεζήτησέ σου ἡ ἁγιωσύνη δοῦναί με λόγον, πῶς δεῖ τὴν σεπτὴν Χριστοῦ εἰκόνα προσκυνεῖν. (But indeed for a long time your holiness has asked me to give the reason why it is necessary to offer προσκύνησις to the holy image of Christ.)' Fatouros 57.10-12.

72

evidently had become the central issue in the years following the 787 Council (until the 815 Council).

The preface to *Antirr* I also indicates the literary form. Theodore will gather the various components of the iconophile argument and present them alongside the arguments of the iconoclasts:

> Ἤδη δὲ προβληθήσεται ὁ λόγος κατὰ ἀντίθεσιν τοῦ τε οἰκείου δόγματος, καὶ τοῦ ἀλλοτρίου· ...
>
> (Now I shall put forth the argument, by juxtaposition of our own dogma and the other side ...)

If the preface promised that *Antirr* I would sort out all the component arguments of the controversy, what remains to be done? My analysis of *Antirr* I in the following section will reveal that Theodore's intention is to clarify the eighth century iconophile arguments as they are represented in the 787 'Refutation' and ὅρος. In *Antirr* II Theodore will review the specific claims of the iconoclasts around the time of the 815 Council. The entire *Antirr* was written soon after the 815 Council.[178] The preface to *Antirr* II[179] begins by ridiculing the iconoclasts for their shift in doctrine from the 754 to 815 Councils:

> Ὁ δὲ τοῦ ψεύδους μῦθος, ἅτε πολυσχιδὴς καὶ μυριόγνωμος τυγχάνων, ἐξ ἄλλων τε εἰς ἄλλα μεταπίπτων, πῇ μὲν τοῦτο πρεσβεύει, πῇ δὲ ἕτερον ἀντιδοξάζει,

---

[178] The *Antirr* may be referred to in a letter dated by Fatouros to 818, addressed to Thomas, Patriarch of Jerusalem, and also sent to the Patriarch of Antioch (Fatouros 276). In this letter Theodore speaks of the renewal of persecution under Leo V, but then concludes: 'In order that you may know at least partially how impious the dogmas of these people are, I have appended some pages about them to this letter, together with a refutation that I have inexpertly made at the request of the devout' (Fatouros 276, 92-94). I shall argue that a shift in theological language of the letters after 816 suggests that Theodore wrote the *Antirr* in 815/16 (see chapter three below). Perhaps a copy of this 815/816 *Antirr* was attached to Fatouros 276.
[179] Migne *PG* 99.328D-329B.

73

καὶ ἵσταται ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ οὐδαμῇ οὐδαμῶς, τοῖς τῆς ἀλλοιώσεως τε καὶ τροπῆς πάθεσιν ὑποβαλλόμενος. Καθὰ καὶ ὁ εἰκονομάχων ὑλακτισμός· ὅτι ποτὲ μὲν τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἴδωλον πλάνης βλασφήμως ἀποκαλοίη, ποτὲ δὲ οὔ φασιν, ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι καλὸν ἡ ἱστορία, ἐξηγήσεως καὶ ἀναμνήσεως λόγον ἔχουσα, οὐ μὴν προσκυνήσεως· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὴν ἐν ὑψηλοῖς χώραν αὐτῇ ἀπονέμουσι, δεδοικότες μή πως ἐν τοῖς χαμηλοτέροις καθιεμένη, καὶ προσκυνήσεως ἀφορμὴν λαμβάνουσα, εἰδωλολατρείας αὐτοῖς εἴη αἴτιον. ... Νῦν δὲ ἐπειδὴ εἰρχθέντες τοῖς ἐλέγχοις, ὁμολογοῦσιν εἰκονίζεσθαι τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστον, οὐ μὴν προσκυνεῖν δεῖν τὴν ἀναστηλωθεῖσαν αὐτοῦ εἰκόνα·

(The fables of falsehood, however, because they are fragmented and diverse in opinion, always shifting from one position to another, proclaim one thing now, then hold the opposite opinion, and never stand still in the same place, since they are subject to the pressures of variation and change. That is how it is with the barking of the iconoclasts: at one time they blasphemously miscall the εἰκών of our Lord Jesus Christ an idol of deceit; at another time they do not say so, but say instead that the depiction is good, because it is useful for education and memory, but is not for veneration. For this reason they assign the εἰκών a place high up in the church, fearing that if it is located in a lower place, where it could provide an opportunity for veneration, it may cause them to fall into idolatry. ... Now that they have been hemmed in by our proofs, they admit that our Lord Jesus Christ can be portrayed, but not that His εἰκών should be set up and venerated.)

In *Antirr* I the iconoclast speaker had insisted that the image should not be portrayed at all. Theodore has the iconophile argue in typical eighth century fashion that the image is useful for education and the encouragement of piety and prayer. In the *Antirr* II preface Theodore suggests that that iconophile argument had succeeded in convincing

74

the iconoclasts by 815 that the image is useful for pedagogical purposes. The εἰκών of Christ itself is no longer called 'an idol of deceit', as it had been viewed by Constantine V and iconoclasts in the earlier period. Rather, the 815 Council insists that it is the act of offering προσκύνησις to an εἰκών which is idolatrous.

As the literary form of *Antirr* I was indicated in its preface, Theodore indicates the literary form of *Antirr* II in its preface where he says that he will proceed 'by the opposition of two persons, an orthodox, I say, and an iconoclast, in order that the power of the arguments might be better known and easier to see at a glance.' The preface to *Antirr* I made it clear that the strong iconophile arguments would be seen to defeat the heretic. In this preface however, Theodore suggests that he will present the power of the arguments of both sides of the debate.

In his preface to *Antirr* III[180] Theodore states that in this third argument he hopes ὀλέσαι τὸν ἀλλόφυλον νοῦν τῶν Εἰκονομάχων (to destroy the foreign/strange thinking of the iconoclasts). He indicates that, unlike *Antirr* I and II, this will not be a straightforward marshaling of traditional arguments and authorities. Rather, Theodore will employ syllogistic reasoning. Theodore is keen to caution that his syllogisms will be employed in a specific way: 'I shall use some syllogisms to present the subject of my treatise, not indeed with the technical artifice of the Aristotelian system (or rather silliness), but with a simpler form of expression, relying on the power of truth.'[181]

Thus the intention is to offer a logical destruction of the iconoclast heresy within the tradition. For the wise (i.e., those who have been educated in Aristotelian logic), says Theodore, this will be a beginning of a new way of considering the image question within

---

[180] Migne *PG* 99.389A-B.
[181] οὐκ ἔχουσι μὲν ἔντεχνον τὴν πλοκὴν κατὰ τὴν Ἀριστοτελικὴν τεχνολογίαν, εἴτ' οὖν φλυαρίαν· ἁπλοϊκωτέρῳ δὲ φθέγματι, τῷ κράτει τῆς ἀληθείας ἐρηρεισμένοις.

θεωρία: 'ἀφορμὴν ἐμποιοῦν σοφωτέρας θεωρίας' (creating a starting place for a wiser contemplation). For those ἀμαθέσι (uneducated in Aristotelian logic),[182] the argument of *Antirr* III will give 'στοιχείωσίν τινα εἰς βοήθειαν τοῦ ὀρθοῦ λόγου' (a preparation to assist right thinking). Even after reviewing all of the eighth century iconophile arguments in *Antirr* I and in *Antirr* II giving the strongest response of the traditional authorities to the 815 Council, Theodore tells us in his preface to *Antirr* III that the ὀρθός λόγος was still κάμνοντος ἄρτι μάλα ἐκ τῆς ἐπιλυττώσης εἰκονομαχικῆς αἱρέσεως (entirely worn out/hard pressed by the fury of the iconoclast controversy). Theodore's creative and philosophical third argument is motivated by the pastoral urgency to destroy a heresy which continued to upset the liturgical life of the church and the ascetic practices of the faithful.

As with the previous two prefaces, Theodore indicates the literary style and structure of *Antirr* III. The third argument will contain four chapters and will conclude with the demonstration

"Οτι πρωτότυπον ὢν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ εἰκόνος ὁ Χριστός, μίαν ἔχει τὴν πρὸς αὐτὴν ἐμφέρειαν, ὥσπερ καὶ τὴν προσκύνησιν.
(Since Christ is the prototype of His own εἰκών, he has one likeness as he has one veneration with it.)

An examination of these three prefaces overcome any of the initial doubts over the integrity of the *Antirr* as a single argument. Although the preface to *Antirr* I might at first suggest that the entire iconophile reasoning will be presented there, the actual intention is

---

[182] Or uneducated in the practices of θεωρία?

soon made clear in the argument itself. An analysis of the content of *Antirr* I reveals that it considers iconoclast arguments and iconophile responses which are fully admitted in the preface of *Antirr* II to be past iconoclast positions which are no longer held. An analysis of the content of *Antirr* II shows that it presents iconophile arguments which were not considered in *Antirr* I.[183] Either *Antirr* I was written at an earlier period than *Antirr* II and before the 815 Council, or, as I maintain, *Antirr* I limits itself to a theological defence of the specific claims of the 787 Council in the interest of Theodore's broader argument. Although Theodore earlier had harboured doubts about the worth of the 787 Council, in his letter to the iconoclastic 815 Council[184] he first makes it known that he supports it as the authentic Seventh Council. Since the 787 Council had not attempted to give a theological response to the theological argument of the 754 Council,[185] Theodore provides this response, within the limits of the content of the 787 Council proceedings and ὅρος. *Antirr* I describes and enhances the limited response of the 787 'Refutation', and will also substantiate the truth of the limited statements of the 787 ὅρος. Although Theodore's apology for the offering of προσκύνησις to the Christ-εἰκών in *Antirr* III will take a different tack, he recognizes the need to support theologically the positions articulated by the 787 Council.

By 815 the situation had worsened substantially for the iconophiles. *Antirr* II does not manifest the same sort of dogmatic confidence in the iconophile position and shrinks from any definitive claim that the new iconoclast position of 815 is able to be defeated by

[183] Even Fatouros 57 (written to Plato around 809) reveals substantial developments in the iconophile arguments since 787, such as the distinction between τεχνητὴ εἰκών and φυσικὴ εἰκών which are not presented in *Antirr* I. This distinction, along with other terminology in Fatouros 57, is absent from the 787 Council 'Refutation' and ὅρος. The promise in the preface to *Antirr* I to bring together all the iconophile arguments seems clearly to be limited to giving a theological grounding for the claims of the 787 Council within the limits of the eighth century iconophile argument.
[184] Fatouros 71.
[185] Perhaps this is why he withheld his full support of the Council earlier.

77

current iconophile argument and tradition. Rather *Antirr* II will set forth the full weight of the argument and florilegia of each side. Traditional iconophile arguments and the appeal to established iconophile florilegia have not been sufficient to prove that the act of offering of προσκύνησις to the Christ-εἰκών is free from idolatry and necessary within the Christian οἰκονομία. This admission sets the stage for *Antirr* III which promises to be the new type of argument or σοφωτέρας θεωρίας required to achieve the iconophile victory.

Antirr I: The Councils of 754 and 787

The fragments of Constantine V's Πεύσεις,[186] the ὅρος of the 754 Council,[187] and the proceedings of the sixth session of the 787 Council including its ὅρος, are the significant texts which define the context for the argument of *Antirr* I. Other sources relating to the controversy in the eighth century are peripheral to the stated intention of Theodore in *Antirr* I to marshall the various iconophile theological arguments.

Πεύσεις I[188] begins with a Chalcedonian based statement of the incarnate Lord as:

τῶν δύο φύσεων συνελθουσῶν εἰς ἕνωσιν ἀσύγχυτον μίαν, τήν τε τῆς θεότητος καὶ τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος, ἕνα τὸν αὐτὸν καθ' ὑπόστασιν μίαν ὑπάρχειν·

---

[186] These fragments are found throughout Nicephorus' *Antirrheticus* I and II. (Migne *PG* 100.206-373) They have been gathered by Ostrogorsky (1964), 8-11 who generally divides the fragments into Πεύσεις I and II. These also appear in Hennephof (1969), 52-57 who adds fragments from Nicephorus' *Antirr* III which he calls Πεύσεις III. The addition of these fragments to Ostrogorsky's collection raises some significant questions (cf. the negative judgement of Gero 1975, 5) and thus I shall limit my consideration to the twenty four fragments as they appear in Ostrogorsky. There is also an accompanying florilegium to the Πεύσεις preserved in Nicephorus' *Contra Eusebium* and *Versus Epiphanidem*, which becomes relevant for us in our later chapters.

[187] The transcript of the 754 ὅρος is reproduced in the proceedings of the sixth session of the 787 Council. These proceedings along with the 787 Council ὅρος are found in Mansi XIII.

[188] I.e. the first fifteen, or perhaps eighteen, of the fragments.

τουτέστι διπλοῦν ἐν ἑνὶ προσώπῳ ὄντα...[189]

(the two natures coming together in one unconfused union, both of divinity and humanity, he himself existing as one, according to a single ὑπόστασις. Thus being twofold in one προσώπον...)

The next fragment asserts that a proper εἰκών is ὁμοούσιος with its πρωτοτύπος.

πᾶσα εἰκὼν παράγωγος πρωτοτύπου τινὸς γνωρίζεσθαι.[190] καὶ εἰ καλῶς, ὁμοούσιον αὐτὴν εἶναι τοῦ εἰκονιζομένου.[191]

(Every εἰκών is known to be a derivative of some πρωτοτύπος. And if this is correct, the εἰκών is of the same οὐσία as that which it represents.)

The remainder of Πεύσεις I introduces the Christological dilemma which was to dominate the debate for the rest of the eighth century:

ζητοῦμεν... παρ' ὑμῶν, πῶς δυνατόν ἐστι τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν ἐκ δύο φύσεων ἀύλου τε καὶ ἐνύλου ἑνώσει ἀσυγχύτῳ ἐν πρόσωπον ὄντα, γράφεσθαι, τουτέστιν εἰκονίζεσθαι;[192]

(We ask of you how it is possible that our Lord Jesus Christ, being of two natures, one immaterial and one material, in an unconfused unity, one person, is depicted, that is, made into an image?)

Constantine prefers to use πρόσωπον rather than ὑπόστασις, but in fragment 5 suggests

---

[189] Migne *PG* 100.216BC. A little later Nicephorus comments that Constantine does not use the Chalcedonian formula ἐν δυσὶ φύσεσιν:'Εν δυσὶ δὲ αὐτὸν φύσεσιν, οὐδαμῶς τέως εἰπὼν φαίνεται (300D).
[190] Nicephorus tags this protasis onto the end of the first fragment (Migne *PG* 100.216C) and himself comments on the unnatural breaking of the thought.
[191] Migne *PG* 100.225A.
[192] Migne *PG* 100.232A.

that he assumes the terms to be interchangeable.[193] The crux of the argument is that any circumscription of the person of Christ includes the impossible attempt to circumscribe the divine nature which is uncircumscribable:

ὁ περιγράφων τὸ πρόσωπον ἐκεῖνο, δῆλον ὅτι καὶ τὴν θείαν φύσιν περιέγραψεν, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἀπερίγραπτος.[194]

If the circumscription is claimed to be only of the circumscribable nature of Christ (εἰ δὲ καὶ τῆς σαρκὸς μόνης εἰκόνα ποιεῖ), then a fourth person is added to the Trinity.[195] The attempted image is of a ψιλοῦ ἀνθρώπου,[196] or Christ as creature alone (ποιῶν τὸν Χριστὸν κτίσμα καὶ μόνον.)[197] Thus the πρόσωπον of Christ cannot be imaged, because the attempt to separate the human from the divine natures results in an image of a Christ which is human and not divine.

Πεῦσεις II claims the Eucharist to be the τύπον εἰς σῶμα αὐτοῦ[198], ὡς εἰκών τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ[199] or εἰς μόρφωσιν [τοῦ σώματος] αὐτοῦ. By the priestly consecration the bread and wine become a true image ἀχειροποίητον.[200]

The ὅρος of the 754 Council begins by describing how the fallen Lucifer deceived mankind τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα προσκυνεῖν ὑποθέμενος.[201] God then appointed his own Son and Logos who:

---

[193] καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ, ἤγουν ἡ ὑπόστασις... 236C.
[194] Migne *PG* 100.236D.
[195] Migne *PG* 100.248D-249A.
[196] Migne *PG* 100.252C.
[197] Migne *PG* 100.253A.
[198] Migne *PG* 100.333B.
[199] Migne *PG* 100.336A.
[200] Migne *PG* 100.337D.
[201] Mansi XIII.213A.

ἐν μήτρᾳ οἰκήσας παρθενικῇ καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας καὶ ἀμωμήτου σαρκὸς αὐτῆς ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ὑπάρξει ἤτοι ὑποστάσει σάρκα λαβὼν τὴν ἡμῖν ὁμοούσιον, καὶ ταύτην διὰ μέσης ψυχῆς λογικῆς τε καὶ νοερᾶς συμπήξας τε καὶ διαμορφώσας.[202]

(having dwelt in the virgin's womb and taken up in his own existence, or ὑπόστασις, flesh consubstantial with that of ours from her holy and spotless flesh, having put together and formed this [flesh] by the mediation of a rational and intellectual soul.)

Christ was thus able to undo the mischief of Lucifer:

ἀπέστησεν ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς φθοροποιοῦ τῶν δαιμόνων διδασκαλίας ἤτοι τῆς τῶν εἰδώλων πλάνης τε καὶ λατρείας καὶ τὴν ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ προσκύνησιν παρέδωκεν[203]

(he removed us from the corrupting teaching of demons, that is to say, from the deception and service of idols, and delivered us to an offering of προσκύνησις which is in spirit and in truth.)

Lucifer however is still active in this world.

ἐν προσχήματι χριστιανισμοῦ τὴν εἰδωλολατρείαν κατὰ τὸ λεληθὸς ἐπανήγαγε πείσας τοῖς ἰδίοις σοφίσμασι τοὺς πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁρῶντας μὴ ἀποστῆναι τῆς κτίσεως, ἀλλὰ ταύτην προσκυνεῖν καὶ ταύτην σέβεσθαι καὶ θεὸν τὸ ποίημα οἴεσθαι τῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ κλήσει ἐπονομαζόμενον[204]

(with the pretext of Christianity [Lucifer] re-introduced idolatry unnoticeably by convincing, with his subtleties, those who had their eyes turned to him not to relinquish the creation but rather to offer προσκύνησις to it, and pay respect to it,

---

[202] Mansi XIII.213D.
[203] Mansi XIII, 216C.
[204] Mansi XIII, 221D.

and consider that which is made as God, calling it with the name 'Christ'.)[205]

The Council reviews the results of the previous six oecumenical councils and concludes (following Πεύσεις I) that the Christ-εἰκών either attempts to circumscribe the divinity and falls into the errors of Arius, Dioscorus, Eutyches and the heresy of the Acephali, or it intends to circumscribe the flesh only and falls into the error of Nestorius. But both the flesh and soul of Christ are inseparable from the divine nature:

Σκοπητέον γὰρ καὶ ἐν τούτῳ, ὅτι εἰ κατὰ τοὺς ὀρθοδόξους πατέρας ἅμα σάρξ, ἅμα θεοῦ λόγου σάρξ μηδέποτε μερισμοῦ ἔννοιαν δεχομένη, ἀλλ' ὅλη ὅλως τῇ θείᾳ φύσει προσληφθεῖσα καὶ ὁλοκλήρως θεωθεῖσα, πῶς διχασθήσεται ἢ ἰδιοστατηθήσεται παρὰ τῶν ἀσεβῶς τοῦτο δρᾶν ἐπιχειρούντων; Ὡσαύτως δὲ ἔχει καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ ἁγίας ψυχῆς. Προσλαβούσης γὰρ τῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ θεότητος ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ὑποστάσει τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς φύσιν ἡ ψυχὴ ἐμεσίτευσε θεότητι καὶ σαρκὸς παχύτητι καὶ ὥσπερ ἅμα σάρξ, ἅμα θεοῦ λόγου σάρξ, οὕτως ἅμα ψυχή, ἅμα θεοῦ λόγου ψυχὴ καὶ ἀμφότερα ἅμα τεθεωμένης δηλονότι τῆς ψυχῆς ὡς καὶ τοῦ σώματος καὶ ἀχωρίστου τούτων τῆς θεότητος ὑπαρχούσης καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ διαζεύξει τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος ἐν τῷ ἑκουσίῳ πάθει. Ὅπου γὰρ ψυχὴ Χριστοῦ, ἐκεῖ καὶ ἡ θεότης, καὶ ὅπου σῶμα Χριστοῦ, ἐκεῖ καὶ ἡ θεότης.[206]

(It is necessary, even on this point, for one to consider that if, according to the

---

[205] See Sideris (1979) who reviews the theological arguments of the iconoclasts from Eusebius of Caesarea in the fourth century through to the 754 Council and concludes that the sole motive of iconoclasm was the charge of idolatry: 'The conviction of the iconoclasts that the worship of the images was idolatry can be noticed at the close of the Council of 754, when the council decreed the destruction of the images prompted by the theology of Constantine V. All those present at the meeting praised the emperor by standing up, raising their hands high, and crying out that that day salvation had come into the world because the emperor had redeemed them from idolatry. [PG 100, 1121B]... They could not reconcile matter, out of which the images were made, with the worship of God in spirit and in truth. Because of this, the Patriarch Germanus was anathematized by the Council of 754 as a worshipper of wood (ξυλολάτρην). [PG 100,1121A] For the iconoclast, matter had no place in Christianity. For this reason, they stated that it is wrong to insult in ignoble and dead matter (ἐν ἀδόξῳ καί νεκρᾷ ὕλῃ καθυβρίζειν) the saints who will be illuminated in such glory. [Mansi XIII, 277D].' (184).

[206] Mansi XIII.256E, 257AB.

82

orthodox Fathers, the flesh is at the same time flesh and flesh of God the Word, never subject to any notion of partition, but rather assumed as a whole within the divine nature and deified as a whole, how can it be split into two, or be given a hypostasis of its own, by those who try impiously to do so? So it is with his holy soul too. For when the divinity of the Son assumed the nature of the flesh in his own ὑπόστασις, the soul played the role of the mediator between the divinity and the density of the flesh. In the same way that the flesh is at one and the same time the flesh of God the Word, so is the soul at one and the same time the soul of God the Word - both these together: that is, the soul is deified just as is the body. Divinity remains inseparable from them, even in the parting of the soul from the body during His voluntary passion. Where the soul of Christ is, there is also the divinity, and where the body of Christ is there is also the divinity.)

This leads to the accusation that iconophiles depict Christ as a 'mere man' (ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος):

Καὶ ἐν τούτῳ γὰρ εἰς ἕτερον ἀνομίας βάραθρον ἐμπίπτουσι χωρίζοντες τὴν σάρκα ἐκ τῆς θεότητος καὶ ἰδιοϋπόστατον αὐτὴν παρεισάγοντες καὶ ἕτερον πρόσωπον διδόντες τῇ σαρκὶ, ὅπερ εἰκονίζειν λέγουσιν, ἐκ τούτου δεικνύντες τετάρτου προσώπου προσθήκην ἐν τῇ τριάδι, πρός γε τούτοις καὶ τὸ θεωθὲν πρόσλημμα ἱστοροῦντες ἀθέωτον.[207]

(For in this respect, too, they fall into another abyss of impiety, by separating the flesh from the divinity and presenting it as if it had a ὑπόστασις of its own, and give another πρόσωπον to the flesh which they pretend to depict. By this they show that they add a fourth πρόσωπον to the Trinity; moreover they describe that which was assumed and deified as being without divinity.)

---

[207] Mansi XIII.257E, 260A.

These accusations of Christological heresy are entirely in the language of the Πεύσεις I:

> May we be equally far from the "separation" of Nestorius and the "confusion" of
> Arius, Dioscorus, Eutyches, and Severus, opposing evils but equivalent as far as
> impiety is concerned.[208]

The Council then takes up a theme from the Πεύσεις II in describing the
Eucharist as the only τύπος of the body of Christ, but μὴ σχηματίζουσαν ἀνθρώπου
μορφήν[209]:

> ὡς οὐκ ἄλλου εἴδους ἐπιλεχθέντος παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ὑπ' οὐρανὸν ἢ τύπου
> εἰκονίσαι τὴν αὐτοῦ σάρκωσιν δυναμένου. Ἰδοὺ οὖν ἡ εἰκὼν τοῦ ζωοποιοῦ
> σώματος αὐτοῦ ἡ ἐντίμως καὶ τετιμημένως πραττομένη.[210]
> (there was no other kind or τύπος under the sun selected by Him which could depict
> his Incarnation. Behold the image of His life-giving body, the image made properly
> and with honour.)

As in the Πεύσεις II, it is the priestly consecration which effects the change from
the natural to the divine, thus allowing τὸ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ἄρτον ὡς ἀψευδῆ εἰκόνα
τῆς φυσικῆς σαρκός.[211] The lack of such a 'sanctifying' prayer for the Christ-εἰκών is
noted here, as in Πεύσεις II.

This completes the first part of the ὅρος[212] which has shown how the

---

[208] Mansi XIII.260B.
[209] Mansi XIII.264B.
[210] Mansi XIII.264A.
[211] Mansi XIII.264B.
[212] Mansi XIII.213C-280D.

Christological arguments of the Πεῦσεις follow directly from the Trinitarian and Christological orthodoxy of the six previous oecumenical councils. Through argument and appeal to authority, the 754 Council determined to demonstrate that the tradition declares the painting and use of images to be illegitimate. The second part of the ὅρος[213] is an iconoclast florilegium, introduced by the statement: 'In addition, therefore, to this diligent and carefully thought out teaching of ours, we shall provide also the testimonies which are from the Scripture inspired by God and from our eminent Fathers....'[214]

The concluding canons and anathemas add nothing to the argument as outlined above. They position the claims of the 754 Council to be derivative entirely from the orthodoxy of the previous six councils and then they restate the Christological errors of the iconophile. The only subject introduced in the anathemas which is neither in the ὅρος nor in the Πεῦσεις, is that which today is called the 'ethical theory' of images:[215]

εἴ τις τὰς τῶν ἁπάντων ἁγίων ἰδέας ἐν εἰκόσιν ἀψύχοις καὶ ἀναύδοις ἐξ ὑλικῶν χρωμάτων ἀναστηλοῦν ἐπιτηδεύοι, μηδεμίαν ὄνησιν φερούσας· ματαία γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ἐπίνοια, καὶ διαβολικῆς μεθοδείας εὕρεσις· καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον τὰς τούτων ἀρετὰς διὰ τῶν ἐν γραφαῖς περὶ αὐτῶν δηλουμένων οἷόν τινας ἐμψύχους εἰκόνας ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἀναζωγραφεῖ, καὶ πρὸς τὸν ὅμοιον αὐτοῖς ἐκ τούτου διεγείρεται ζῆλον, καθὼς οἱ ἔνθεοι ἡμῶν ἔφησαν πατέρες, ἀνάθεμα.[216]

(If anyone ventures to set up profitless figures of all the saints in soul-less, speech-less images made of material colours - for this is a vain invention and the discovery of diabolical craft - and does not, on the contrary, reproduce their virtues in himself as actual living images with the aid of what has been recorded about them in books,

---

[213] Mansi XIII.280E-313D.
[214] Mansi XIII.280DE.
[215] See Anastos (1979a).
[216] Mansi XIII.345CD.

in order to be stimulated to zeal like theirs as our inspired Fathers have said, let him be anathema.)

Thus the 754 Council took up the Christological themes and language of Constantine's Πεύσεις. The accusation of idolatry was set within the Biblical account of the fall, and the arguments of the Πεύσεις are expanded and linked to specific heresies of the past. The notion that a proper εἰκών is ὁμοούσιος with its πρωτότυπος did not appear in the proceedings or ὅρος of the 754 Council. Neither do we find in 754 the Πεύσεις reference to the consecrated bread and wine of the Eucharist as ἀχειροποίητον, although both documents agree that the transformation of the bread and wine into the true yet non-anthropomorphic image of the body of Christ is accomplished by the Holy Spirit through the priestly consecration.

The 787 Council[217] refused to respond even to the first part of the 754 ὅρος which is a philosophical argument based on Christological definitions.[218] Instead, the 787 Council opposed both the first and second parts of the 754 ὅρος with legend, hagiography and quotation from the tradition, largely if not entirely based on the iconophile florilegium which had been put together in Rome in 770.[219]

The 787 proceedings begin by indicating the accusation of the 754 Council: 'they falsely accuse the holy Church of God of being adorned with idols.'[220] But instead of a

---

[217] The text of the 'Refutation of the Fabricated and Falsely Called "Definition" of the Mob Assembly of the Accusers of the Christians' is found in Mansi XIII.205A-324E. I use the translation of Sahas (1986) but locate passages according to Mansi XIII.

[218] Anastos (1955) correctly suggests that the only adequate response to the 754 Council would have been theological in nature. 'Whatever one's own theological predilections may be, it must be admitted that the iconoclasts presented the best possible case that could be made against the use of images. They omit nothing of importance that could be said on their side, and present their material with force, logic and energy.' (188).

[219] See Alexakis (1996).

[220] Mansi XIII.212D.

reasoned reply to this accusation, the 787 Council responds with a bold claim that images have been part of the tradition of the Church 'since the time of the preaching of the Apostles, as we learn from looking at the holy churches in every place, as the holy Fathers have testified and as the historians, whose writings have survived until now, relate.'[221] This claim is repeated several times.

The 787 Council next presents the eighty-second canon of the Sixth Oecumenical Council (692). As Theodore refers to this passage in the *Antirr* and in three important image letters, I provide a translation here for future reference as well:

> In some venerable images, and pointed to by the finger of the Forerunner, there is the drawing of a lamb, which has been received as the figure of grace, making what is for us the true Lamb - Christ our God - glimmer through the Law. Although, therefore, we totally embrace the old forms and figures as symbols and foreshadowings which have been handed down to the Church (παλαιοὺς τύπους καὶ τὰς σκιάς, ὡς τῆς ἀληθείας σύμβολά τε καὶ προχαράγματα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παρεδομένους), yet we prefer to honour Grace and Truth, because we have welcomed this as the fulfillment of the Law. We, therefore, decree that the human figure (κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον χαρακτῆρα) of Christ, the Lamb of our God, who has taken away the sin of the world, be painted with colours as perfectly as possible, in view of everyone, and from now on be reinstated in images (ἐν ταῖς εἰκόσιν) in the place of the former lamb. This way we may perceive the height of the humility of God the Word (τὸ τῆς ταπεινώσεως ὕψος τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου), and be led to the remembrance of his conduct in flesh, his suffering, his redemptive death, and the salvation which resulted from it for the world.[222]

---

[221] Mansi XIII.217D.
[222] Mansi XIII.220D.

The 787 Council affirms: 'We all therefore see and understand that the painting of images is something that has been handed down to the church before the holy councils, as well as after them, like the tradition of the gospel.'[223] The 787 Council refuses to engage the arguments of 754 but rather is content to declare that images have always been part of the tradition.

It is likewise with the notion of the 754 ὅρος that in the image the creature is offered προσκύνησις. The 787 'Refutation' simply states: 'As for images, Christians do not call them 'gods,' nor do they worship them as gods ... nor do they bestow a divine reverence upon them, or upon any of the creatures - away with such accusations.'[224] In answer to the charge of κτισματολατρείαν, the answer is passionate and unequivocal: 'Not one Christian who has ever lived under the sky has worshipped an image.'[225]

The 787 Council refuses to enter into debate of the Christological issues because theological argument is not the path to right thinking:

Οὐδαμῶς τῆς μιᾶς ὁδοῦ ἔχονται οἱ τῆς Χριστιανοκατηγορικῆς αἱρέσεως πρόβολοι, καθὼς ἔθος ἐστὶ τοῖς περὶ θείων δογμάτων ὀρθοδόξοις τῆς βασιλικῆς ὁδοῦ ἔχεσθαι μόνον, καὶ μὴ ἐκκλίνειν ἔνθεν καὶ ἔνθεν. ἀλλὰ διαστρέφοντες τὰς ὁδοὺς Κυρίου, ἐναντιωτάτας δόξας παρ' ἑαυτοῖς συλλέγουσι τῷ ἰδίῳ νοῒ πληροφορούμενοι, σοφοὶ τὰ πάντα δοκοῦντες εἶναι. ἀλλὰ ἀκούουσι παρὰ τοῦ παρρησιαστοῦ Ἡσαΐου λέγοντος· οὖσι οἱ σοφοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ ἐνώπιον ἑαυτῶν ἐπιστήμονες. καὶ γὰρ τὰ μηδέπω παρὰ ὀρθοδόξων χριστιανῶν λαληθεῖσα ὡς ὁμολογούμενα λαμβάνουσι. καὶ παρασυλλογιζόμενοι σοφιστικῶς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐλέγχουσι· καὶ συνάγεται παρ' αὐτῶν ὕβρις καὶ λοιδορία, ἐπὶ προσθήκῃ δὲ

---
[223] Mansi XIII.220E.
[224] Mansi XIII.225A.
[225] Mansi XIII.232C.

τούτων καὶ ἀσέβεια.[226]

(In no sense do the propagators of the offensive heresy against the C h r i s t i a n s
follow the only way, as is the tradition of those who are orthodox with regard to
divine doctrine - to follow, that is, the royal way, and not lean either to one side or
the other. On the contrary, by distorting the ways of the Lord, they, guided by their
own mind, collect the most adverse ideas on their own, thinking that they are wise
in every respect. They are the ones of whom Isaiah, the outspoken one, says: 'Woe
to them that are wise in their own conceit, and knowing in their own sight.' For
they take as confessed what the orthodox Christians have never said. Drawing
untenable syllogisms, they criticize the Church by using sophistry. The result of all
this is simply insult and scorn, and, in addition to these, impiety.)

Upon this view, the road to heresy is precisely the type of Christological argument of the
Πεῦσεις and 754 Council.

In a somewhat puzzling failure to understand the 754 accusation that the image
must of necessity fall either into Nestorianism on the one hand (division of the natures) or
the heresy of Severus, Arius, et. al., on the other (confusion of the natures), the 787
proceedings interpret this as an accusation that iconophiles hold to both heresies at the
same time, rather than one or the other.[227] Since the heresies are incompatible, the 787
Council asserts, the 754 Council is foolish to suggest that the iconophiles fall into both
errors at the same time. Equally unconvincing is the following rebuttal by the 787 Council:
'Severus the confuser [of the natures] did not accept the εἰκών of Christ our God in the
Church, as many historians relate. Therefore, it is a wonder that they say that the catholic
church follows Arius, Dioscorus, Eutyches, and the heresy of the Acephaloi, since she

---

[226] Mansi XIII.260BC.
[227] Mansi XIII.244E-245C.

has accepted iconographic representations.'[228] The reasoning here is that the Christ-εἰκών cannot be an instance of the heresy of confusing the two natures of Christ because Severus was the chief architect of that heresy and we know from history that he did not accept images!

The 754 suggestions that the implication of the Christ-εἰκών is the addition of a fourth person to the Trinity, or else reduces Christ to a ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος, are described as folly and madness. The Eucharist is denied to be a type or image of the body of Christ, but after the consecration is called the 'true body and blood of Christ.'[229]

I now briefly describe the four positive claims of the 787 Council: that the Christ-εἰκών has a nominal relation with its prototype, Christ himself; that the image outlines the bodily shape of the prototype; that the image relates stories of the faith; and that the honour or dishonour of the image passes over to the prototype.

The claim that the relation of image to prototype is solely nominal and that the image bears a resemblance only to the outline of the bodily form of the person, serves to dismiss every argument of the 754 Council. To the argument that the Christ-εἰκών reinstates the Nestorian division into a duality of sons, the 787 Council insists,

ἡ εἰκὼν οὐ κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν τῷ πρωτοτύπῳ ἔοικεν, ἢ μόνον κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα καὶ κατὰ τὴν θέσιν τῶν χαρακτηριζομένων μελῶν.[230]

(The εἰκών resembles the prototype, not with regard to the essence, but only with regard to the name and to the position of the members which can be given a particular character.)

---

[228] Mansi XIII.253B.
[229] 'σῶμα κυρίως καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ.' Mansi XIII.265D.
[230] Mansi XIII.244B.

An image cannot be linked to any heresy since there is no reality of the prototype in the image, but is only related to the prototype by name. The image of a man does not include the soul, nor even 'the very substance of the body, I mean flesh, muscles, nerves, bones, and elements, that is, blood, phlegm, fluid, and gall, the blending of which it is impossible for one to see in an image.'[231] A man is one thing. The image of a man is something altogether different, excepting the name and bodily outline. As with the response to the accusation of Nestorian division, when the 'Refutation' considers the accusation that the image is the result of the heresy of Arius, Dioscorus, Eutyches, and the Acephaloi, the 'Refutation' simply announces that the accusation is false. It states, 'Christians confess that what the image has in common with the archetype is only the name, not the essence.'[232]

In other words, the Christological arguments will not be taken seriously because of the second positive affirmation of the 787 Council that the image is nothing but a mere outline resemblance of a body which also has the name of its prototype:

ἄλλο γάρ ἐστιν εἰκών, καὶ ἄλλο τὸ πρωτότυπον, καὶ τὰ ἰδιώματα τοῦ πρωτοτύπου οὐδαμῶς τις τῶν εὖ φρονούντων ἐν τῇ εἰκόνι ἐπιζητεῖ.[233]
(For the image is one thing and the prototype another. No one of sound mind looks in any way to the image for the qualities of the prototype.)

The third positive claim of the 787 'Refutation' is that images are useful as reminders of

---

[231] Mansi XIII.244C.
[232] Mansi XIII.252D.
[233] Mansi XIII.257CD.

the:

> εἰ δὲ ἐναρέτων ἀνδρῶν βίους καὶ μαρτυρτυρικῶν ἄθλων διηγήσεις καὶ τὰ τούτων ἐξηγητικὰ παθήματα καὶ τῆς τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν οἰκονομίας γράφειν ἐθέλωμεν.[234]
>
> (life-stories of virtuous men, the narratives of the contests of the martyrs and the explanation of their sufferings, as well as the mystery of the dispensation of God almighty and our Saviour...)

> καὶ γίνεται πρὸς φυλακὴν τῆς ἐπιστροφῆς καὶ διηνεκῆ μνήμην ἡ τῶν εἰκονικῶν ὑποτυπώσεων συνεχὴς θέα, πρὸς τὸ μὴ παλινδρομῆσαι εἰς τὸν ἴδιον ἐμετόν.[235]
>
> (the continuous looking at pictorial drawings serves to preserve one's conversion and keeps one constantly mindful of it.)

The Refutation here teaches that an image of Matthew will convict a person of greediness and avarice and lead to repentance, the image of blessed Susanna gives encouragement to lead a life of chastity, and so on. A striking example of this is a quotation from Gregory Nazianzen found in the Damascene's florilegium appended to his third *Apology*, and read aloud at the fourth session of the 787 Council:

> I cannot pass over Polemon either, for his amazing performance too is one of the far-famed. At first he was not chaste at all, but an extremely shameful slave of his passions. Yet he found an advisor - I cannot say whether it was a wise man or himself - and was caught by love for virtue: suddenly he showed himself to have risen high above his passions. I shall mention one of his marvelous deeds. A libidinous

---

[234] Mansi XIII, 241BC.
[235] Mansi XIII.360C.

young man called a whore in. When she reached, it is said, the door, a portrait of Polemon looked down at her; she looked at it and immediately went away (for indeed it was venerable), overcome by the sight of it: she felt ashamed in front of Polemon's portrayal as if he were alive.[236]

Two participants (Basil, bishop of Ancyra and Nicephorus, bishop of Dyrrhachion) responded to this reading by agreeing that 'Indeed it [the image of Polemon] provoked chastity, for if the whore had not seen Polemon's image, she would not have refrained from licentiousness,' and 'the image is respectable and venerable (θαυμαστὴ καὶ ἀξιάγαστος): it was able to save the woman from wicked and shameless conduct.'[237]

The fourth and important claim of the Refutation is that the signifying of a name to the image transfers the honour to the prototype after which the image is named: 'διὰ τῆς τοῦ ὀνόματος σημασίας εἰς τὴν τοῦ προτωτύπου τιμὴν ἀναφερόμεθα.'[238] This notion is dependent upon Basil's *De Spiritu Sancto* 18.45: 'ἡ τῆς εἰκόνας τιμὴ ἐπὶ τὸ πρωτότυπον διαβαίνει.' (The honour given to the image passes over to the prototype.)[239] This passing of honour from image to prototype because of the common naming, understood in the context of Basil's formula, justifies the embracing, kissing and 'offering to [the image] the veneration of honour'.[240] In the 'Refutation' this is said to result in our sanctification, in the same way that we receive a blessing from holy utensils when they are kissed and embraced.

It is not until the ὅρος itself, however, that Basil's formula is said to imply that

---

[236] Mansi XIII.13BC.
[237] Mansi XIII.13CD.
[238] Mansi XIII.269E.
[239] The 'Refutation' adds that dishonour given to the image passes over to the prototype in the same manner: 'τῆς εἰκόνος ἀτιμαζο..., πάντως τὸ πρωτότυπον ἀτιμάζεται.' Mansi XIII.273B.
[240] Mansi XIII.225A, 269E.

'he who offers προσκύνησις to the εἰκών offers προσκύνησις to the ὑπόστασις of the πρόσωπον ....'[241] Undue emphasis here must not be attached to the notions of ἡ ὑπόστασις or τὸ πρόσωπον. The 'Refutation' is clear throughout that it does not promote a unique offering of προσκύνησις due only to the image because it shows the outline of the body of the prototype. Rather, the image receives the very same offering of προσκύνησις which is given to the cross, the Gospel book and all types of holy utensils used in the Liturgy.[242]

The ὅρος of the 787 Council which follows its detailed 'Refutation' of the 754 Council adds no new statement or claim which is not considered in the 'Refutation', other than the assertion that Basil's formula formally implies that 'he who offers προσκύνησις to the image offers προσκύνησις to the ὑπόστασις of the πρόσωπον...'.

Antirrheticus I: Theological arguments for the 787 'Refutation' and ὅρος

As I have pointed out, the preface to *Antirr* I[243] reveals Theodore's intention to supplement an inadequate previous attempt to respond to the iconoclast arguments in a treatise he refers to as ὁ Στηλιτευτικός. The first step of this task will be undertaken in *Antirr* I. Theodore will systematically review the iconophile arguments:

> τὰς συστατικὰς ἀποδείξεις περὶ τῆς προκειμένης ὑποθέσεως ἀνελιττόμενος καὶ συμφοπίζων.
>
> (proving the component parts concerning the overall design [of the argument] set before one, explaining them and bringing them together.)

---

[241] Mansi XIII.377E.
[242] Mansi XIII.377E.
[243] Migne *PG* 99.328D-329B.

My analysis will show that Theodore restricts himself in *Antirr* I to a consideration of the eighth century argument, and especially to an attempt to give theological grounding to the claims of the 787 Council. Even a cursory comparison of *Antirr* I with Theodore's earliest image letter c.810[244] makes it clear that Theodore is rehearsing the iconophile argument of a past generation. Nonetheless, the 787 Council must be theologically defended and affirmed. Theodore attends to this task in *Antirr* I.

Theodore's intention to τὰς συστατικὰς ἀποδείξεις περὶ τῆς προκειμένης ὑποθέσεως ἀνελιττόμενος καὶ συμφοπίζων is accomplished in the following way. After an opening statement of theology in *Antirr* I.1, eighteen questions and objections of heretics are answered (*Antirr* I.2-19) before the concluding anathemas are presented in *Antirr* I.20. The overall question and answer form of the *Antirr* is within the tradition of monastic catechesis (the general form of instruction given by a spiritual father to his disciples)[245] and is ideally suited to Theodore's primary goals of pastoral care and spiritual direction which are the impetus of his writing the entire *Antirr*. Consciously within this ascetic and monastic tradition, Theodore writes the *Antirr* I, 'relying on the prayers and urgings of my Fathers' (ταῖς πατρικαῖς εὐχαῖς τε καὶ παρορμήσεσι θαρρήσας.) The argument will proceed by 'opposing our own teaching and that of the other side' (κατὰ ἀντίθεσιν τοῦ τε οἰκείου δόγματος, καὶ τοῦ ἀλλοτρίου). Both sides seek to represent orthodox Christological doctrine within the tradition.[246] The dogma τοῦ

---

[244] Fatouros 57.

[245] See chapter one of Blowers (1991) which is an informative essay on the monastic genre of ἐρωταπόκρισεις and the positive review by Louth (1998), 76-78.

[246] See Sendler (1981) who is one of the few contemporary scholars who will acknowledge the intention and weight of the iconoclast arguments in defending Chalcedon Christology. Before Theodore's *Antirr*, the iconoclasts presented stronger arguments than the iconophiles. Leo V has gathered astute theologians under John Grammaticus to fortify and represent the iconoclast position. In *Antirr* I the arguments of Constantine V and the 754 Council appear, and the claims of the 787 Council are identified and given as much theological support as they can bear.

ἀλλοτρίου is represented only by the 'they' of φασί, but their questions and objections identify them as representatives of the doctrine of the Πεύσεις and 754 ὅρος. Their theological questions are answered by an individual (first person singular) who shows the error in the iconoclast argument. This response in *Antirr* I is always an argument or dogmatic statement which supports an element of the 787 'Refutation' or ὅρος.

As I begin a summary of *Antirr* I, the reader must be prepared to find only a dogmatic restatement of the claims of the 787 Council. Every substantial philosophical or theological question is avoided and the position of the 754 Council is simply contradicted with an opposing statement. The most stark and surprising comparison will be that of the dogmatism of *Antirr* I with the creative argument of *Antirr* III. *Antirr* II provides the bridge. Because Theodore refuses to enter into the theological debate more significantly than the claims of the 787 Council can bear (although Theodore offers clear explanations of the position of the 787 Council), so I shall attempt to reflect the nature of *Antirr* I by restricting myself to a presentation of its contents. Questions such as apophatic/cataphatic theology, the deification of the baptized individual, the character of the human nature found in Christ, and the deeper definition of the concept of the image itself are all introduced but not refined either in the proceedings of the 787 Council or here in the text of the *Antirr* I. These questions will be addressed appropriately in subsequent chapters of our argument.

Antirr I.1

Antirr I.1 begins with the unquestionable declaration that for Christians there is:

Μία ... πίστις καὶ λατρεία καὶ προσκύνησις· ἡ εἰς Πατέρα τε, φημὶ, καὶ Υἱὸν καὶ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα· ὅτι καὶ ἓν τὸ προσκυνούμενον τῇ φύσει τῆς θεότητος..., κἂν τρία τὰ νοούμενα ταῖς ὑποστατικαῖς ἰδιότησιν, ὡς κατὰ συνέπειαν.[247] (One ... faith, worship and προσκύνησις - I mean for the Father, Son and Holy Spirit - because that which is offered προσκύνησις is one in the nature of divinity ... even if they are intellectually perceived as three in their hypostatic properties, according to our common teaching.)

Both iconoclasts and iconophiles agree that the entire debate over the permissibility of the offering of προσκύνησις to the εἰκών depends on whether this offering of προσκύνησις violates or supports the indivisibility of the single worship and offering of προσκύνησις to the Trinity as one in nature yet intellectually perceived as three in their hypostatic properties.

Antirr I.2

The opening speech of the heretics[248] in *Antirr* I sets forth three fundamental accusations of the iconoclasts. First, that the offering of προσκύνησις to images destroys the single offering of προσκύνησις of the Trinity affirmed in *Antirr* I.1.[249] Second, that the offering of προσκύνησις introduces the offering of προσκύνησις to idols (εἰδωλικήν). Third, that it denies the incomprehensibility and uncircumscribability of God.[250] Theodore's response is

---

[247] Migne *PG* 99.329B.

[248] Although those opposed to τοῦ τε οἰκείου δόγματος are not called heretics in the body of the text of *Antirr* I, the position τοῦ ἀλλοτρίου is that of the iconoclasts who are anathematized as heretics in the concluding chapter of *Antirr* I.

[249] The adequate response to this fundamental charge against the iconophile position will be given only in the concluding arguments of *Antirr* III.C.5 where Theodore will insist that the affirmation of this theological truth in the Christian οἰκονομία not only allows but requires the offering of προσκύνησις to images.

[250] This accusation of idolatry taken straight from the Πεῦσεις and 754 ὅρος.

the admission that the heretics have accurately described three crucial issues of the controversy. First, the single offering of προσκύνησις to the Trinity must not be violated. Second, the iconophiles must counter the accusation of the 754 ὅρος that the setting up of images leads to worship of the created order. Third, theology demands a radical apophatic description of the Godhead:

> It is obvious to all that the Godhead is incomprehensible and uncircumscribable, and I add boundless, limitless, formless, and whatsoever else through the removal of [properties by privation] the Godhead is not ... We, however, have only one God whom we offer veneration as Trinity. And in regard to the doctrine of theology, so far from inventing some kind of circumscription or comprehension of form (perish the idea! for this was an invention of pagan thought), we do not even know that the Godhead exists at all, or what sort of thing it is, as it alone understands about itself.[251]

In this affirmation of radical apophaticism in matters pertaining to θεολογία, Theodore is surely following the teaching of those to whom he most often refers in his letters, the Cappadocians and especially Gregory Nazianzen. Theodore maintains throughout the *Antirr* and all his correspondence that human thinking is unable to grasp any adequate conception of the inner life of the Trinity.

After Theodore establishes that the heretics have identified the proper questions, he indicates that the iconophile argument will develop entirely on an orthodox understanding of the Incarnation. The entering of one of the Trinity into human nature (εἰς ἀνθρωπείαν φύσιν ἐλήλυθε) allows Christ to be imaged:

---

[251] Migne *PG* 99.329CD. Greek text is above, page 47.

καὶ φυσικὴν περιγραφὴν κατέχεται τοῦ σφετέρου σώματος, ὁ τῇ οἰκείᾳ θεότητι ὑπάρχων ἀπερίγραπτος

(He who in his own divinity is uncircumscribable, accepts the natural circumscription of his body.)

The most basic demand of the doctrine of the Incarnation is that it must avoid the denial of either of Christ's natures of divinity or humanity (*Antirr* I.2). Theodore understands that the implications of the Incarnation can only be described in a paradoxical language:

καὶ γέγονε τῶν ἀμίκτων μίξις, καὶ τῶν ἀκράτων κρᾶσις, ἤτοι τοῦ ἀπεριγράπτου πρὸς τὸ περιγεγραμμένον· τοῦ ἀπείρου πρὸς τὸ πεπερασμένον· τοῦ ἀορίστου πρὸς τὸ διωρισμένον· τοῦ ἀσχηματίστου πρὸς τὸ εὐσχηματισμένον· ὃ καὶ παράδοχον· διὰ τοῦτο Χριστὸς εἰκονίζεται, καὶ ὁ ἀόρατος ὁρᾶται.

(There is a mixture of the unmixed, and a compounding of that which is not able to be combined: that is, of the uncircumscribable with the circumscribed, of the boundless with the bounded, of the limitless with the definite, of the formless with the well-formed, which is paradoxical. Because of this, Christ is depicted in images, and the invisible is seen.)

Thus the accusation of 754 that the image denies the divine nature of Christ is opposed by the 787 statement that the rejection of Christ's εἰκών denies the human nature of Christ. Each side is convinced that Chalcedonian orthodoxy is violated by the other's position on images. Theodore will now proceed to undo the theological arguments of the

Πεύσεις and 754 ὅρος, at least as much as the doctrine of the 787 Council will allow.[252]

Antirr I.3,4

Antirr I.3,4 takes up the Christological challenge of the Πεύσεις[253] and 754 ὅρος that the image either divides or confuses the natures of Christ, contrary to the Chalcedonian definition. In his initial response, Theodore indicates the proper relation of ἰδιώματα, φύσις and ὑπόστασις:

νόει αὐτὸν μεμενηκέναι καὶ ἀπερίγραπτον ἐν τῷ περιγεγράφθαι. Ταῦτα γὰρ καὶ ὁμοίως ἰδιώματα· ἀλλὰ τὰ [ἰδιώματα] μὲν τῆς ἀπεριγράπτου φύσεως ἐν οἷς τὸ εἶναι θεὸς γνωρίζεται· τὰ δὲ τῆς περιγεγραμμένης, ἐν οἷς τὸ εἶναι ἄνθρωπος ὡμολόγηται. Καὶ οὐδ' ἕτερον θάτερον κεκαινοτόμηκεν, οὐδ' ἀπεφοίτησε τοῦθ' ὅπερ ἦν· οὐδὲ μετηλλοίωται ἐν ἑκατέρῳ ἑκάτερον· σύγχυσις γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ ἦν πεφεύγαμεν· ἀλλ' εἷς καὶ ὁ αὐτός ἐστι τῇ ὑποστάσει, τὸ ἀσύγχυτον τῶν ἰδίων φύσεων εἴσω τῶν οἰκείων ὅρων ἔχων.[254]

(you should understand that [the divinity] has also remained uncircumscribable in being circumscribed. For these are ἰδιώματα just as those are; but the [ἰδιώματα] τῆς ἀπεριγράπτου φύσεως are those in which Christ is known to be God, while the ἰδιώματα τῆς περιγεγραμμένης are those in which he is confessed to be man. Neither one makes the other into something new, nor departs from what it was itself; nor is one changed into the other - for such a change would produce the

[252] See Lossky (1987): 'Second Nicaea is primarily, above all, a Christological synod. ... It is not primarily a synod about sacred images as such; it is primarily a Christological synod in the full sense of the word, i.e., in the soteriological, trinitarian sense of a proclamation by the church of the nature of salvation offered to humanity: deification.' (340).

[253] It is very likely that at least in the early years of the ninth century, later in the short reign of Michael I Rhangabe, and even in the beginning years of Leo's reign when he had reconciled with the patriarch Nicephorus, (times when Theodore was in favour with the imperial and ecclesiastical authorities), Theodore would have been one of the few who were able to study the writings of Constantine V and the full text of the *Acta* of Hiereia available in the Patriarchal Library. The *Acta* had been relegated by Canon 9 of the 787 Council to the collection of heretical books in the Library, and thus were accessible to very few clergy.

[254] Migne *PG* 99.332C.

confusion which we have refused to admit; but he is one and the same in his ὑπόστασις, with his two φύσεις unconfused in their proper spheres.)

This is the beginning of Theodore's attempt to give reasoned support to the themes and doctrine of the 787 Council. The 787 'Refutation' had ridiculed the 754 use of syllogistic logic[255] but had not tried to refute it by argument. Here Theodore repeats the claim of the 787 'Refutation'[256] that the 754 ὅρος had misused logic, but then challenges, ἀλλὰ δεῦρο κἀντεῦθεν πανσθενῶς ἐκραπίσθητι (come hither and be utterly overthrown). In *Antirr* I.4 he addresses the accusation of the Πεύσεις and 754 ὅρος that the image reduces Christ to a ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος. Theodore suggests that a more accurate interpretation of the Incarnation reveals that Christ is:

τὸν δὲ καθ' ὅλου, ἤτοι τὴν ὅλην φύσιν· ἀλλὰ μὴν τὴν ἐν ἀτόμῳ θεωρουμένην ([man] in general, even the whole nature [of man]; but contemplated in an individual [manner]...332D)

A proper understanding of the Incarnation allows Christ to be circumscribed and remain 'οὐ εἷς τῶν πολλῶν, ἀλλὰ θεὸς ἀνθρωπισθείς' (not one among many, but God made man.)[257]

Just as Constantine V pointed to the Chalcedonian definition as proof of the illegitimacy of the εἰκών, so Theodore maintains that a deeper understanding of the Chalcedonian definition requires the εἰκών of Christ:

---

[255] 'Using untenable syllogisms, they criticize the Church by using sophistry.' Mansi XIII.260C.
[256] καὶ μὴ νῷ νοῦν διακρουόμενος, τῷ ἀποδεικτικῷ τὸν ἀναπόδεικτον· καὶ τῷ συλλογιστικῷ τὸν ἀσυλλόγιστον· (You try to evade our argument with non-argument, to refute what is undemonstrated by your demonstration and what is illogical with your logic.) Migne *PG* 99.332D.
[257] Migne *PG* 99.333A (*Antirr* I.4).

Τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ καινοπρεπὲς τῆς οἰκονομίας μυστήριον, σύνοδον γενέσθαι θείας καὶ ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως ἐν τῇ μιᾷ τοῦ Λόγου ὑποστάσει· τὰς ἰδιότητας ἑκατέρων ἀλωβήτους διατηρούσῃ ἐν τῇ ἀδιαιρέτῳ ἑνώσει.[258]

(For this is the novel mystery of the dispensation, that the divine and human natures came together in the one hypostasis of the Word, which maintains the properties of both natures in the indivisible union.)

Antirr I.5,6

In *Antirr* I.5,6 Theodore begins to highlight the nature of the 787 defence of the εἰκών as legitimate 'symbol'. The 787 'Refutation' had begun by emphasizing the focus of the 754 ὅρος on the charge of idolatry, and then indicates that the 754 ὅρος had set as its preface a quotation from Dionysius the Theophantor. The 'Refutation' then suggests that the 754 Council would not have gone astray if it had truly held to the teachings of Dionysius the Areopagite. The argument of *Antirr* I and II reveals how the notion of 'image' had been progressively clarified in the controversy by a gradual distancing from other related but distinct notions of narrative representation, symbol and relic. I shall describe this important development in chapter two. It is simply to be noted here that in the eighth century debate reflected in *Antirr* I Theodore describes the 787 'Refutation' and ὅρος to be an attempt to defend the εἰκών as symbol. In *Antirr* II he will reveal that the defence of the Christ-εἰκών within the tradition demands an understanding of εἰκών as other than

---

[258] Migne *PG* 99.332C (*Antirr* I.4).

102

symbol.[259] *Antirr* III will give this final justification of the εἰκών as wholly distinct from symbol.

Antirr I.5,6 tells that the prohibition of Exodus 20.4,5 was written to teach the Israelites that for the true God:

οὗ οὐκ ἔστι σημασία, οὐχ ὁμοίωσις, οὐ περιγραφὴ, οὐ περιορισμὸς, οὗ τί πως ἂν τῶν ὅσα ὑπὸ κατάληψιν ἀνθρωπίνῃ διανοίᾳ ἔνεστι.[260]

(there is no designation, no likeness, no circumscription, no definition, nothing at all of what comes within the comprehension of the human mind.)

Nevertheless, at the same time as this teaching of the radical apophatic theology of divinity, Moses is commanded by this same God to make symbolic figures of angels[261], and the serpent as a symbol of Christ.[262] Thus the distinction between image and symbol is established. The Godhead is not like any creature and any attempted likeness is forbidden, but symbolic representation is commanded. The Lord commands Moses to create symbols:

---

[259] In *Antirr* I Theodore not only insists that image and prototype must be different from one another in essence, but then states that of ἀρχέτυπος and παράγωγον: Οὐκ ἄν ποτε μανείη ἄν τις τοσοῦτον ..΄ ἀρχέτυπον καὶ παράγωγον ... λέγεί ἐν ἑκατέρῳ ἑκάτερα, ἢ θάτερον. 341B (No one could ever be so insane as to suppose ... prototype and derivative...to say that each is in the other, or either one is in the other.) But in *Antirr* II the image begins to be seen in its own right as a notion different from that of symbol and thus the Dionysian formula is offered which says precisely what was claimed in *Antirr* I to be impossible: Τὸ ἀληθὲς ἐν τῷ ὁμοιώματι, τὸ ἀρχέτυπον ἐν τῇ εἰκόνι· τὸ ἑκάτερον ἐν ἑκατέρῳ. 357C (The truth in the likeness, the prototype in the image; each in the other except for the difference of essence.) The important shift in the concept of image considered as physical object (Constantine V and 754 ὅρος) to image considered as immaterial symbol (787 'Refutation' and ὅρος and reflected in *Antirr* I) to image as distinct from symbol (*Antirr* II) will be considered below.
[260] *Antirr* I.5. Migne *PG* 99.333C.
[261] Ex 25.18-22.
[262] Numbers 21.8-9 and John 3.14.

103

πρὸς δὲ τὸ δι' ἐκτυπωμάτων καὶ μορφωμάτων τινῶν συμβολικῶς ἀνάγεσθαι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ, ἐπι τὴν τοῦ ἑνὸς Θεοῦ, ὡς ἐφικτὸν, θεωρίαν καὶ λατρείαν, ἡ κατάφασις· ἢ οὐχὶ καὶ αὐτὸ τό τε παράδειγμα τῆς ὅλης σκηνῆς προχάραγμον ἐναργές ἐστι τῆς ἐν πνεύματι λατρείας, σκιαγραφούμενόν πως συμβολικαῖς θεωρίαις τῷ μεγάλῳ Μωσεῖ πρὸς τοῦ τῶν ὅλων Θεοῦ;[263]

(to lead Israel symbolically by means of certain sculptured and modeled forms as far as possible toward the contemplation and worship of the one God. Is not the very pattern of the whole tabernacle a distinct prefiguration of worship in the Spirit, roughly sketched in symbolic visions for the great Moses by the God of all?)

Antirr I.7 considers the 754 ὅρος 'ethical theory of images,' which not only states that the εἰκών of Christ is to be discovered in the virtues of His saints, but even Christ 'is formed in us by the Holy Spirit, who sends into us a kind of divine formation through sanctification and righteousness.'[264] Theodore does not deny this, but rather insists that this is the subject of Baptism:

Καὶ οὐ περὶ τοῦ ἐξεικονίζεσθαι ἐν ἡμῖν τὸν χαρακτῆρα τῆς ὑποστάσεως τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς, ὁ λόγος, ἀλλὰ περὶ τοῦ ἐξεικονίζεσθαι ἡμᾶς τὴν ἀνθρωπόμορφον εἰκόνα ἐν ὑλικοῖς χρώμασιν.

(And we are not speaking about how the character of the hypostasis of God the Father is in us, but about how we depict His human image with material colours.)

Theodore here establishes that his argument in defence of the 787 doctrine will focus on

---

[263] *Antirr* I.6. Migne *PG* 99.336AB.

[264] 'μορφοῦται ἐν ἡμῖν ἐνιέντος τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος θείαν τινὰ μόρφωσιν δι'ἁγιασμοῦ καὶ δικαιοσύνης.' Alexander (1953) describes the ethical theory: 'the only true image of Christ and of the saints is Man endowed with the Christian virtues' (44, 50). He wrongly suggests that this ethical theory was first introduced in the 815 Council. Anastos (1979a) shows conclusively that it was present in 754 and notes that six of the eight passages of the 754 florilegium deal specifically with the ethical theory.

the painted anthropomorphic image of Christ which was the direct concern of the 754 ὅρος. The ὅρος promoted the Eucharist as image because it was 'μὴ σχηματίζουσαν ἀνθρώπου μορφήν, lest idolatry be introduced.'[265] It is the setting up and offering of προσκύνησις to the anthropomorphic image of Christ the god-man which the iconoclasts claim to be the falling into the same idolatry of the pagans who set up and offered προσκύνησις to the images of the gods in human form.

The theological debate in the eighth and ninth centuries focused exclusively on the Christ-εἰκών. Brown (1973) suggests that this focus was 'a red herring' which missed the real meaning of the crisis as more precisely 'a debate on the position of the holy in Byzantine society'. It is true that historically it was the offering of προσκύνησις to images of the saints which forced the issue, but the theological justification of images of the saints depended upon the legitimacy of the Christ-εἰκών. This linking of the Christ-εἰκών with the images of the saints reveals that by the eighth century the εἰκών of the saint is not seen to have the character of a portrait which sparks the remembrance of a holy person and his virtues, but the εἰκών of the saint is thought somehow to convey the same divine presence in the εἰκών of the saint as that of the Christ-εἰκών.

The possibility of the participation of the human soul in divinity through the sanctification and purification of the soul (including the body), i.e. through πρᾶξις and the achievement of θεωρία and even θεοπτία, would be acknowledged by all monks and Byzantine laymen, both iconoclasts and iconophiles alike. They would agree also that this progress is entirely dependent upon the union of human and divine natures in the one Person of Jesus Christ. We are made in the image of God, and more precisely, as the image of the Image (the Son). Only through the Son do we carry the image of the hypostasis of

---
[265] Mansi XIII.264B.

the Father. As the Christian grows more completely into the divine image of Christ through πρᾶξις and θεωρία, he more and more 'puts on Christ.' The question which is at issue in the controversy is this: can the soul, ἡ ὑπόστασις, or τὸ πρόσωπον of the saint who has participated in divinity be imaged? The answer is yes only if Christ himself can be imaged. Christ is the one in whom both human and divine natures are united in one ὑπόστασις, 'without confusion, without change, without division, without separation.' Thus the theological controversy focuses on the Christ-εἰκών. As Theodore describes it: 'we are not speaking about how the character of the hypostasis of God the Father is in us, but about how we depict His human image with material colours.'

Antirr I.5,6 takes up the claim of the 787 'Refutation' and ὅρος that certain specific and divinely inspired symbols effectively can be used to lead the mind to contemplation of the true God. The doctrine of the Incarnation allows the Christ-εἰκών to be the ultimate and perfect instance of such a divinely inspired symbol.[266] But if this is admitted, the overwhelming strength of the iconoclast position is brought to bear against the Christ-εἰκών precisely because of the substantial and consistent Christian charge of idolatry against the pagan image in the early centuries. The image of Christ must somehow be distinguished from the anthropomorphic images of the pagans, but, in fact, how are the arguments of the iconophiles any different from the old pagan apology of the human

---

[266] In comparing the serpent of bronze to the Christ-image, Theodore reflects the doctrine of the 787 Council when he asks: 'And if the symbol in animal form cured those who had been bitten by its sight alone, how could the holy representation of Christ's very form do otherwise than hallow those who see it? (καὶ εἰ ὁ θηριόμορφος τύπος ὁρώμενος τύπος χαρακτὴρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ βλεπόμενος ἁγιάσειε τοὺς τεθεαμένους;) Migne *PG* 99.336A.

symbols of divinity?[267] Theodore admits that these are the questions to be answered when he pleads:

Ἀποίσειν δὲ καθ᾽ ἡμῶν Γραφικὰς φωνὰς ἀμαθῶς παύσειας ἄν ἄρα τὰς κατὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐπὶ ταῖς εἰδωλικαῖς ἀνατυπώσεσι τῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰκόνι προσάπτων; Τίς γὰρ ἄν νοῦν ἔχων οὐ συνίει τὴν διαφορὰν εἰδώλου τε καὶ εἰκόνος· ὅτι τὸ μὲν σκότος, τὸ δὲ φῶς· καὶ τὸ μὲν πλάνον, τὸ δὲ ἀπλανές· καὶ τὸ μὲν τῆς πολυθεΐας, τὸ δὲ τῆς οἰκονομίας ἐναργέστατον γνώρισμα; [268]

(Would you please stop ignorantly dragging out scriptural verses to use against us, taking the words spoken against the pagans in regard to the forms of idols, and misapplying them to the εἰκών of Christ? For what person with any sense does not understand the difference between an idol and an image: the one is darkness, the other light; the one deceiving, the other not deceiving; the one is of polytheism, the other the clearest token of the οἰκονομία.)

There is is no argument at all being offered against the iconoclast position, but a simple turning away from any serious consideration of the question which Theodore raises in a stark manner. In this way it is an admission that the 787 Council did not

---

[267] For example, the 'image made without hands' finds a parallel in Iamblichus attributing to the statues a miraculous origin. The iconophile agenda was to show how it was that the prototype was somehow present in the image, just as Iamblichus struggled to explain how it was that the gods are present in the statues. The psychological theory that images are aids to contemplation which raise the mind to the prototype and bring the prototype to the image, is similar to Proclus' teaching that through initiatory rites the statues can be made like to the gods and fit to receive the divine illuminations. See Armstrong (1963): 'The iconodules, when they made the doctrine of the Incarnation the foundation of their arguments, were arguing as Christians, not as pagans. But they were unconsciously giving Christian ratification to the deep instinctive conviction of Hellenic popular piety that man's strange power of making human images which suggested something more than man could rightly be used in divine worship, a conviction which some cosmic pantheists had attacked and which the philosophers whose arguments the Christian defenders of images took over had clarified and formulated rationally' (123). Hans von Campenhausen remarks: 'If we consider the actual development of devotion to images, and its 'decadence' in popular piety, we are bound to ask whether the victory of the Church over 'Judaism' was not bought, to a great extent, at the price of a victory of paganism over the genuine Christian heritage. ... Greek theology actually took over completely the pagan philosophical justification of images and their worship ....' Campenhausen (1968), 198.
[268] *Antirr* I.7.

succeed in demonstrating the difference between the Christ-εἰκών and the pagan

anthropomorphic representation of the divine. Kitzinger (1955) comments:

> For in the portrait there is no action to absorb the attention of either subject or
> beholder. Quietly confronted with each other face to face they may easily enter into
> a relationship basically identical to that between the heathen worshiper and the cult
> image in the temple. It was, in fact, its inherent resemblance to the pagan cult image
> (the foremost target of all Christian opposition in the sphere of the visual arts),
> which made the portrait a particular stumbling block for Early Christian writers. The
> increasingly frequent and bold use of the portrait form in the art of the late sixth
> and seventh centuries is a measure of the degree to which the original scruples in the
> matter of graven images had been overcome at this time. It meant the emergence of
> what was in effect an equivalent of the pagan cult statue.[269]

Those 'original scruples' returned fully in the iconoclast argument of the eighth century.

Alexander (1958b) agrees, 'At some time between the third and the seventh century,

Christians took over the pagan argumentation. Arguments which heretofore had been used

by pagan writers in defence of pagan cult statues were in the seventh century cited in

writings directed against the Jews and Pagans in defence of Christian images.'[270]

I am not suggesting that Theodore would not recognize this dependence, but I only

point out that at this stage of the image debate a specifically Christian argumentation is

not to be discovered. In chapter two, I shall show that Theodore understands generally

that the inability to go beyond the older idol debate has to do with the eighth century

perception of the Christ-εἰκών as anthropomorphic symbol. In fact, both Baynes (1955)

---

[269] Kitzinger (1955), 144.
[270] Alexander (1958b), 33.

and Armstrong (1963) point out that it is not only the iconophiles who represent the older pagan position, but the position of the iconoclasts also can be found in the former debate about the legitimacy of anthropomorphic symbol. Thus even the Christian protest against pagan anthropomorphic images was taken over from an earlier criticism of these images by the pagans themselves. Armstrong shows how there was a lively pro and con image debate among the Greek pagans, 'a dispute between men who shared the same theological position, that of the cosmic religion of late antiquity.'[271] In the same vein, thirty years previous, Baynes had reviewed the evidence extensively and remarked, '...the Christian is, in his [anti-anthropomorphic image] argument, exploiting a capital which has been amassed by pagan thinkers.'[272] Thus the iconoclasts and iconophiles, 'men who shared the same theological position' as Armstrong contends, but this time a Christian position, unwittingly were locked in an ancient debate.

The debate in Theodore's time is now set in the context of the Christian language of the Incarnation, but the nature and function of the Christ-εἰκών fundamentally is not understood by the 787 ὅρος to be conceptually different from any symbol. Theodore indicates here only that he recognizes the problem. The anthropomorphic nature of the Christ-εἰκών demands that he show why the ancient Christian apology against pagan anthropomorphic forms no longer applies in the case of the Christ-εἰκών. This task, however, is not the subject of the *Antirr* I which continues in its efforts to make clear the dogmatic claims of the 787 'Refutation' and ὅρος.

---

[271] Armstrong (1963), 122.
[272] Baynes (reprint, 1955), 121.

Antirr I.8,9

In *Antirr* I.8 the Christ-εἰκών is justified on the same grounds as the symbol of the cross. The 787 'Refutation' had quoted Dionysius as authority that the 'nature' of the cause is what determines its standing above its effect.[273] Theodore combines this notion with the dominant theme of the 787 'Refutation' and ὅρος that the relation of image and prototype is purely nominal:

καὶ οὐκ ἀπέσχισται τῇ δόξῃ τὸ παράγωγον τοῦ πρωτοτύπου· ὡς οὐδὲ φωτὸς σκιά. Καὶ γὰρ ὅσα κατὰ τοῦ αἰτίου λέγεται, ταῦτα καὶ κατὰ τοῦ αἰτιατοῦ πάντως ῥηθήσεται· ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν κυρίως, ὅτι καὶ φύσει· τὰ δὲ οὐ κυρίως, ὅτι καὶ ὁμωνύμως.

(... the copy shares the glory of its prototype, as a reflection shares the brightness of the light. For whatever is said about the cause, the same can in all respects be said about the effect. In the case of the cause, it is said properly, because it is true by nature; while in the case of the effect, it is not said properly, because it is true by identity of name.)[274]

Speaking of both the cross and the Christ-εἰκών, Theodore remains strictly within the 787 doctrine which does not distinguish the justification of the anthropomorphic

---

[273] Mansi XIII.256A, quoting Dionysius, *On the Celestial Hierarchy.*

[274] Theodore here draws upon the long history of exposition on cause and effect which would have been known to him through many authors, including Dionysius. A *locus classicus* for the late antique world was still Proclus' *Elements of Theology* 25-30 which explains how cause and effect are 'at once united and distinguished: καὶ ἥνωται καὶ διακέκριται' (28). The effect at the same time is distinguished from cause yet participates in it. The effect (or image in this case) 'both remains in the cause and proceeds, and the two relations are inseparable.' (30) The question for the two sides of the image controversy is precisely to describe the nature of this participation. If it is a participation by name alone (as suggested here in *Antirr* I), does this carry any ontological implications? The iconoclasts reasonably insist that any talk of participation carries ontological implications, but this is precisely the conclusion that the 787 Council wanted to avoid, insisting that prototype and image (Christ and the Christ-εἰκών) could not in any way share the same nature.

Christ-εἰκών from the image of the cross, when he continues, 'Is not every image a kind of seal and impression bearing in itself the proper appearance of that after which it is named?'[275] *Antirr* I.9 shows that the argument of image as legitimate symbol does not identify the image with the physical object on which it appears. The προσκύνησις is offered to the image itself and not the physical object.

Antirr I.10

In *Antirr* I.10 Theodore gives a very brief comment on the claim of the Πεύσεις and 754 ὅρος that the Eucharist is the one true image of Christ. Perhaps Theodore does not review the arguments of the 787 'Refutation' because he judged that it had adequately refuted this symbolic view of the Eucharist with its argument that the Eucharist must not be called a τύπος, but a reality. Indeed, it seems that the Eucharistic doctrine at the time was such that this perspective of the 787 'Refutation' could not be seriously contested. The notion of the Eucharist as true τύπος does not reappear in the 815 iconoclast arguments.[276] Theodore is content to ask: τί τὰ τῆς ἀληθείας μυστήρια εἰς τύπους μεταλαμβάνων φληναφεῖς; (Why do you babble on, changing the sacraments of truth into symbols?)

A reflection on the development of the Eucharistic argument from the Πεύσεις to *Antirr* I helps to track the important shift of emphasis from considering the εἰκών as material object to immaterial outline and depiction. Here in *Antirr* I.10 Theodore uses the language of τύπος which we find in the original argument of the Πεύσεις. By the Lord's command a τύπος of his body had been given to mankind. In the pre-754 Πεύσεις,

---

[275] Ἡ οὐχὶ πᾶσα εἰκὼν σφραγίς τίς ἐστι καὶ ἐκτύπωσις ἐν ἑαυτῇ φέρουσα τὸ κύριον εἶδος τοῦθ' ὅπερ καὶ λέγεται;

[276] And thus is not considered in *Antirr* II.

Constantine V's demand that an image be consubstantial with its prototype was consistent with his interpretation of the 'Christ-εἰκών' to include the physical object which contained the image.[277] The first evidence of this is the attestation of contemporary sources[278] to Constantine's rejection of relics. Constantine likely was of the opinion that the Christ-εἰκών was due the same claims of 'holiness' whether it was considered as a material object bearing an εἰκών of Christ or as a physical relic. Secondly, it is noted above that Constantine called the Eucharist the genuine ἀχειροποίητος which is the term used to refer to images which had supernatural origin. Constantine thought that all proper images are consubstantial with their prototypes. In his understanding the Christ-εἰκών cannot properly claim this consubstantiality, but the Eucharist can. Neither the demand for consubstantiality of εἰκών and prototype, nor the rejection of relics, nor the calling of the Eucharist 'ἀχειροποίητος' is found in the 754 ὅρος. But a third element of the Eucharistic doctrine of the Πεύσεις[279] was taken up in the 754 ὅρος, as outlined above. This was the objection that there was no sanctifying or consecration prayer for the image which would convey it (like the bread and wine of the Eucharist) from the realm of the common to the realm of the holy[280] . The 754 Council had made some ground in seeing the image apart from the object on which it was composed, but was still tied to the notion that the iconophile had to make holy not just the immaterial image, but the εἰκών as object. The

---

[277] Barber (1995), 5-10 suggests that Constantine's demand that the image and prototype share an essential relation is nothing other than the position taken by John of Damascus and the early iconophiles. Barber argues that this common essentialist reading of John Damascus and Constantine informed the debate in the first half of the eighth century. The Damascene's trinitarian emphasis led him to suggest that in His Incarnation Christ had redeemed matter, which could now participate to some degree in the divine essence. This is the sense in which the εἰκών participates in the divine. On the other hand, Constantine V drew out the Christological implications of this essentialist theory and concluded that the essentialist theory itself forbade the setting up of an εἰκών of Christ.
[278] See Gero (1977), 152-165.
[279] In addition to consubstantiality and the Eucharist as ἀχειροποίητος, Constantine's rejection of relics helps to explain the grounds of his rejection of the εἰκών although this is not mentioned in the Πεύσεις.
[280] Mansi XIII.268C.

response of the 787 'Refutation' further distanced the εἰκών as object from the εἰκών as image by insisting that the εἰκών as object did not require a consecration prayer any more than the sign of the cross required such a prayer. It was not the object on which the image appeared which was holy, but the immaterial image itself. The likeness of image to prototype is not to be found in the object but in the pure outline or depiction of the prototype.

Antirr I.11

Theodore continues to explain the gradual distancing of the εἰκών as object from the εἰκών as image in the the doctrine of the 787 ὅρος:

Καὶ ὅτε μὲν πρὸς τὴν τῆς εἰκόνος φύσιν ἀπίδοι, οὐ Χριστὸν μόνον, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ εἰκόνα Χριστοῦ εἴποι ἂν τὸ ὁρώμενον. Ἔστι γὰρ τυχὸν ξύλον, ἢ χρῶμα, ἢ χρυσὸς, ἢ ἄργυρος, ἢ τι τῶν διαφόρων ὑλῶν ὃ καὶ λέγεται. Ὅτε δὲ πρὸς τὴν δι' ἐκτυπώματος ἐξομοίωσιν τοῦ ἀρχετύπου, καὶ Χριστὸν καὶ Χριστοῦ. Ἀλλὰ Χριστὸν μὲν κατὰ τὸ ὁμώνυμον· Χριστοῦ δὲ κατὰ τὸ πρός τι.

(When one considers the nature of the image, not only would he not say that the thing he sees is Christ, but he would not even say that it is the εἰκών of Christ. For it is perhaps wood, or paint, or gold, or silver, or some one of the various materials which are mentioned. But when one considers the likeness to the original by means of a representation, it is both Christ and the εἰκών of Christ. It is Christ by the identity of name, but the εἰκών of Christ by its relationship.)

The Aristotelian language of the *Categories* is evident here. *Antirr* I.11 begins with a question which clearly reflects the present stage of the argument in 787. About the

εἰκών of Christ and of Christ himself, the heretics ask: 'And how can one say that each is in the other, or that either one is in the other? The absurdity is obvious.'[281] Theodore agrees that 'No one could ever be so insane as to suppose ... prototype and derivative ... to say that each is in the other, or either one is in the other.'[282]

This language clearly mimics yet contradicts a crucial quotation from Dionysius which will form the basis of Theodore's argument in *Antirr* II and III: 'The truth in the likeness, the prototype in the image; each in the other except for the difference of essence.'[283] The seeming contradiction is resolved by placing each statement in context. In *Antirr* I Theodore reflects the 787 doctrine which was in the early stages of distancing the εἰκών as object to the εἰκών as pure image. But in *Antirr* II the εἰκών will be defined as a notion distinct from that of symbol. What is not true of the relationship of 'εἰκών as symbol' to its prototype, is true of the relationship of 'εἰκών as pure image' to its prototype. Thus the Dionysian formula is articulated in *Antirr* II because the more complete development of the notion of εἰκών as image allows it to be correctly understood. Within the defined limits of *Antirr* I which sets out to present the doctrine of the 787 'Refutation' and ὅρος, Theodore cannot yet make use of Deny's *EH* 4.3.1 to advance his image theology.[284]

Antirr I.12

Consideration of the nature of the εἰκών as image continues as Theodore speaks of the

---

[281] Καὶ πῶς λεκτέον ἐν ἑκατέρῳ ἑκάτερα, ἢ θάτερον; καὶ τὸ ἄτοπον προφανές.

[282] Οὐκ ἄν ποτε μανείη ἄν τις τοσοῦτον ... ἀρχέτυπον καὶ παράγωγον ... λέγεί ἐν ἑκατέρῳ ἑκάτερα, ἢ θάτερον. Migne *PG* 99.341B.

[283] Τὸ ἀληθὲς ἐν τῷ ὁμοιώματι, τὸ ἀρχέτυπον ἐν τῇ εἰκόνι· τὸ ἑκάτερον ἐν ἑκατέρῳ. Migne *PG* 99.357C, from Denys the Areopagite *EH* 4.3.1.

[284] The sole quotation from Dionysius in the 787 'Refutation' is one which emphasizes the difference between cause and effect, image and prototype. Mansi XIII.253E.

Christ-εἰκών as containing nothing of ἡ φύσις τῆς σαρκὸς (the nature of the flesh), of Christ, much less anything of his uncircumscribable divinity. On the other hand, because it can truly be said that divinity is everything and present in everything, it is correct to say that the presence of divinity is in the Christ-εἰκών, but only inasmuch as divinity is located ἐν σκιᾷ τῆς ἐνωθείσης αὐτῇ σαρκὸς (in the shadow of the flesh [of Christ] united with it [divinity]). This passage is an important preparation for one of the anathemas at the end of *Antirr* I which speaks of the impossibility of offering προσκύνησις to Christ's divinity which is present naturally in the image. Rather, Theodore speaks of offering a σχετικὴ προσκύνησις (relative veneration) to the image which itself 'is the shadow of the flesh which is united to the divinity.' (ἡ σκιὰ τῆς ἐνωθείσης αὐτῇ σαρκός.)[285]

Theodore will use the figure of the shadow again in Antirr III to explore the relation of the Christ-εἰκών to Christ. Nothing more clearly illustrates the limited nature of Theodore's intention in the *Antirr* I than to compare the philosophical and theological precision of that later discussion with the comments here. Such a comparison, and consequent confirmation of my argument, will have to wait until chapter four.

Antirr I.12 concludes with a passage reminiscent of the Damascene, if not in precise terminology then at least in concept:

> Ποῦ γάρ ἐστιν, οὗ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ θεότης, ἔν τε λογικοῖς καὶ ἀλόγοις· ἐν ἐμψύχοις καὶ ἀψύχοις; ἀλλὰ κατὰ ἀναλογίας τῶν ὑποδεχομένων φύσεων πρὸς τὸ μᾶλλον καὶ ἧττον. Οὕτω καὶ ἐν εἰκόνι εἶναι τὴν θεότητα εἰπών τις οὐκ ἂ ἁμάρτῃ τοῦ δέοντος· ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐπὶ τύπου σταυροῦ τῶν τε ἄλλων θείων ἀναθημάτων, ἀλλ' οὐ φυσικῇ ἐνώσει· οὐ γὰρ σὰρξ ἡ θεωθεῖσα· σχετικῇ δὲ

285 Migne *PG* 99.349CD.

μεταλήψει, ὅτι χάριτι καὶ τιμῇ τὰ μετέχοντα.[286]

(Is there anywhere, among rational or irrational, animate or inanimate beings, where divinity is not to be found? As is appropriate to the natures receiving it, in some places you find more, in some places less. Thus even if one says that divinity is in the image, he is not speaking improperly. The same is true for the figure of the cross and other sacred objects, although not by natural union; for flesh is not what is deified. The participation is relative, and takes place by grace and honour.)

Theodore is careful in his language here to reflect the stage of argument of the 787 'Refutation' without falling into the essentialist reading of the relation between the image and prototype. The tracking of the gradual transformation of the iconophile commitment from the essentialist to formal reading of the εἰκών/πρωτότυπος relationship will be completed in *Antirr* III. I shall describe below how popular piety in the eighth and ninth centuries did not make a parallel adjustment in its devotional use of the εἰκών and in practice remained committed to the essentialist definition. Regardless, Theodore here does make it clear that not only a spiritual entity like soul can be divinized. He suggests that the deification of the (human) flesh is natural to it, whereas deification of irrational or inanimate beings can only be accomplished through a sharing in grace and honour by relative participation.[287]

Antirr I.13

Theodore continues to argue that the image has the same status as the cross or Gospel

---

[286] Migne *PG* 99.344BC; (*Antirr* I.12). Cf. the Damascene's notion of 'sanctification of all matter' and his doctrine of objects made holy by divine energies, which is foreshadowed in the Enneads 4.3.11 where Plotinus allows the essence of the universal soul to be present in everything which is disposed to receive its action and thus in some small degree to participate in its power.

[287] That deification is natural for the human flesh will be important as the argument develops.

book or any other consecrated thing which can be used as a symbol to assist the elevation of the mind to God,[288] because God is to be worshipped in spirit and in truth. But note the ambiguous exaltation of ὕλη in Theodore's presentation of the 787 doctrine, which again is reminiscent of John of Damascus:

ὑπεξαιρουμένων τῶν ὑλῶν διὰ τῆς τοῦ νοῦ ἐπὶ Θεὸν ἀνανήξεως. Οὐ γάρ τοι πρὸς αὐτὰς ἐναπομένοι ἄν, ὅτι μηδὲ πέποιθεν, ὡς ἡ τῶν εἰδωλολατρούντων πλάνη· δι' αὐτῶν τε ἐπι τὰ πρωτότυπα ἄνεισιν, ὡς ἡ τῶν ὀρθοδόξων πίστις.[289] (the matter is exalted by the raising of the mind toward God. The mind does not remain with the materials, because it does not trust in them: that is the error of the idolaters. Through the materials, rather, the mind ascends toward the prototypes: this is the faith of the orthodox.)

Theodore need not be thinking here of any text in particular, for the entire tradition in some way cautions against seeing this finite and material world as an end in itself. He suggests that the way to avoid idolatry is to recognize that 'the sight of visible and empirical realities' was able to 'lead the mind, as by a hand, to the contemplation of invisible realities.'[290] These words of Basil were echoed in various ways by the other Cappadocians. Gregory of Nyssa said, 'Our eyes are fixed, not on the things that are seen, but on the things that are unseen; for what is seen is transient, what is unseen is eternal.'[291] Two centuries later, Denys the Areopagite was to gather up the previous tradition (so accurately that he was able to present it as the source of the tradition) and provide his

---

[288] Basil's formula that the honour paid to the image passes over to the prototype (*De Spiritu Sancto* 18.45) is quoted often by the Damascene.
[289] Migne *PG* 99.344D.
[290] Basil, *In Hexaemeron* 1.6; *Sources chrétiennes* 26.10.
[291] *Homiliae in Cantica Canticorum*, Jaeger 6.411.

own synthesis of the 'anagogical' or upward movement of the mind from the sensible to the intelligible through the realm of symbols:

> For it is quite impossible that we humans should, in any material way, rise up to imitate and to contemplate the heavenly hierarchies without the aid of those material means capable of guiding us as our nature requires. Hence, any thinking person realizes that the appearances of beauty are signs of an invisible loveliness. The beautiful odours which strike the senses are representations of intellectual diffusion. Material lights are images of the outpouring of an immaterial gift of light.[292]

We know that Theodore is thoroughly familiar with the ascetic tradition of freeing the mind from those distractions which would tie the soul to sensible reality as if the sensible itself was eternal and the destiny of the human soul. Thus the finite became the means of achieving θεωρία. Theodore continually urged his monks to an ascetic struggle which would prepare the soul to experience contemplation of the eternal verities through the anagogical movement described above. Blowers (1991) has argued that the entire hermeneutic of the monk scholar Maximus Confessor can be understood by the notion of διάβασις or the sensible objects 'crossing over', 'passing over', 'ascending beyond', 'passing through', or 'penetrating', 'en route to the intelligible and spiritual truth that inheres, by grace, in those sensible things'.[293]

Each of these theologians refined the movement from the material to the

---

[292] *CH* 1; Migne *PG* 3.121CD. Dionysius warns us to 'withdraw from the attraction of material things' *Ep.* 10.1117B. Theodore advises that this is the way to avoid idolatry.
[293] Blowers (1991), 97.

prototypes to God in different ways, but Theodore's point here is simply to insist that the image itself, or even the material object on which the image is found, is not the object of the act of προσκύνησις. In order to avoid idolatry, the mind must ascend to the prototype of the image or symbol and offer to the prototype the προσκύνησις which it is due .

Antirr I.14

Theodore has the Iconoclast raise a question: 'Is it the εἰκών itself that is venerated, or the title written on it?' This question indicates that Theodore believes that a proper understanding of the relation of name to the thing named will be important for image theory. The iconoclast separates the name entirely from that of which it is the name. The orthodox, on the other hand, sees a necessary relation between name and object. Objects are only known through their names and vice versa.[294] This discussion anticipates the argument of *Antirr* III which shows a similar necessary relationship between εἰκών and prototype which is not arbitrary. Just as the object is known to us only through its name, so the prototype is made known to us only through its εἰκών. Thus the act of offering προσκύνησις to an εἰκών is something required of us according to the προσκύνησις due to the prototype. Here is Theodore's summation:

> καὶ τί γάρ ἐστι τῶν κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς ἡμῶν ἀκατονόμαστον; καὶ πῶς διασχισθήσεται τῇ δόξῃ τῆς οἰκείᾳ προσηγορίας τὸ ὀνομασθέν, ἵνα ἐν θατέρῳ θήσωμεν τὴν προσκύνησιν, τοῦ ἑτέρου ἀποστεροῦντες; Τῶν γὰρ πρός τι ταῦτα· τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα, ὀνομαζομένου ὄνομα, καὶ οἷόν τις φυσικὴ εἰκὼν τοῦ καθ' οὗπερ

---

[294] Plato, *Cratylus*, 428D-440E.

λέγεται, πέφυκεν· ἐν οἷς οὐ διέσχισται ἡ κατὰ προσκύνησιν ἑνότης.[295]

(What is there, of all the things before our eyes, that is nameless? How can the thing be separated in honour from its appellation, so that we may offer veneration to the one and deprive the other of it? These are relationships, for a name is by nature the name of something which is named, and a sort of natural image of that to which it is applied. Therefore the unity in veneration is not divided.)

Antirr I.16

Antirr I.16 emphasizes how the language of the 787 Council does not show how the εἰκών is distinguished from idol, but simply claims the difference to be necessary. The use of the terms χαρακτήρ and ὁμοίωμα are said not to be in relation to the Trinity, but only in reference to the bodily form of Christ:

οὐ μὴν ἐπειδὴ πάλαι πρὸς Θεοῦ κατὰ φύσιν ἄπειρον ὁμοίωσιν, κατηγορεῖτο ἡ τῆς εἰκόνος φωνή, ἀπαράληπτος ἡμῖν, ὥσπερ καὶ τὰ σύστοιχα. Χρώμεθα δὲ μᾶλλον ἐπι τῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σωματοειδεῖ χαρακτῆρι τῇ τῆς εἰκόνος φωνῇ· ὡς ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐν τῇ κοσμοποιίᾳ κατὰ τὴν διάπλασιν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ταύτης προσημανθείσης. Ποιήσωμεν γάρ, φησὶ, ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ ὁμοίωσί. Καὶ αὐτίκα κατὰ τὴν θεόλεκτον ἐρώτησιν· Τίνος ἡ εἰκὼν αὕτη;[296]

(Therefore since the name of εἰκών has been forbidden from of old for the likeness of God according to His limitless nature, we must not for that purpose use it or anything of the same order. We use the word εἰκών rather in reference to the bodily form of Christ; as in the beginning, in the creation of the world, this was already indicated at the formation of the first man. For God said, "Let us make man in our εἰκών and ὁμοίωμα." (Genesis 1.26) And again the word is used in the divine

[295] *Antirr* I.14. Migne *PG 99*.345AB.
[296] *Antirr* I.16. Migne *PG*, 99.348A.

question, 'Whose εἰκών is this?' (Matthew 22.20).

Thus although in one way the accusation of idolatry will disappear from the controversy after 787, Theodore indicates that the whole controversy continues to be about idolatry in a subtle fashion. The iconoclast continues to insist that any offering of προσκύνησις to the Christ-εἰκών is an offering of προσκύνησις to an idol. Theodore discusses the difference in meaning between the terms τὸ εἰδώλον and ὁ εἰκών[297] and concludes rather surprisingly, 'For the danger of idolatry comes from both sides [idol and εἰκών].' The danger from the side of idol is that of giving undue προσκύνησις to the physical object on which the εἰκών appears. The danger from the side of εἰκών is to suppose that the image fully represents the prototype so that the difference between them disappears. Theodore asks if the Christ-εἰκών which shows the bodily χαρακτὴρ of the incarnate Christ, whose bodily form was already indicated at the formation of the first man, does not become an εἰδώλον by seeing it as a complete representation of his divine χαρακτήρ?

Summary of *Antirr* I

Antirr I.8-19 has reproduced various aspects of the argument of the 787 Council. Throughout, the depth and strength of iconoclast arguments are opposed only by the

---

[297] Ἀμφοτέρωθεν γὰρ τῆς εἰδωλολατρείας τὸ ἐπικύνδυνον. Henry (1984), 79. Henry comments that Theodore addresses three iconoclast accusations in his *Antirr*: 1. that icons are idols; 2. that icons are an exterior sign of a Christological heresy; and 3. that icons are an abomination when improperly used. He suggests that the third is really a return to the first accusation of idolatry. The whole problem with the viewing of the image simply as a symbol is that the possibility of idolatry always exists. Almost a millennium later in the sixteenth century, John Jewel will argue against Harding's Roman defence of images (based on the 787 Council) that the differentiating degrees of worship were meaningless in practice for the simple folk who could hold no such subtle distinction in their minds. Cf. Jewel, *Works*, ii, 663-666.

claim of the 787 Council, and not by reasoned argument beyond the 787 doctrine. *Antirr* I.19 is an admission that the 787 Council failed to engage truly the challenge of the iconoclasts. Theodore suggests that the 754 Council reasoned successfully but the 787 Council turned to the greater authority of ancient customs and traditions:

κρατεῖσθαι ἐμπεδούντων ἡμᾶς τῶν θεσπεσίων Πατέρων, εἰ καὶ παρέλκον τοῦτο, πρὸς τὴν λογικὴν ἀπόδειξιν· φασὶ γάρ, Τὸ ἁπλοῦν τῆς πίστεως ἰσχυρότερον ἔστω τῶν λογικῶν ἀποδείξεων. Καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ· Τὰ παλαιὰ ἔθη κρατείτω.[298]

(The divinely inspired Fathers command us to hold fast against even a logical demonstration, even if superfluous, for they say, 'Let the simplicity of faith be stronger than the demonstrations of reason.' And elsewhere they say, 'Let the ancient customs prevail.')[299]

The eighth century iconoclasts and iconophiles share a common faith and interpretation of the first six Councils, yet they entirely disagree about the implications of that common tradition for the producing and giving προσκύνησις to the Christ-εἰκών. Each side is determined not to violate their common faith through the wrong approach to images. Neither side can find the theological and analytical tools to demonstrate that the Christian εἰκών substantiates or violates this orthodoxy. Gardner (1904) is a typical voice of the opposite notion, proposing that iconoclasts and iconophiles radically disagreed about the essentials of the faith. She suggests that the two sides of the controversy, 'involve rival conceptions as to the authority of Christian tradition, the essential nature of Christian worship, and the most fundamental doctrine of the Christian Creed, while

---

[298] Migne *PG* 99.349AB.
[299] The wording of this very inadequate conclusion (which reflects the state of the controversy in 787) clearly is taken up in the preface to *Antirr* III where Theodore will turn around and state his intention to use syllogisms to defeat the argument of the iconoclasts.

beyond all this they summarize opposite views as to the whole manner and disposition in which human nature should endeavour to reach after that which is divine.'[300] But if Gardner is correct, how does she account for the fact that the same bishops who anathematized iconophiles in 754 became the iconophile bishops in 787 who anathematized iconoclasts! And in less than forty years again, most of the bishops of the church would be won over to the reversal of 787 in the iconoclastic Council of 815. These bishops could change their minds about the legitimate use of images precisely because they were firm in their common Christian faith. Contrary to Gardner, it seems clear that the controversy ultimately was about the one question of whether the giving of προσκύνησις to the Christ-εἰκών properly expressed or violated that deeply held shared orthodox faith.

This is well illustrated in the list of anathemas of the 754 Council. The first seven of the nineteen anathemas summarize the Trinitarian and Christological doctrine which is shared by both iconoclasts and iconophiles. The third, fourth and fifth anathemas are taken directly from the twelve which Cyril of Alexandria appended to his third letter to Nestorius.[301] The sixth and seventh are particularly important in presenting the Chalcedonian doctrine:

> If anyone does not acknowledge two natures in one Christ, our true God, and two natural wills and two natural energies, in communion [with each other] and inseparable [from each other], without change, without division, without confusion, according to the teaching of the holy Fathers, let him be anathema.

---

[300] Gardner (1905), 261.
[301] Migne *PG* 77.105-122.

123

If anyone does not confess that our Lord Jesus Christ sits in council with God the Father along with that which he assumed, that is, along with his flesh which was animated by an intellectual and rational soul, and that he will return again in the same way, with the glory of his Father, to judge the living and the dead - being no longer flesh, nor without a body either, but with a more Godlike body described with words which only he knows, so that he may even be seen by those who pierced Him, and yet remain God beyond the density of substance - let him be anathema.[302]

At this point the character of the anathemas shifts to reflect the contemporary controversy. The anathemas now turn against those who through the offering of προσκύνησις or production of an εἰκών, attempt to circumscribe the uncircumscribable essence and hypostasis of God the Word,[303] confuse the two natures,[304] divide the one Christ into two hypostases,[305] depict the flesh which was deified by the union with the divine Logos,[306] or introduce a fourth person into the holy Trinity.[307] The 787 Council denies that these are the implications of producing or giving προσκύνησις to the Christ-εἰκών, since there is only a 'nominal' relationship between the image and its prototype. On the positive side in favour of images, the 787 Council goes no further than to state repeatedly that insofar as Christ has assumed human nature, he is visible, circumscribable, comprehensible and therefore depictable in an εἰκών. The image serves only to prompt the memory to recollect the saving Gospel of the οἰκονομία.

The concluding anathemas of *Antirr* I.20 summarize the doctrine of the 787 Council: the Christ-εἰκών is identical to Christ in name only; the προσκύνησις offered to

[302] Migne *PG* 99.336CD.
[303] Migne *PG* 99.337C.
[304] Migne *PG* 99.340C.
[305] Migne *PG* 99.341CD.
[306] Migne *PG* 99.341E.
[307] Migne *PG* 99.344C; cf 341CD.

the Christ-εἰκών is both relative (σχετικἡ) and at the same time is offered to Christ himself; the offering of σχετικὴ προσκύνησις to the Christ-εἰκών is necessary; the Scriptural prohibitions of idols do not apply to the Christ-εἰκών; equal respect is due to the visual reminder of the Scriptural narration of the image and to the narration in speech; the cross and the Christ-εἰκών deserve equal treatment; and there are differing types of προσκύνησις according to the worthiness of the object receiving the προσκύνησις.

The whole discussion in *Antirr* I accurately reflects the narrow focus of the eighth century debate which revolved solely around whether the Christ-εἰκών is a legitimate symbol for Christian worship and devotion. This debate was not theoretical but took place within a church and culture which was sharply divided about the most practical issues, such as how the interior of churches should be decorated and how the Christian should seek a contemplative unity with his Saviour and Lord. How the faithful had come in practice to use images, both within formal worship and in their daily devotional lives of prayer, must be weighed as a significant aspect of the debate. In my next section I turn to the consideration of the influence of Byzantine piety on the eighth century debate, and how the 787 Council failed to address the most urgent demands of that piety.

Antirrheticus I: The devotional use of the image in the eighth century: Byzantine piety and the 787 Council

Theodore's presentation of the 787 proceedings in *Antirr* I thus rests on his judgement that the formal doctrine of the 787 Council contained in the 'Refutation' and ὅρος is supported by the liturgical, devotional and hagiographical sources within the tradition,[308]

---

[308] This is to say little more than that the 770 florilegia used by the 787 Council represents the true tradition.

and that the Council itself does not provide theological argument to justify those claims. *Antirr* I provides a sorting out of the arguments of 787, but Theodore is careful not to move beyond the four positive statements of the 787 Council described above. Thus by restricting itself to a theological articulation and careful elaboration of the 787 'Refutation' and ὄρος, *Antirr* I becomes Theodore's formal acceptance of the 787 Council as the true Seventh Oecumenical Council.

Nonetheless, the controversy itself would not be resolved by an appeal to the 787 Council. In terms of the current ninth century debate with the iconoclasts led by John Grammaticus, the 787 Council was of little theological currency and Theodore's apology for that Council would not contribute directly to the resolution of the controversy. As the first of a three part argument, *Antirr* I will be significant, but the issues had become both deeper and different. Meanwhile, the four positive statements of the 787 Council provided a sufficient basis to support neither its theoretical defence nor the actual devotional use of the εἰκών in the eighth century.[309] The bold statement of the 787 Council that 'Not one Christian who has ever lived under the sky has worshipped an εἰκών,' is hardly part of an argument and is in fact precisely the question which was at issue in the eighth century and on into the controversy in the ninth century.

The 787 Council defended the use of the εἰκών as purely didactic or symbolic, declaring the εἰκών to function either as a visual reminder of a Gospel narrative, a depiction of an incident in the holy lives of the saints, or as a pure symbol which can

[309] Cf. Parry (1996), 'The thing that strikes one on reading the refutation [of 754 in the 787 proceedings] is its evasiveness, its reliance on patristic authority, and its failure to grasp the arguments of the other side. What it lacks in theological precision it more than makes up for with legend, hagiography and quotation.' (134). Schönborn (1994) is more direct: 'The veneration of images was indeed solemnly reinstated by the Council gathered in Nicaea in 787, yet theologically the Council's efforts remained rather disappointing. The detailed refutation of the iconoclastic decrees of 754 ... at no time addressed that synod's Christological arguments. Instead, the opponent receives an elaborate tongue-lashing. The *argumentum ad hominem* largely replaces any theological argument.' (200).

126

elevate the mind to its prototype. But it has also been noted that the 787 Council itself offered accounts of miracles performed by images and healings attributed to the paint and other materials from which the image is formed. Although these stories are left unsupported by the argument of the image as visual reminder or symbol, in its presentation of hagiographical literature as confirmation of the tradition of Christian images the 787 Council was keen to promote images as:

> depictions of objective reality, and, as such, were held to bring the very presence of the divine to the worshipper. Images 'recalled' the Gospel narrative or the saint who was depicted, but were also regarded as having all the power of the personage represented.[310]

This understanding of the movement from prototype to image such that the person depicted is made present in the image, must be the foundation for any suggestion of a *necessary* devotional offering of προσκύνησις to the prototype in and through the εἰκών. If the prototype is actually present in an εἰκών then the image cannot be ignored without shunning the prototype. Such an apparent identification of the εἰκών with the prototype in quoted hagiographical sources extends beyond the consideration of the relation of the immaterial image and its prototype, to that of the image as an actual object which includes the material on which the image appears. That is to say, sometimes the hagiography does not seem to describe an image which appears in the material as much as it points to the material image itself. It is this vague and undefined, yet passionately engaged, devotional use of the image as object which is objectionable, for example, to the

---

[310] Cameron (1992), 15.

authors of the *Libri Carolini*, and which would eventually lead to the second phase of iconoclasm in the second decade of the ninth century.[311] There are sufficient indications and implications in the 787 Council to promote the impression that the Christ-εἰκών should receive the same προσκύνησις as would be offered directly to Christ, because Christ seems to be present in his εἰκών.

In actual fact, most of the confirmatory examples cited from from hagiography and earlier Christian literature did not deal with the Christ-εἰκών but with images of the Theotokos or other saints carrying the presence of their prototypes. Early on in the controversy, however, all sides were agreed that the Christ-εἰκών was the test case for the legitimacy of the images of the saints. The heretics in *Antirr* I acknowledge that those who are depicted in an εἰκών are the saints who have attained 'heavenly glory.'[312] The orthodox speaker describes them: 'Here we have saints who are venerable and glorious, because they have earned honour by the blood of martyrdom or by a holy way of life.'[313] The question is not the depiction of a person, but of a saint who has attained deification. The problem then becomes, how is the deified nature of that saint depicted? Obviously the test case is that of the depiction of Christ, the god-man, in the Christ-εἰκών.

Surprisingly, that doctrine which the 787 Council suggests in its hagiography, and which the iconoclasts most resist, is precisely what Theodore will eventually promote. In *Antirr* II Theodore makes it clear that to limit the εἰκών of Christ, the Theotokos and the saints to a didactic or pedagogical use is to overturn the Christian οἰκονομία. Theodore seeks an image theology which is adequate to the whole tradition, including hagiography

---

[311] See Sendler (1981), 49 who acknowledges that the doctrinal definitions were not accompanied by a real theology of icon, but by bold and unsupported statements in relation to the worship of icons.

[312] 'ὑπερκόσμιον δόξαν' Migne *PG* 99.348B.

[313] ' 'Αλλ' ἐνταῦθα σεβαστοὶ καὶ δοξαστοὶ, ὅτι δι' αἵματος μαρτυρικοῦ, ἢ βίου ἱεροπρεποῦς τὸ σεπτὸν αὐτοῖς.' Migne *PG* 99.348C.

and legend. The review of the eighth century debate in *Antirr* I, reveals that there is a significant gap between the strong implied claims for the εἰκών in the 787 Council (cited from hagiography, early literature and devotional practice) and its formal theological presentation of the relationship between εἰκών and prototype which is based on insubstantial argument (where there is any attempt at argument at all) too weak to support such claims. The 787 Council had discerned a proper doctrine of the image from the tradition, but had presented it in a confused and imprecise way. I have suggested that the recognition of this lack of clarity in the overall proceedings of the 787 Council very likely contributed to Theodore's long hesitation in acknowledging 787 as the legitimate Seventh Oecumenical Council. Perhaps Theodore felt that a more substantial and clear thinking Council would be convened? In any case, such a Council was not convened before the situation turned desperate by the sitting of the 815 Council and Leo's determination to enforce yet another period of persecution. Only then did Theodore feel forced to give his full attention to the image debate, almost forty years after 787. This task required that Theodore accept the 787 Council as authoritative and I have characterized *Antirr* I as his affirmation of the 787 Council. But before I consider the next phase of the controversy (815) which Theodore reviews in *Antirr* II, it is important to say more about this significant gap between the pedagogical and symbolic justification of the εἰκών and its actual devotional use in the eighth century.

The 787 Council itself clearly supposed that it could support the continued use and role of icons on the basis of a pedagogical rationale:

> The holy Catholic Church of God, using many different means, attracts those who

129

are born within her to repentance and to the knowledge of how to keep the commandments of God. She hastens to guide all our senses to the glory of the God of all, as she works out a rectification through both hearing and sight, by displaying to the gaze of those who come forward what has taken place.... Thus we have the entire story of the gospel depicted in images, leading us to the remembrance of God and filling us with joy ... Therefore through the images we are continually reminded of God. For sometimes there is no reading chanted in the venerable churches, while the reproductions of images, being established in them, tell us either at daybreak or at noon the story, as they also proclaim to us the truth of the things which have been accomplished[314].

This didactic use of images is summed up by John Damascene: 'The images are books for the uneducated, heralds that never fall silent but teach beholders with mute voice and sanctify their sight.'[315] The roots of this thinking can be traced at least to the Greek Fathers in the second half of the fourth century.[316] The didactic justification of images was articulated authoritatively for the western church by Pope Gregory I (590-604). Prompted by the report that Bishop Serenus of Marseilles was removing images from the churches in order to prevent their worship, Gregory sent two letters to order him to desist:[317]

---

[314] Mansi XIII.360B-361A.

[315] *Imag.* 1.47; 11.43 (Kotter, 151). See Wallach (1977), 106-7 who references the second letter of Pope Adrian to the Emperor Constantine VI and Irene in which he quotes Cyril of Alexandria in defence of the didactic role of icons.

[316] See Baynes (1955), 136 and Campenhausen (1968), 182. In the west see also *Baedae Opera Historia*, II.405, 407 where Bede describes the purpose served by the pictures of Christ, the saints, and various Biblical scenes which Bishop Biscop brought from Rome to adorn the walls of his abbey church of Wearmouth and Jarrow. Bede says that the paintings were installed 'in order that all men which entered the church, even if they might not read, should either look (whatsoever way they turned) upon the gracious countenance of Christ and His saints, though it were but in a picture; or might call to mind a more lively sense of the blessing of the Lord's Incarnation, or having, as it were before their eyes, the peril of the last judgement might remember more closely to examine themselves.' Trans. King (1930).

[317] Migne *PL* 77.1027-1028, 1128-1130.

Furthermore, we declare that it has come to our attention that you, Brother, seeing certain adorers of images, broke and threw down these same images. And we commend you indeed for your zeal, lest anything made with human hands be adored; but we declare that you ought not to have broken these images. For a picture is introduced into a church that those who are ignorant of letters may at least read by looking at the walls what they cannot read in books. You, Brother, should therefore have both preserved the images and prohibited the people from adoring them, so that those who are ignorant of letters might have wherewith to gather a knowledge of history and that the people might in no way sin by adoring a picture.[318]

This position is reflected in a letter of Germanus to Thomas of Claudiopolis quoted at the 787 Council:

For that which the word of the story presents through the faculty of hearing is that which silent painting shows through imitation, Basil the Great proclaims, saying that those who pay heed are aroused to manliness from both these. For the very representation of each person set down by the painter in the image becomes for us the beholders a brief and compendious narrative, as one might say, of the exploits attained by that person and so an imitable example just as even in the case of idols or false gods, their defiled deeds are also in the proper sense exemplified ... Such a beholding urges him who has received the deeds of holy men through hearing about

them to a remembrance of what he has heard, and prepares him who is ignorant of them to inquire after them and being instructed in them stirs him warmly to the

---

[318] Migne *PL* 77.1027-28.

desire for them and praise of God, so that through both of these, those who behold the good works of the saints should praise our Father in heaven.[319]

The didactic role was also combined with an emphasis on the emotive quality and inspirational value of the image.[320] Gregory continued in the letter quoted above, to speak of the power of the image to evoke an emotional response:

> that from the sight of the event portrayed they should catch the ardour of compunction, and bow down in oration of the One Almighty Holy Trinity.

In a letter to the hermit Secundinus, accompanying pictures of Christ, the Virgin Mary and the Apostles Peter and Paul sent at the hermit's request, note how Gregory combined his insistence that the image be not reverenced with the acknowledgement of the ability of the image to move the heart:

> I know indeed that you do not seek the image of our Saviour, in order to worship it as God, but by bringing to mind the Son of God you may keep warm in the love of him whose image you desire to have before you. We do not bow down before it as a divinity, but we adore him whose birth or passion or enthronement is brought to remembrance by the picture.[321]

In this same fashion the 787 Council attempted to separate the emotive power of the

---

[319] Mansi XIII.113DE.

[320] Included in the 770 florilegia was the testimony from Gregory of Nyssa (Migne *PG* 46.572C) of how he wept whenever he saw a picture of Isaac about to be sacrificed by Abraham. When this passage was read out in 787 a participant remarked, '... if the picture had such an effect on a learned man, how much more would it have on the ignorant and unlearned?' (Mansi XIII.9D).

[321] Migne *PG* 46.991.

image from the temptation to offer προσκύνησις to it. The following passage from the 787 Council indicates how difficult it was to maintain this distinction. The images become far more than aids to remembering:

> Just as true children, when their father is away from home for a while, feel great affection for him from the bottom of their soul, and if they see his staff in the house, or his cloak, kiss them fervently with tears, not venerating these things but showing their love for their father ... and just as Jacob, when he received from his sons Joseph's coat of many colours stained with blood, kissed it fervently with tears and enveloped it with his own eyes (Gen. 37.35), not out of love for the garment, but reckoning in this way it was Joseph he was kissing and holding in his arms, so too all Christians, when we handle and kiss the image of Christ, or of an apostle, or of a martyr outwardly, think inwardly that we are holding Christ himself or his martyr.[322]

In the above passage, it is implied that the images are not venerated at all (showing love for the prototype but not venerating the εἰκών), but this denial was impossible for the iconophiles to maintain. The 787 Council stated that images share a τιμητικὴ προσκύνησις.[323] Thus the Council attempts to avoid the accusation of idolatry by making a distinction between προσκύνησις which is σχετική and that which partakes of the nature of λατρευτική. Yet the fourth session (1 October) contained a florilegium of Scripture and Fathers to which was appended a number of reports of wonder working images[324].

---

[322] Mansi 13.44E-45AC.
[323] Mansi XIII.377D.
[324] Cf. Mansi XIII.1A-156E.

Demons are often driven away by the use of the relics and images of martyrs ... tell

me, how many overshadowings, how many exudations, and often flows of blood too,

have come from the images and relics of martyrs?[325]

How did a dead man revive when he touched the bones of Elisha? (2 Kgs. 13.21). If

God works miracles through bones, it is obvious he can do so through images and

stones and many other things".[326]

Current researchers describe the seventh and eighth century Byzantine cultural

environment as conducive to a popular superstitious and magical interpretation and use of

Christian images.[327] The conclusions of recent archaeological research would caution a

reliance upon extant texts alone, pointing to the vast gap between formal church teaching

and actual popular superstitious belief and practices:

As a rule such [superstitious] beliefs were frowned on by the authorities, both secular

and religious.... No amount of preaching, however, nor even the occasional

---

[325] Mansi XIII.48C, Cf 132E.

[326] Mansi XII.52A.

[327] See Russell (1995), 35-50. For the evidence of Constantinople as a centre of pilgrimage in the middle (and late) Byzantine periods (along with the relics, ampullae, eulogiae, etc.), see Wortley (1982), 253-79 and Majeska (1995). For description of other centres of pilgrimage, see Bakirtzis (1990), 140-149 where many lead ampullae with linear images of busts of saints (containing holy oils and myrrh) are dated from the 12th to 15th centuries, and miracle producing ampullae from Thessaloniki (inscribed with images of saints) are dated from the 9th century. Also see the convincing evidence of the widespread magical use of icons in Magoulias (1967), 228-69 who cautions against interpreting the emergence of the 'miraculous icon' as an isolated phenomenon, but rather suggests that sorcery, relics and icons are interrelated phenomena. He says, 'in a thought-world which accepts sorcery and relics, magic and miracle, angels and demons, the icon is but another manifestation of these assumed realities. ... The concept of *sympathetic magic*, in fact, is the key to both the relic and the icon. To advance from sorcery to the miracle working relic and thence to the miracle-working icon was a natural progression.' (229-30). Margoulias usefully documents the numerous accounts of the magical use of the images of the saints in sixth and seventh century hagiographical material. The weeping of some images and bleeding of others, speaking images, and physical stepping of the saint out of the image, all confirms the belief that the image was 'the actual habitation of the saints.' (266). These same hagiographical texts reveal that the material on which the image appears is also believed to be imbued with miraculous properties, and to exude certain miracle-working substances.

134

imposition of penalties on their use by both civil and religious authorities, seems to have had much effect on the use of amulets by the peasant and the artisan. Just how widespread their use was may be deduced from the archaeological context of the objects under consideration, which provides a more objective record of how ordinary people coped with the evil eye in their daily lives than the prejudiced testimony of most literary texts.[328]

In Russell's analysis of excavations of Anemurion on the coast of Isauria, (apotropaic objects found with coins dating 589 to 656) he describes inscribed amulets, a round terra-cotta mold (decorated with a Latin cross which stamps εὐλογία τοῦ ἁγίου Ῥαφαήλ), rings equipped with a bezel engraved with a cryptic formula or mystical symbol to protect the bearer from harm, phylacteries, bells intended as apotropaic devices, etc. From the late sixth and early seventh century also was found a bronze steelyard counterpoise weight molded in the shape of a bust of Athena, undoubtedly apotropaic. A similar counterpoise weight in the shape of a bust of Athena was excavated from a Byzantine shipwreck at Yassi Ada, dated around 625. Russell concludes:

> What strikes us forcibly from what we can piece together of life in the cluster of houses occupying the old palaestra at Anemurium is that magic for their humble residents was no abstract belief or perversion of true religion practiced in secret, as the sermons of the church Fathers would have us believe, but was as common a function of daily existence as any other activity represented among the small finds. Given the circumstances of their discovery, in which they appear at random along with other *disjecta membra* of people's lives, there is surely nothing inherently special or remarkable about the various *instrumenta magica* found at Anemurium.

[328] Russell (1995), 38.

The measures taken to cope with the unseen menace of demons constituted a domestic necessity as familiar as cooking, working, playing games, or bringing up children. The worship of Christ and his cross was certainly an essential part of their lives, but it is hard to escape the impression that the control of the unseen force of the evil eye by the time-honoured instruments of their ancestors was of more immediate concern to them. It is an attitude that survives in remote corners of the Greek countryside even today, where people might still proclaim with the poet:

> We are neither Christians nor pagans,
> With crosses and pagan symbols
> We are trying to build the new life
> Whose name is not yet known.[329]

The iconoclasts saw clearly that Christian images were being used in superstitious and heretical ways. The iconophile defence of the image as pedagogical device or symbol of the divine was ineffective in curbing the popular and superstitious use of the image.

One of the difficulties with the 787 distinction between the various forms of προσκύνησις, is that the outward manifestation of the person giving veneration remains the same, whether offering honour to a person, an image of the emperor, an image of a saint, the Christ-εἰκών, or to the Trinity itself. Kitzinger suggests that although the cross had received a gesture of προσκύνησις since at least the fourth century (Epiphanius of Salamis drew a distinction between honour, τιμή, and veneration, προσκύνησις), the first reference to προσκύνησις offered before an image is in the first half of the sixth century.[330]

---

[329] Russell (1995), 50.
[330] Kitzinger (1954), 94.

But the practice quickly spread.[331] Both Leontius of Neapolis[332] (7th c.) and the patriarch Germanos[333] (8th c.) insist that the intention (σκοπός) of each act of προσκύνησις is the determining factor in assessing whether proper veneration (worship of creator) or idolatry (worship of creation) is taking place. The Damascene goes further in describing the intention of the image-maker to be significant as well. In his summary of the discussion of προσκύνησις in the arguments of the first phase of the controversy (*Antirr* I.19), Theodore lists the types of προσκύνησις all the way from the λατρεία due to God alone, to the προσκύνησις which children should give to their parents. These many offerings of προσκύνησις have the same form (ἰσότυπος), varying only in intention (διανόησις). The diversity of veneration (διαφορὰ προσκυνήσεως) depends upon the nature of the prototypes who are offered προσκύνησις through the image. The 787 Council accused the iconoclasts of not distinguishing divine worship (θεία λατρεία) from the relative veneration of honour (σχετικὴ καὶ τιμητικὴ προσκύνησις).[334] Although such a distinction would mean that it was possible to give προσκύνησις to the image in a way

---

[331] Babic (1994), 189-222 seeks to understand the Byzantine contemporary significance of images and suggests: 'L'importance fondamentale des images, notamment de celles réputées pour leur pouvoir thaumaturge, s'est manifestée surtout à partir de la seconds moitié du VIe siècle, tout d'abord à Camouliana, en Asie Mineure, à Édesse, en Mésopotamie, à Memphis, en Égypte, et à Constantinople, au sein d'une population chrétienne dont l'existence était menacée par les attaques perses, puis arabes, avares, slaves et celles des autres peuples barbares. De nombreuses interprétations historiques, théologiques, iconographiques ou sociologiques et psychologiques, ont été proposées pour expliquer cette importance croissante des icônes et du culte qui leur était rendu, phénomènes dont l'ampleur dans les grandes villes au cours de la seconde moitié du VIe et au VIIe siècle est tout particulièrement attestée par les sources écrites. Dans les croyances des fidèles de l'époque, l'image du saint devenait elle-même sainte par son rôle d'intermédiare entre la population d'une ville et son saint patron ou entre l'individu et le saint protecteur qu'elle représentait. le saint patron, reconnu à travers l'image, assurait en effet la protection divine à celui qui s'en approachait en priant, en faisant *le proskynèse* , en baisant l'image du saint, et en lui offrant de l'encens et des cierges.' (192) The response of the iconoclasts (and perhaps the *Libri Carolini*) was not so much to the iconophile textual defence of images as a response to the popular devotion of the day as described here by Babic. The account of the proceedings of the 787 Council did not address the actual devotional practice of the faithful which went far beyond the didactic function of images.
[332] Cf. Migne *PG* 93.1601A.
[333] Cf. *Letter to Thomas of Claudiopolis*, Migne *PG* 98.181A, 188A.
[334] Mansi XIII, 281E.

that was not idolatrous, it equally allowed the possibility of the same outward act to be a true idolatry! The iconophiles could only declare what an appropriate offering of προσκύνησις might be for a given image, but they could have no way of assuring the iconoclasts that those who offered προσκύνησις did not fall into exaggerated προσκύνησις or the idolatry of worshipping the creation rather than the creator.

The 787 Council argues that none of the properties of the prototype is found in the image:

> For the image is one thing and the prototype another. No one of sound mind looks in any way to the image for the properties of the prototype. True reason recognizes nothing in the image other than a nominal communion with the image's subject and not an essential communion, as we have said in many ways when we were challenged by their disputations.[335]

> Christians confess that what the image has in common with the archetype is only the name, not the essence.[336]

The iconophile claim that there was only a nominal relation between image and prototype was meant to suggest a minimal relationship to avoid the iconoclast charge of the division or confusion of the natures of Christ, but as such it backed away from an explanation of the intense devotion of the Byzantines for the image, let alone the miracles accomplished through and by the images themselves.

Indeed, within the context of the popular devotional use of images, the language of

---

[335] Mansi XIII, 257D.
[336] Mansi XIII.252D.

the 787 ὅρος no longer seems straightforward, but ambiguous and troublesome:

> We declare that, next to the sign of the precious and life-giving cross, venerable and holy images - made of colours, pebbles, or any other material that is fit - may be set in the holy churches of God, on holy utensils and vestments, on walls and boards, in houses and in streets. These may be images of our Lord and God the Saviour Jesus Christ, or of our pure Lady the holy Theotokos, or of honourable angels, or of any saint or holy man. For the more these are kept in view through their iconographic representation, the more those who look at them are lifted up to remember and have an earnest desire for the prototypes[337]

The significance of the mention in this ὅρος of images on utensils, vestments, walls, houses and streets is highlighted by Maguire's (1990) study which tracks the profound change in the use of Christian images on textiles before the eighth century and after the ninth. The evidence he gathers suggests why this 787 ὅρος would have been unacceptable to the iconoclasts. The changes documented by Maguire include the pre-eighth century repeated figures of images on secular clothing of ambiguous identity which are not accompanied by inscriptions as opposed to the post-controversy identified image of an established portrait type on liturgical clothing only. Maguire has situated for us rather precisely the context in which this ὅρος is written. The 787 Council insisted on the purely nominal theory of image and prototype relationship but the inscription of the name of the prototype on the image was not yet universal practice. In the context of the pre-controversy superstitious use of the repeated image on secular clothing, the ὅρος did

---

[337] Mansi XIII.377D as translated by D.J. Sahas (1986).

not sufficiently restrict the image to single images in devotional settings but rather encouraged their appearance on 'walls and boards, in houses and in streets.' Maguire suggests that the new specificity in portrait types, the provision of inscriptions and the avoidance of repetition are characteristic of all visual arts of Byzantium after iconoclasm. The reason for these changes was to protect the image from being seen as magical charms or apotropaic devices, used in superstitious ways and offered inappropriate προσκύνησις.

Another adjustment in the presentation of the image to reflect the emerging orthodox doctrine was the placement of the image. Pre-controversy images were often placed in hard-to-see locations on the clothing, and they were too abbreviated to be useful for teaching. Thus they were not primarily directed at human viewers but rather 'at forces that were unseen.'[338] These images were thought to be self-sufficient and powerful in and of themselves. It was natural in this context for the 787 Council to distance the true doctrine of the image from this magical conception by insisting on the direction of influence being solely from the narrative image to the prototype and not vice versa. Any notion of an ontological relationship of image and prototype would open the door again to the pre-controversy magical conception of the image. But the 787 doctrine in the end proved to be a sheer denial of the relationship between image and prototype which was at the heart of all Byzantine devotional use of the image. Insisting solely on a nominal relationship and failing to describe the relationship more fully, endorsing the narrative nature of the image as useful for teaching (the image as narrative), and limiting the direction of influence from image to prototype (the image as symbol), this positive doctrine of the 787 Council was insufficient to account for the current devotional use of the image which it itself describes.

---

[338] Maguire (1995), 64. See also Maguire (1990), 215-24 and Mango (1992), 215-23.

According to the 787 Council the one who looks upon these images has a "desire" for the prototypes:

> Also, [we declare] that one may render to them the veneration of honour: not the true worship of our faith, which is due only to the divine nature, but the same kind of veneration as is offered to the form of the precious and life-giving cross, to the holy gospels, and to the other holy dedicated items. Also [we declare] that one may honour these by bringing to them incense and light, as was the pious custom of the early [Christians]; for 'the honour of the image is conveyed to the prototype.' Thus, he who venerates the image venerates the hypostasis of the person depicted on it.[339]

Thus in the same breath that it is said that λατρεία is not offered to the Christ-εἰκών, incense and candles are burned before the εἰκών, the honour is conveyed to the prototype, and the offering of the εἰκών goes directly to the hypostasis of the person represented! Since the 787 Definition admits[340] that λατρεία is due to the divine nature and this divine nature is wholly present in the person of Jesus Christ, if the εἰκών shows forth the person of Jesus Christ then it is an easy step to assume that Christ must be offered λατρεία in His εἰκών.[341] Since 'the glory of the image becomes that of the subject

---

[339] Mansi 377E as translated by Sahas (1986).

[340] Mansi XIII, 377E.

[341] Indeed, Theodore addresses precisely this question in his letters because in the first quarter of the ninth century, iconoclasts are still challenging that the offering of λατρεία to the image is the implication of iconophile doctrine. In Fatouros 428 and 528 Theodore addresses the question which has been asked of him, "Πῶς", φῆς, "οὐ λατρεύεται ἡ εἰκὼν Χριστοῦ, ἀλλ' ὁ ἐν αὐτῇ προσκυνούμενος Χριστός, μιᾶς οὔσης ἐπ' ἀμφοῖν προσκυνήσεως;" (You say 'How is it that the image of Christ is not given λατρεία, but only Christ [is given λατρεία] who is offered προσκυνήσις in it [the image], although one act of προσκυνήσις is offered to both?').

141

represented,'[342] if the only proper offering of προσκύνησις to Christ is λατρεία, then only

proper offering of προσκύνησις to the εἰκών is also λατρεία because the προσκύνησις

goes directly to the hypostasis of Christ himself. To the iconoclasts, these seemed to be

the clear, and unacceptable, implications of the 787 Council. We shall see that Theodore

himself accepts these implications of the tradition. However, his sharp mind would cause

him to realize that the 787 Council did not only fail adequately to support these claims

theologically, but that several theological statements of the Council itself about the

relation of image to prototype would actually disallow these statements. The 787 Council

did articulate the tradition faithfully. He would provide the theological underpinnings.

The iconoclasts recognized that the didactic argument did not begin genuinely to

address the real concerns of the controversy, nor in any way support the significant role,

presence and function which the εἰκών had assumed in the church and Christian θεωρία by

the eighth century. Images were not simply, or even primarily, considered as useful for

the remembrance of the saving events of the gospel story and of the edifying history of

the church. In speaking of portable icons, Kitzinger (1955) says that narrative scenes:

> ... though not unknown as subjects of portable religious paintings even as early as
>
> the fifth century, occur only rarely on the extant panel paintings of the period
>
> between Justinian and Iconoclasm. This concentration on portraiture is in striking
>
> agreement with the literary record. The icons mentioned in texts as objects of
>
> devotion or instruments of miracles are usually individual portraits of holy persons
>
> and the increase of such uses must have produced an increased demand for
>
> representations of this kind, especially in panel form. Icons such as the 'St. Peter'

[342] "If the icon of the emperor is emperor, and the icon of Christ is Christ and the icon of a saint is holy, neither is the power divided nor is the glory apportioned, but the glory of the icon becomes that of the subject represented". John Damascene, *Imag* I, 36, 1-4 (Kotter, 147).

on Mt. Sinai or the 'Sts Sergius and Bacchus' in Kiev [figured in his article] may, in fact, serve to give us a graphic idea of the kind of image that the texts tell us watched over the safety of the home and the traveler, received the prayers of the faithful and was expected to operate miracles on Christ's behalf.[343]

The iconophiles and iconoclasts share this religious culture in eighth century Byzantium. The iconoclasts urge a reformation of this superstition and idolatry. The response of the 787 Council is to offer a rationale for images and relative προσκύνησις which ignores the current devotional use of the εἰκών. Instead we find a justification for images of a different sort, the solely narrative image. The 787 Council repeats a traditional didactic justification of narrative images and proves unable creatively to move beyond this language to respond to the new situation of image veneration which had developed. Theology in seventh and eighth century Byzantium was not able to rise to the challenge of justifying the contemporary status of the Christian image in Byzantine piety. The reason for this failure will become clear below when I describe the character of Byzantine theology in these centuries, and especially its strict dependence on established florilegia collected from previous centuries.[344]

For these reasons the iconoclasts insist that in practice and in their hagiographical and other supporting literature from the tradition, the iconophiles treat the image and prototype as if they were of the same essence. The images are offered προσκύνησις as if Christ and the εἰκών of Christ were identified in essence, and not in name only. Theodore's argument in *Antirr* III will show a different solution to this impasse. He will

---

[343] Kitzinger (1995), 143.
[344] In particular, Alexakis (1996) shows the dependence of 787 on a huge iconophile florilegium which was compiled in Rome in 770.

143

show the necessary relation of image to prototype in terms of hypostatic identity. Within

a year or so that Theodore wrote the *Antirr* he writes to Naukratios to defend the

statement that he offers προσκυνήσις to the εἰκών of Christ as Christ himself (ἐγὼ τὴν

εἰκόνα χριστοῦ ὡς αὐτὸν τὸν Χριστὸν προσκυνω̃)[345] and to Severianus he writes that

Christ is offered λατρεία in his εἰκών, (λατρεύεται ὁ Χριστὸς ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ εἰκόνι).[346]

Antirrheticus II: The *Libri Carolini* and moderate iconoclasm

I have tried to show that the *Antirr* I reviews the argument of the 787 Council and

concludes that its ὅρος is correct but suffers from a lack of clarity, particularly in its

failure to define its notion of 'image.' This ultimately is the cause of its inadequacy and

confusion. Consequently, when the account of the proceedings of the 787 Council reached

Charlemagne's court, it interpreted the 787 Council as promoting the various forms of

excessive προσκυνήσις and wicked superstition that had been associated with images for

several centuries. The Carolingian theologians demanded correction of these abuses and

resolutely refused to encourage what it saw to be heretical practices.

In *Antirr* II Theodore presents a very different situation in his description of the

theological debate within Byzantium at the time of the 815 Council. Now the voice of

Theodore's αἱρετικός is that of the Byzantine churchman who has come to acknowledge

that Christ legitimately can be portrayed in an image (at least in an image which shows

him before his resurrection), but who denies only that προσκύνησις can be offered to the

---

[345] Fatouros 409.3-4.
[346] Fatouros 445.23.

144

image.[347] This new moderate iconoclasm supposes itself to affirm the positive teaching

role of the narrative image, and at the same time to safeguard the church from superstition.

This is a much reduced doctrinal position from that of 754, even though the 815 gathering

insisted that it wanted only to reinstate the legitimacy of 754 as the Seventh Oecumenical

Council and overturn the claims of the 787 Council. To understand something of the

impetus for this revised and moderate iconoclasm doctrine, it will be necessary briefly to

observe the western responses to the 787 Council.[348]

Theodore does not take up the specific objections of the *Libri Carolini* (793) to

the 787 Council, but its general content would certainly have been known by him. It

would also inform his understanding of the intention of the claims of the 815 Council.

Recent scholarship has suggested that much of the weighty speculation earlier in the

twentieth century about the reception of the 787 proceedings by Pope Hadrian I and

Charlemagne's court was erroneous in its assumptions. This recent review of the evidence

suggests that it is unlikely that the *Libri Carolini* (composed by Theodulf (?) in

Charlemagne's name and originally called *Opus Caroli Regis contra Synodum*)[349] received

any distribution at all because of its inability to receive sanction from Pope Hadrian, in

---

[347] Afinogenev (1996b) notices that *Antirr* II deals exclusively with the situation in 815, but since he does not appreciate the overall structure of the *Antirr*, he attributes the character of *Antirr* II to the entire work. He refers to the opening statements of *Antirr* II: '[Theodore] does not spend time refuting the old iconoclasts, and combats exactly those doctrines that were proclaimed by the council of 815 and became the official ideology of the second iconoclast period' (608). It is clear that *Antirr* I exactly reflects this refutation of the 'old iconoclasts' by the 787 'Refutation' and ὄρος. Alexander (1953) suggests other ways that 815 differs from 754, such as the introduction of several notions as the ethical theory of images, the description of saints in 815 as τοὺς συμμόφους αὐτοῦ ἁγίους (like Christ in form), and the definition of images as ἀψύχοις εἰκόσι (soulless) or ψευδώνυμοι (false). Anastos (1979) considers these claims and concludes that each of these notions is present in 754.

[348] For recent discussions which judge the extensive scholarship of the previous century to be highly speculative and based on dubious assumptions, see Wallach (1977), Wallace-Hadrill (1983), Freeman (1985, 1994), and Neil (2000). We follow Freeman's datings of *Capitulare versus synodum* (792), *Hadrianum* (793), *Libri Carolini* (794).

[349] Wallach (1977) assigns authorship to Alcuin of York, but Freeman (1985) discounts this because Alcuin had left for England in 790. Wallace-Hadrill (1983) suggests that Alcuin could have sent his contribution from England and Neil (2000) supports his dual authorship theory.

spite of the fact that its preface declares that wide dissemination was intended.[350] Even if we cannot be certain that Theodore was familiar with the actual text, the *Libri Carolini* accurately represented the general response of both the Carolingian Court and the prelates of England to the 787 Council which would have been well known in the Constantinople Court and thus part of the debate in Byzantium at the turn of the ninth century.[351]

A minimalist reading of the *Libri Carolini* is that it justifies icons as decorative and useful in commemorating past events. A more conventional interpretation of the *Libri Carolini* suggests that it recognizes the function of Biblical images to educate the illiterate and generally stimulate Christian devotion. The most recent and careful rereading of the *Libri Carolini* raises significant doubts that it can be given this generous interpretation. Two reasons follow.

First, Freeman (1994) argues that Theodulf refused to refer to passages in Gregory which might lead to the suggestion that the pictures of Biblical scenes were on a par with the reading of Scripture itself. These passages had been quoted at the 787 Council, with that specific interpretation encouraged. In fact, the *Libri Carolini* quoted Gregory's letter to Serenus of Marseilles, but stopped short of the passage which later was to become so well known: 'It is one thing to adore a picture, another to learn, through the history presented in the picture, what ought to be adored. For what writing (*scriptura*) gives

---

[350] In this preface Charlemagne insists that he must meet the threat of these image worshippers '... *aut manus tenentium aut aures audientium...inertem vel potius inermem Orientali de parte venientem hostem occidua in parte per nos favente Deo lata sanctorum patrum sentia feriat.*' (...wherever hands may touch or ears may hear them ... so that the enemy advancing from the East may be struck helpless and harmless, by the judgement of the holy Fathers, in the Western lands given us by God's grace.) in *Libri Carolini sivi Caroli Magni Capitulare de imaginibus*, ed. Hubert Bastgen, MGH *Legum sectio 3, Concilia tomi 2 supplementum* (Hanover 1924), 5.

[351] 'The reaction of the bishops and princes of Britain to the Acta of the Second Nicene Council, sent to them by Charlemagne, had not differed from that of the Frankish king and his scholars - the shock and horror had been the same. In their name Alcuin composed a letter (now lost), apparently citing Scripture to justify their stand, which he presented to Charlemagne on his return to the Frankish Court.' Freeman (1994), 187, citing *York Annals* for 793.

those who read it, the picture (*pictura*) provides for the unlearned who see it; in it the ignorant see their duty, thus reading without knowing their letters. For this reason, especially for the gentiles, pictures take the place of reading (*pro lectione pictura est*).'[352] Theodulf knew that *scriptura* in Gregory's letter was used in a generic sense, probably meaning the saints' lives. But since Bible scenes were often illustrated in churches, Theodulf suspected that it would be easy for others to think that Gregory was referring to those Biblical scenes. This was too close to the heretical notion that images were on a par with Scripture for Theodulf, and thus the concept for which Gregory was to become famous 'images are the Bible for the poor' (*laicorum litteratura*) finds no place in the *Libri Carolini*.

Second, it is well known that although Hadrian I in his own correspondence was careful to use *venerare* and *veneratio* in reference to images, somehow the translation of the 787 Council which arrived at Charlemagne's Court used *adorare* and *adoratio* for both προσκύνησις and λατρεία. This is generally taken to be a mysterious error. But could this have been a deliberate attempt by Hadrian to assure the total rejection of the 787 Council and eastern patriarchs by Charlemagne's court? His own role as mediator between the two empires would then be assured, a position which would delight him. Regardless, because of the mis-translation the text made the bishop of Cyprus say that the Greeks offered to images the same worship they gave to the Holy Trinity. Generally, this misinterpretation of the 787 Council proceedings has been seen to be the one unfortunate mistake (or, perhaps, intentional misrepresentation) which prevented the Byzantines and Carolingians from affirming a common view of images. This naïve position does not bear a close reading of the available evidence. More recent scrutiny of the events surrounding the composition

---

[352] Freeman (1994), 170.

of the *Libri Carolini* show that Pope Hadrian and the Frankfurt Court disagreed generally and substantially in their responses to the 787 Council proceedings.[353] Hadrian fully assented to the doctrine of the 787 Council (not only because he had a true translation which did not suggest that the image received trinitarian *adoratio*), and the Frankfurt Court radically disagreed with almost every aspect of the 787 Council proceedings.

Neil (2000) outlines the positive contribution of Pope Hadrian I (772-95) to the 787 Council. Just prior to his election, the Lateran Council (Rome) in 769 had condemned the 754 iconoclast Council. When the Empress Irene and her son Constantine VI sought papal support for a council to condemn the iconoclast heretics, Pope Hadrian I replied with two letters.[354] Both letters affirm iconophile doctrine and Hadrian agrees to send legates to the Council. In the *Synodica* he asks that the 754 Council be condemned in the presence of the Legates. Hadrian's three basic arguments for image veneration are 'their Christological significance, their pedagogical function, and adherence to tradition.'[355] He suggests that images of Christ *secundum carnem* elicit feelings of spiritual love (*spirituali affectu*) that carry the mind upward toward the contemplation of God in spirit.[356] On the authority of Gregory the Great, Hadrian quotes Denys the Areopagite in an argument that corporeal seeing of the image has a place in the intellectual contemplation of God:

> Truly, the incorporeal hosts mentioned above are portrayed in various colours, and

---

[353] See Freeman (1985). One hundred years ago Gardner (1905) had the same intuition that the notion of the entire spirit of the *Libri Carolini* as grounded upon a mistranslation was incredible: 'We can hardly say that the theological misrepresentation was the result of the density of the Western mind compared with the subtlety of the Eastern. It shows, not a failure to understand, but a culpable and voluntary misunderstanding.' (47).

[354] The *Synodica* to Emperor Constantine VI and Empress Irene sent in October 785, and a letter to Patriarch Tarasius sent at the same time. See Neil (2000).

[355] Neil (2000), 541.

[356] See Kessler (2000), 121-124. Kessler suggests that the *Synodica* of 785 'deserves more attention than it has received, as a cleaner and more concise statement on images than the later *Hadrianum*.' (232 n.58)

148

in diverse painted compositions, so that by means of these most holy likenesses (*per sacratissimas effiges*), we can, with pious mind, pass over silently to the abstract and incorporeal [beings] (*ad simplices et incorporales*). In fact, it is impossible for our mind to reach that imitation and vision of the incorporeal heavenly hosts, except through material elements can we touch the invisible and beautiful likeness by means of the visible (*nisi per elementorum poterimus per visibilem ad invisibiliem pulcherrimamque attingi effigiem*), and by means of visible and fragrant images the invisible and intellectual transmission shines forth.[357]

The attitude of Charlemagne's court could not have been more different. The initial response of the Franks to the 787 Council sent along to Pope Hadrian was called the *Capitulare versus synodum* (792), of which the text is known only on the basis of Hadrian's reply to it, the *Hadrianum* (793). In this document, Hadrian defended the 787 ὅρος in a detailed refutation of each of Charlemagne's objections which are briefly quoted.[358] Unfortunately, as Freeman (1995) speculates, between the time that the *Capitulare* arrived from Charlemagne and Hadrian sent his response (*Hadrianum*), Charlemagne had finished his final *tour de force* against the 787 ὅρος in what is known as the *Libri Carolini*, which he intended to have broad distribution. The *Hadrianum* and the *Libri Carolini* crossed one another in the courier system, so to speak, and when Charlemagne received the *Hadrianum* he was forced to abandon his plans for distribution of the *Libri Carolini*.

---

[357] As quoted by Kessler (2000), 123.

[358] See Sefton (1987), 112-125, for details of Hadrian's long defence of the acts of the Council of Nicaea. His survey of contemporary texts shows that all of the eighth century popes defended the veneration of images. He concludes, 'It would seem beyond question that eighth century popes were not theologically backward with respect to the images. Their defense of the images contained traditional, didactic and Christological dimensions. One could not expect more, either from the images or from the popes.' (125).

Theodore would interpret that the Frankfurt Court understood correctly the radical implications of 787. Wholly inadequate in the rationale and justification of its ὅρος, the implications of the overall proceedings of the 787 Council were that nothing less than λατρεία was appropriate for the Christ-εἰκών, although the Council did not say this explicitly in its proceedings or ὅρος. In an ironic twist, the mis-translation which was so offensive to Charlemagne's court will turn out to be precisely the doctrine out of which Theodore would construct a theology to defend in *Antirr* III. Theodore will encourage the offering of λατρεία to Christ in and through his image, implied by the 787 'Refutation' and judged to be so utterly reprehensible to the *Libri Carolini* and Frankfurt 794.

There was no reason for the iconoclasts to diminish their rejection of the images during this period between 787 and 815. The superstitious use of images continued. The potential for ambiguity in the offering of προσκύνησις to the image did not lessen throughout the second period of iconoclasm. Even as late as 824, the emperors Michael II and Theophilos wrote to the Carolingian emperor Louis the Pious to complain of the same excesses that had fueled iconoclasm from the beginning and that had prompted the severe reaction of the Franks to the 787 Council:

> This too we make known to your Grace, beloved by Christ, that many men, both clergy and lay, estranged from apostolic tradition and heedless of paternal limits, have become inventors of evil things. First they cast out the hallowed and life-giving crosses from the holy temples, and set up images in their places, with lamps about them, honoring them with incense, and according them the same reverence as the hallowed and life-giving wood [of the cross] on which Christ, our true God, deigned to be crucified for our salvation. They sang Psalms and paid homage, and appealed

to these same images for help. Moreover, many wrapped these images with linen cloths, and made them sponsors of their children at the baptismal font... Certain priests and clerics scraped paint from images and mixed it with the offerings and wine [of the Eucharist], and after the celebration of the Mass gave it to those wishing to partake. Others placed the Lord's body in the hands of images, from which those wishing to communicate were obliged to receive it. Some, spurning the church, used panels [painted] with images for altars, and celebrated the sacred office upon them, in ordinary homes. And many other things, likewise illicit and contrary to our religion, were done in churches, which were recognized as disgraceful by wiser and more learned men. Consequently the orthodox emperors and most learned priests determined to unite in a local council to make inquiry into these things. When they came together in this gathering [the Council of 815], inspired by the Holy Spirit, by common consent they prohibited such things to be done anywhere. They caused images to be removed from less exalted places; those that were displayed in high places they permitted to remain, so that the picture might serve as Scripture, but not to be worshipped by the untaught and the infirm, and they forbade that lamps should be lighted or incense [used] to honour them. We now feel and hold the same, casting out from Christ's church those who favour wicked practices of that kind.[359]

The danger identified by the emperors is in the confusion of the distinction between the image and the prototype. When he received this letter, Louis the Pious sent a small delegation to Rome to ask advice from Pope Eugenius about an appropriate

[359] Mansi XIV.420B-E as translated by Freeman (1985), 100. Michael had ascended the throne after Leo V was killed on Christmas 820, and soon after this Theodore wrote a letter to Michael, praising him for ending the active persecution and outlining the iconophile position (Fatouros 418). Still in 821, a delegation of several metropolitans, bishops and *hegumeni*, including Theodore Stoudite, met with Michael in order to persuade him to abandon iconoclasm. Michael's letter, co-authored with Theophilos, to Louis the Pious quoted here is subsequent to these approaches and indicates that Michael is more interested in correcting inappropriate and superstitious practices than he is in entering the theological debate.

response. The Pope arranged for a gathering of bishops in Paris late in 824 to consider this matter. Their reply to Louis the Pious in 824-5 confirms our interpretation of the *Libri Carolini* above. These bishops condemn both 754 and 787 Councils and indicate that Pope Hadrian was wrong in opposing Charlemagne's rejection of the 787 Council and his intention to distribute broadly a document which approved only the pedagogical use of images for all Christians. Note the repeated accusation that the 787 Council had fallen into superstitious error.

> First of all we had the letter read aloud to us that Pope Hadrian sent overseas some years ago, to Emperor Constantine and Irene, his mother, at their request, on behalf of the erection of images. Although, as far as we could comprehend the matter, he justly rebuked those who, in those regions, rashly destroyed the images of saints, and dared to abolish them altogether, we recognize that he acted injudiciously in ordering them to be superstitiously worshipped. ... the emperor and clergy, together with the people, convoked a synod, in which - just as those [others] transgressed greatly who decreed in another synod, held under the Constantine who was the grandfather of this Constantine, that images of saints should be wholly done away with - so these [persons] went seriously astray, who not only ordained that images should be honoured and worshipped and called holy, but also claimed to receive sanctity from them. And to prove the truth of what they sought to assert, they rashly appropriated certain *testimonia* of holy Scripture, and certain sayings of the holy Fathers, and in order to confirm their superstitious error, ineffectually adapted them for that purpose ... When your father [Charlemagne] of blessed memory had [the Acts of] that same synod read aloud in his own presence and that of his advisors, he found them reprehensible in many places, as was [only] proper, and having noted down the *capitula* that were open to censure, he sent them by Abbot Angilbert to

152

Pope Hadrian, so that they might be corrected by his judgement and authority. He [Hadrian], in return, favouring those who at his instigation had introduced into the aforesaid synod such superstitious and incongruous *testimonia*,[360] undertook to respond chapter by chapter, making excuses for them, and answering as he chose, but not as they deserved. Certain things he alleges in his objections [to the *capitula*] are of fact of such a nature that, in the absence of papal sanction, they would contradict both truth and authority.[361]

The bishops continue on to say that although Pope Hadrian I appealed to the authority of Gregory, he obviously did not understand Gregory's position which Hadrian ignorantly contradicted by his excessive support of images.

Thus the moderate iconoclasm instituted in 813/15 under Leo V and continued by Michael II after 820 (albeit without the excessive persecutions), is consistent with the ninth century doctrinal position of the Carolingian church. Further, this position is characterized here by the 824 gathering of bishops in Paris under the authority of Pope Eugenius as neither that of 754 nor 787, but a true discerning of a 'middle way' which affirms what is best about both Councils and rejects the chaff. Such a seemingly judicious and responsible account of this new and moderate iconoclasm accounted for its strength and popularity, and why it was so detested by Theodore.

Antirrheticus II: The limits of 'argument by florilegia'

Theodore introduces his reader to this new moderate iconoclasm in his preface to *Antirr* II:

---

[360] The iconophile florilegium of 770?
[361] MGH ibid. 481-482, surviving in the *Libellus synodalis* of 825, trans. Freeman (1985), 101-102.

Νῦν δὲ ἐπειδὴ εἰρχθέντες τοῖς ἐλέγχοις, ὁμολογοῦσιν εἰκονίζεσθαι τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, οὐ μὴν προσκυνεῖν δεῖν τὴν ἀναστηλωθεῖσαν αὐτῷ εἰκόνα· κἀντεῦθεν ἐνταράττειν πειρῶνται τὸν νοῦν τῶν ἁπλουστέρων, ὡς τῇ προσκυνήσει λατρευόντων τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν Κτίσαντα.[362]

(Now that they [the heretics] have been hemmed in by our proofs, they admit that our Lord Jesus Christ can be portrayed, but not that his image should be set up and venerated; and they try to shake the understanding of the simpler people by saying that in venerating the image they are worshipping the creation instead of the Creator.)[363]

He then promises to present the two sides of the argument, 'by the opposition of two speakers - an orthodox, that is, and an iconoclast - so that the force of the arguments may be easier to see and understand.'[364]

A remarkable feature of *Antirr* II is Theodore's attempt to be fair in his presentation of both sides in the debate.[365] This characteristic of *Antirr* II, hitherto unnoticed by readers and commentators, distinguishes it from both *Antirr* I and III, and is explained by its role within my interpretation of the overall argument of the *Antirr*. Theodore re-examines many of the issues which were considered in the 787 Council and reviewed in *Antirr* I, but now re-frames this discussion within the theological context of the moderate iconoclasm surrounding the 815 Council. His concern in *Antirr* II is to

---

[362] Migne *PG* 99.353AB.
[363] Note how the challenge of the iconoclast has returned to a more sophisticated accusation of idolatry as indicated above in our consideration of *Antirr* I.7.
[364] Migne *PG* 99.353B.
[365] I am unaware of any scholar who has suggested that *Antirr* I and II reflects a theological summary which gives equal weight to the two sides of the debate. I am convinced that the overall development of his argument in the *Antirr* depends upon the presentation of the full weight of the iconoclast theological position so that he can address the iconoclast objections fully in *Antirr* III.

sharpen the points of the theological issues which are yet to be resolved in the aftermath of 815,[366] viz.: Christ as prototype of his image (*Antirr* II.1-11); the different character of the offering of προσκύνησις to 'symbol' versus 'image', concluding with the pivotal quotations from Denys the Areopagite and Basil (*Antirr* II.12-40); the fundamental distinction between θεολογία and οἰκονομία; and the new focus of the iconoclasts on the categorical denial of the circumscription or any depiction of the Risen Christ (*Antirr* II.41-47). These themes will be addressed in his definitive and positive argument in *Antirr* III. Thus there is a well developed and intentional structure to the argument which allows the *Antirr* II to function as a bridge between *Antirr* I and III by giving contemporary early ninth century expression to the eighth century questions which remain unresolved. In the final section of *Antirr* II, Theodore concludes his theological survey of the eighth and early ninth century controversy by identifying the excessive and exclusive use of florilegia (*Antirr* II.48-49) to be the stumbling block which has prevented the resolution of the image question. The florilegia contest had ended in a draw. A new approach will be required.

There is a long and interesting history behind the role of florilegia in theological disputes prior to the ninth century. From the fifth to the seventh century ecclesiastical councils became almost totally dependent upon Patristic testimony in the form of florilegia.[367] This development of a canon of the Fathers had begun immediately after the first Council of Nicaea and reached its zenith in this period of Byzantine history. The

---

[366] Alexander (1958b) suggests that the debate between 787 and 815 shifts to a justification of religious images and their veneration in terms of the philosophy taught in the Byzantine schools - the scholastic period of iconophile theory.
[367] For the growth of florilegia in the early church to the middle Byzantine period, see Gray (1989) and (1996). For the massive increase in the production of florilegia in the sixth century, see Grillmeier (1987), 52-53 and 55-71. Alexakis (1996) describes the actual florilegia in use in the eighth and ninth centuries.

first florilegia had been assembled by their users from their own reading of the Fathers, but by the sixth century florilegia were being derived entirely from earlier collections of texts. Citations from the Fathers became proof-texts divorced from their original contexts. Theology became:

> an enterprise that worked, not with ideas, but with authoritative sources. ... We have with this arrived at a new vision, in fact, a vision of the past in which the development of the tradition really is seen as the majestic unfolding of a simple monolithic theology through pronouncements of Fathers who always intended to expound that monolithic theology and no other in their entirely consistent texts.[368]

This theological enterprise is very different from the character of the first five centuries when theological discourse made use of philosophical and conceptual language to explore the meaning of the authoritative Biblical revelation within the liturgical and communal experience of the church:

> The sixth century theologians conceived of themselves as the organizers and harmonizers of the sacred and intrinsically complete tradition. Seeing themselves in this way, they functioned accordingly, and so did not do what the Fathers in fact did.[369]

By the eighth century, the patristic texts of the contemporary florilegia were acknowledged as the sole authority and justification of revealed doctrine. This fact is key to understanding the stark theological discourse which characterized the debate at the

---

[368] Gray (1989) 30, 32.
[369] Gray (1989), 35.

156

beginning of the iconoclastic controversy.[370] Patrick Gray suggests that Byzantine

theology saw itself as 'a mere exegete and expositor of the truth formulated by the great

ones of the past.' He posits that this attitude prevented the establishing of doctrine

through creative philosophical argument but rather caused theologians to turn to the more

fruitful fields of spiritual and liturgical theology.[371]

Antirr I was devoid of references to and quotations from the Fathers because

Theodore was simply repeating the claims of the 754 Council and 787 Council, whose

florilegia were well known.[372] In his *Antirr* II, since he is writing soon after the 815

Council, Theodore provides a fresh response to the enhanced florilegium of 815. The

iconoclast florilegium of 815 was more extensive than that of 754 both in number of

references and in length of quotation, more accurate in its identification of sources, and it

revealed many 'hidden quotations' of the Fathers from the 754 Council proceedings.

Theodore presents the orthodox response to this fuller 815 florilegium, urged on

by his literary heretic opponent who several times requests confirmation of the orthodox

---

[370] Increasingly, the Byzantine emphasis had been on liturgical theology, the encouragement and reformation of the monastic life, and pilgrimages to holy places or to the holy ascetic on the way to becoming a saint. There was a hesitancy to attempt theological reflection as it had developed up to the seventh century. This paved the way for a continued emphasis on apophaticism and the doctrine of the incomprehensibility of God. In turn, this made the Byzantine soil fertile for a theurgy which promised a direct experience of the divine through the liturgy and the hierarchy of the church. Such theurgy also had a popular unrefined form which unequivocally led to much superstitious and magical belief. The question would be whether the Christ-εἰκών was legitimate theurgy or illegitimate superstition. Theodore would lift this debate onto the plane of theology and give it a truly theological foundation within the tradition of the Church.

[371] Florovsky (1987) made this same point when he called Pseudo-Dionysius, 'not so much a theologian as a contemplative observer and a liturgist.' (210).

[372] According to Mango (1984) the florilegia of the Acts of the 787 Council contain seventy different quotations in addition to those contained in the iconoclastic florilegium which was read out and refuted. Cf. Van den Ven (1957), 325 ff.

157

argument from the Fathers.[373]

In an illuminating accusation, the 787 Council alleged that at the 754 Council the iconoclasts did not produce the actual books, but circulated extracts on loose sheets which are referred to as πιττάκια, and that these extracts had been sometimes falsified or taken out of context. Within the temper of the times, it is astonishing that the 754 Council would take such a casual attitude toward the actual texts. Van den Ven (1957) describes how the Lateran Council of 649 and especially the Constantinopolitan Council of 680-681 took great care to collect various copies of the same text to expose interpolations and determine correct readings. Signatures and handwriting of the texts would be verified, and the age and physical properties of the manuscripts noted. The very real threat of forgery caused the Constantinopolitan Council to be exhaustive in these efforts, and thus it 'a été appelé, non sans raison, le concile des antiquaires et des paléographes, tellement on y admit de soin à la collation des documents sur les exemplaires des archives patriarcales et au contrôle des interpolations, qui devaient provoquer la découverte de fraudes d'envergure...'[374]

Alexakis (1991) attempts a theory to explain the serious allegation directed to the 754 Council that they misquoted passages and that they did not have the complete texts present. He suggests that these books were present, since it would have been inconceivable for a Council of the day not to have gathered the texts, but that the problem arose from their uncritical dependence upon existing florilegia during the proceedings.

---

[373] Of thirty three direct quotations in *Antirr* II, thirty are used by the orthodox speaker, responding to such challenges of the heretic as the following: 'Συμπεφορημένος ὁ λόγος ἐκ διαφόρων Πατρικῶν μαρτυριῶν ἐπιδεικνύσθω· ὡς ἂν εἴη βεβαιότερος πρὸς πειθὼ τοῖς ἐπαΐουσιν.' (Please prove your case by bringing together testimonies from various Fathers, so that it may be more convincing to those who listen.) *Antirr* II.28. Migne *PG* 99.373B.
[374] Van den Ven (1957), 328-329.

Although participants at councils typically were cued in advance to bring forth texts according to the order and incipits/desinits of the florilegia in the hands of the 'organizing committee,' the general expectation was that volumes would be present to legitimize the translation and use of the florilegia. Alexakis concludes that the philological evidence points to the proceedings of the 787 Council as 'a thoroughly stage managed performance.'[375] Even so, this was the expected method and the 787 proceedings were not criticized by the iconoclasts. The dependence upon pre-existing florilegia was the sole authoritative standard of truth for both iconoclasts and iconophiles at that time. The criticism made of the 754 Council had not been its undue dependence upon florilegia as authority, but only that it had not been careful enough to check the accuracy of the florilegia in the manuscripts. It had relied on loose sheets of paper which caused suspicion both regarding the accuracy of the citations of the florilegia and in the possibility that fragments taken out of context could suggest a meaning contrary to its original intention. The 754 Council, in effect, was criticized for not properly orchestrating its reading of florilegia from the complete manuscripts of books in the established and approved practice:

> What appears, therefore to be a theatrical performance is a routine for the operation of a legal system and that is why the authority of the Lateran Council or the Seventh Ecumenical Council has never been disputed on the basis of prearranging a procedure.[376]

It is clear that the authority of the florilegia tradition was not one which

---

[375] Alexakis (1991), 261.
[376] Alexakis (1991), 263.

encouraged the understanding of the arguments of the Fathers, nor an appreciation of the unfolding development of concepts and dogmas within the tradition. The controversy over images in the eighth century was carried out in the context of the oecumenical council as the highest ecclesiastical court, convoked only in exceptional cases to judge the crime of heresy. The florilegia embodied the authoritative tradition by which the orthodoxy of a theological position was judged: it is the 'presentation of the written evidence'. Alexakis' speculations help to explain why the stalemate in the controversy was not able to be resolved: no fresh thinking or consideration of the tradition was possible because a particular florilegium (iconoclast or iconophile) controlled each side's interpretation of the tradition. The tradition was fixed within the established florilegia.

In the light of the allegations against the 754 Council, in 814/15, Emperor Leo V wanted to regain the credibility of the iconoclastic florilegia. He appointed a committee (John Grammarian plus five others) to lay the theological foundation for his iconoclastic programme by compiling an enhanced iconoclastic florilegium. The contemporary history, *Scriptor Incertus*, comments, '[John the Grammarian] requested [from the Emperor] authority to examine old books everywhere, namely those that are deposited in monasteries and churches, and he was allowed to do so.'[377]

If not present already in Constantinople in 814, many volumes would have been brought to the capital by the imperial committee from monasteries within Byzantium. Generally speaking, the evidence suggests that there was no lack of theological and ecclesiastical books in Constantinople available in the eighth century, even if they were largely ignored until the budding of the renaissance of learning in the final decades of the

---

[377] Migne *PG* 108.1025A-B.

eighth century.[378] The impoverished state of education and book learning generally in Byzantium and Constantinople contrasts starkly with the evidence of the number of books in the Stoudite library (obviously accessible to John Grammaticus' committee), and the expected reading of those books by the monks as noted in my introduction. This highlights the exceptional influence of the Stoudite initiative under Theodore to collect and copy manuscripts from the whole tradition, with emphasis on monastic and ascetic works. Instead of the typical assumption that Theodore had been swept up by a humanist revival, it might be more true to point to the Stoudite contribution as a chief cause, or at least the ongoing push behind this renaissance.

At any rate, once the actual books were collected from which the various iconoclast florilegia had been compiled, 'The members of this Committee took up residence and met in the imperial palace.'[379] The passage from the *Scriptor Incertus* continues,

> And so they brought together a great multitude of books and searched through them, but they found nothing, fools that they were ... until they laid their hands on the *synodicon* of Constantine the Isaurian ... and, taking from it the *incipits* (τὰς ἀρχάς), they began finding the passages in the books, and these they stupidly brought forward, making marks in the places they had found. In this way they wished to persuade the senseless multitude that they had found it in old books that

[378] We follow Lemerle (1986) who argues that Photios' significant *Bibliotheca* was compiled in Byzantine territory and read in Constantinople. Others assume a dearth of learning and libraries in Constantinople such that Photios could have discovered these philosophical works only in his travels in Arab lands. Alexakis (1996) traces the development and and influence of the eighth and ninth century florilegia and supports Lemerle's positive opinion. For a less optimistic, but more generally held, speculation about the availability of books in Byzantium at this time, though unsupported by evidence or argument, see Cameron (1992a), '... By the eighth century it was a difficult thing to get hold of a classical text even in Constantinople itself, let alone the provinces ... The reign of the Emperor Heraclius (610-41) probably saw the last manifestation of traditional learning for many years to come.' (2,3).
[379] Alexander (1958b), 126.

icons should not be offered προκύνηοις.

Thus although these books were available, even the most scholarly in Constantinople were not familiar with the contents of the texts and had to conduct a primitive word search operation based on the former florilegia.

Around December 814 Leo asked Patriarch Nicephorus to remove the images which were hanging low enough to receive such expression of προσκυνήσις as kissing. He refused. On the day before Christmas 814[380] many monks and bishops assembled in the Patriarchal Palace and the newly revised florilegium of iconoclastic quotations was read and rejected.[381] The next day this assembly met with the emperor. The general nature of the conversation between Emperor Leo V and Patriarch Nicephorus and his congregation turned out to be a very unsatisfactory citing of respective florilegia on both sides. Theodore also played a key role in the proceedings. After the florilegia had been thrown back and forth, Theodore reduced the issue to one of 'whose authority.' A choice had to be made between the opposing florilegia, and Theodore insisted that the Emperor was not to be the authoritative voice because 'the Emperor was outside, and even subject to, the Church.'[382] Theodore's challenge to the Emperor was not original in its conception, but exceptional in his daring to voice such a challenge to the Imperial Court. Alexander (1958b) suggests that Theodore's argument previously had been made by John Damascene who had been out of reach of Imperial sanction, and, in Alexander's words, 'It took almost a century before a man was found who dared to voice the sentiments of the

---

[380] As per *Scriptor Incertus de Leone Armeno*, Mansi, *PG* 108.1029C.
[381] See Alexander (1958b) for a review of all the sources for the chronology of events.
[382] Alexander (1958b), 132.

Damascene in the presence of the Emperor and of his court.'[383]

In fact Theodore concludes *Antirr* II with reference to the question of the authenticity of the same passage from Epiphanus which was so hotly debated at this Christmas Eve meeting of the two sides, an event which would have been fresh in the minds of those for whom Theodore was writing the *Antirr*. This observation strengthens my contention that *Antirr* II intends to reflect the current situation around 815. The Council of 754 had cited only one passage of Epiphanius[384] but added that the same Father 'issued many other statements which stand in opposition to the making of images and which can be found by those who lovingly seek to learn.' The 815 Council took up this challenge and cited quotations from an oration and two epistles purporting to be from Epiphanius. Because Epiphanius was the favorite Father for the iconoclasts, Theodore's concluding discussion in *Antirr* II in which he highlights the unresolvable question of the authenticity of Epiphanius' works nicely sums up Theodore's argument in the *Antirr* that the controversy had reached a theological stalemate in the second decade of the ninth century. In the environment in which philosophical theology was unable to significantly contribute to the resolution of the image controversy, the question of pure authority became paramount. Who should decide which works were authentic and carried the sanction of the orthodox Fathers? Who would decide which florilegia were truly in keeping with the tradition of the Church? Whose authority?

---

[383] Alexander (1958b), 132.
[384] 'And in this matter, my beloved children, keep it in mind not to set up images in churches, or in the cemeteries of the saints, but always have God in your hearts through remembrance. Do not even have images in private houses. For it is not permissible for the Christian to let his eyes wander or indulge in reveries' (Mansi XIII.292DE).

CHAPTER TWO

In the shadow of the 815 Council

Lex orandi: lex credendi

Although from another time and context, this pithy saying is a reminder that sometimes in the developing οἰκονομία the Holy Spirit leads his people into a deep form of praying which is followed only later by a theological understanding of this prayer. The space in time between the revelation of *lex orandi* and the establishment of an equivalent and adequate *lex credendi* is often a time of uncertainty in the church. Can this particular new *lex orandi* be defended theologically? Is it consistent with the tradition or are elements of this praying opposed to the authoritative and established dogma of the tradition? Is it prayer gone wrong, even by the majority of the church over a long period of time? Or prayer gone right? When the theologians of the church finally do give their attention to the *lex credendi* of this praying, it is expected that on the one hand this theological reflection will discern where the praying has opened new avenues of devotion which are theologically sound (and thus itself contribute to a deeper theology than had been known previously in the οἰκονομία) and on the other hand that it will give correction to any aspects of the praying which are contrary to the true life in the spirit and proper Christian devotion.

This understanding of *lex orandi: lex credendi* describes the general character of the eighth and ninth century image controversy. The iconoclasts challenged the orthodoxy of a

164

way of praying that had been developing in the church for several centuries. They were confident that a *lex credendi* could not be found for this praying and that it was time for the established *lex credendi* of the tradition to correct (and in their opinion, entirely purge) this careless *lex orandi*. But if the practice of the giving of προσκύνησις to the εἰκών had been consistent since the sixth century, why was there such a time lag in the articulation, or the challenge, of a specific *lex credendi* to the giving of προσκύνησις to the εἰκών?[385]

Generally it might be said that this time lag is always present in the developing οἰκονομία, and that the theological work of the church in the patristic period was often driven by the need to identify heresy. When praying went wrong, often because of confused thinking about the Godhead or the person of Christ, the church convened councils to state definitively the parameters of orthodox doctrine so that the prayer and worship of the church might remain pure and effective, or be returned to such a state. Just two centuries before Theodore, Maximus defended the church against the contemporary heresy of monothelitism which he was convinced made true prayer impossible. He discerned the whole body of articulated doctrine of the previous orthodox Christological council definitions within the established tradition and concluded that this tradition is ultimately undermined by monothelitism. Maximus entered the theological debate in the seventh century only as a response to the queries of the faithful who were becoming increasingly confused about the Christological debates around them and the implications of those opposing views of the Person of Christ for prayer and devotion. The denial of a fully operating human will in Christ (even if this particular human will moves fully and naturally towards the good, as does his divine will) in the willing activity of the one

---

[385] Hans Belting (1990) despairs that *lex credendi* will ever catch up or be adequate to *lex orandi*, setting up as an unresolved opposition, 'Die Macht der Bilder und die Ohnmacht der Theologen' (11-19).

personal incarnate divine Lord is of tremendous consequence to the praying Christian. It carries practical implications of what it means to live 'in Christ' and for Christ to live 'in us'. If Christ cannot be spoken of as having a human will, profound doubts arise about the ability for the human will to be redeemed. What has not been taken up by Christ cannot be redeemed and glorified.

When Theodore is challenged by the heretic in *Antirr* II.7 that the statement 'Christ is the prototype of his εἰκών': '...is not included in the traditional confession of our faith,' he agrees that this is a new formulation in the developing articulation of doctrine. Doctrinal formulation is most often the response to a heresy which arises from time to time and which threatens the pure worship of the church:

Πολλὰ δὴ ἃ οὐ ψέγραπται λέξεσιν αὐταῖς, ἰσοδυναμεῖ δὲ τοῖς γεγραμμένοις, τοῖς ἁγίοις Πατράσι κεκήρυκται. Καὶ γὰρ ὁμοούσιος ὢν τῷ Πατρὶ ὁ Υἱός, οὐκ ἐν τῇ θεοπνεύστῳ Γραφῇ, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τῶν Πατέρων ὕστερον τετράνωται· ὥσπερ καὶ Θεὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον· καὶ Θεοτόκος ἡ Κυριοτόκος, ἄλλα τε ἄττα μακρόν ἐστιν ἀπαριθμεῖν· ὧν μὴ ὁμολογουμένων, ἐξήρνηται ἡ ἀληθινὴ λατρεία ἡμῶν. Τότε δὲ ὁμολογηθέντων, ὁπηνίκα πρὸς καθαίρεσιν τῶν ἐπανισταμένων αἱρέσεων ἡ χρεία ἐκάλεσε. Τί οὖν λοιπὸν θαυμαστόν, εἰ καὶ μὴ γέγραπται πρωτότυπον εἶναι Χριστὸν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ εἰκόνος, τοῦτο νῦν τοῦ καιροῦ ἀπαιτοῦντος πρὸς τὴν ἀναφυεῖσαν εἰκονομαχικὴν αἵρεσιν λεχθῆναι, τῆς ἀληθείας οὕτω φανερούσης βεβαιότατα;

(Many teachings which are not written in so many words, but have equal force with the written teachings, have been proclaimed by the holy Fathers. It is not the inspired Scriptures but the later Fathers who made clear that the Son is consubstantial with the Father, that the Holy Spirit is God, that the Lord's mother is Theotokos, and many other doctrines which are too many to list. If these doctrines

166

are not confessed, the truth of our worship is denied. But these doctrines were confessed at the time when need summoned them for the suppression of heresies which were rising up against the truth. So after all how is it surprising, although it is not written that Christ is the prototype of His εἰκών, if times now require this to be said in opposition to the growing iconoclast heresy, since the truth is so clearly evident?)

After monothelitism, the image controversy in the eighth century creates the next demand for *lex credendi* to catch up with and correct a developing *lex orandi* which has not been disciplined by theological reflection. It was natural that in the developing οἰκονομία, the heresy of iconoclasm should follow that of monothelitism. They are related in that they both threaten the integrity of the human nature of Christ. They both challenge theology to explain how the fullness of the divine nature can be present in the single person of Christ without destroying or altering his human nature. Maximus' powerful theological meditations on Christ's struggles in Gethsemane lead to the confidence that our union with Christ can be total, for his human will operates in the very same manner as does our will. Thus, the possibility of the redemption and perfection of our wills in him is assured. Maximus' resolution of the two wills controversy depends upon his understanding of the notion of hypostatic union inherited from the tradition. In chapter four I will show how Theodore's resolution of the image question rests upon a similar attention to that Christology.

Included in the Roman iconophile florilegia of 770, reproduced in the 787 Council, and referred to in *Antirr* II.40 is an allusion to an incident where Maximus gave much respect to an image on a panel. Yet nowhere in his corpus does Maximus address the

167

question of the relation of image to prototype, nor the giving of προσκύνησις to the εἰκών, because the devotional use of the εἰκών had not been challenged as a way of praying that might be inconsistent with established doctrine. That this challenge was made so long after the practice had become common, and why it took so long for an adequate *lex credendi* to be articulated in response to the challenge, is clearly related to my description above of the paucity of pure theological and philosophical reflection in these centuries. A contributing factor was also the increasingly prevalent view in these centuries that the doctrine of the tradition had been authoritatively and fully worked out in the previous council definitions of the faith. At any rate, it is clear that the continuing philosophical consideration of theological issues (as found lastly in a more rigorous philosophical style perhaps in Maximus during this time) is largely produced and transmitted within a variety of literary genres including liturgical commentary (Germanus), scholastic style in-gathering of the tradition (John of Damascus), hagiography (voluminous), sermon writing, letter writing (Barsanuphius and John of Gaza), and practical catechesis especially written for monastic communities. This created an environment in which the vigorous and evolving prayer life of the church did not have a continuous and corresponding reflection in specific and independent *theological* tractates.

Thus, the phrase *lex orandi:lex credendi* illustrates the general character of the image controversy. But this notion also highlights one very significant yet particular aspect of the debate which has not been adequately recognized in previous studies. In his review of the theological debate to 815 (undertaken in *Antirr* I and II) Theodore uncovers a significant and clear lack of connection between *lex orandi* and *lex credendi* in the actual subject matter at the heart of the controversy. The εἰκών of Christ, the Theotokos or a

168

saint which appears on the portable panels that are found in homes, the larger liturgical panels found in churches, the panels displayed in public places, and as wall and ceiling mosaics and depictions, have stylistically evolved into a type of image which is not described nor defended in the iconophile theological writings of the eighth and ninth centuries. In the area of the theology of the image, *lex credendi* has fallen far behind *lex orandi*.[386] In fact, the *lex credendi* which is thought to apply to the *lex orandi* does not embrace the actual image to which προσκύνησις is offered at all. The *lex credendi* is taken over from a previous age in the form of a florilegia of older texts, and it applies to forms of praying through images contemporary at that time, and the giving of προσκύνησις to those images from that previous era. The form of the εἰκών has significantly changed in a way that affects the entire theology of the devotional practice, yet the *lex credendi* had not adjusted to the new character of the εἰκών. Indeed, in *Antirr* I and II Theodore sets out to identify first and foremost this specific separation of *lex orandi*: *lex credendi* which had confused the debate for more than one hundred years. It is one of Theodore's unique contributions to the debate to point out that the florilegia defend an εἰκών described in an imprecise way, and which had been significantly transformed since the texts of the florilegia were written. He shows that insufficient care has been taken to isolate, identify and describe the nature of the εἰκών which is actually at the centre of the current debate. Once this is made clear, the argument in *Antirr* III will describe the relation of this seventh to ninth century liturgical, doctrinal and devotional εἰκών to its prototype. This will allow the articulation of a *lex credendi* fully adequate and supportive of the ninth century

---

[386] Another example of this 'lagging behind' is canon 82 of the 692 *in Trullo* Council, quoted above. According to Kitzinger (1954), and cited by Neil (2000), theriomorphic representations of Christ were no longer common in either East or West by the seventh century: In this respect the Canon is nothing more than a recognition of an accomplished fact' (142).

lex orandi.

The argument which follows has not been anticipated by others. I have developed it solely through hints and indications within the *Antirr* itself, and I think it reflects a genuine insight of Theodore which is present in his argument. As stated above, I believe that Theodore constructs his argument to have an internal integrity and demonstrable necessity which begins from indubitable theological truths, council definitions and universally accepted axioms, and then proceeds by 'simple' logic to show the requirement of offering προσκύνησις to the εἰκών. Within *Antirr* I and II Theodore indicates that the εἰκών which receives προσκύνησις in his day is often confused with a purely story narrative or didactic representation of an event, a symbol, or a relic. These internal textual indications of the *Antirr* will be compared with other literary evidence of the period. I take account of the evidence of surviving images from this period, as well as many studies and theories of art historians in the past fifty years about the stylistic shifts of Byzantine portraiture in these centuries. All of these considerations confirm our reading of Theodore's text.

The image as narrative

As illustrated by the letter of Michael II and Theophilus to Louis the Pious, quoted above, the post-815 iconoclasts allowed that images of Christ, the Theotokos and the saints were permissible to educate the illiterate and to serve as Biblical *aides-memoires*, but that they were not to be offered προσκύνησις. The stylistic development of the artistic representation of Christ himself (or the saints) adds weight to iconoclastic concerns in general, and to the argument of the *Libri Carolini*, that the actual devotional

170

use of the εἰκών in these centuries was not primarily pedagogical.[387] The formal, frontal and motionless figure of Christ or a saint teaches little about Biblical stories or saintly deeds. In this section I will very briefly review some of the implications of the current art historical discussion of the representational shifts in Christian art in the Middle Byzantine period away from the previously dominant style called 'Hellenistic' or 'illusionist' to what is referred to as the 'abstract' style, and suggest how the evidence which has been uncovered contributes to the credibility of my argument.

Maguire (1996) has recently synthesized and interpreted the last fifty years of research and speculation pertaining to the stylistic development of the image within Byzantium. He suggests that the key to understanding the Byzantine image is to appreciate that the Byzantines:

> did not seek optical illusionism in their portraits, but rather accuracy of definition. Their expectation was that the image should be sufficiently well defined to enable them to identify the holy figure represented, from a range of signs that included the clothing, the attributes, the portrait type, and the inscription. For the Byzantines, these features together make up a lifelike portrait. ... Modeling and perspective did play a role in Byzantine images of some saints, but their role was not to create an

---

[387] The image used for pedagogical purposes also has an historical development of style. Loerke (1984) documents how the earliest church depended entirely on signs and symbols which alluded or referred to Biblical events rather than represented them. He suggests that in the fifth and sixth centuries the narrative style develops the Biblical scene in the moment of happening such that viewers 'are drawn into the action of the scene and thereby into its "presence." In this process, they change from observers of a picture to eyewitnesses of a deed.' (30) This is the distinction made in the 787 Council and the *Libri Carolini* between images that teach and images that provoke an emotional response. Following Gregory, the *Libri Carolini* acknowledges both functions as legitimate uses of the narrative image. This description is also consistent with the increasing demands that the εἰκών be defined by the developing programme of images which is becoming established in church decoration. The 'drawing in' of the worshipper to an action which is 'made present' is one of the demands of the liturgical εἰκών which often has a narrative component. This 'making present' fits the action of the Liturgy, and allows the worshipper to 'experience' the event of a particular liturgical feast or season of the expanding church year.

illusion. Rather, their purpose was also that of definition; that is, to make statements about the nature of the holy person being portrayed and about his or her position in the scheme of intercession and salvation.[388]

Here Maguire points out a distinctive feature of the developed ninth century εἰκών, its 'doctrinal' character which Maguire calls its 'definition.' The former didactic or 'story-telling' image has been gradually enhanced in such a way that it no longer only, or even primarily, describes an event. Rather, the εἰκών seeks to describe the depicted holy person (almost always a deified saint) and 'his or her position in the scheme of intercession and salvation.' It is also important to point out, however, that the εἰκών of Christ, the Theotokos or the saint depicted was intended to bear the likeness, appearance and bodily outline of the person as he or she appeared in his or her lifetime. This might seem obvious, but some art historians suggest that at this stage of the development of the εἰκών, the physical resemblance to the person depicted had become irrelevant. Maguire himself insists that the Byzantine notion of life-like was not that of 'illusion' (or resemblance) and that portraiture had become a matter of 'definition,' whether through inscription, symbol, dress, or whatever: 'The Byzantine notion of true and lifelike portraiture did not correspond to our ideas of realism, for their purpose was only to define the saint sufficiently for recognition, not to create an optical illusion.'[389]

Maguire and others do not adequately consider the testimony of eighth and ninth century image theology that the simple relation of bodily 'likeness' continued to be an essential link between prototype and image throughout the move toward the more abstract representation of Christ and the saints as they appeared in the εἰκών. Kitzinger

---

[388] Maguire (1996), 16.
[389] Maguire (1995), 195.

172

(1955) describes the evolving aesthetic character of the image in the sixth and seventh centuries:

> Figures, on the whole, lack bodily weight and volume. They are apt to appear emasculated, unsubstantial, almost phantom-like. This quality appears most clearly in the full-length standing figures of the newly discovered icon of the Virgin from Mt. Sinai, whose bodies seem hardly substantial enough to support their heads [figured in the article]. But faces, too, are apt to be deprived of their solidity. Even so sharply defined a head as that of the Virgin of Sta. Francesca Romana [figured] has something brittle and transparent and gives the impression of a very thin shell liable to break any moment. The precariousness of its physical existence enhances the spiritual content of the face. As the material weight decreases, the spiritual weight increases. There is a haunting, a quietly hypnotic quality ... The image is, as it were, a mere shell dependent upon receiving power and life from on high.[390]

This new style, seen in the surviving sixth and seventh century mosaics at Cyprus, Ravenna and Thessaloniki, as well as in the panel-icons at Saint Catherine's monastery at Mount Sinai, is thought to have been influenced by Egyptian funeral portraits. The function and purpose of these funeral portraits, and the representation of Christ or a saint in the εἰκών continued to depend upon showing forth the likeness of the deceased, even if the depiction of the bodily likeness was of a sort which included a spiritual

---

[390] Kitzinger (1977), 145-6. See also Kitzinger (1977), chapters 6,7. Cameron (1992a) reviews this extant art with reproductions showing clearly the non-narrative character of the εἰκών. She concludes from the extant visual and literary evidence that Byzantine images 'were also regarded as having all the power of the personage represented' (15). See also the detailed survey by Kitzinger (1977), 99-126 and (1976), 30ff, Cormack (1975a), 42-3, and Mathew (1963).

interpretation.[391] Parry (1996) suggests that by the seventh century the εἰκών is a composite image suited to expressing the spiritual state of the person depicted, and the blessings of living a virtuous and prayerful life.[392]

Kitzinger (1980) writes of this period from the middle of the sixth to the early eighth century as having left behind precisely the type of narrative teaching image which is posthumously defended in the 787 Council. The symbolic, Biblical history in narrative cycles, epic narration and scenes of Christian martyrdom (emphasizing the story of the martyrdom rather than depicting the saintliness of the martyr) were no longer common. Evolving during this period was to be the art form which became dominant in the later seventh century: the simple, straightforward portrayal of the Christ or the saint on its own (Christ as pantocrator), or this straightforward portrayal in the midst of a more complex image, perhaps including other saints as well (Christ with his disciples at the Last Supper) or very often as part of a narrative scene of one of the major liturgical Feasts (the Ascension). Regardless, the depiction of Christ, the Theotokos or the saint is meant to be beheld and contemplated, beholder and prototype of the εἰκών in each other's presence. Although the narrative component of the painting often remains, the actual εἰκών of Christ or the holy person now becomes entirely liturgical, doctrinal and devotional in nature:

The shift reflects a need for a more direct and intimate communication with the

[391] See Peers (2001): 'As Hans Belting [1990, 42ff, 92ff] has demonstrated, images of saints grew directly out of the late antique practice of honouring the dead through portraits; images became venerated like relics and were treated like vestiges that had contact with the person represented' (16).

[392] Parry (1996) speculates that Maximos' doctrine of deification allows that divine grace makes it possible for saintly individuals to regain the heavenly likeness lost by Adam. It is this 'heavenly likeness' which is conveyed in the image. This highly speculative interpretation is suggestive of important theological themes developed below, but does not dismiss the fact that the εἰκών intends to show a bodily likeness to Christ or the saint.

heavenly world. No longer is it sufficient for the beholder to perceive the image as a factual or historical record, or as part of a self-contained system. It must serve him here and now. It must receive, and be responsive to, his appeals. It becomes a means of harnessing the heavenly powers to clear and present needs. ... the portrait's true function is 'representation' in the literal sense. It exists to make present that which is absent. It conveys no message and illustrates no story. ... A holy person represented in this manner is ready to receive homage and listen to pleas and - particularly when the image is portable - may serve the votary in concrete situations of need.[393]

Haldon (1990) points out the same shift in style which Kitzinger documents so thoroughly, even if he interprets the dynamic between image and beholder slightly differently. Haldon suggests that the developing 'abstract' style which dominates the seventh to ninth century allows the image to be more active in the world of the beholder. Acknowledging his debt to Kitzinger's scholarship forty years earlier, Haldon summarizes his own detailed description of the change in the perception of the effects of an image from the sixth to the ninth century:

The central element in this change involves the transfer of emotional weight from the representation itself to the onlooker. The ... Hellenistic or illusionist mode depending upon an inwardly directed and narrativistic involvement within the frame of the composition; the abstract mode invoking attentiveness, accessibility, the direct involvement of the onlooker with the main subject of the composition, and, potentially, the intervention of the portrayed figure into the world of the onlooker. In the former, the figures inhabit their own world; in the latter, they look out and

---

[393] Kitzinger (1980), 148.

175

touch the world of the onlooker.[394]

Haldon[395] illustrates the difference in the narrative style (also called 'Hellenistic' or 'illusionist') and the devotional style (also called 'abstract') by exploring situations where they exist side by side. The Ravenna mosaics, those in the church of Demetrius in Thessaloniki and some icons in the monastery of St Catherine on Mt Sinai all combine the illusionist and abstract modes. The figures who are meant to be spiritually 'present' to the beholder are represented frontally, formally and without motion. Other figures around these central images are presented in an active, illusionist, naturalistic style.

It is also interesting to note that commemorative images of an ascetic were distributed even in the ascetic's life-time, although more so after his death. The significance here is that the εἰκών clearly is meant to correspond to the 'holiness' or 'deification' of the depicted saint, whether before or after physical death. The likeness of the εἰκών to the saint was very important. Anthony was said to have asked a silent pilgrim if he wanted to ask something. The pilgrim answered 'Father, it is enough for me to see your face.'[396]

Such saints' emaciated faces, with their intense, spirit-filled gaze, were reproduced constantly in images by those who sought their subject's intercession and protection. Icons like these provided the growing-point *par excellence* of the potentiated image, a 'two-way door' [*Vita S. Stephani Junioris*, Migne *PG*

[394] Haldon (1990), 422.
[395] Haldon (1990), 407.
[396] *Apophth. Patrum* (Alphabetical series), Antonios 27. Brown (1973) argues that from the fourth century onwards 'the holy man was a living icon. ... The belief in intercession, and the consequent psychological need to focus one's attention and hopes on the face of the intercessor, was the lever that shifted the religious art of the early Byzantine world.' This is described by Brown as 'the momentum of the search for a face.' (12, 14, 15).

100.1113A], through which grace might be mediated and prayers conveyed. Standing face to face with the holy man in his image, the early Byzantine believer was provided with a palpable point of encounter with the heavenly world, through which he could directly address his needs to the saint in question and expect equally direct assistance. In this way, the relationship which might be established with the *living* ascetic as 'spiritual physician' could be indefinitely extended in time through his icon. No wonder, then, that (especially in the late sixth and early seventh centuries) we have numerous accounts of individuals always wearing an icon of their favourite saint on their persons.[397]

This phenomenon of the significant stylistic change in the εἰκών contributes to our understanding of the urgent concern of the iconoclast to protect Chalcedonian orthodoxy. The iconoclast Christological objections are understood more sympathetically when the radical style of the εἰκών is identified. The εἰκών seeks to achieve both the bodily likeness and an impression of the divinity of Christ or the Theotokos or saint as deified. The offending representations of Christ were not 'story scenes' of Biblical teaching.

For convenience, from this point on I shall use the term εἰκών to refer to the liturgical, doctrinal, and devotional εἰκών of Christ, the Theotokos or a saint. Such an εἰκών is sometimes included in a larger painting or scene of narrative style. An εἰκών often includes a formal representation of a major feast or theme of the liturgical cycle (the Anastasis, the Ascension, etc.) which required the Christ-εἰκών and the εἰκών of other saints to be figured within the scene in such a way that the worshipper in his θεωρία came to see himself within the salvific moment represented. This style of εἰκών is fully developed by the ninth century and generally can be described as an abstract, motionless,

---

[397] Gendle (1981), 185.

formal, and frontal depiction of an established type for Christ (or one of the saints) with an identifying inscription. Significant examples survive from these centuries.[398] Theodore's *apologia* for the image in *Antirr* III is for the offering of προσκυνήσις to this devotional εἰκών.[399] The separation of the devotional εἰκών from the strictly narrative 'story' image of previous times is an important step for Theodore in his untangling of the confused arguments in both east and the west in the eighth century. Although all of the elements of the developed seventh and eighth century εἰκών are found in εἰκών of earlier centuries, they were not gathered together in a concentrated and consistent form as they appear in the ninth century εἰκών. The crucial point is that most of the examples of paintings and images cited in the Fathers and quoted at the 787 Council were Biblical stories or martyrdom narrative scenes which were very different from the εἰκών which was offered προσκύνησις in eighth and ninth century Byzantium.[400]

I have described an instance of a significant lag of *lex credendi* behind a well established and developed *lex orandi* at a time of theological and philosophical inactivity.

---

[398] This describes the devotional εἰκών as it had fully developed by the eighth and ninth centuries. Not all elements were to be found in its earliest forms, and identifying inscriptions are found consistently only in the ninth century. Its primary use was liturgical, by which I include the iconic programme in church decoration, and devotional, either in a private home or carried by a person, regardless of whether the image appeared on a small panel or the wall or ceiling of a church. The liturgical identification is primary. Both public liturgical and domestic devotional use was related to the practice of θεωρία. Such a devotional εἰκών could appear in various media. I fully acknowledge that the word 'εἰκών' does not have this limited connotation in Byzantine literature but continues to have a much broader meaning in ninth century texts, referring generally to all paintings and depictions, including narrative scenes, images which were also relics and images which were primarily symbols. Throughout I avoid the use of the word 'icon' because of its varied and indefinite modern meanings.

[399] Although I disagree with Belting's (1990 and 1994) reading of the *Antirr*, he also recognizes the need to identify the type of image being examined during this and later periods. He isolates the mediaeval 'holy image' from the mediaeval narrative image, and treats them separately in different books, as distinct phenomena.

[400] Examples from the iconophile florilegia include Gregory of Nyssa's allusion to the artist who depicted all the struggles of the martyr Theodore, 'as in a speaking book' (Migne *PG* 66.739D), Basil's praising of the eloquent scenes of the 'victorious conflict' of the martyr Barlaam (Migne *PG* 31.489), Asterios of Amasea's reference to the martyrdom of Euphemia as illustrative of the capacity of art to render emotions such as anger or compassion (Migne *PG* 50.335A), and Gregory Nazianzen's account of how the facial expression of Polemon in a narrative scene was enough to convert a prostitute (Migne *PG* 37.737-8).

The inability of the church from the seventh to ninth centuries to engage in a continuous theological reflection on current devotional practices eventually led to a crisis when the *lex credendi* was demanded by the iconoclasts. The iconoclasts challenged the church to provide a theological justification of the current habits of prayer and the offering of προσκύνησις to the eighth century εἰκών. This challenge forced the iconophiles to a dependency on florilegia developed at a time when the devotional practices, and the nature of the εἰκών itself, had been very different. Thus, an earlier *lex credendi* was borrowed and inappropriately applied to justify the current devotional situation which was far removed from that which produced the original teaching.

I am not suggesting that Theodore isolates this liturgical, doctrinal and devotional εἰκών conceptually or describes it as such in his text. Nor is it plausible that Theodore had any sense that the εἰκών had recently developed since the sixth century in the way current art historians trace its evolution from the Egyptian and late pagan funeral portraits.[401] Theodore was born into a religious culture for which this type of εἰκών had become a central element in the devotional life of the Byzantine Christian, and especially in the monasteries. Perhaps Theodore assumed that this type of Byzantine Christian εἰκών had always been part of the tradition, although only recently challenged by the emperor and heretical Christians. At any rate, in his review of the eighth century arguments, in his awareness of the response of Charlemagne's Court to 787 (however unlikely it is that Theodore actually saw a copy of the *Libri Carolini*), in his familiarity with the

---

[401] An example of current theory is found in Belting 1990 and 1994. Belting 1994 (78-101) traces Greek, Roman and Egyptian traditions of the painted mummy portraits which culminates in the funerary portrait of Roman Egypt, as reflecting 'both the Greek concept of idealizing a person and the Roman concept of recording his or her real likeness. ... The icons of saints soon make use of the possibilities of the funeral portrait, their predecessor, as they too represent an individual in a most specific heroization, and as they too look backward at a human life as well as forward to a suprahuman reality.' (99).

179

authoritative texts of the established florilegia, and in his acquaintance with the proceedings of the 815 Council, Theodore came to understand that an *apologia* for the εἰκών based on the pedagogical Biblical story-telling εἰκών was woefully inadequate. An apology for the necessary giving of προσκύνησις to the ninth century εἰκών would require a creative theological argument resulting from a fresh trawling of the depths of the tradition.

The image as symbol

This liturgical, doctrinal and devotional εἰκών is easily distinguished from illusionist or narrative story telling paintings which represent Biblical history in narrative cycles, epic narration and historical scenes of Christian martyrdom. But the confusion of the eighth century controversy was not concerned primarily with the style of the representation of Christ, the Theotokos and the saints. The εἰκών was an established element in the practical devotional and liturgical life of the Middle Byzantine Christian, but its functioning and place within that prayer life and worship had never been defended theologically. The lack of theological vigour in these centuries prevented an adequate theological reflection and understanding of the functioning of this εἰκών within the prayer life of the church. The hopeful perusal of the authoritative texts of the past failed to provide a ready packaged *apologia* for this form of contemplation and prayer. Nevertheless, such authoritative texts were the only resources at hand for the eighth century iconophiles. The major distinction which was absent in the early texts of the florilegia was that between symbol and εἰκών.

In my review of Theodore's summation of the 787 Council in *Antirr* I, I suggested

that the image controversy was largely a revisiting of the pagan debate over anthropomorphic symbols of the gods. The iconoclast was convinced that the anthropomorphic likeness disqualified the image as a legitimate Christian symbol. Any προσκύνησις would remain with the image as idol. The iconophile was convinced that the Christ-εἰκών was a symbol separate from its prototype. The προσκύνησις would cross over or ascend from symbol to Christ himself. But this language was still too close to that of the older pagan debate, and as long as the two sides agreed to treat the Christ-εἰκών as symbol, arguments of neither side were persuasive.

Until the devotional εἰκών is distinguished from symbol, the iconophile arguments are nothing other than the traditional and sophisticated philosophical defence of anthropomorphic images of pagan gods:

> [These pagans] were perfectly aware that images of the gods are human symbols, not divine realities, and symbols by no means altogether adequate to represent the fullness of those realities. What they are defending is the religious value of anthropomorphic images precisely as signs and symbols.[402]

The early church was tempted to represent Christ as anthropomorphic symbol in this same pagan tradition. Du Bourquet (1972) shows early third century anthropomorphic 'symbols' of Christ as Good Shepherd (mural in the catacombs of Callixtus), Christ as Orpheus (mural in the cemetery of Domitilla) and Christ as True Philosopher (sarcophagi in the Lateran Museum and at the Palazzo S. Severino). In like fashion, Baynes (1955) had previously illustrated from the writings of Maximus of Tyre, Dio Chrysostom, Julian

---

[402] Armstrong (1963), 118.

the Apostate, and others that pagan statues were also defended as pure symbols of divinity.[403] Armstrong points to Alexander (1958b) as actually contributing a plausible history of the transmission from the pagan to the Christian iconophile apology. Alexander concludes, 'But as far as the symbolic view of images is concerned, the evidence seems clear that it was consciously and deliberately annexed from pagan theologians.'[404] Thus, Theodore's efforts to isolate and distinguish the Christ-εἰκών from anthropomorphic symbol of divinity, which I am about to document, were crucial to the iconophile apology.

In his examination of the arguments of the eighth and early ninth century controversy presented in *Antirr* I and II Theodore undertakes to untangle the definition and function of εἰκών from that of 'symbol'. This is achieved with the help of a reference to Denys the Areopagite,[405] supported by two quotes from Basil which deal with images. This Denys citation concludes Theodore's discussion of the relation of image and prototype in *Antirr* II.11. It is a passage not present in the 787 'Refutation' or ὅρος nor used significantly by Nicephorus. This citation (*EH* 4.3) is not a reference to the Dionysian theory of symbol nor particularly useful in promoting the notion of the world as symbol. Rather it suggests a mutuality of presence in image and prototype. It is cited by the orthodox in response to a challenge by the heretic that Theodore is advancing a notion of image which is innovative to the tradition:

> Πόθεν σοι τοῦτο εἴληπται; οὐ γάρ σε νομοθέτην νεοφανῆ δέξομαι
>
> Where did you get this idea? I will not accept you as a new law-giver.

---

[403] Baynes (1955), 130,131.
[404] Alexander (1958b), 126.
[405] *EH* 4.3.

The importance of Theodore's reply, Dionysius' *EH* 4.3, in his developed understanding of image is indicated by the fact that this passage is the second most often quoted citation in Theodore's letters. Only Basil's *De Spiritu Sancto* 18.45 is quoted more often. In four critical letters these two passages are brought together in a creative juxtaposition, along with a critical change in a verb prefix, to promote Theodore's final understanding of image theology.[406] Theodore's commitment to the Chalcedonian definition of the Person of the incarnate Christ leads to an interpretation of this Dionysian passage in which the image and prototype mutually support one another to the extent that they come into being at the same time and are both seen to be equally necessary in the divine οἰκονομία. At the same time Basil's *De Spiritu Sancto* 18.45 is given a peculiar interpretation by Theodore precisely to allow it to protect the priority of the prototype and avoid the charge of idolatry. All this will be considered in our analysis of Theodore's mature argument in *Antirr* III. Now I turn to Theodore's account in *Antirr* II of the unraveling of the devotional εἰκών from symbol in his review of the moderate iconoclast doctrine.

Throughout *Antirr* I and II the iconoclast insists that both the theological representation of the image by the iconophile and the devotional use of the image strongly implies that the devotional εἰκών operates in a different way from symbol. By allowing the iconoclast to identify this distinction, Theodore gently points out that the eighth and early ninth century iconophile has not recognized the confusion and inadequacy of his own argument. The Dionysian passage which challenges the usual interpretation of symbol comes just before the section on προσκύνησις which Theodore introduces with Basil's *De Sancto Spiritu* 18.45. The voice of the orthodox in *Antirr* II does not put these

---

[406] Fatouros 57, 380, 393, 408.

two concepts together, and thus continues to represent the traditional eighth and early ninth century iconophile position which has not adequately isolated the nature and function of the εἰκών. This failure to discern the possibilities of the synthesis of the Dionysian/Basilian passages is characteristic of the inability of the pre-815 iconophiles to present a thoughtful, clear and sustained argument. In the controversy before Theodore's *Antirr*, the theology of εἰκών as 'εἰκών' and its unique relationship to its prototype did not surface as a central question because this specific dogma is not represented in the established florilegia.

The attempted iconophile justification of the image as symbol throughout the eighth century and the thorough rejection of the image as legitimate symbol by the iconoclasts of the eighth and ninth centuries is expressed in an exchange constructed by Theodore in *Antirr* II.23:

ΟΡΘΟΔΟΞΟΣ. ... Τί γὰρ ἐγγύτερον Χριστοῦ εἰκὼν εἰς παράδειγμα, ἢ τύπος σταυροῦ, ὁπότε τῆς αὐτῆς ἐμφερείας ἡ εἰκὼν πρὸς τὸ ἐκτύπωμα;...

ΑΙΡΕΤΙΚΟΣ. ... "Ἀλλ" ὅμως παραβλητέον σοι εἰκόνα εἰκόνι καὶ ἐκτύπωμα ἐκτυπώματι. Κἂν ἰσοδυναμεῖν φαίης τὸ πρῶτον τῷ δευτέρῳ.[407]

(Orthodox: ... For what closer comparison does the εἰκών of Christ have than the symbol of the cross, when the εἰκών has the same relation with its archetype as the symbol has?...

Heretic: ... Nevertheless you must compare εἰκών with εἰκών and symbol with symbol, even though you say that the former has the same meaning as the latter.)

Such a statement put in the mouth of the heretic should be considered in the context of

---

[407] *Antirr* II.23. Migne *PG* 99.368CD.

iconoclast theology in general. A theme in the writings of Florovsky (1950) suggests that the Origenist tradition provides the theological foundation of the iconoclast position.[408] For the iconoclast, as for Origen, symbols are at the heart of the Christian faith, whereas an image such as the devotional εἰκών has no place. Florovsky attributes to the iconoclasts an Origenist theology which results in a thoroughly symbolic interpretation of Christianity. Whether or not Florovsky's tracing of the iconoclastic position to an Origenist influence is true, the comparison of Origenist and iconoclast thought highlights several characteristics of the iconoclast argument. For Origen, the humanity of Jesus is but the first and lowest step of our spiritual understanding. More than this, Florovsky argues that for Origen's symbolic/allegorical understanding of the material world, even in the days of His flesh Christ had no definable image because his external appearance depended upon the measure of one's ability to receive Him. According to Origen, 'He did not appear the same person to the sick, and to those who needed his healing aid, and to those who were unable by reason of their strength to go up the mountain along with him.'[409] Thus Christ Himself is interpreted wholly as 'symbol' of the Word.[410] In like fashion, *Antirr* I reveals that the eighth century iconoclasts refused to portray Jesus in the humility of the form of the servant (human) which he took on in His Incarnation. For Origen, Christ's resurrection transcends the state of his humiliation which has now been exalted to a higher perfection, 'transformed into God.'[411] Similarly, the heretic in *Antirr*

---

[408] Florovsky (1950) claims that the letter of Eusebius of Caesarea to Constantia Augusta is grounded in Origenist theology. 'Origen's Christology was the background and presupposition of Eusebius. He drew legitimate conclusions from the principles laid down by Origen. If one walks in the steps of Origen, would he, really, be interested in any 'historical' image or 'ikon' of the Lord? ... A true 'icon claimed to be something essentially different from a 'symbol'. It had to be a representation of something real, and a true and accurate representation. A true icon had to be, in the last resort, a historic picture.' (114, 115).
[409] *Contra Celsum* III.41.
[410] *Contra Celsum* II.64.
[411] *Contra Celsum* III.41.

II.41 quotes from Gregory the Theologian: '[Christ] has become that which anoints it [His divinity] and even the same as God.' The iconoclasts often refer to 2 Cor. 5.16 in their conviction that the resurrected Christ can no longer be imaged in his earthly body. Even in Theodore's description of moderate iconoclasm which includes the compromise of the iconoclast to allow the depiction of Christ's body before the passion there remains an absolute refusal to allow any depiction of the resurrected body of Christ.

This iconoclast 'symbolic' view of the Christian religion was also made current in the preceding centuries by the popular Dionysian use of symbol in the contemplation of the divine. I believe that Theodore intentionally breaks away from this symbolic model in his *apologia* for the image in *Antirr* III, by referring to a lesser known passage in Dionysius which more closely supports the developing role of the εἰκών in the contemplative and liturgical life of the church. The iconoclasts were content to accept that the cross and the other symbols of the faith always point beyond themselves to the vision of the Divine glory, but they resisted the Christ-εἰκών precisely because it seemed too 'earthy' (bearing a likeness to the earthly body) and likely to give the impression that the divine resides in this material world.

Support for these observations about the significant yet subtle shift in the perception and understanding of the visual image from symbol to image is provided by a similar conceptual shift in the contemporary liturgical commentary, as described by Taft (1980). Taft argues that Maximus Confessor 'clearly depends on the Alexandrine-type symbol system of Denys' *EH*. For both, the Incarnation is the 'model' of the soul's union with God, and Maximus' 'special' (ἰδικῶς) level of liturgical symbolism - i.e. the liturgy seen as an image of the individual soul's conversion and ascent to union with God - is

transparently Dionysian.'[412] Following Bornert (1966), Taft suggests that Maximus

advances the tendency to put greater emphasis on the historical οἰκονομία, but remains

'decisively Alexandrine'.[413] Taft points to *in Trullo* 692 canon 82 as illustration that this

shift in liturgical commentary was paralleled by a similar change in the perception of the

visual image from pure symbolism to a less abstract symbolic art. Taft's main thesis is

that Germanus' liturgical commentary 'is the encroachment of a more literal tradition

upon another, more mystical level of Byzantine interpretation - and this precisely on the

eve of Iconoclasm, when shifts in Byzantine piety led to such growth in the cult of images

that Orthodoxy soon found itself locked in mortal combat to defend this new expression

of radical Incarnational realism against the reaction of a more traditional iconoclastic

spiritualism.'[414] Cameron (1992) adds her voice in testimony to the shift in liturgical

commentary: 'we shall see in the seventh century a shift away from the more symbolic

interpretation of Maximus Confessor in the direction of literal realism associated with

Patriarch Germanos I.'[415] I suggest that much the same synthesis of the purely Dionysian

symbolic interpretation with the Antiochene 'realism' achieved by Germanos in liturgical

interpretation, is described by Theodore in the *Antirr*. The fear of idolatry led the

iconoclasts to insist on the purely non-anthropomorphic symbolic Dionysian

interpretation of the sensible. The Christ-εἰκών itself, as it had recently developed, could

not be part of such a purely symbolic interpretation of the world and of the faith. The

iconophiles in the eighth century responded to the iconoclast attacks by attempting to

---

[412] Taft (1980), 70.
[413] According to Bornert (1966), 117-21, Maximus continued to describe this typological approach as symbol (σύμβολον) which is conditioned by his allegorical view of the church as type and image (τύπος καὶ εἰκών) of the universe.
[414] Taft (1980), 58,59.
[415] Cameron (1992), 23.

defend the 'more literalist, popular and monastic piety' (Taft 1980, 72) but were handicapped in that they were unable to find any such justification in the tradition. The central thesis of my argument is that only Theodore Stoudite, because of his years of studying the Fathers as monk and Abbot at Saccoudion and Stoudios, sufficiently understood all these strands of tradition at work in the controversy. Consequently, he applied the innovative synthesis of Dionysian mystical interpretation ('The sensible rites are the image of intelligible realities. They lead there, and show the way to them.')[416] to the devotional practices of eighth and ninth century Byzantines and produced a creative apology for the devotional εἰκών.

The eighth century iconophiles insisted (see the 787 ὅρος) that the Christ-εἰκών should receive the same προσκυνήσις as other symbols of the faith. The difficulty with this position for the iconoclast, on the basis of either the Origenist or the Dionysian understandings, is that the image is *prima facie* different from the other symbolic holy items like crosses, gospel books, church buildings, etc. because it bears a bodily resemblance or physical similarity to its prototype. The Christ-εἰκών seems clearly to violate the Pseudo-Dionysian demand that the most effective symbol to lead the mind to divine contemplation must be a finite object which is clearly 'unlike' that to which it leads, just so there is no danger of confusing the material and the intelligible. This Dionysian way of thinking is clearly seen in the sixth century letter of Hypatius, Archbishop of Ephesus 531-538, to Julian, Bishop of Atramytium who had accepted paintings as devotional aids but was hesitant about allowing statues in churches. Hypatius concludes by rejecting all paintings as ineffective and lesser symbols to be tolerated only

---

[416] *EH* II.3.2

for the edification of the simple and uneducated.[417] In this letter we see both the emphasis on the role of symbols in the Christian life and the caution that the best symbols are dissimilar to their prototypes:

We leave the material ornament in the churches ... because we conceive that each order of the faithful is guided and led up to the divine in its own way and that some are led even by these (images) towards the intelligible beauty and from the abundant light in the sanctuaries to the intelligible and immaterial light.[418]

For no existing thing is like or identical or the same as the good and divine Trinity which transcends all existing things and is the creator and cause of all existing things, for it is said "who is like Thee?", and we hear the divines sing "who will be likened to Thee?" ... Yet, O beloved and holy man, we own and record that, whatever the divine essence be, it is not like, or identical with, or the same as any of the existing things ... But we permit simpler people, as they are less perfect, to learn by way of initiation about such things by [the sense of] sight which is more appropriate to their natural development ... for the sake of their salvation...

We do not then, disturb the divine [commandments] with regard to the sanctuaries but we stretch out our hand in a more suitable way to those who are still rather imperfect, yet we do not leave them untaught as to the more perfect [knowledge] but we want even them to know that the divine being is not at all identical or the same or similar to any of the existing things.[419]

---

[417] Theodore refers to this letter as highly offensive in that it promotes the view that there are several classes of Christians. His response to this view is that if these images are helpful for the simple, they are equally helpful for a bishop. The point for Theodore is that images are not narrative teaching aids, but play an essential role in Christian prayer, contemplation and worship.

[418] Diekamp, *OCA* 117.128 as quoted by Bernard (1975), 11.

[419] Translated by Alexander (1952).

The iconoclast in *Antirr* II.23 quoted above, who insists that symbol be compared with symbol and image with image, knows that the devotional εἰκών does not have a legitimate place in the traditional Christian understanding of symbol. I have indicated that the defining influence of the Dionysian framework in Byzantine culture encouraged a symbolic understanding of material signs as necessary aids to the contemplation of the intelligible and the divine. Theodore summarizes this perception of the world in *Antirr* I when he describes that by consecrated objects:

> God is evidently worshipped 'in spirit and in truth', as the materials are exalted by the raising of the mind towards God. The mind does not remain with the materials, because it does not trust in them: that is the error of the idolators. Through the materials, rather, the mind ascends toward the prototypes: this is the faith of the orthodox.[420]

This general symbolic[421] understanding of the universe and the necessity of symbol in the salvific process is shared by both iconoclasts and iconophiles and informs the eighth and ninth century controversy over the devotional εἰκών. The iconoclast claim is that the iconophiles violate the rules of this symbolic interpretation.

This perspective helps us understand the questions raised at the very beginning of the image controversy, and in particular Constantine's insistence that the εἰκών be of the same οὐσία as the prototype. Such *homoousia* cannot be expected of a symbol. This

---

[420] *Antirr* 1.13. Migne *PG* 99.344D.
[421] Dionysius freely uses the terminology of 'images' but within the context of the eighth and ninth century 'image' debate it is more accurate to speak of his teaching in terms of symbol.

seemingly absurd demand becomes reasonable when placed within its context. The Christ-εἰκών could not claim to operate under the normal rules of symbol. The 787 Council missed the point of the iconoclasts and declared that the εἰκών operated as a legitimate symbol according to the teaching of the tradition. By the early ninth century, moderate iconoclasm admitted that the narrative story image in some way could be seen to be a legitimate symbol in that it leads the mind to contemplation of the event pictured, but they could not accept the liturgical, doctrinal, devotional εἰκών of the holy person within the narrative image, or in a separate εἰκών. This is the theme of the 815 Council as reviewed in *Antirr* II.

Finally, the εἰκών is most clearly separated from symbol in Theodore's careful distinguishing of the symbol or type of the cross (ὁ τύπος σταυροῦ) from the Christ-εἰκών (ἡ εἰκὼν Χριστοῦ). The iconoclasts greatly promoted the symbol of the cross but resisted every comparison of the type of the cross with the Christ-εἰκών. The cross did not replace images during iconoclastic periods 'merely as a neutral replacement for images,' but the iconoclasts practiced a positive and enthusiastic cult of the exaltation of the cross. It was the εἰκών at the centre of the controversy, entirely different from the symbol of the cross, which threatened to undo the symbolic universe and illegitimately attempt to offer a true material εἰκών of Christ, the Theotokos or the saint who already shines in light ineffable.

By the final stage of the controversy Theodore admits that the iconoclasts have correctly pointed out a fundamental difference between τύπος and εἰκών which will be important to his final argument, but he continues to argue even in *Antirr* III, though very carefully, that appropriate comparisons can be made between type and image while

191

maintaining this distinction. The iconoclasts did not have to look far to discover the difference between the symbol of the cross and the Christ-εἰκών. To begin with, in Theodore's letters and throughout the *Antirr* the difference of designation between type and εἰκών is consistently maintained. In the earliest theological statement on images that we have from Theodore, his letter to his spiritual father Plato c. 810, he has established the language of type and image which he will hereafter maintain:

καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ τύπου τοῦ ζωοποιοῦ σταυροῦ, τῆς εἰκόνος τῆς τε παναγίας Θεοτόκου καὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων πάσης ἁγιωτικῆς εἰκόνος προσκυνήσεως διὰ μέσου τῶν κατ' αὐτὰς πρωτοτύπων ἐπὶ θεὸν ἀναβαινούσης ...[422]

(When we consider the type of the life-giving cross, the εἰκών of the all holy Theotokos and all the saints, or any holy εἰκών of sanctity, those who approach the εἰκών rise up to God through the offering of προσκύνησις, by means of the prototypes represented in the εἰκών.)

Earlier in this letter, and in his letter sent several years later to the participants of the 815 Council, Theodore distinguishes two types of εἰκών (εἴτε φυσικῆς εἴτε τεχνητῆς), but all references to the life-giving and honoured cross are designated by τύπος.[423] Theodore says that the type of the cross and the Christ-εἰκών are related by analogy (τὸ ἀνάλογον), but type and image are clearly different.[424] This attention to distinction of

[422] Fatouros 57, 121-125. Dated by Fatouros during Theodore's second exile, 809-811.
[423] Fatouros 71, 51-60.
[424] I am aware that Barasch (1992) claims that Theodore uses *typos* as a synonym for εἰκών (259), but he gives no evidence or example. Barasch's discussion of Theodore's terminology is so general and careless that it is almost entirely misleading. In addition to *typos*, he wrongly suggests that *eidos, morphe, schema* and *character* are likewise used by Theodore as synonymous with εἰκών. In his discussion of *morphe* he insists that the term 'evoked the sense of a visually perceptible image.' (ibid., 260). On the contrary, in his letter to the 815 Council, Theodore describes Christ both as seen in his human *morphe* but also as remaining in his divine uncircumscribed *morphe*: μένει τῇ θείᾳ μορφῇ ὁ αὐτὸς ἀπερίγραπτος. Fatouros 71.39&40.

image and type is peculiar to Theodore and not maintained by Nicephorus even in the section of his *Antirr* III (*PG* 100.428-433) which has been set apart by Mai and published separately as 'The difference between the Image of Christ and the Cross in ten reasoned demonstrations.'[425] Nicephorus uses τύπος to refer both to the Christ-εἰκών and the cross. 'The τύπος of the stretching out of Christ's hands and of this figure are venerable. ... Thus, those which belong to the body are better than those which belong to the figure, and if this is so, the τύπος of the body is more venerable than the τύπος of the figure.'[426] Theodore is precise and consistent when describing the dead body of Christ on the cross.[427] In his refutation of the Chalce inscription, Theodore writes 'His holy body became breathless and voiceless on the cross: that is why it is called a dead εἰκών by the great Gregory of Armenia. Suitably Christ is depicted as voiceless εἰκών bereft of breath ...'[428] Theodore is alluding to the authority of an excerpt from the life of St Gregory of Armenia:

> Because men loved to worship images in human shape, skillfully carved from wood, he himself became the image of man, that he might subject to his own image of his divinity the image-makers and image-lovers and image-worshippers. And because men were accustomed to worship lifeless and dead images, he himself became a dead image on the cross.[429]

The persecution of Leo V begins soon after the 815 Council and Theodore writes urgently

[425] Spicilegium Romanum, X.2.157-170, as noted by O'Connell (1972), 59.
[426] Migne *PG* 100.429BC.
[427] The earliest example of the Crucifix with the dead Christ on the cross is the portable icon from Mt Sinai, from this period (early-mid eighth century). See Kartsonis (1986), 67, 68.
[428] *PG* 99.461D.
[429] Agathangelos, *History of the Armenian*, trans. Thomson (1976). Greek text in G. Lafontaine, *La version Grecque ancienne du livre arménien d'Argathange. Édition critique*, 202.81-84.

But the iconoclast insists that the iconophile has established no basis for the analogy between type and εἰκών. Rather, εἰκών is to be compared with εἰκών and symbol with symbol (εἰκὼν γὰρ εἰκόνι παραβάλλεται, καὶ ἐκτύπωμα ἐκτυπώματι). The iconophile suggests that the relationship of type and εἰκών is so strong that sometimes figuratively (κατὰ κατάχρησιν) the εἰκών σταυροῦ is spoken of. Furthermore, similarity is understood, named, and perceived in both εἰκών and type (τὸ δ'ὅμοιον καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς εἰκόνος, καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ τύπου καὶ νενόηται καὶ λέλεκται καὶ τεθέαται). The iconoclast grants all this, but continues to insist that the notions of εἰκών and type must not be conflated nor confused. At this point in the argument the notion of the iconoclast is not refuted by the orthodox, but rather the truth of his insight is implicitly acknowledged by the lack of iconophile response.

Thus the iconoclast advances the cause of εἰκών doctrine by forcing Theodore to recognize not only the stylistic difference between the narrative story-telling painting and εἰκών, but also the theological, ontological, epistemological, liturgical and devotional implications which accompanied this stylistic development. The unique character of this εἰκών means that Theodore must construct an *apologia* for the εἰκών and its relation to its prototype which does not lean upon the sophisticated notion of Christian symbol within the tradition, nor upon the doctrine of the type of the cross.

The εἰκών as relic

Theodore also came to realize that the εἰκών must be separated from its association with relic as part of his prolegomenon for the *apologia* for the devotional εἰκών. The Damascene claims that the grace of the Holy Spirit resides in the εἰκών of the saints in the

195

same way that the Holy Spirit resides in their relics.[432] The fourth session of the 787 Council records that:

> Demons are often driven away by the use of the relics and images of martyrs ... tell me, how many overshadowings, how many exudations, and often flows of blood too, have come from the images and relics of martyrs?[433]

I have suggested above that in the first phase of the controversy to 787 the imprecise language of the iconophiles grants the same holiness to an εἰκών as to a relic. This early iconophile theology convinces the iconoclasts that the same heresy, idolatry, superstition and magic which accompany the excessive offering of προσκυνήσις to a relic are potentially involved in the offering of προσκύνησις to an εἰκών. Theodore also believes that the relics of the saints are filled with divine grace[434] but he understands that a relic and an εἰκών theologically are defined differently in the divine οἰκονομία.[435] A relic is 'sanctified matter,' usually without the form of an εἰκών. An εἰκών is pure outline and form, entirely apart from matter. The relic is offered προσκυνήσις because of what it is. The εἰκών of the saint is offered προσκύνησις only because of the προσκυνήσις due to its prototype. The relic is a defined and isolated part of the body of a saint, or an object made holy by its association with a saving mystery. Relics cannot simply be 'produced.'

---

[432] *Orations* 1.19; Kot 3, 95.
[433] Mansi XIII, 48C, Cf 132E.
[434] Migne *PG* 99.1816A.
[435] See Kitzinger (1954), 125 for the suggestion that regardless of the fact that theological writings continued throughout this period to compare images and relics, in popular devotion the relic and the image were seen to be very different. He believes that the cult of images was entirely separated from the worship of relics from the late sixth century onwards. Jones (1977) points out that Gregory of Tours 'had a great deal to say about wonder working relics, but fewer anecdotes to relate about miraculous images.' For a contrary view that is based on a thorough analysis of hagiographical material, and more consistent with the 787 textual evidence and Theodore's commentary, see Magoulias (1967).

The εἰκών, on the other hand, is a repeatable and artificial likeness of the saint. The

iconoclasts fear that the offering of προσκύνησις to εἰκών will lead to heresy and idolatry.

Middle Byzantine hagiographical sources relate how the pilgrim to a tomb

containing a relic would seek to return home with ampullae or tokens containing oil, water,

or earth charged with the healing and apotropaic powers of the holy martyrs by physical

contact with their relics or tombs. Many extant examples from Palestine, Egypt, and Syria

are impressed with relief εἰκών of the saints and their attributes, accompanied by

appropriate inscriptions. The ampullae from Asia Minor, however, are missing the

identifying inscriptions and typical attributes such that their identity is not determined.[436]

The association of the εἰκών of the saint on these ampullae (with or without identifying

inscription) along with the miracle working substances contained within the flask, is the

type of phenomenon that would contribute to the doctrinal fears of the iconoclasts.[437] The

sanctity and power of the holy person could be carried about by the privileged εἰκών. Not

only was the εἰκών invested with the same type of power and mystery as the relic and

physically blessed materials from holy places, but the εἰκών was thoroughly associated

with the relic and physical objects of holy power as an integral aspect of the ampullae

themselves.[438]

Thus, because on the one hand the devotional εἰκών was often described by

---

[436] See Vikan (1982) 3-6 & 10-14 and Gendle (1981): '...by the fifth century, icon and relic may be fused at times into a single spiritually charged object. The 'sacred dust' of ascetics like Symeon the Younger is incorporated into commemorative portraits...' (183).

[437] The story is recorded in the Miracles of S. Simeon the Younger. Simeon received a priest with his infirm son brought to him to be healed. Simeon blessed the boy and sent him away. 'The priest suggested that they remain with the saint since "the presence at your side assures us of a more complete cure." To this the saint responded "The power of God ... is efficacious everywhere. Therefore take this *eulogia* of my dust and depart, and when you look at the imprint of our image, it is us that you will see." The same *eulogia* was later used to heal another child, who was told that with the object "S. Simeon has the power to come and visit you here." ' trans. Hahn (1990), 86.

[438] Magoulias (1967) studies these sixth and seventh century ampullae and concludes that sorcery, relics and images are interrelated Byzantine phenomena which can only be understood in their relation to one another.

197

iconophiles as worthy of a similar προσκύνησις as that received by relics, and on the other hand the προσκύνησις offered to the actual devotional εἰκών was sometimes wrongly thought to include the material on which the εἰκών had been produced, Theodore had to isolate the devotional εἰκών as the pure bodily outline and formal likeness of Christ, the Theotokos, or the saint. But there was yet another phenomenon in this period which combined the notions of relic and εἰκών as likeness.

The ἀχειροποίητος cloth of Edessa was a well established legend by the beginning of the eighth century.[439] Whatever the origin of the legend or the precise textual transmission, by the seventh century the following is common to the various versions. King Abgar sent his messenger Ananias (Hanan) to obtain a description of Jesus (either by painting his portrait or a verbal description), but Ananias was unsuccessful either in his attempt at portraiture or to comprehend Jesus with his mind. However, Ananias brought back to King Abgar a towel with which Jesus had washed his face. King Abgar was healed when he offered προσκύνησις to the εἰκών of Jesus which remained on the towel. In 944 the Edessa εἰκών and a letter which Jesus wrote to King Abgar to accompany the imprinted cloth were placed in a casket and taken from Edessa to Constantinople, producing healings and miracles along the way, where they were deposited with other such relics as the crown of thorns, the nails from the crucifixion and the burying cloths of Christ. John of Damascus refers twice to the Edessa image and each time it is not as an image by which we might know the likeness of Christ, but as a relic which proves both that such a likeness is possible and that Christ gave his authority to

---

[439] See Andrew of Crete, *De sanctarum imaginum veneratione*, Migne *PG* 97.1301. I depend on the following for the largely uncontested information on the Edessa image: Kitzinger (1954), Cameron (1993) and (1998), Drijvers (1998), and Kessler (1998).

venerate his likeness.[440] In the 787 proceedings the Edessa εἰκών is cited as an example of the miraculous power of the εἰκών.[441]

That the Edessa image is more relic than εἰκών is illustrated by the history of the almost exact counterfeits made of the image and fraudulently exchanged as if the real item, while in Edessan hands. Further, considerable precautions were made by the court of Emperor Constantine VII to ensure that the image brought to Constantinople in 944 not be a counterfeit.[442] These accounts reveal the worth of the Edessa image to be primarily as a relic of sanctified matter. An almost exact replica or copy of a liturgical εἰκών was as valuable as the εἰκών from which it was copied. It was the likeness of the prototype reproduced in the εἰκών which was important, not the material object.

Kessler (1998) comes close to understanding the need for Theodore to dissociate the εἰκών from the material in the instance of the Edessa image when he notices the general insistence of Theodore to separate immaterial εἰκών from physical object. Although Kessler does not appreciate Theodore's intention to isolate the devotional εἰκών from any notion of relic, nevertheless in his historical survey of the Edessa image Kessler provides an interesting context for Theodore's arguments. Kessler strongly suggests that after 843 an heightened awareness of the dangers of the possible misunderstanding of the nature of the Edessa image led to a change in its designation. In the early eighth century Andrew of Crete had referred to the Edessa image as ἐκμαγεῖον (likeness or impression), but Kessler speculates that there was a conscious effort to re-name it as μανδηλίον (derived from the Arabic word *Mandi'l* for the object of the towel) in the tenth century. In this way, argues Kessler, the Edessa cloth itself was finally defined fully as a relic and not primarily an

---

[440] See *De fide orth.*, 89; *Contra imag. calumn.*, I.33; II.29; III.45.
[441] Mansi XIII, 189.
[442] See Kessler (1998), 137-38.

εἰκών. Kessler also notes that as the cloth itself was identified as a relic, copies of the image began to appear after it was received in Constantinople as a relic in 944. Such a copy of the Edessa Christ-εἰκών was now not seen as counterfeit but just as much an authentic εἰκών as the εἰκών on the relic itself. Thus the devotional Christ-εἰκών was separated from relic.

My argument suggests that it is no accident that the Edessa 'εἰκών as relic' was recognized to be potentially confusing and harmful for orthodox εἰκών doctrine after 843. Decades before, Theodore had drawn attention to this potential confusion in his *Antirr* I and II conclusion that the iconoclasts could only be defeated if the liturgical, doctrinal and devotional εἰκών was distinguished from relic. He mentions the Edessa εἰκών only once in a letter to Naukratios. It is surprisingly in a context in which Theodore is teaching Naukratios that Christ is not in the εἰκών by nature but by relationship, and therefore according to likeness (οὐκ ἐν αὐτῇ ὄντος τοῦ Χριστοῦ φυσικῶς ἀλλὰ σχετικῶς ... ὁμοιωματικῶς). Theodore offers no hint that King Abgar makes προσκύνησις to the cloth itself by nature (φυσικῶς), but only to the εἰκών according to likeness (ὁμοιωματικῶς).[443] On the other hand Theodore also uses the Abgar story to instruct Naukratios that Christ is not only to be offered προσκύνησις intelligibly, but also through his εἰκών (ὥστε ἐν αὐτῇ ὁμοιωματικῶς ὁμοῦ τε καὶ νοερῶς προσκεκύνηται Χριστός). The fact that the cloth was permeated with the bodily fluids of Jesus and therefore a relic was ignored by Theodore in his attention to image theology. In his teaching to Naukratios, Theodore separates devotional εἰκών from relic in the clearest way.

---

[443] This is not to say that Theodore did not believe strongly in giving προσκύνησις to relics, but only that in his teaching on images Theodore is careful to separate the image from the relic.

The εἰκών as work of art

Theodore describes the devotional εἰκών as neither a symbol, a narrative account of saving history, nor a relic. Positively, the devotional εἰκών was a depiction of Christ, the Theotokos or a saint whose image not only is an actual likeness of the appearance of the historical person and an indication of his or her glorified state, but also stretches over time and beyond physical death to the prototype such that the person depicted is made present to the beholder:

> In accordance with the affection and love which we feel for the Lord and the saints, we depict their countenance in images; we venerate not the boards and colours but the persons themselves whose names the images bear.[444]

Consistent with this description of the εἰκών, Theodore writes to John the Spatharius and praises him for using an εἰκών of saint Demetrius as a baptismal sponsor for his son of the same name. Theodore assures Spatharius that 'the great martyr was spiritually present in his own εἰκών (πνεύματι τῇ οἰκείᾳ εἰκόνι)', and 'the martyr clearly received the child through his own εἰκών (διὰ τῆς οἰκείας εἰκόνος).'[445]

Catherine Osborne states very well the mature and full expression of the devotional Christ-εἰκών and its place within Byzantine Christian piety. She articulates the positive doctrine of the orthodox iconophile:

---

[444] Mansi XIII.1063A.

[445] Theodore acknowledges that these claims were unacceptable to the iconoclasts (ἀκοαῖς καὶ ἀπίστοις ψυχαῖς ταῦτα ἀπαράδεκτα ὡς ἄπιστα, καὶ μάλιστα τοῖς εἰκονομάχοις) and speaks encouragingly to Spatharius that 'to your piety these things reveal self-evident proofs and manifestations' (τῇ δὲ σῇ εὐσεβείᾳ ἐναργῆ τὰ γνωρίσματά τε καὶ ὑποδείγματα πεφανέρωται).

201

... the argument is not that Christ *was* incarnate but that the Incarnation is an ongoing event that has fundamentally changed the relationship of God with the natural world. The point is not then that we can copy the once-upon-a-time incarnate Christ but that Christ is now in a position of being currently Incarnationable. A picture of Christ *is* the currently incarnate Christ, not a copy of an old no-longer-existent-man. Christ exists incarnate in art ... and he depends upon art ... for his current Incarnation.[446]

But these positive descriptions of the devotional εἰκών must be explained and defended. After his account of the controversy up to the moderate iconoclasm of the second half of the second decade of the ninth century, Theodore has pushed the iconophile agenda to its final and most crucial questions. He represents the 787 iconophile argument as having left behind the final vestiges of an essentialist reading of the relation of image and prototype, and as adopting a purely nominalist and formal understanding of this relationship.[447] Is then this relationship of ὁμώνυμα between image and prototype simply logical?[448] If so, does such a strictly logical theory of the relation of the Christ-

---

[446] Osborne (1987), 68. Henry (1976) makes the same point: 'Once the Word became flesh he did not subsequently become non-flesh. The heart of the Iconophile argument against the Iconoclast Christological dilemma is the insistence that the paradox of the Incarnation cannot be relegated to a period of thirty-three years several centuries ago. The Iconoclast wanted the world to be intelligible in its own terms once again. The Iconophile claimed that even logic itself had been irreversibly altered by the divine *oikonomia*.' (23).

[447] From εἰκών as physical object to εἰκών as pure image.

[448] See Anton (1968) and (1969) for a modern view which interprets the *Categories* to have a metaphysical as well as a logical intention. Anton (1968) points out the internal evidence in the Aristotelian corpus that the doctrine of ὁμώνυμα 'figures largely in Aristotle's various discussions on the nature of first principles and his method of metaphysical analysis' (315). He then outlines the approaches of ancient commentators on the *Categories* from Porphyrius (c.233-303) to Elias (fl. c. 550) concluding that these interpreters strayed far from Aristotle's text and meaning. Anton judges that one of the ways these neoplatonic commentators misrepresented Aristotle was to introduce the notion of 'intended' similarity to the discussion and to illustrate ὁμώνυμα by example of portraiture, especially in Simplicius (fl. c. 533) and Elias. Regardless of the modern debate, we know that it was through the tradition of Porphyry, Elias, David, etc., that Theodore would receive his knowledge of Aristotle, either directly or (at least partially) through the logical compendium of the day.

εἰκών to its prototype reduce the role of the image in devotion and contemplation to psychological and mnemonic explanations? Are such psychological and mnemonic theories strong enough to account for the notion that the prototype is present in the image in some way?

Barber (1995) is one who gives such a psychological and experiential interpretation of the relation of the Middle Byzantine Christ-εἰκών to its prototype and concludes that the theological debate in these centuries develops the devotional εἰκών into a 'work of art'. Avoiding the dangers of an essentialist discourse, 'For Nicephorus the icon of Christ ... is simply a work of art, no longer an image that can be considered as the one it re-presents.'[449] Barber attributes this particular reading of Nicephorus as the end point of the whole of the Middle Byzantine theology of the image. His careful attention solely to the writings of Nicephorus and his neglect of Theodore's argument leads him to his inadequate analysis and erroneous conclusion. Based on his study of Nicephorus, Barber attempts to explain the developed Byzantine εἰκών as a work of art as understood by means of twentieth century theories of the viewer's subjective response. This formalist interpretation is, in effect, a denial of the εἰκών as intrinsically worthy of any sort of offering of προσκύνησις.[450]

For Barber, Nicephorus' theology of the εἰκών is summed up in his own words: 'In painting there is nothing of presence...'[451] Barber insists that this conclusion of the iconophile theology completely separates art and worship, but allows that 'Such a reading does not preclude cultic activity being brought to bear on the icon.'[452] In his search for the

---

[449] Barber (1995, 7).
[450] Barber (1989), 80.
[451] Migne *PG* 100.357B. Nicephorus is simply distinguishing painting from circumscribability, insisting that there is not an equivalency. Painting the Christ-εἰκών does not circumscribe him.
[452] Barber (1995), 10 n.35.

best psychological theory to explain the use of the Byzantine image, he dismisses several, including the subjective inner transformation theories of Mathews (1986) and (1990), Franses (1992), and the 'gap' theory of Brubaker (1989). Instead, Barber posits his own psychological theory in which he calls the image a 'seat of desire': 'I would suggest that the icon maintains the gap between the icon and its archetype, and that the separation of art from worship is an aspect of this maintenance. The icon neither participates in its archetype, nor acts as a substitute for it; instead, it exists within its own terms as a site of desire.'[453]

Brubaker's theory is based primarily on her interpretation of Nicephorus' writings and is similar to Barber: 'The force of images is, precisely, that of the subjective: the beholder supplies an emotional response, the beholder completes the image, the beholder becomes, in a sense, part of the picture.'[454]

But there are difficulties with this general approach. For example, Barber does not offer a convincing account of the continuing orthodox Byzantine devotional use of the εἰκών after Nicephorus. Art and worship were not separated, as he claimed. Nor does his theory acknowledge the radical difference in the future development of the artistic image in the west and of the εἰκών in the east. The typical art historical overview of the different paths of developing painting styles in the west and the east cites the devotional εἰκών in the east as clearly distinguished from the evolving naturalistic, illusionist styles of western art.[455] Barber is not convincing in his argument that for the Byzantines the liturgical,

---

[453] Barber (1993), 15 n. 52.
[454] Brubaker (1989), 80.
[455] Belting (1994) notes that when the Greeks came to Italy for the Council of Ferraro-Florence in 1438, they were unable to pray before Western sacred images, whose form was unfamiliar to them. Thus Patriarch Gregory Melissenos argued against the proposed church union: 'When I enter a Latin church, I can pray to none of the saints depicted there because I recognize none of them. Although I do recognize Christ, I cannot even pray to him because I do not recognize the manner in which he is being depicted.' (1).

doctrinal and devotional εἰκών functions as a 'work of art' in that the viewer provides the only connection between εἰκών and prototype.[456]

Barber's general reading of Nicephorus is shared by others, including Mondzain-Baudinet (1989) who presents Nicephorus' understanding of the relationship of εἰκών to prototype as entirely formal and relative. As for Barber and others, this purely formal relationship demands a psychological theory to explain the power of the εἰκών to the Byzantines. Mondzain-Baudinet describes Nicephorus' writing as 'une doctrine de la médiation symbolique et de l'intentionalité imaginaire'[457]

These scholars have identified an important aspect of the eighth and ninth century iconophile *apologia*. They correctly see that the later iconophile apologists realized that the justification of the εἰκών had to avoid the essentialist language of such theologians as John Damascus. According to Barber, '

> Nicephorus demonstrates that the essentialist paradigm could be replaced by a
> formalist one. Through this discourse shift Nicephorus broke with the late Antique
> notion of the image and in its stead placed the icon, and autonomous visual
> discourse.[458]

---

[456] A completely opposite interpretation which better accounts for our knowledge of the actual devotional use of the image in Byzantium, is that of the social historian Cameron (1992a) who observes that in practice, "the images ... were taken to be not 'works of art' in the modern sense, but depictions of objective reality, and, as such, were held to bring the very presence of the divine to the worshipper. Images 'recalled' the Gospel narrative or the saint who was depicted, but were also regarded as having all the power of the personage represented.' (15).
[457] Mondzain-Baudinet (1989), 13. At the same time that she describes Nicephorus' purely formal and logical image theory she senses its inadequacy and wants to claim a greater relationship of image to prototype. She remains with psychological theory: 'Mais la "schesis" dit plus que le "pros ti", c'est la modalité relationnelle elle-même, c'est-à-dire l'*intimité vivante et intentionnelle* du visible avec l'invisible image.' (25).
[458] Barber (1995), 8.

This caricature of Nicephorus saves the εἰκών/πρωτότυπος relationship from accusations of superstition and the εἰκών from receiving excessive προσκύνησις, but only by betraying the Byzantine popular understanding and use of the devotional εἰκών. Barber turns his reading of Nicephorus' attempt to answer the criticisms of the *Libri Carolini* and the iconoclast theologians, into a 'consensus' of ninth century Byzantine theology. I will respond to this claim below when I highlight some of the differences between Nicephorus and Theodore and show that in a very different type of argument Theodore reveals that he is aware of the dangers of Nicephorus' approach. Theodore carefully avoids the conclusion that a purely formal, nominal and logical relationship of εἰκών to πρωτότυπος is a sufficient theological defence of the Christ-εἰκών.[459] *Antirr* III provides a theological defence of the intimate relation of εἰκών and prototype based on the identity of hypostatic likeness. Before we go on to that, more must be said about the liturgical, doctrinal and devotional character of the ninth century εἰκών.

The liturgical, doctrinal and devotional εἰκών

In Theodore's review of the eighth century arguments in *Antirr* I and II the iconoclasts successfully challenge the offering of προσκύνησις to the εἰκών as indistinguished from relic, symbol or pure narrative story-telling. Theologically, the iconoclasts have contributed to clarifying the unique character of the ninth century Byzantine εἰκών and the real dangers of idolatry and heresy inherent in presenting such an εἰκών as either relic or symbol. On the one hand, the understanding of the Christ-εἰκών as relic leads to an exaggerated emphasis on the material in which the image appears and thus obscures the

---

[459] Belting (1990), is a recent argument that the Byzantine εἰκών cannot be interpreted as a work of art in the modern sense but as having more the nature of the objective reality of its prototype - obviously the εἰκών does not share the οὐσία of the prototype, but neither is the relationship purely formal.

way the image operates in assisting Christian devotion and contemplation. On the other hand, the understanding of the Christ-εἰκών as symbol fails to acknowledge the peculiar claim of the Christian image to be an actual likeness of the body of Christ or the saint who is depicted. But if not solely narrative, nor symbol nor relic, what are the positive characteristics of the devotional εἰκών? Fundamentally, it was defined liturgically and doctrinally.

The conceptual isolation of the εἰκών is necessary for Theodore's argument to proceed. In practice, however, the εἰκών was neither an isolated object nor 'devotional' in a personal, subjective sense. The individual εἰκών was but an instance of the liturgical programme of images defined by the hierarchy of images in the church, which made present the entire saving work of Christ. Thus the εἰκών at the centre of the debate was as doctrinal as it was devotional, not only because it represented both the historical and glorified bodily likeness of Christ or the saint, but also because it ultimately found its meaning in its place within the overall οἰκονομία represented in the church iconic programme.

The detailed doctrinal programme and hierarchy of images was not fully developed in the early part of the ninth century. We know that by 881 when Patriarch Photius preached on the occasion of the consecration of the Nea Church built by Emperor Basil I, there was a substantial doctrinal programme of images in the church interior. He praised the mosaics which are clearly not of historical incidents from the Gospel, but are primarily portraits of Christ, angels and the saints, in an hierarchy beginning with the Pantocrator in the dome. In the next few centuries the full Byzantine programme developed a cycle of images demonstrating the οἰκονομία corresponding to the cycle of

207

Sundays and Feasts with their appointed Gospel readings.

But it is certainly not anachronistic to suggest that in the seventh and early eighth centuries the devotional εἰκών was already beginning to be defined doctrinally by its place within the represented οἰκονομία as if in a formal programme of images which might appear in a church. There is a primitive description of an ordering of images in the eighth century text in Migne *PG* 95.309-344. This text is no longer attributed to John of Damascus (the final text, though perhaps based on an earlier discourse, must be dated after 766 because it mentions the falling out of Patriarch Constantine II with the emperor), and Beck (1969) speculates its author to be John of Jerusalem. Its title indicates that it is directed against Constantine V (741-755). It catalogues the subjects of the images which are offered προσκύνησις in churches:

> Who will dare apply the word idolatry in connection with such a beautiful exposition of the order of salvation, and by so doing blaspheme against the suffering of Christ and his saints and of those whom holy Church has handed on to us? For the church we have received from the holy Fathers is a church adorned [and representing] what the sacred Scriptures also teach us: The οἰκονομία of the Incarnation of Christ, his descent among us for our salvation, the annunciation of Gabriel to the Virgin, and the following as well: the birth, the cave, the manger, the midwife and the swaddling clothes, the star and the wise men. In addition: the baptism, the Jordan, John who touches the head of Christ, and the Holy Spirit descending in the form of a dove.
> Let us move further on to his passion ... the crucifixion ... Furthermore; the resurrection, which is the joy of the world; how Christ descends into hell and raises Adam from the dead, and likewise the ascension. ...[460]

If a pagan should come to you and ask: 'Show me your faith, so that I too may

[460] Migne *PG* 95.313C. Trans. Schulz (1986), 52, 53.

208

believe,'what would you show him? ... Listen, then! You lead him into the church and show him its decoration. You open his eyes to the figures in the images. ... and in this way you bring the man to a knowledge of God.[161]

Theodore himself in Fatouros 532 lists a series of images as if they would be familiar to the reader in 826:

> Of what sort are the things which are perceived? Lo, on the one hand, this is the one who was born in a grotto and who was glorified by the angels, verily lifted up into the arms of his mother and offered προσκύνησις by the magi. Then as a young boy he was seen sitting among the doctors. Then he was baptized by the Precursor. He did miracles with the apostles. He mounted the cross, gave up the ghost, was dead, risen, ascended into heaven. In all these things therefore, everything has been contemplated by means of images.

Thus we see that the εἰκών which is at the core of the controversy is understood by both sides of the debate to have a basic doctrinal and liturgical character, largely defined by its place within the set programmatic schema of the οἰκονομία which was being developed in concert with the liturgical Feasts and associated Gospel readings. But the εἰκών was doctrinal in another sense as well and in his description of the εἰκών Theodore picks up on a theme introduced in *Antirr* I.7.

There the heretic reminds the orthodox that the true image of Christ is within the soul of the baptized Christian: 'He is formed in us by the Holy Spirit, who sends into us

---

[161] Migne *PG* 95.325C/D. Trans. Schulz (1986), 53.

209

a kind of divine formation through sanctification and righteousness (θείαν τινὰ μόρφωσιν δι' ἁγιασμοῦ καὶ δικαιοσύνης).' Theodore quickly dismisses this line of discussion because he wants the debate immediately to focus on the painted image of Christ. Later in *Antirr* I.17&18 however, he makes it clear that only those saints who have 'obtained heavenly glory', 'venerable and glorious', are depicted in a devotional εἰκών. Since there would be many other figures represented in the paintings in the churches, especially in the paintings which included a narrative scene, Theodore is again making clear that his argument in the *Antirr* has to do with a specific type of image, the devotional εἰκών.

In his catecheses Theodore continually spoke to his monks about their advancement in the spiritual life toward God. From the Fathers, and especially from the Cappadocians, the ascetic saints and Maximus, the tradition had presented to Theodore a notion of θέωσις which would be the final sharing of man in the being and nature of God. This process of deification begins at baptism (and thus Theodore says that at baptism Christ is formed in us *again* - ἀναμορφουμένου[462]) and is the goal of the Christian life sought through ascetic practice. This explains why the entire image debate focuses on the Christ-image. It is his image in whom we were made. That image was restored in our baptism, and the life of the Christian is a continual advancement toward the perfection of that image within us. The Theotokos and the saints have achieved the full image of Christ in their glorification.

This theme is dominant throughout the tradition. Gregory of Nazianzus sometimes speaks of man as 'κατ' εἰκόνα',[463] or according to Christ, the divine Image of the Father. According to Gregory:

---

[462] Migne *PG* 99.336D.
[463] Or. 1.4: 'Let us give back to the image that which is according to the image.' Cf. Or. 2.22; 6.14.

This is for us the purpose of the great mystery, this [is the purpose] for us of God who was incarnated and became poor, that he might raise our flesh, and recover the image, and form man anew, that we all might become one in Christ who became in all of us all that he himself is, that we might no longer be male and female, barbarian and Scythian, slave and free, which are the marks of the flesh, but might bear in ourselves the divine χαρακτήρ of which and to which we have become, and have so far received our form and model from him that we are known by it alone.'[464]

The notion that the human body takes part in the process of deification is an aspect of the ascetic tradition and has been alluded to at various points in this thesis. Just as the body participates in the purification of the soul in the ascetic struggle, it also reflects the progressive deification of the soul. John Klimakos teaches the gradual sanctification of the bodies of the saints during their lifetime so that they are 'in some way rendered incorruptible through the flame of purity.'[465] Maximus teaches that as the soul participates in divine grace, 'the body is deified along with the soul through its own corresponding participation in the process of deification.'[466]

If Christ, according to which we have our divine likeness, can be painted in an image then so can the saints who now have achieved the fullness of his image and share in his divinity. Thus the style of the devotional εἰκών is meant to present the Person of Christ and the ὑπόστασις of the Logos, God and man. It is likewise with the saints who are always imaged in their glorified bodies. If the moderate iconoclasts had achieved the compromise that Christ be imaged only before his resurrection, Theodore's argument

---

[464] Or 7.23.
[465] *The Ladder of Divine Ascent* 30; Migne *PG* 88.1157B.
[466] *Capita theologia et oecumenica*, Migne *PG* 90.1168A.

would be useless because the devotional εἰκών always depicts Christ in his glorified body. The Transfiguration, considered in *Antirr* III.A.53, demonstrates that Christ's divinity was ever present. His resurrected body is the same body as before the resurrection. In the case of the saints, even if we see them in a scene depicting an incident before their death and glorification, we remember them as those who are now glorified, and at that time who were on the path of deification. The style of the devotional εἰκών always depicts the prototype as glorified and sharing in the divine nature.

Thus the individual devotional εἰκών was timeless, reminding us of the historic life of Christ or the saint, assuring us of the presence of the prototype in the present moment, but most particularly reminding us of the fulfillment of all things in the final eschaton. It was given a meaning by its specific place in the larger scheme of the programme of images in the church, but each particular devotional εἰκών also spoke doctrinally, in and of itself, of the eschaton in the same manner that the divine liturgy found its deepest meaning in looking ahead to the final consummation of the entire creation. This is another way in which the εἰκών is 'liturgical' in nature, even if it is found in a home or carried by a person. The εἰκών has its primary place in the lifting up of the soul in θεωρία during worship, and thus the εἰκών and the divine liturgy give interpretation and doctrinal confirmation to one another.

Blowers (1997)[467] refers to a distinction which Maximus makes between the 'ages of Incarnation' and the 'ages of deification', suggesting that the 'ages of Incarnation' have already reached their conclusion for us in Jesus Christ, and that we look forward to the 'ages of deification' 'that have not yet (οὔπω) arrived, when God will finish the work of

---

[467] See also Blowers (1992).

his Incarnation by elevating and divinizing humanity by grace.'[468] The εἰκών proclaims that the 'ages of Incarnation' are fulfilled and directs our attention to the 'ages of deification.' But this direction of focus is in itself the means by which the 'ages of glorification' will come, as the faithful see in the revealed Christ-εἰκών and in the devotional εἰκών of his saints, the sanctification which is ours even now through the present indwelling of the Holy Spirit. The εἰκών has a part to play in both πρᾶξις and θεωρία.

This completes our description of the ninth century εἰκών as Theodore has presented it. It is not a narrative representation solely of a Biblical story for teaching purposes. It does not function as a symbol. It is not a relic. It is liturgically, doctrinally and devotionally defined. The one question which remains is the question which Theodore asked in his first image letter: why must the Christ-εἰκών be offered προσκύνησις? Theodore can now proceed with his argument, but where will he look in the tradition to find support? The sources of the written tradition handed on through the established florilegia were prior to the full development of the liturgical, doctrinal and devotional εἰκών and thus most of the passages defended the narrative story telling image as teaching aid, symbol or relic. In other words, a creative demonstration was needed to show that the necessary offering of προσκύνησις to the recently developed Byzantine devotional εἰκών falls within the parameters of the tradition. This is accomplished in *Antirr* III. To appreciate better the unique character of this creative argument and theological method of the *Antirr* III within the early ninth century context, I shall now present a general comparison of the iconoclastic dogmatic works of Theodore Stoudite and Nicephorus.

---

[468] Blowers (1997), 260.

***Antirr* III and the writings of Nicephorus as responses to 815:**

methodological difference

Both Theodore and Nicephorus wrote significant theological responses to the 815 Council. These responses have much in common, including the fact that they both introduce a greater amount of specific Aristotelian logical terminology than previously had been part of the image controversy. Yet even a general comparison of these two Byzantine responses also shows a critical difference in approach and method.

Although the increased use of the terminology of Aristotelian logic by Theodore and Nicephorus in response to the 815 Council is significant, I will not attempt to contribute to the general question of the Byzantine *Nachleben* of Aristotle in the seventh to ninth centuries. There is little doubt that the Neoplatonic tradition as transmitted through the Cappadocians straight through to Pseudo-Dionysius, Leontius and Maximus, forged the only framework available for any Christian theology in the Middle Byzantine period. Whatever the precise history of the recovery of Aristotelian logical terminology (whether through the fresh discovery of specific Neoplatonic commentaries and exegesis on the *Organon*, a renewed emphasis on the three tiered classical education which included a basic grounding in the logical works,[469] or simply the attending to texts such as the seventh century logical compendia[470] which were available but had fallen into disuse for a century or so), it is clear that the specific logical terminology of the *Organon* was

---

[469] An examination of hagiographical literature leads Lemerle (1986), 169 to conclude that the secular education in the ancient curricula (both the literary cycle and the scientific cycle) had continued unimpaired in these centuries. This literature attests to the study of grammar, dialectic, rhetoric, ethics, philosophy, etc. as well as to the mathematical disciplines of arithmetic, geometry, music or harmonics, and astronomy.
[470] Cf. Roueché (1974), 61-76.

taken up by Theodore and Nicephorus in the early ninth century. Although I have taken account of the opinions of current scholars on the cause of the recovery of the Aristotelian logic in the early ninth century, there is no need to summarize these speculations here. It is sufficient for my argument simply to establish the likelihood that there was no lack of complete theological texts available in Constantinople itself and more generally in the monasteries to allow Theodore the opportunity for a re-reading of the tradition in texts more expansive than the currently established florilegia.

Of the books produced at the 787 Council to substantiate the seventy or so florilegium passages, fifty of these books came from the Patriarchal Library of Constantinople. The Patriarchal notary remarks, 'We have come bearing the holy books which we have brought from among those deposited in the library of the holy Patriarchate of Constantinople, namely the canons of the Holy Apostles and of the Holy Synods, and the books of our holy Father Basil and of the other holy Fathers.'[471] Mango (1984) lists the bishops and abbots who provided the other twenty volumes at the 787 Council.[472]

We also note that speculation concerning the complete uncial manuscript of Dionysius the Areopagite presented by the emperor Michael the Stammerer to Louis the Pious in 827 at Compiègne includes the observation of Leroy (1961a) of its palaeographic and archaeological similarities to an uncial manuscript of the *Parva Catecheses* of Theodore. This makes it possible that the two manuscripts were produced at Stoudios and perhaps Theodore himself gave the Dionysian manuscript to Michael. Whether or not this is true, it is likely that the complete works of Denys the Areopagite were available to

---

[471] Mansi XII.1019D. See also Alexakis (1991) who claims that there were plenty of complete books present at the 787 Council which were produced not only by Patriarchal Secretaries from the Patriarchal Library, but also brought to the session by participating monks and clerics.
[472] Mango (1984), 31&32.

Theodore, although our argument does not lean on such dependence. More generally, Lemerle describes how the ninth century was the great century of Arabic translations of the sciences and philosophy, including Porphyry's *Isagoge* and Aristotle's *Organon*. For our purposes we need only note that this enterprise required the ready availability of Greek texts in the conquered lands. It is natural to assume that if the outlying reaches of the empire possessed such a quantity of manuscripts ready for translation, Constantinople would also have been rich in these full manuscript texts in which Theodore and Nicephorus would have been able to discover the philosophical tradition directly, or through logical compendia, or as mediated through theologians who themselves creatively had assimilated and applied the original and/or developing Platonic and Aristotelian philosophies. In addition to this common heritage and early education of Theodore and Nicephorus, I have outlined in the introduction how the intense literary and manuscript copying activity of the Stoudios Monastery, and the preparation involved in Theodore's initiative of teaching the monks at least three times a week from the ascetic tradition, would have significantly provided Theodore with a familiarity with the depth of the tradition.

Only this extent of availability of books would have made it possible for Theodore, as Alexakis suggests, to avoid quoting directly from the available florilegia but from the actual works. In his letters Theodore shows familiarity with the entire corpus of Basil's letters. Finally, in his study on Theodore's use of Gregory Nazianzen, Demoen (1998) concludes, 'We have seen that Theodore frequently cites Gregory, and sometimes gives evidence of perfectly knowing the context: he must have been thoroughly acquainted

with the works of the Theologian.'[473]

I have pointed out that the extensive or entire use of florilegia in theological debate does not show that complete texts were not available, but that the current theological method recognized the authority of tradition only in the established collections of texts. It also needs to be remembered that the avoidance of florilegia does not indicate in itself that florilegia were not available. For instance, Alexakis (1996) comments that Theodore 'ignored' the authoritative 770 florilegium. The immediate conclusion of Alexakis is that the 770 florilegium was not available to Theodore. A better explanation within the context of the broader evidence, is that Theodore's theological method included the reading of complete texts to discern the logic governing the arguments and the theological meanings of the key concepts. In Fatouros 499 we read that Theodore has received a βιβλίον from the monk Nicetas, asking about the interpretation of a quotation from Hypatios (the Hypatios text here is more reliable than the texts which were available in the florilegia at the time, at least from the evidence of the surviving florilegia). The βιβλίον is either a large iconophile florilegium, or a fuller or complete text of Hypatios. It is reasonable to assume that the extensive correspondence of Theodore would make him aware of every iconophile florilegium in use at that time as well as other fuller texts being read and interpreted.

In this discussion of the availability of books and theological method, it will be recalled that the assembling of books in 814 for the purpose of recovering the original context of all the citations from the previous iconoclast florilegia did not prompt a re-

---

[473] Demeon (1998), 82. We have noted above the witness of Lemerle to the availability of full texts in Constantinople in the ninth century, based on his review of the various theories of the possible sources and circumstances surrounding Photios' *Bibliotheca* which contained 279 summaries of books. Lemerle (1986) concludes, 'It is therefore certain, and this is what matters to us, that Photios procured in Byzantine territory and read in Constantinople the Greek books which he analyzed in his *Bibliotheca*.' (40).

reading of the complete texts. Consistent with the attitude of the previous one hundred years, these complete manuscripts discovered in the Patriarchal Library and elsewhere were not seen in themselves as a rich source of understanding the tradition, but only as the treasures from which authoritative florilegia could be substantiated.

Since Alexander (1958b) there has been considerable speculation to explain the sudden appearance of Aristotelian logical categories in the Byzantine iconophile arguments of the early ninth century. In the most general way, the availability of the Aristotelian logic in Constantinople in the early ninth century should not be surprising. It is probable that Maximus acquired his great learning, which included a thorough grounding in logic, through a private education in Constantinople.[474] Within a few decades, soon after 610, the Emperor Heraclius called Stephen from Alexander to Constantinople to teach and expound Plato and Aristotle in a new imperial university which probably was the school closed by Leo III in 729. Mossman Roueché has identified three logical compendia of the seventh century (composed after Stephen and before the Damascene) which he concludes to be school texts. In all likelihood these would continue to be used throughout the eighth century.[475] These compendia quote both Stephen and Maximus, show familiarity with the prolegomena of Elias and David, and give evidence of direct influence of the *Isagoge* or at least a text which contained lemmata from the *Isagoge*. It may be true that there was a significant break in the writing of actual Aristotelian commentaries from Stephen, pseudo-Elias and David in the seventh century to Eustratius and Michael of Ephesus in the

---

[474] He reveals in the prologue to the *Mystagogia* that he was privately educated.

[475] On the general question of classical education in the eighth century, see Speck, *Der Kaiserliche Universität von Konstantinopel* and Lemerle (1986). Speck challenges Lemerle's view that the classical tradition of three stages of education continued throughout the seventh and eighth centuries. In the introduction I mentioned the evidence from the sources of Theodore's life that after an elementary and secondary education, he studied philosophy, including ethics and dialectics. Migne *PG* 99.117-120.

eleventh and twelfth centuries, but in itself this does not suggest that texts of all sorts were not available in Constantinople for study throughout this period. Speculation continues about how much the actual writings of John of Damascus were available in the capital in the eighth century, but his writings were certainly known about. His Κεφάλαια φιλοσοφικά includes outlines of Porphyry's Εἰσαγωγή and of a Neoplatonic commentary on Aristotle's Περὶ Ἑρμηνείας. One hundred and fifty years after the Damascene and only several decades after the death of Theodore, Photius clearly has knowledge of both Porphyry and Ammonius[476] and gives his own explanation of the *Categories*.

Given this context, it is no mystery that Theodore's *Antirr* contains Aristotelian terminology, argument, logic and definitions and betrays a familiarity with the *Categories*. In this, he and Nicephorus are noted to be representative of a general, though perhaps short lived, Byzantine renaissance of learning dating from the last quarter of the eighth century.[477] Both Theodore and Nicephorus make extensive use of terms and derivatives of such concepts as συνώνυμον, ὁμώνυμον, ὅμοιον, ὁμοιῶσις κυρίως, ταὐτότης, σχέσις, λόγος τῆς οὐσίας and πρός τι. The availability and use of Aristotle in Theodore and Nicephorus is not an issue here, but rather to question why there is a lack of Aristotelian argument in the earlier eighth century image debate. We suggest that the answer lies not in speculation concerning the availability of texts, but in the discernment of eighth century theological method and the character of its argument.

This inattention to the argument and structure of complete treatises led to an unfamiliarity with and lack of appreciation of the logical components of theological

---

[476] Oehler (1964) suggests that Photius explained the *Categories*, wrote commentaries on 'many other works of Aristotle', and that his pupils Arethas and Zacharias of Chalcedon continued this enterprise (137).
[477] Cf. Alexander (1958), Lemerle (1986) and Parry (1996), 54-63.

reasoning within the developing tradition. Part of the missing arsenal in the eighth and early ninth century controversy which stalled the debate had been an imprecision in the use of theological language and the loss of adequate analytic tools with which to understand better the underlying philosophical and theological trajectories of the tradition. The attention given to the Aristotelian logic within the general renaissance of learning in the early ninth century is important to Theodore's project, but he insists that the recovery of 'scholastic' language alone or syllogistic formula in itself is not sufficient to break the theological impasse. I have noted above Theodore's caution in his preface to *Antirr* III that Aristotelian philosophy and logic is useful only if it is applied within the proper context and parameters of the tradition. This attitude itself is a dominant aspect of the tradition at least since Basil whose witness and writings were so important to Theodore. In a similar type of passage, Leontius of Byzantium in his *Against Nestorianos and Eutychianos* had qualified the usefulness of philosophy in theological discourse:

> the simple impression of things [can] produce in us complete and solid understanding. The [further] distinction(s) which we fashion in our thinking lead us to a more exacting understanding of the elements which constitute [such] objects. Continuing [however] beyond primary division to further subdivision of these parts into smaller parts is absurd. [For] there is no point in pursuing inquiry indefinitely. ... the endless drawing of distinctions is sanctioned neither by dogmatic conciseness nor by the Word of the Gospel; rather it is due to skeptical theorizing, and upon the excesses of an overworked and meaningless art...[478]

As in Theodore's *Antirr*, the Aristotelian influence in Leontius' treatise is unmistakable

[478] Migne *PG* 10.1296B,1297B. Translation in Moutafakis (1993), 99-119, 100-1.

both in form and substance.[479] Leontius' qualification quoted here is not a blanket indictment of philosophical inquiry but rather a caution against the divorce of logic from substantive theological discourse . This accurately reflects Theodore's attitude as well. Thus Theodore scolds a member of his community, Severianos, who did not have a sufficient grasp of grammar and philosophy to appreciate and make use of the technical language of the debate:

> For just as you have not discussed the reasoning of your argument neither have you heard from us what is required in this case. Thus you were led to suggest statements, perhaps from someone else who is an opponent, but more accurately an opponent of the truth. Indeed, such a one ought not to teach. I do not say this only because you should be quiet - for you bear that patiently - but also because you are one of those caught in the fellowship of heretics. I say that you do not have permission to open your mouth, but to remain still in an appropriate manner and to seek forgiveness with all your life. Since your knowledge and skills in dogma are not so great that you know how to speak in a precise manner, neither as a grammarian nor by clinging to philosophy, because even those who are wise concerning God do not propose something as dogma in isolation but swear by those who are inspired. I ask, where did it come to you to say 'the εἰκών of Christ is not to be offered προσκυνήσις σχετικῶς?' For do you not know what it means for something to be σχέσις? σχέσις is τῶν πρός τι, as the prototype is πρός τι its derivative. Surely this is the case for Christ and his εἰκών, because each is understood in the other and is separated neither by power not by glory. Indeed, since you have not been taught, you do not know to speak elegantly that this is the case. I see wickedness everywhere: men who seem to be wise only to themselves, who are scarcely so,

---

[479] Cf. Moutafakis (1993).

221

striving to teach others.[480]

After this strong condemnation Theodore goes on to challenge Severianos' suggestion that Christ is given λατρεία in his εἰκών. This reasoning is contrary and foreign to the tradition:

Οἷον δέ σου καὶ τὸ δεύτερον πρόβλημα; λατρεύεται ὁ Χριστὸς ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ εἰκόνι, ὥστε καὶ ἡ εἰκὼν λατρευτή. πόθεν τοῦτο ἢ παρὰ τίνος μαθὼν δογματίζεις; οὐδεὶς γάρ πω τῶν ἁγίων τοῦτο φαίη...[481]

(But of what sort is your second problem? 'Christ is given λατρεία in his εἰκών, therefore the εἰκών is given λατρεία.' Where and from whom have you learned this dogma? For no one of the saints would ever say this...)

This attitude is consistent with that found in Theodore's preface to *Antirr* III, written five years previously, where he suggests that the proper application of grammar and philosophy as governed by the tradition is crucial to the iconophile argument, εἰς βοήθειαν τοῦ ὀρθοῦ λόγου, κάμνοντος ἄρτι μάλα ἐκ τῆς ἐπιλυττώσης εἰκονομαχικῆς αἱρέσεως[482] (to assist the proper thinking, which is now greatly wearied by the iconoclast heresy). In this letter to Severianos, Theodore criticizes him on two counts. First, he simply is not sufficiently skilled in grammar and philosophy to enter the debate. Second, he has not been guided by the tradition for 'those who are wise concerning God do not propose something as dogma in isolation but swear by those who are inspired,' and 'no one of the saints has ever said this.'

---

[480] Fatouros 445.2-21.
[481] Fatouros 445.22-24.
[482] Migne *PG* 99.389A.

The preface to his positive argument in *Antirr* III thus indicates how Theodore breaks through the theological stalemate of the controversy whereas Nicephorus fails to do so, even though both equally use Aristotelian terminology and logic. Theodore is convinced that the renaissance of learning makes it possible for the controversy to be resolved only through a re-examination and re-appropriation of the tradition of the Church. Theodore appreciates that the 'new learning' is actually the recovery of a fuller Aristotelian logic which has been an essential element in the development of the tradition. The eighth century exclusive reliance on the piling up of florilegia prevented the discernment of the logical distinctions and the creative application of syllogistic argument which had governed the arguments of the past and the development of doctrine. Theodore's viewpoint is that the tradition must be read and understood in a deeper way which reveals how the logical categories properly had been applied to theological discourse. This approach allows Theodore to present a creative mode of argument in *Antirr* III which makes use of philosophical categories to interpret the tradition as a developing clarification of the οἰκονομία grounded in a firmly established and fixed θεολογία.

On the other hand the approach and method of Nicephorus' theological writings, dated between 813 and 828, has not sufficiently freed itself from that of the eighth and ninth century controversy as described in Theodore's review of the controversy in *Antirr* I and II. The eighth century had begun with the Damascene's keeping a strict conceptual distance between his logical and theological writings, and consequently he did not apply

223

the logic to the image question.[483] This was both a result of and a further contribution to the view that logic was a preparation for, but not necessarily part of, speculative philosophy. In like fashion, these two areas of learning largely remained apart in the writings and arguments of the eighth century. There was very little speculative and theological debate in the eighth century which furthered the logical distinctions or arguments of the tradition, for such debate was replaced by the collecting and organization of florilegia.

At the beginning of the ninth century this changed. First, the importance of Aristotelian logic was recognized. Nicephorus showed familiarity with the contents of Aristotle's *Physics* and *Metaphysics*, in addition to his logical works.[484] He seemed aware of traditional definitions and logical distinctions in a form typical of that given by John of Damascus in his *Dialectica*. Second, this logic was formally and studiously applied to the image controversy. A comparison of Nicephorus' writings with those of John of Damascus led Alexander (1958b) to conclude that the technical and logical character of the argument had been greatly intensified and refined by the familiarization with Aristotelian thought. A comparison of the Damascene and Nicephorus makes it clear that Nicephorus was more bold in turning Aristotelian definitions to the actual image argument than was John of Damascus. Nicephorus was determined to overcome the distance of logical and speculative thought as one might see, for example, in the Damascene's *Three Orations* in

---

[483] Oehler (1964), describes the Damascene's Κεφάλαια φιλοσοφικά as 'meant to be a definitive treatment of the problems of logic. It includes outlines of Porphyry's Εἰσαγωγή and of a Neoplatonic commentary on Aristotle's Περὶ ‛Ερμηνείας, discussions of φύσις and ὑπόστασις, and a collection of definitions.' Yet he says, 'It is surprising that in his theological treatises John does not use all the terms he used in his logical treatise but, almost without exception, only such as were used by the Fathers and only with the meanings which they had in the Fathers. ... It is therefore unlikely that the Κεφάλαια φιλοσοφικά was meant to be a general philosophical introduction to the theological treatises.' (142).

[484] Baudinet-Mondzain (1978) suggests that 'les connaissances de Nicéphore en matière de textes aristotéliciens sont vraisemblablement de deuxième main.' (85-106, 86).

which there is no speculative attempt to make creative and innovative use of the philosophical definitions found in his *Dialectica*.

Both Theodore and Nicephorus use Aristotelian language to refute the arguments of the iconoclasts.[485] They both use the language of the *Categories* extensively to counter the iconoclast view that there is an essential identity between image and prototype, distinguishing artificial from essential image and assigning the artificial image to the category of relations.[486] However, Nicephorus and Theodore represent two distinct phases in this beginning of the flowering of humanism. In the initial phase Nicephorus applies Aristotelian philosophical argument to the contemporary theological concerns, remaining within the set florilegia of the controversy.[487] Theodore also applies the *Categories* in his examination of the arguments in *Antirr* I and II, but in *Antirr* III he goes beyond this endeavour by using the recently appropriated philosophical categories to re-read the tradition and apply the philosophical and theological history to the contemporary image debate. Nicephorus' first step was insufficient for Theodore, and thus in the preface to *Antirr* III Theodore cautions that the direct application of Aristotelian reasoning to contemporary theological problems apart from the witness of the tradition (as found in

---

[485] Nicephorus wrote all of his theological tractates against the iconoclasts after 815: the *Apologeticus & Antirrhetici* and the *Contra Eusebium & versus Epiphanidem*. Finally, Nicephorus wrote the *Refutatio et Eversio*, described by J.M. Featherstone (1977) as 'the longest of Nicephorus' compositions; it is also the least satisfying: as we shall see, it is largely a rhetorical re-working of bits and pieces of the author's earlier works.' (xvii).

[486] Schönborn (1994), 215 gives a good example of Nicephorus' efforts to apply Aristotelian logic in his detailed and sustained refutation of Eusebius' formulation that 'The form of the servant has been totally transformed into ineffable, inexpressible light, into light proper to the Word of God.' Schönborn reviews this passage from 'Contra Eusebium', in J.B. Pitra, ed., *Spicilegium Solesmense*, vol I (Paris, 1952), 425f, in which Nicephorus not only uses the *Categories* to challenge the integrity of Eusebius' argument, but indicates a familiarity with Maximus' distinction between λόγος and τρόπος.

[487] In his recent critical edition of the *Refutatio*, Featherstone (1997) comments critically: 'Indeed, the *Refutation* is as much a work of oratory as of theology. Nicephorus here rehearses most of the standard Iconodulic arguments, but perfunctorily, it seems; and one cannot help finding the text's rhetoric more interesting in itself: first fruits, as it were, of the "revival" of learning in the ninth century' (xx). The analysis of Mondzain-Baudinet (1989) also supports the notion that Nicephorus represents the first phase of a two part humanist renaissance.

225

the argument of *Antirr* I and II and witnessed in the writings of Nicephorus) has limited

value. This application of Aristotelian logic had clarified some issues in the debate, but it

had failed to resolve the central theological dimensions of the controversy.

In the introduction to his own critical edition of the *Refutatio*, Featherstone (1997)

judges harshly Nicephorus' attempt to apply Aristotelian thought to the image debate:

> Perhaps most infelicitous of all is the author's use in the *Refutation* of the
> Aristotelian material which had been introduced into iconodulic argumentation in
> the second period of iconoclasm ... As with so much else in the *Refutation*, the
> Aristotelian arguments occur in bits taken from Nicephorus' earlier works.
> Compare, for example, the (already weak!) argument of the relation of image to
> prototype in the first *Antirrheticus*, in answer to Constantine V's Christological
> objections, with the inept refitting of this same argument in the *Refutation* in
> answer to the charge of 'counterfeit' images.[488]

Although generally more favourable in his assessment of Nicephorus' arguments,

Alexander (1958b) gives several examples where Nicephorus unsuccessfully attempts to

apply the Aristotelian doctrine of the categories and Aristotelian physical science, to

Constantine V's Πεύσεις.[489] He concludes that Nicephorus' attempt to refute part of the

Πεύσεις by an argument from the category of relation is 'erroneous'; that his lengthy

argument of cause and effect, dependent upon Aristotle's *Physics* and *Metaphysics*, 'is as

faulty as the one discussed in connexion with the category of relation;'[490] and that even

Nicephorus' unique contribution to the doctrine of images (his distinction between

---

[488] Featherstone (1997), xx.
[489] Alexander (1958b), 201-203.
[490] Alexander (1958b), 205.

circumscription and religious art) resulted in an argument which is 'confused.'[491]

Regardless of his 'lack of tight reasoning which distinguishes the works of the Aristotelian

school,'[492] Alexander says of Nicephorus' theological treatises:

> What remains true is that they are scholastic from beginning to end. From the first
>
> warning of the *distinguendum est* (γραφή and περιγραφή) to the careful definitions
>
> borrowed from the highest theological authority (John of Damascus), terminology
>
> and argumentation are coloured with the scholastic dye.[493]

The suggestion here is that the whole of Nicephorus' argument remains within the broad

conceptual framework that had been shared by the opponents since the beginning of the

controversy. Nicephorus was not able to understand the authority of the tradition of the

church beyond a piling up of florilegia. In this way, Nicephorus remained true to his

times:

> They [Byzantine thinkers of the seventh to tenth century] did not read them
>
> [ancient works] much; they were easily content with florilegia, collections of
>
> quotations, glossaries, commentaries and manuals. They did not seek out the spirit
>
> of them; everything seems to have been reduced to techniques. Often their erudition
>
> surprises us, but if we look closely, is ancient literature for them anything but a vast
>
> store of props at the service of a learned and complicated 'rhetoric'?[494]

Alexakis (1996) traces the development and dependence of the eighth and ninth century

---

[491] Alexander (1958b), 210.
[492] Alexander (1958b), 201.
[493] Alexander (1958b), 211.
[494] Lemerle (1986), 352.

florilegia and shows that Nicephorus made use of the huge iconophile florilegium of 770 which was the collection of all earlier iconophile florilegia, including the florilegia of the Damascene. His dependence upon florilegia indicates an understanding of the tradition as a set 'external authority' which did not lead Nicephorus to desire to understand the philosophical and theological principles as revealed in their historical development. Thus, he was not able to break out of the methodological impasse which had stalemated the debate for so long. For example, in his final work, *Refutatio et Eversio*, the first part contains a systematic refutation of the Horos of 815 and the second part is a criticism of the 815 florilegium. Alexander describes the second part of the *Refutatio et Eversio* as follows:

> Nicephorus' system of refuting the heretical florilegium is as follows. Wherever possible he undertakes to prove that the quotations do not actually belong to the Church Father to whom they are attributed. This proof is conducted in such a way that the iconoclastic quotation is confronted with undoubtedly genuine works of the Father in question and found to be inconsistent with this second text. Where this method of rebuttal is impossible, Nicephorus shows that although the quotation is genuine, it is not really directed against image-worship. This method makes the second part of the *Refutatio et Eversio* a long-drawn-out duel of quotations.[495]

It is precisely this 'proof text' approach which Theodore describes in *Antirr* II as ultimately ineffective in resolving the theological debate.

This discussion has established significant differences between Nicephorus and Theodore. As an early representative of the renaissance of Aristotelian thought in the late

---

[495] Alexander (1958b), 181.

eighth and early ninth century, Nicephorus is not skilled in his application of Aristotelian logic to the image question.[496] Theodore's superior skill in this regard, long overlooked by scholars, recently has begun to be noticed.[497] Nicephorus continues to see theological debate as grounded in the authority of tradition as transmitted fully in florilegia. This dependence on florilegia, characteristic of his age, hides from Nicephorus a deeper understanding of the theological issues within the tradition, and prevents his appreciation of the strength of the iconoclastic argument. This also makes it impossible for him to discover the application of the Aristotelian logic as it was 'baptized' developmentally within the writings of the tradition itself. The Aristotelian logic is not something apart from and applied to the issues of the tradition, but like the whole neoplatonic history, its philosophical tools and concepts gave shape to and influenced the formation of every aspect of developing Patristic thought. Theodore's *Antirr* III acknowledges the role of the Aristotelian logic in better understanding the tradition as an evolving clarification of the Christian οἰκονομία grounded in a firmly established and fixed θεολογία. Theodore's appreciation of the wider historical and philosophical understanding, gained through a re-reading of the authoritative texts of the tradition is what distinguishes *Antirr* III from the writings of Nicephorus.

It is within this deeper and renewed appreciation of the core teachings of the tradition of the Church that the resolution of the controversy will be discovered.

---

[496] Alexander (1958b), 201-211.
[497] Cf., for example, Featherstone (1997), xx.

CHAPTER THREE

The response to 815: Antirr III

The urgency

So far we have considered the entire *Antirr* from a theological perspective, and the style of

Theodore's writing encourages such a reading. The juxtaposition of the orthodox and

heretical positions throughout the *Antirr* clearly proceeds by the demands of an argument

which is highly structured and intentional. The reader is not caught up in the intrigue or

passion of an imagined dialogue between two rivals. The role reversed ἐρωταπόκρισεις of

Antirr I and II ('questions and answers': the heretics ask the questions in *Antirr* I, the

orthodox in *Antirr* II) and the interjections by the heretic of the most difficult theoretical

ἀπορίαι to his fresh argument in *Antirr* III, are formal, structured theological applications

of the long-established monastic literary genre.[498] In treating the *Antirr* as a purely

theological treatise I attempt to be true to Theodore's own purpose which is to offer a

theological argument within the Christian οἰκονομία whose timeless revealed truth is

applied to images and defended by definition and logic within the tradition. His opening

sentence to *Antirr* II reads:

> Because the word of truth is single and unshakable by nature, it is not subject to
> divisions of opinion or changes with time; for it is always glorifying and proclaiming

---

[498] As Louth (1998b) describes this phenomenon in Maximus: 'the scholarly tradition finds a role within the monastic tradition.' (77).

230

the same doctrines, since it is free from all subtraction or addition.

Thus to contextualize the *Antirr* as a 'period piece' illustrative of the style of argument of the second phase of the iconoclastic controversy is to dismiss the integrity of the treatise altogether. Theodore would have it judged by its legitimate use of logic and force of argument within the ongoing tradition.

On the other hand, the historical circumstances which prompted the writing of the *Antirr* can help to explain the situation to which the argument, although complete in itself, responds. For theology is not an abstract subject for Theodore, unrelated to Christian devotion, worship and service. His letters reveal that Theodore writes this theological treatise for urgent pastoral reasons, although in the *Antirr* itself there is little to indicate this, and no reference to historical event. There are suggestions in his three prefaces, however, which help to place the setting of the *Antirr*. There he speaks of 'a certain heresy threatening us, barking at the truth and frightening unstable minds'; of the heretics who 'try to shake the understanding of the simpler people'; and that correct understanding is 'now hard-pressed by the attack of the iconoclast heresy.'

It was the moderate 'new iconoclasm' of the softened claims of the 815 Council along with the offer of reconciliation to the iconophiles that the iconoclasts would endorse the putting up of images high up in churches (although likely only those which included at least an element of story-telling narrative), that signaled the crisis for Theodore, monk and abbot of the Stoudios monastery. The 815 Council convinced Theodore that much more was at stake here than just another church skirmish among the faithful in the east. As I suggested above, the claims of the 815 Council were carefully put together in such a way

231

as to be agreeable to both the emperor in the west (being largely in accord with the spirit

of the *Libri Carolini*) and the papacy. Although it claimed only to be promoting the

legitimacy of the 754 Council, the significance of the 815 ὅρος lay in its reserved tone.

Compared with the highly charged debate of the previous century, the language of the

ὅρος appeared to be balanced and moderate in spirit, appealing to a spirit of compromise

and toleration. It submitted to the council authority of the 754 claims, but reduced the

extremity of its language and demands wherever possible. Alexander (1953)[499] expresses

surprise at the conciliatory tone of the 815 ὅρος and comments:

> one will have to admit it is an exceedingly tame and disappointing document ...while
> they do not hesitate to revile their opponents in a general way, they hesitate to
> drive them into theological despair: the argument of idol-worship is officially
> disclaimed by the Council, and the famous dilemma of Constantine V -
> Monophysitism or Nestorianism - is presented without naming these heresies.

Alexander is wrong to suppose that the 815 proceedings were a 'tame' (and thus

inadequate) expression of a well known extreme position. Rather, the 815 position was

quite different from that of 754. It was representative of the moderate 'new iconoclasm'

under emperor Leo V and his freshly appointed patriarch Theodotus. This 'new

iconoclasm' is described by Theodore in his *Antirr* II preface and reviewed throughout

Antirr II. It acknowledges the usefulness of the narrative image,[500] forbids the offering of

---

[499] Alexander (1953), 41.
[500] In the *Antirr* II preface Theodore describes the new moderate iconoclast as one who says ὅτι καλὸν ἡ ἱστορία, ἐξηγήσεως καὶ ἀναμνήσεως λόγον ἔχουσα: (that the depiction is good, because it is useful for education and memory) Migne *PG* 99.352C.

προσκύνησις to these images, allows them to be displayed high up in churches,[501] and strictly forbids any post resurrection depiction of Christ.[502] The 815 ὅρος said very little on its own, content to gently summarize and condone the 754 Council (removing the names of heresies attributed to the iconophiles, as noted in the quote above), and to summarize and condemn the 787 Council for promoting the manufacture of spurious images (τῶν ψευδωνύμων εἰκόνων) and the giving of προσκύνησις to other images. It is at least possible that the wording here is more significant and the syntax more careful than modern scholars have noticed. A straight reading of the text of the 815 ὅρος suggests that its disapproval of the 787 ὅρος was twofold. On the one hand, it condemned the manufacture of a certain type of image (viz. τῶν ψευδωνύμων εἰκόνων) and on the other, it condemned the excessive honour which was paid to other images. These other images (i.e., those not 'spurious') were presumably legitimate to manufacture, but it was heretical to offer προσκύνησις to them. This would be consistent with the famous request of Leo V to Patriarch Nicephorus, in December 814, just four months before the 815 Council convened. This request of the emperor to the patriarch seemed innocent enough. Leo V appealed to the charity of Nicephorus for the sake of the laity who were unsure or confused about the offering of προσκύνησις to images, in the interest of οἰκονομία, to remove the lower images for risk of improper offering of προσκύνησις but to allow the higher ones to remain.[503] It would seem that the higher images could not have been those

---

[501] See *Antirr* II preface (Migne *PG* 99.372D) and the new-style moderate iconoclast who admits that Κἀγὼ δὴ τιμῶ ἀνωφερῆ ἐῶν τὴν εἰκόνα Χριστοῦ (I too honour the image of Christ, when it is placed up high.) Migne *PG* 99.372A.

[502] The final series of objections in *Antirr* II (Migne *PG* 99.381B-388A) is from the iconoclast who concedes Christ is circumscribed before his passion, but not after his resurrection, Εἰ καὶ ὡμολόγηται περιγεγράφθαι τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, ἀλλὰ μέχρι τοῦ πάθους, οὔπω δὲ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν. (381C).

[503] This new moderate view of the iconoclasts is reflected in the *Antirr* preface and later by the iconoclast speaker in *Antirr* II (Migne *PG* 352D and 372A).

described by the 815 Council just four months later as τῶν ψευδωνύμων εἰκόνων (deceitful or spurious images) because this specific type of image presumably would not have been permitted at all.

What are these spurious images? It is very possible that this could be a reference to the isolated Christ-εἰκών or full single εἰκών of the Theotokos or a saint, as opposed to a broader narrative representation in which such an εἰκών might appear? That is, if the painting contained no story-telling teaching value whatsoever, it would be called a 'spurious image' because its only purpose would have been for the offering of προσκύνησις. At the time that the iconophiles are being asked to accept the images high up in the churches (images which are at least partially narrative), the 815 ὅρος declares: 'ὅθεν ἡμεῖς τὸ ἰθὺ τοῦ δόγματος ἐγκολπωσάμενοι τὴν αὖθῶς δογματισθεῖσαν ἄκυρον ποίησιν τῶν ψευδωνύμων εἰκόνων τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐξοστρακίζομεν (Embracing the straight doctrine we banish from the catholic church the invalid production, presumptuously proclaimed [by the Seventh Ecumenical Council of 787] of the spurious images).'[504] My speculation about the identity of the spurious image is supported by the 824-5 letter of Michael II to Louis the Pious where we read, 'Imagines de humilioribus locis auferri ... [of the others] ut ipsa pictura pro scriptura haberetur.'[505] If this is a reference to the situation just prior to 815, the images recommended to be placed at the higher levels definitely contain an element of Biblical or church historical narrative, even if it might happen to include a formal εἰκών as well. If placed high in the church the narrative aspect of the image could teach but any formal εἰκών included in the painting could not be offered προσκύνησις.

---

[504] Trans. of Alexander (1953), 41.
[505] M.G.H. Leges, III.ii.479, in the *Libellus synodalis* of 825, cited by Martin (1930), 165.

Regardless, a very moderate iconoclasm is being described. Was this new moderate iconoclasm a compromise which Leo hoped to be acceptable to both east and west? It is possible to see this new moderate iconoclasm as an attempt by Leo V to develop a doctrine of the image which would appeal both to the political and ecclesial powers in the west (at a time in which it was important for the east to establish positive relations with Rome and the Carolingians) and at the same time as a reasonable compromise in the east to resolve the image controversy which had caused so much division in the church.

The hope of the emperor and bishops in the 815 Council that this moderate iconoclasm would find general approval within Byzantium was realized. Theodore's letters reveal that the moderate position of the post-815 iconoclasts was attractive to many and this relaxed dogma of the iconoclast position made it difficult to maintain a strong and rigorous opposition. In Fatouros 393 (c. 817-18) Theodore coins a word 'μεσοπόνηρος' to mean something like 'moderately evil' to describe how some orthodox iconophiles viewed the softer position of the 815 iconoclasts. Theodore warns that this minimizing of the heresy is treacherous and that the iconoclast heresy is nothing other than the denial of Christ. Theodore describes how the iconoclasts often operate; they appear to be friendly, first inviting the iconophile to have a meal, then for conversation, and finally to worship together. In response to these 'devious plots', Theodore encourages the faithful not to compromise by taking communion with the iconoclasts, and he sometimes forbids any association with them at all. At every turn Theodore uses the strongest language to point out the utter apostasy and great danger of the iconoclast position. Even after Leo's persecution comes to an end Theodore writes:

οὐδεμία αἵρεσις τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀναβρασάντων τῆς εἰκονομαχικῆς ταύτης αἱρέσεως δεινοτέρα. Χριστὸν ἤρνηται, εἰς πρόσωπον δέρει, πραγματικῶς καὶ λογικῶς λυττῶσα· τὸ μὲν φληναφεῖ Χριστὸν μὴ περιγράφεσθαι κατὰ τὸν τοῦ σώματος χαρακτῆρα, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἀναιρετικὸν τοῦ σάρκα γενέσθαι τὸν λόγον (εἰ γὰρ σάρξ, πάντως καὶ περιγράφοιτο, ἐπεὶ φάντασμα τὸ εὐαγγελιζόμενον μανιχαϊκῷ φρονήματι.[506]

(No heresy that has boiled up from the Church has been worse than that of Iconoclasm. It has denied Christ, and raging furiously by deeds and words it strikes him in the face. The one who babbles that Christ cannot be circumscribed according to his bodily character is a destroyer of the notion that the word became flesh, for if flesh it would be entirely able to be circumscribed, but rather he is a phantasm in the manner of thought of the evangelism of the Manichees).

Theodore insists in this letter that by the rejection of the Christ-εἰκών, Christ is rejected, just as Christ is confessed in the affirmation of his εἰκών.[507] Theodore became particularly discouraged as abbots and monks defected to the 815 position. By 817 his letters reveal that large numbers of monks joined the iconoclasts.[508] In Fatouros 333 he tells of a former orthodox Stoudite monk Leontius who sides with the iconoclasts and is made 'illegal' head of the Stoudios and Saccoudion monasteries. Even worse in some ways, is the strategy of some abbots formally to sign the oath to declare that one does not give προσκύνησις to the εἰκών, in order secretly to maintain the practice. Theodore writes sternly to the Abbot Eustratios:

---

[506] Fatouros 425.35-40.
[507] 'ὥστε τῇ τῆς εἰκόνος ἀρνήσει ἀρνεῖσθαί ἐστι Χριστόν, ὡς καὶ ἔμπαλιν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ ὁμολογεῖσθαι.' To Thaddaeus, 816. Fatouros 183.9-10. The same language is used in Fatouros 301, 817-18, written to those imprisoned from his own place of exile, and in many other letters.
[508] See Fatouros 275, 332.

The reports of credible authorities have caused me great pain. I speak of your hyprocritical oath. Pardon me, honoured one, if I speak candidly. It was not without reason that you were arrested by the imperial authorities and remained unpunished, that is to say, were let go free. ... And do not tell me that your churches have been saved, your τὰς ἱστορίας remain intact, and the name of our holy patriarch kept in the Office. That is what others claim who have been caught in the trap. It is not possible to have kept these things except at the price of betrayal of the true faith. What use is it to make ourselves useless who are in name and fact the Temple of God and preserve lifeless buildings? (τί τὸ ὄφελος, εἰ ἡμεῖς, οἱ ναὸς θεοῦ καὶ ὄντες καὶ λεγόμενοι, ἠχρειώθημεν καὶ ἀψύχους οἴκους περιεποιησάμεθα;) The εἰκών of Christ, as well as that of the Theotokos and of any saint, does not perish. It remains in them as in its prototype. The ones who really perish are those who seem to destroy the εἰκών: and the same holds true for those who treat such people sparingly, thus avoiding the suffering that results from speaking openly. ... Let the whole material world of things perish; let the certain damnation of the soul be known, which is the portion of every prevaricator.[509]

All of these factors help to provide the context for the writing of the *Antirr* which Theodore undertook only when convinced of the pastoral urgency for an adequate *apologia* for the Byzantine Christian εἰκών. He did not intend to present a disinterested theory of art or Christian representation, but suddenly and passionately entered the debate after the 815 Council and beginning of the persecution of Leo V. He undertook the dual task of highlighting the severity of the iconoclast heresy and encouraging those who had been banished, persecuted, imprisoned, and tortured for their faithfulness to Christ, the Theotokos and the saints, through their refusal to take an oath not to offer

---

[509] Fatouros 448.

προσκύνησις to an εἰκών. Only Theodore's own words can portray the urgency with which he writes. Here are three brief introductions to letters written in each of three years following 815. They are chosen not primarily as examples of Theodore's elegant yet sincere hyperbole in describing the Leontine persecutions, but to illustrate Theodore's determination to highlight the apostasy of the iconoclast position. It is important to note that each of these letters then proceeds to address significant theological aspects of image doctrine. In Theodore's mind there can be no divorce between pastoral and dogmatic issues. These letters also reveal that for Theodore the resolution of the terrible image controversy in the church will only be achieved by a renewed proper philosophical and theological understanding of Christian prayer and worship. The first letter is addressed to the exiled and imprisoned:

> Grace to you and peace, to speak to you in an apostolic manner, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ, who is our hope. For him and through him is our persecution, affliction, distress, destitution, exile, prisons, penalties and whatsoever other things we have met and suffered in tribulation. Because of this, my brothers in love, although our humble face is absent, we send this epistle to you as an encouragement that you may know that we remember you without ceasing in our humble prayers. We recollect and keep each one of you in our thoughts. With tears and groaning we lift our hands to God so that we might appropriately enter into your struggle for truth with one spirit and one soul and proceed from our holy monasteries, as from a nest. In this way we shall persevere even to the end through the strength of the Lord.[510]

---

[510] Fatouros 221.1-16, c. 815-16.

The second is written after the death of Thaddaeus (end of 816) and another 'martyr'.[511] It is addressed to fellow monks who have been imprisoned:

> We are, O brothers, in this crooked and perverse generation, as lights shining in the darkness of heresy, even as Christ chose us in his glory, in the glory of orthodoxy. As there were those who established us, even so we afterwards give support and example to them, and in the day of Christ we shall be found ecstatic with joy. And in truth we have the testimony of those devoted ones who shine even yet more brightly:[512]

The third is written from 'captivity':

> I am late in writing to your holy father because I was hindered by those keeping me in captivity. I heard a long time ago of your incarceration because of the Lord and the work of your brave struggle. But God is praised, who calls your piety to the confession of his son Jesus Christ, our Lord and our God. For to suffer bravely in defence of the εἰκών of his bodily χαρακτῆρ is nothing other than to be a martyr for him because the εἰκών is one and the same in hypostatic likeness to him who is imaged. (οὐ γάρ τι ἄλλο ἐστὶν τὸ ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ σωματικοῦ αὐτοῦ χαρακτῆρος ἐναθλεῖν ἢ τὸ περὶ αὐτοῦ μαρτυρεῖν· ἐπειδὴ ἓν καὶ ταὐτὸν τῇ ὁμοιωτικῇ ὑποστάσει ἡ εἰκὼν πρὸς τὸν εἰκονιζόμενον.)[513]

Thus, from his various places of exile and house imprisonment in Bithynia, central

---

[511] Fatouros 301.44-46. Thaddaeus died after having been flogged one hundred and thirty times. In Fatouros 186 he is called ὁ μάρτυς Χριστοῦ Θαδδαῖος (l. 30) and consequently Theodore begs his intercessions: Δέομαί σου, ἅγιε τοῦ θεοῦ Θαδδαῖε, πρέσβευε ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ τοῦ ἀναξίου δούλου σου (26,27).

[512] Fatouros 301.59-65.

[513] Fatouros 305.1-9.

239

Asia Minor, and Smyrna from 815 to 820[514] Theodore held the dispersed Stoudios

community together and encouraged many others through his voluminous correspondence.

We must remember that only ten percent of the letters from this period deal substantially

with questions of image theology. Although the theological and devotional controversy

and its accompanying persecutions affected all aspects of life in Byzantium during these

years following 815, Theodore exhibited a broader care and concern for his monks and

those who turned to him for counsel. In the 557 letters edited by Fatouros we find

correspondence to both men and women: laity, priests, bishops, theologians, patriarchs

and emperors. In these letters Theodore gives confidence to the Christian who is being

persecuted, urges resolve to the one who is being tempted by the iconoclasts, pronounces

harshly on those who have betrayed the offering of προσκύνησις to the εἰκών,[515] counsels

those who have repented of their apostasy, gives much spiritual counsel in many areas of

Christian living, teaches the doctrine of the liturgical, doctrinal and devotional εἰκών to

those who seek a greater understanding, arms those with doctrine who are being persuaded

by the arguments of the iconoclasts, and challenges patriarchs and emperors alike to

uphold the Christian tradition concerning the offering of προσκύνησις to the εἰκών.

During these years (821-826) the catacheses contained in the PC are also being composed

and sent out by Theodore, in which Theodore continues his teaching about the ascetic

struggle and the ongoing purification of the soul.

---

[514] See Fatouros (1991a), 17,18 who summarizes Theodore's movements during these years from the evidence of *Vita A* and *B* and the letters.

[515] Cf. Fatouros 384 (c. 818) which tells of the apostasy of a Stoudite monk Anatolios, and describes discipline for various forms of apostasy, including the apostasy of taking a public oath (written?) that they do not give προσκυνήσις to any εἰκών, and the act of whitewashing an εἰκών: 'If anyone swears he does not venerate a divine εἰκών, and does not receive an Orthodox monk; then, after taking the oath, recognizes his guilt, repents, and venerates secretly, the fault is grave, since he has already denied Christ, the Theotokos, and the saints. Let him be excluded from the divine mysteries for a period of three years, and this is very lenient. If anyone through fear whitewashes an εἰκών of Christ, or of any saint, let him be excluded from communion for a year.' (31-37)

The *Antirr* was written within a year or so of the 815 Council and as the persecution of iconophiles under Leo V was intensifying. It had a clear spiritual and practical purpose and must be approached in the particular context of ninth century Byzantium. Theodore was not defending the Christian representation of images in general, but the offering of προσκύνησις to Christ through the liturgical, doctrinal and devotional Christ-εἰκών. But at the same time that we admit that the historical context can assist us better to interpret the intent and language of the *Antirr*, Theodore only achieves his theological purpose if he is successful in producing an *apologia* which is grounded in a logical and philosophical presentation of the central themes of the tradition as established in Scripture, Fathers, Councils, creeds and canons. Aware of the failure of the appeal to the authoritative Fathers in the eighth century to produce such an apology, throughout the entire argument of *Antirr* III Theodore makes mention of only one quotation from Basil. *Antirr* III is the demonstration of the iconophile position that it is necessary within the Christian οἰκονομία for every faithful Christian to offer προσκύνησις to Christ in and through the Christ-εἰκών. To fail to do so is to deny the offering of προσκύνησις to his Lord. In the writing of *Antirr* III, Theodore is motivated by his care for the spiritual and eternal welfare of his monks and those who look to him for spiritual counsel.

The letters and the *Antirr*: chronology

In following the argument of *Antirr* III it will be helpful to have a clear sense of the chronology of the letters and their relation to the *Antirr*. In addition to the preliminary ordering of the letters which I outlined in the introduction, concepts and arguments within the letters also betray a sequential ordering which Fatouros and others have not explored.

241

Theodore's use of the phrase ἡ τῆς εἰκόνος τιμὴ ἐπὶ τὸ πρωτότυπον διαβαίνει from Basil's *De Spiritu Sancto* 18.45 is the most quoted passage in the image letters, occurring in twenty of the fifty letters. The complete sentence runs:

γὰρ ἡ κρατοῦσα ἡμῶν ἀρχὴ καὶ ἐξουσία μία, οὕτω καὶ ἡ παρ' ἡμῶν δοξολογία μία καὶ οὐ πολλαί, διότι ἡ τῆς εἰκόνος τιμὴ ἐπὶ τὸ πρωτότυπον διαβαίνει.[516]
(For as the power and authority which rules over us is one, so even is our giving of honour one and not many, because the honour of the εἰκών passes to the prototype.)

The phrase is quoted five times in the *Antirr*.[517] It is clearly the authoritative quotation and concept in Theodore's iconophile doctrine.

In the twenty citations of this phrase in the image letters Theodore makes an interesting change in the prefix of the verb. The verb διαβαίνει is replaced by the verb ἀναβαίνει. This change seems to happen for the first time in Fatouros 71 which is his letter to the 815 Council, presumably when they were still meeting sometime after Easter. This 'mis-quotation' is all the more remarkable in a letter to this Council because, as described above, Leo V had mandated John Grammaticus to take utmost care to procure books and complete texts instead of depending upon iconoclast florilegia. Theodore would have known this. After all, it was to the monasteries that the committee had gone to discover, consult, copy and collect full texts. He knew his letter would be closely scrutinized. Further, Theodore was not in exile at this time and had books at his disposal. Finally, in Fatouros 57, written five years previously, Theodore retained Basil's use of

---

[516] Fatouros 57, 28-30.
[517] *Antirr* I.8, II.24, II.25, II.29, III.B.4.

the the verb διαβαίνει in citing this passage.

But the mystery deepens. In only two of Theodore's letters dated definitively after 815 is διαβαίνει used in the citation of the text: Fatouros 170 in 816 and Fatouros 201, c.816-818. It is possible, remaining within the allowable datings of Fatouros, that these were the next two letters written after Fatouros 71, and that therefore there is a moment in 816 that Theodore consistently began to use ἀναβαίνει in the citation of *De Spiritu Sancto* 18.45. There are twelve image letters after this date that cite this phrase with ἀναβαίνει.[518] Fatouros' dating also allows that the other three letters (17, 479, 491) which use διαβαίνει in the citation, be dated prior to 815.[519] Further, if the *Antirr* is given a date within a year or so of the 815 Council, written in immediate response to the Council, then the *Antirr* itself fits into the theory that from a specific point in time in 816, after the composition of the *Antirr*, Theodore uses ἀναβαίνει consistently in the citation. But why?

First of all, it seems unlikely that this was a variant in the Basilian text at that time. In his consideration of the *Parisinus graecus 1115* (a manuscript dated 1276 with an archetype from 774/5), Alexakis (1996)[520] considers this passage as part of his review of the immense iconophile florilegium put together in Rome in 770 and its relation to the 787 Council. It was from this 770 florilegium that the *Parisinus graecus 1115* is derived. In his comments on the citation 'διότι ἡ τῆς εἰκόνος τιμὴ ἐπὶ τὸ πρωτότυπον διαβαίνει' which is included in the proceedings of the 787 Council, he suggests that the earliest source for the citation as it appears in the 770 florilegium is the *Doctrina*

---

[518] Fatouros 60, 63, 64, 221, 225, 305, 380, 393, 408, 427, 463, 546. These are all dated post 815, and conceivably after Fatouros 170 and 201 if these are both given early dates within Fatouros' scheme.
[519] Letter 17 is undated by Fatouros but traditionally is considered to be early, appearing in Sirmond 1.17. Letter 479 is dated by before 815. Letter 419 is entirely undated.
[520] Alexakis (1992), 151-2.

Patrum.[521] This citation finds its way via the 770 florilegium and 787 Council proceedings to the *Parisinus graecus 1115*. The citation in each of these sources is identical with the modern version of the text (Pruche 1968). The citation as quoted (διαβαίνει) is consistently found in John of Damascus[522] and Nicephorus. In none of this textual history is there any suggestion that Theodore would have discovered ἀναβαίνει as a variant to διαβαίνει in a received text of Basil. How then do we account for this exchange of ἀναβαίνει for διαβαίνει in Theodore's citation of Basil's *De Spiritu Sancto* 18.45?

Second, Theodore is renowned for his paraphrasing when referring to a text. This is true particularly when he was writing from exile without benefit of a library. Excepting Fatouros 71, all of the letters in which ἀναβαίνει appears in the citation were written when Theodore was in his third exile. These letters were written in various places of confinement from Metopa to Bonita to Smyrna, under Leo V, and from Smyrna to Acragas and finally to the island of Prinkipo, under Michael II. It is unlikely that he was able to consult books. Nicephorus, on the other hand, although less able to communicate and correspond with others, continued to have a 'well stocked library' at his disposal during his imprisonment.[523] Thus perhaps Theodore, without his books at hand, mistakenly recalled the verb with ἀνά- prefix instead of the correct διά- prefix. According to this speculation, Theodore would have composed the *Antirr* just before his exile, with books at hand and the citation quoted accurately.

Militating against this theory are three considerations. First is the use of ἀναβαίνει

---

[521] The *Doctrina patrum de Incarnatione Verbi* is an up to date dogmatic florilegium of Christological orthodoxy from the early eighth century. It cites 93 different writers and documents under a series of doctrinal headings.

[522] *Contra imaginum* I.21,41-43; I.35, II.31, III.48; I.51, II.47. Kotter (1975) 108, 147, 154.

[523] This is the opinion of Alexander (1958b) and O'Connell (1972) who cites Photius, *Epistolae*, Migne *PG* 102.768. This is also borne out by Nicephorus' texts. In late 816 Theodore describes him as 'hidden away' (ἐν παραβύστω). Fatouros 222.

in Fatouros 71 to the 815 Council when we know Theodore had books at hand. Second is the importance of this citation for Theodore's εἰκών theory and his use of the correct form of the verb in five letters before 815. Third, in Fatouros 427 (undated[524]) a monk Theodoros writes to Theodore and challenges his substitution of ἀναβαίνει for διαβαίνει in the Basil citation. Let us observe Theodore's reply.

Theodore immediately admits the error (τὸ σφάλμα). But then he goes on to defend his use of ἀναβαίνει. 'Besides, in this it bears both understandings. (πλὴν εἰς ταὐτὸν φέρει τὸν νοῦν ἀμφότερα.)' Theodore claims that both in the case of the natural image (φυσικῆς εἰκόνος) and of the image technically produced (τεχνητῆς), the honour of the image ascends to the prototype. (ἡ τῆς εἰκόνος τιμὴ ἐπὶ τὸ πρωτότυπον ἀναβαίνει).

Theodore then interprets Luke 10.16, 'He who rejects you, rejects me; and he who rejects me, rejects the one who sent me.' He reasons that as the Son is the natural image of the Father, so the fashioned devotional εἰκών is the τὸ τεχνητὸν image of the Son. According to similarity (καθ' ὁμοίωσιν) our 'character' (ὁ χαρακτήρ) has a relation to the Incarnate Son, but not to the Father:

ἐπειδὴ θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων τὸ μέσον ἄπειρον· ὅτι ὁ μὲν ἄκτιστος, ἀπερίληπτος, ἀπερίγραπτος καὶ ὅσα τῆς αὐτῆς συστοιχίας, ἄνθρωποι δὲ κτίσμα, σῶμα, περιγραμμὸς καὶ ὅσα ὁμόστοιχα τούτων.

(Because there is an infinite distance between God and man. For God is uncreated, incomprehensible, uncircumscribable, and those things of his rank: but men are created, in body, able to be depicted and whatsoever of those things are of his rank.)

---

[524] Fatouros refuses to assign a date. He cites Dobroklonskij who suggests 815-826. Our argument will indicate c. 819-826.

We learn here that Theodore's use of ἀνά- has to do with emphasizing the ineffable nature of the Godhead and maintaining an awareness of the infinite distance between God and man. As the mediator, Christ is approached by us through his fashioned εἰκών (which shows a 'character' similar to ours), and in turn Christ approaches his Father as his natural εἰκών. Christ both reveals the Godhead and maintains its essential hiddenness at the same time. He is the one mediator between God and man.

Theodore thanks the monk Theodoros for his question about ἀνά- and διά- because it helps to clarify the relation of the εἰκών of Christ to Christ himself and thus to the Father:

Καὶ εὖγε τὸ πρόβλημά σου, ὅτι ὑπέδειξεν ἡμῖν ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς θεολέκτου φωνῆς ἐν τῇ ἀθετήσει τῆς εἰκόνος αὐτὸν ἀθετεῖσθαι καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀθετήσει ἀθετεῖσθαι τὸν πατέρα τὸν πέμψαντα αὐτόν· καὶ εὑρίσκονται οἱ εἰκονομάχοι οὐκ ἀρνησίχριστοι μόνον, ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ τρισάρνητοι.

(And I am glad of your question, because it shows us from the divinely inspired voice itself that in despising the εἰκών he himself is despised: and in despising Christ himself the Father who sent him is despised. The iconoclasts are discovered therefore not to be deniers of Christ alone, but deniers of the three.)

This is a crucial point for Theodore's image theology. The offering of προσκύνησις to the εἰκών ultimately rises to the incomprehensible Trinity. In the same way, the despising of the εἰκών equally rises to the ineffable Trinity. In my opinion Theodore fears that this will not be understood unless he replaces διαβαίνει with ἀναβαίνει in the Basil citation; Theodore is not suggesting that Basil is in need of

correction, but only that his original meaning bears the sense of both prefixes. Fatouros 427 continues:

τὸ δὲ "διαβαίνει", ὅτι εἰς ταὐτὸν φέρει ἡ διάβασις τῇ ἀναβάσει ... ὥστε τὸ ἀναβαίνειν καὶ τὸ διαβαίνειν εἰς ταὐτὸν φέρει.

(With respect to 'crossing over', it bears 'the crossing over' in 'the ascending' ... Thus 'to ascend' and to 'cross over' are equally legitimate.)

Within the general tradition, before the current demands to justify the devotional εἰκών, notions such as of 'the Lord ascending' and 'Moses crossing over' were all understood to be included in the verb διαβαίνει. Theodore knows that the phrase in its original context described the relation between God the Only-Begotten Son and God the Father:

Υἱὸς γὰρ ἐν τῷ Πατρί, καὶ Πατὴρ ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ· ἐπειδὴ καὶ οὗτος τοιοῦτος, οἷος ἐκεῖνος, κἀκεῖνος οἷόσπερ οὗτος· καὶ ἐν τούτῳ τὸ ἕν.

(The Son is in the Father and the Father in the Son; What the Father is, the Son is likewise and vice versa - such is the unity.)

In this context the use of the verb prefixed by ἀνά- would be inappropriate. Basil wants to emphasize the divinity of Christ and goes on in the next sentence to say that being in the image of the Father in no way diminishes his divinity nor separates the glory given to either of them. The honour and glory given to the Son passes over (διαβαίνει) to the Father because they are of the same 'rank (ὁμόστοιχα). In replacing διά- with ἀνά- Theodore claims that he is only bringing to the present debate that which Basil originally

247

intended and that which is true to the tradition. In the case of the προσκύνησις offered to

the Christ-εἰκών, it must rise (ἀνά-) to one of a different order (the Trinity).

This shift in prefix is acceptable for Theodore precisely because he knows the

tradition so well. He is aware that throughout the Cappadocian and more recent ascetic

tradition the terms διαβαίνειν/διάβασις, ἀναβαίνειν/ἀνάβασις, μεταβαίνειν/μετάβασις

and other like compounds are used sometimes interchangeably and with a variety of

meanings to speak of the ascent of the soul to God or the passage from sensible to

intelligible realities. This general phenomenon, from Origen to Maximus, is commented on

by Blowers (1991), 96-100. Blowers describes how Maximus uses a number of

compounds of βαίνειν to describe various aspects of the spiritual ascent and their

relatedness. He then speculates why Maximus betrays a preference for the language of

διαβαίνειν/διάβασις (whereas, for example, Gregory of Nyssa prefers the ἀνά-

terminology):

> [Maximus] concentrates on διαβαίνειν/διάβασις because they can convey for him
> both a sense of *transcendence* - in keeping with the need to 'pass over,' or to
> 'ascend beyond,' sensible objects and the passions which they can spark - and yet
> also a crucial sense of *continuity*, namely, the necessity of first 'passing through' or
> 'penetrating' sensible objects en route to the intelligible or spiritual truth that
> inheres, by grace, in those sensible things. ... Maximus strives to reflect the
> hierarchy and harmony, but also the dynamism and continuity, inherent in the
> created order ...[525]

Blowers' comments reveal why Theodore might choose to shift Basil's verb to

---

[525] Blowers (1991), 97, 99.

that of ἀναβαίνει. It was precisely the sense of continuity of the prototype with the sensible object of the εἰκών (implied by the prefix διά-) that caused so much confusion in the image controversy. Whereas John of Damascus gave an apology for images in much the same terms which Blowers here attributes to Maximus - of divine inherence 'by grace, in those sensible things' - Theodore carefully avoids this language in his argument. Rather, as Theodore makes clear in Fatouros 427, the verb change is made precisely because ἀνά- suggests the necessary sense of *transcendence* - of a passage of honour simultaneously from the Christ-εἰκών to Christ himself, and from Christ to the very Godhead.

All this explains why, in his letter to the 815 Council (Fatouros 71) Theodore makes the prefix change in the verb. He tells us in the preface to *Antirr* II that the moderate iconoclasm of 815 focused again on the charge of idolatry, as the bishops 'try to shake the understanding of the simpler people by saying that in offering προσκύνησις to the εἰκών they are worshipping the creation instead of the Creator.' As he later explains in Fatouros 427, Theodore wanted to use language which avoided this charge of idolatry, and to offer an understanding of the offering of προσκύνησις to the εἰκών which maintained the 'infinite distance between God and man.'[526]

A reading of the image letters in the chronology suggested by Fatouros has led us to an analysis of the re-working of a phrase in *De Spiritu Sancto* 18.45. It seems likely that at a certain point in his thinking about the image question, within eighteen months of the April 815 Council, Theodore decided consistently to replace διαβαίνει with ἀναβαίνει in the citation. If this is so, the *Antirr* and the letters Fatouros 170 and 201 must be dated within these eighteen months. Fatouros 17, 479, 491 would all be dated prior to 815. As well as offering evidence for the dating of these letters, the discussion of

[526] Fatouros 427.

249

this citation from Basil will assist in the continuing argument.

The pre-815 letters

Consideration of Theodore's image theology must begin with Fatouros 57 and the other three image letters dated prior to 815. Fatouros 57 is the best known of all the letters because it has been often quoted by scholars as a succinct expression of Theodore's image theology. In it Plato has asked Theodore to give the reason 'why it is necessary to offer προσκύνησις to the holy Christ-εἰκών. (πῶς δεῖ τὴν σεπτὴν Χριστοῦ εἰκόνα προσκυνεῖν).' This is the question which will direct all of Theodore's writing on image theology. It is important always to keep in mind that he has no interest in writing about 'image theology' *per se.* His writing is driven by his concern for the spiritual well-being of Christians who are being denied access to worship of Christ and the Holy Trinity by the iconoclasts who forbid the offering of προσκύνησις to the εἰκών of Christ, the Theotokos or one of the saints. I have explained above why the resolution of the question of the Christ-εἰκών will also resolve all concerns about the offering of προσκύνησις to the εἰκών of the Theotokos or any of the saints. When I speak about Theodore's image theology, I mean his attention to this question which Plato has put to him. Theodore addresses the broader issues of image theology only inasmuch as they support his defence of the offering of προσκύνησις to the Christ-εἰκών. Theodore's remarks in Fatouros 57 must be understood in this context. He will speak both of the specific relation of the Christ-εἰκών to Christ, and of the relation of the Divine Image of the only-begotten Son to the Father. Theodore's response is clear and definitive. He claims it wholly to be 'leaning upon the teachings of the Fathers.'[527]

---

[527] ...τῇ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων διδασκαλίᾳ ἐπερειδόμενον. Fatouros 57.114,115.

We are not surprised to learn that Theodore is writing only after being prompted for some time by Plato. He also mentions in his introductory remarks that he has spoken out before about this question. The only texts we have of Theodore before this date are a few of his early catecheses, in which he does not give significant teaching concerning the offering of προσκύνησις to the Christ-εἰκών, and the image letters 17, 479 and 491. Of these, only 491 directly addresses the question in a way which might make it the previous image treatise to which Theodore refers. There are some interesting comparisons and positive indications.

Fatouros 491 is a shorter letter than Fatouros 57, and it is prefaced by the precise formal question, 'What should one call the Christ-εἰκών and why is it necessary to offer προσκύνησις to it?'[528] Both letters cite the *De Spiritu Sancto* 18.45 passage, with the verb διαβαίνει. Both letters say that if the Christ-εἰκών is not offered προσκύνησις then 'the mystery of the οἰκονομία'[529] (τὸ τῆς οἰκονομίας μυστήριον) or 'the οἰκονομία of Christ'[530] (ἡ Χριστοῦ οἰκονομία) is destroyed. Both letters warn that λατρεία must not be given to the Christ-εἰκών, but then go on to describe how the offering of προσκύνησις to the Christ-εἰκών ascends to the Holy Trinity:

οὕτως οὐδὲ τῇ Χριστοῦ εἰκόνι λατρευτέον, ἀλλὰ προσκυνητέον, πασῶν τῶν προσκυνήσεων διὰ μέσου τῶν κατ' αὐτὰς πρωτοτύπων ἐπὶ τὴν μίαν καὶ μόνην λατρευτικὴν προσκύνησιν τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος ἀναφερομένων·[531]

(Thus one must not give λατρεία to the εἰκών of Christ, but rather one must offer προσκύνησις, such that all those offering προσκύνησις through the means of the

---

[528] Πῶς δεῖ καλεῖν τὴν Χριστοῦ εἰκόνα καὶ πῶς αὐτὴν προσκυνεῖν χρή. Fatouros 491.3.
[529] Fatouros 491.26.
[530] Fatouros 57.116.
[531] Fatouros 491.33-35.

prototypes themselves, are raised up into the one and only giving of λατρεία, offering προσκύνησις to the Holy Trinity.)

διὰ μέσου τῶν κατ' αὐτὰς πρωτοτύπων ἐπὶ θεὸν ἀναβαινούσης καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μιᾶς καὶ μόνης οὔσης λατρευτικῆς προσκυνήσεως τῆς ἁγίας καὶ ὁμοουσίου Τριάδος.[532]

(...[those who approach the εἰκών] are raised up to God by means of the prototypes themselves and because of this there is one only offering of προσκύνησις which is λατρεία for the holy and consubstantial Trinity...)

This similarity of content and expression indicates the likelihood that as he writes Fatouros 57, Theodore has his previous letter 491 in front of him, expanding and enhancing his initial answer to the question of offering προσκύνησις to the Christ-εἰκών. In no other letter of the corpus does the expression 'διὰ μέσου τῶν κατ' αὐτὰς πρωτοτύπων' appear. One can easily identify the themes of Fatouros 491 as they are expanded in Fatouros 57.

Fatouros 491 says that there are those who refuse to offer προσκύνησις to the holy εἰκών and those who say that in their offering of προσκύνησις the prototypes themselves (αὐτὰ τὰ πρωτότυπα) are offered προσκύνησις naturally (φυσικῶς). Both positions are said to be equally blasphemous. If this is Theodore's first attempt to explain the necessity of offering προσκύνησις to the Christ-εἰκών, it is clear that he decides in Fatouros 57 that his position requires a consideration of the notions of natural and artificial images. He must explain at greater length how it is that the Christ-εἰκών can be so closely linked with Christ, yet not share his divine οὐσία.

---

[532] Fatouros 57.124-126.

It is also significant that Theodore uses a word in Fatouros 491 which he will never pick up again. This might be another indication that Fatouros 491 is Theodore's first image letter. The word 'μεθεκτῶς' does not appear in any subsequent image letter. Lampe (1961) translates this word 'by participation'.[533] Theodore tells us that the prototype exists naturally but the derivative 'by participation'. (ὅτι ἐκεῖ μὲν φυσικῶς, ἐνταῦθα δὲ μεθεκτῶς πάρεστιν.[534]) Theodore may have borrowed this idea from the Cappadocians' use of the concept of 'participation' in their understanding of man being in the 'image' and 'likeness' of God.[535] In their view, 'participation' is what produces the likeness of the copy to the prototype, and generally implies a sharing in the being of the prototype. The possibility of sharing in the being of God explains how the human image can participate increasingly in the divine attributes. However, regardless of Theodore's source, it is tempting to speculate that after this first image letter, Theodore decides to avoid this suggestive language of 'participation' with its imprecise yet strong ontological overtones.

Theodore begins Fatouros 57 by defining the artificial εἰκών as follows:

Πᾶσα τοίνυν τεχνητὴ εἰκὼν ὁμοίωσίς ἐστιν οὗ ἂν ᾖ εἰκὼν καὶ ἐν ἑαυτῇ τὸν χαρακτῆρα τοῦ ἀρχετύπου μιμητικῶς δείκνυσι.

(Every artificial εἰκών is a likeness of that of which it is the εἰκών, in itself showing the χαρακτῆρ of its ἀρχετύπος imitatively.)

Dionysius' *EH* 4.3 is quoted in support:

[533] Lampe (1961) cites it as a word which does not appear in Liddell and Scott.
[534] Fatouros 491.16,17.
[535] See Harrison (1992), chapter three, 'The ontology of human participation in God'.

253

τὸ ἀληθὲς ἐν τῷ ὁμοιώματι, τὸ ἀρχέτυπον ἐν τῇ εἰκόνι, τὸ ἑκάτερον ἐν

ἑκατέρῳ, παρὰ τὸ τῆς οὐσίας διάφορον·

(... the truth in the likeness, the archetype in the εἰκών, each in the other, except

for the difference in substance.)

The εἰκών is said to be identical to the prototype 'by similarity'. (ταὐτὸν γὰρ ἡ εἰκὼν

τῷ ἀρχετύπῳ τῇ ὁμοιώσει.)

From this definition Theodore confidently claims that it follows that any and full

προσκύνησις offered to the εἰκών is offered to the prototype undivided. This is

supported by Basil's *De Spiritu Sancto* 18.45. In the following brief commentary on this

text, notice how Basil's original intention to protect the unity of 'our giving of honour' to

both the εἰκών and the prototype is matched here with Theodore's additional equal

emphasis on the unity of εἰκών and prototype:

εἰ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ πρωτότυπον διαβαίνει, οὐκ ἄλλη καὶ ἄλλη, ἀλλὰ μία καὶ ἡ αὐτὴ

τιμητικὴ προσκύνησις, ὥσπερ ἕν καὶ ταὐτὸν τὸ προσκυνούμενον κἀν τῇ εἰκόνι

πρωτότυπον.

(But if it [the honour] passes to the prototype, it is not more than one, but one and

the same honorable offering of προσκύνησις, just as the prototype which receives

προσκύνησις is one and the same even if it is in the εἰκών.)

Theodore next distinguishes natural εἰκών from imitative εἰκών. The natural image

(φυσικὴ εἰκών) has a hypostatic but not natural difference from its cause (αἴτιον) [536] The

---

[536] ἡ μὲν οὐ φυσικὴν διαφορὰν ἔχουσα πρὸς τὸ αἴτιον, ἀλλ' ὑποστατικήν.

Son is the natural εἰκών of his Father. The imitative εἰκών (εἰκὼν μιμητική) has a natural but not hypostatic difference.[537] The Christ-εἰκών is the imitative image of Christ.

As the relation of the εἰκών (of the emperor) is in relation to the emperor μιμητικῶς, so is the relation of the Son to the Father φυσικῶς. As in the case of the artificial image (τὸ τεχνητόν) the likeness is according to shape,[538] so in the case of the divine and simple nature, the unity is that of the community of the Godhead.[539]

Theodore implies that these concepts and definitions must be rigorously applied in order to understand his caution in Fatouros 491 about the dangers of falling into one of two contrary heresies: of either attributing a substantial identity to the artificial εἰκών and prototype and eliminating their difference, or of not recognizing the hypostatic identity and thus dividing the προσκύνησις.

Theodore gives the well-known illustrations of the εἰκών in the mirror and the impression of the signet ring to stress that the material itself (i.e. the mirror or the wax in these instances) is not part of the εἰκών. He concludes:

ἀκοινωνήτου μενούσης παντάπασι τῆς εἰκονικῆς ὕλης πρὸς τὸν προσκυνούμενον ἐν αὐτῇ Χριστὸν τῷ ὁμοιώματι·

(All the ὕλη of the εἰκών remains without a share in the offering of προσκύνησις to Christ in it by likeness.)

ἀκοινώνητόν ἐστι τῇ ἐν ᾗ δείκνυται ὕλη, μένον ἐν τῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑποστάσει...

(He has nothing in common with the ὕλη in which he is shown, remaining in the hypostasis of Christ...)

---

[537] φυσικὴν διαφορὰν ἔχουσα, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὑποστατικήν.
[538] κατὰ τὴν μορφὴν ἡ ὁμοίωσις.
[539] τῇ κοινωνίᾳ τῆς θεότητος ἡ ἕνωσις.

By this insistence that 'προσκύνησις is not offered to the οὐσία of the εἰκών, for this is

the unbefitting work of those who offer λατρεία to the creature instead of the creator,'

Theodore seeks to avoid the charge of idolatry.

But this claim in itself does not undo the letter's strong language of hypostatic

identity between Christ-εἰκών and prototype, and the claim for the unity of the

προσκύνησις offered to the Christ-εἰκών being received by the Triune Godhead. The

iconoclasts would not be comforted to discover the following words in Theodore's letter

to Plato:

> καὶ οὕτω λοιπὸν κἂν τῇ τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ Χριστοῦ προσκυνήσει μία ἡ
> προσκύνησις καὶ δοξολογία τῆς πολυυμνήτου καὶ μακαρίας Τριάδος.
> (And in this way it remains that the offering of προσκύνησις and glorification of the
> much hymned and blessed Trinity is one, even if in the προσκύνησις of the Christ-
> εἰκών.)

Further, if we add to the strong language of Fatouros 491 and 57 the incident

reported in letter 17 of the use of an holy εἰκών for a baptismal sponsor,[540] it is clear that

the iconoclasts of 815 could find reason, even in these letters, to believe that the offering

of προσκύνησις to the Christ-εἰκών was a form of idolatry. In Fatouros 17 Theodore

explains that in the Scripture the centurion believed the word and 'the divine command

took the place of the bodily presence, while here the bodily εἰκών took the place of the

prototype (ἡ σωματικὴ εἰκὼν ἀντὶ τοῦ πρωτοτύπου).'[541] He asks, 'Or how is it not

---

[540] Referred to as an excessive and unacceptable practice by Michael II in his letter of 824.

[541] ἐκεῖ τὸ θεῖον πρόσταγμα ἀντὶ τῆς σωματικῆς παρουσίας, κἀνταῦθα ἡ σωματικὴ εἰκὼν
ἀντὶ τοῦ πρωτοτύπου.

that that which is imaged in the εἰκών homonymously both is seen and believed to be in it?'[542] As in Fatouros 491 and 57, Theodore here supports these statements with *De Spiritu Sancto* 18.45, inclusive of the verb διαβαίνει. In this context, διαβαίνει would carry an implication of the 'passing over' of honour to someone of the same 'order' or 'rank'.[543] It suggests a mutuality or reciprocal relationship.

Modern scholars like to quote Fatouros 57 and 17 because some of Theodore's strongest εἰκών language is found here. Together with Fatouros 491, which we accept as Theodore's first attempt at an apology for the offering of προσκύνησις to the Christ-εἰκών, we have discovered in these pre-815 letters the language of 'participation', 'διαβαίνει', προσκύνησις of the Christ-εἰκών rising to become λατρεία of the Divine Trinity, the hypostatic identity of the Christ-εἰκών and Christ, and 'the bodily image taking the place of the prototype.'

The use of this type of language and expression within two decades of the 787 Council would confirm the worst fears in anyone with iconoclast leanings. The 787 Council had promoted the unrestricted offering of προσκύνησις to the εἰκών of Christ, the Theotokos or one of the saints, largely supported by legend, hagiography and dogmatic statement. The 815 Council did not feel that 787 had presented any new argument that had not been dealt with previously by the 754 Council. Consequently, the 815 Council was content mostly to re-affirm the teaching and canons of 754, as I have described above. It forbade the offering of προσκύνησις to the εἰκών on the grounds that it led to worship of the creation instead of the creator.[544] It rejected entirely the 'spurious

---

[542] καὶ πῶς οὐχὶ ἐν τῇ εἰκόνι ὁ εἰκονιζόμενος ὁμωνύμως ὁρᾶταί τε καὶ εἶναι πιστεύεται;
[543] In fact, of course, this was Basil's original use of the word. The honour passes from the Divine Son to the Father (of the same rank), or from the image of the emperor to the emperor.
[544] See Fatouros 71 and the preface to *Antirr* III.

257

image', or the single liturgical, doctrinal and devotional εἰκών which had no element of narrative or ἱστορία. It will be recalled that just four months prior to the sitting of the Council, Leo V had asked the Patriarch to hang the remaining narrative and didactic images high, to avoid any offering of προσκύνησις even to them, or more likely, to individual εἰκών which appeared within the larger painting.

In such circumstances Theodore wrote to the 815 Council (Fatouros 71) and shifted his approach to the image question. First, he introduced the verb βαίνειν with a different prefix (ἀνά-) from what Basil had used in *De Spiritu Sancto* 18.45. Second, he built on his previous letters 491 and 57 with a strong Christological emphasis, pointing to Christ the mediator as the key to the *upward* movement of προσκύνησις which begins with the Christ-εἰκών and ends up (simultaneously) as λατρεία offered to the Trinity. Christ can take on this role because he has both human μορφή (thus he is circumscribable) and divine μορφή (thus he is uncircumscribable). His human μορφή is of the same character as ours and thus he is able to be portrayed in an εἰκών.

Theodore cannot develop fully this Christological theme here in this letter to the 815 Council. He says, 'But this is not the right time for a dogmatic explanation (δογματικῆς ἐξαπλώσεως) which would easily persuade even a most dull person to look up to the splendours of the truth (τὰς αὐγὰς τῆς ἀληθείας).' Within a year or so of this letter, Theodore will return to this Christological theme introduced here in Fatouros 71, and compose that dogmatic explanation of image theology in his *Antirr* III.

The argument of *Antirr* I and II has been outlined above. The style and general character of *Antirr* III has been indicated previously, as has its preface and its place within the structure and argument of the entire *Antirr*. I have also commented on the relation of

258

Antirr III to eighth and ninth century iconophile literature, and in particular to the dogmatic writings of Nicephorus. My final task is to present Theodore's apology for the necessary offering of προσκύνησις to the Christ-εἰκών, and indicate how the later letters supplement that teaching.

CHAPTER FOUR

The necessity of offering προσκύνησις to the Christ-εἰκών

The Christological basis

This thesis has made it clear that both sides of the image controversy were committed to Chalcedonian orthodoxy as interpreted by the Councils of 553 and 680. For example, each of the contested councils of 754, 787 and 815 gives a summary of the previous six oecumenical councils, enumerates the dogmas they formulated (and sometimes the heretics they condemned), and then proceeds to pronounce that on the basis of the doctrine of the Person of Christ contained in that tradition, the Christ-εἰκών either is (787) or is not (754, 815) a legitimate object of προσκύνησις.

A major contributing factor to this doctrinal entrenchment was the lack of a common ground upon which the two sides could engage in debate. The same set of agreed premises, viz. the Christology of Chalcedon as clarified by the church up to and including the Council of Constantinople in 680-81, immediately led each to opposing conclusions. In general it might be said that this is how all the past Christological heresies (including the Nestorian, monophysite and monothelite) arose and were eventually resolved. The difference in the eighth and ninth century, described in previous chapters, was the inability or unwillingness to engage in a significant debate about the Christological content of the received tradition. That is, both sides agreed that the possibility of offering προσκύνησις to the devotional εἰκών depended upon its congruency with orthodox

Christology, but neither side initiated a thorough review of the definitions and arguments which were part of the received developed Christology. The closest attempt was made in the 754 Council which took over the Christological discussions of Constantine V. Generally, however, in its assumption that the meaning of the Chalcedonian definition was clear, each side was convinced that the implications of that definition were so obvious that argument could add nothing to the clarity of the truth. Even Constantine V's Πεύσεις I & II did not provide so much an argument as a impassioned plea to 'see' that the devotional εἰκών of Christ led to a confusion or division of Christ's natures. In the absence of previous arguments in the tradition upon which to model a discussion of the orthodoxy of the devotional εἰκών, each side repeated the 'obvious truth' of the relation of the offering προσκύνησις to the devotional εἰκών and the Chalcedonian definition of the Person of Christ.

Theodore breaks through this impasse by attending more carefully to the Christology of the Chalcedonian definition and its implication for the circumscribability of Christ. But by Christ's 'circumscription' (τὸ περιγραπτὸν), Theodore does not mean the ability to paint Christ in an εἰκών (εἰκονογραφία). That is the next step in the argument and will be considered in *Antirr* III.B. Theodore's insight is that the issue of Christ's circumscribability is not about the Christ-εἰκών, at least initially.

In his treatises Constantine failed to appreciate that the question of the circumscribability of Christ has been resolved already within standard Christological orthodoxy. Rather, he assumed that the issue of Christ's circumscribability was determined by his ability to be depicted in an εἰκών. He began with a focus upon the devotional εἰκών and argues that in the depiction Christ's divine nature is either denied or

261

confused. Therefore Christ is not depictable and neither is he circumscribable. Constantine's error was not so much a defective Christology as it was a failure to attend to the depth of Christological doctrine prior to considering the orthodoxy of the image question. He has reversed the order of dependence.

Theodore, on the other hand, begins his argument with a summary of the traditional definitions concerning the integrity of the two natures of Christ, the necessary set of properties which attend and reveal each nature, and the relation of those two natures within the Person of Christ or the single ὑπόστασις of the Logos. This analysis establishes the circumscribability of Christ entirely within established Christology.

Theodore's prior attention to Christology in the image controversy not only corrects Constantine V's reversal of the proper order of dependency of circumscribability and depictability, but it also indicates the deficiency of Nicephorus' approach. I have indicated above that Nicephorus drives too much of a wedge between the two concepts of 'circumscription in nature' (περίγραπτος), and 'depiction' (γραπτός).[545] Nicephorus points out that circumscription occurs in space, in time or by apprehension (καταλήψει). Depiction is achieved by colours and pebbles. Circumscription does not necessitate depiction, nor vice versa. I indicated above how this separation has led to the justifiable reading of contemporary scholars that in this argument Nicephorus promotes art as an autonomous phenomenon and severs any significant relation between image and prototype.[546] Theodore proposes that the question of the Christ-εἰκών follows from Christ's circumscribability as determined by the tradition.

Theodore's attempt in *Antirr* III.A to show the circumscribability of Christ as a

---

[545] Cited by Alexander (1958b), 253 in his summary of Nicephorus' *Refutatio et Eversio*.
[546] Add to the scholars cited above in chapter three, Barasch (1992): 'At least implicitly Nicephorus acknowledges art as a domain of its own.' (282).

Christological issue, not involving the devotional εἰκών, seems to be denied by the title of this section, as it appears in Migne. The title, Περὶ τῆς ἐν σώματι εἰκονογραφίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ (The portrayal of Christ in the body), suggests that this first section will address the making of the εἰκών of Christ (εἰκονογραφίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ). This is odd because the argument consciously and carefully avoids the language of ἡ εἰκονογραφία (the making of the εἰκών) and focuses entirely on the notion of ἡ περιγραφὴ (circumscription). Theodore strictly avoids speaking about circumscription in terms of the εἰκών. There are well over one hundred instances of the variations of (ἀ)περιγραφὴ, (ἀ)περιγραπτὸς, (ἀ)περιγράφειν, but only in one passage does the verb εἰκονίζειν appear, and that is Theodore's presentation of the iconophile statement that when anyone is made into an εἰκών, it is not the nature but the person which is shown in the εἰκών. *Antirr* III.A is a theological justification of this statement by way of a consideration of Christ's περίγραπτον as determined within the tradition. I do not propose a solution to this problem, but it is important that the reader not be misled by the title of *Antirr* III.A which does not accurately reflect its content.

Theodore's Christological discussion shows a general familiarity with the Councils and their canons, the Cappadocians, Leontius of Byzantium, Denys the Areopagite, Maximus the Confessor, and the various Christological heresies, some of which he mentions by name. In *Antirr* III.A Theodore will address all the points made by Constantine in his Πεύσεις I & II. I do not explore the themes introduced by Theodore in more detail than necessary to make clear his own presentation of the argument, nor do I attempt to identify his sources. As much as possible I allow Theodore to advance his argument in his own words.

263

Theodore begins by announcing that he will build his argument from 'common ideas accepted by everyone' (Αἱ κοιναὶ ἔννοιαι πᾶσιν ἐξ ἴσου ὡμολόγηνται). He claims that from such a beginning, only those who 'voluntarily deafen themselves' will not be able to follow his reasoning. Most of the fifty-eight individual sections of *Antirr* III.A are structured as simple *reductio ad absurdum* ending with the words ὅπερ ἄτοπον (which is absurd) or ὅπερ ἀσεβές (which is blasphemous or impious). 'Blasphemous' (ἀσεβές) in this case does not refer to something contrary to an established dogma, but points to the contradiction of an initial true premise. Alternatively, other sections are syllogistic proofs, simply structured, which begin with a clear premise and proceed logically to a conclusion ὅπερ ἀληθές (which is true). 'Common ideas' are those which are accepted by everyone, by virtue of their definition or which are so commonly accepted as self-evident by people such as to deny them is to be called 'mad'. For example, every rational person would accept that by circumscription we mean 'a three-dimensional body, having a firm surface, that can be seen and touched.'[547]

Circumscription, says Theodore, has to do with those types of things catalogued in Aristotle's *Categories*. After οὐσία, Aristotle lists nine categories he calls 'accidents' because they define an individual as something numerically distinct. Aristotle's nine categories are not exactly reproduced, but is the source of Theodore's list in *Antirr* III.A.13: inclusion or apprehension (ἡ κατάληψις[548]), quantity (ἡ ποσότης), quality (ἡ ποιότης), position (ἡ θέσις), places (οἱ τόποι), times (οἱ χρόνοι), shapes (τὰ

---

[547] *Antirr* III.A.1; Migne *PG* 99.389CD.

[548] Cf. Fatouros 532.79-82 for Theodore's use of κατάληψις: οὐκ ἐξεικονίζεται, ὅτιπερ τὸ θεῖον ὑπὲρ κατάληψιν, ᾗ δὲ μορφὴν δούλου ἔλαβεν, ἐξεικονίζεται, ὅτι ὑπὸ κατάληψιν τῆς ἐν ἀφῇ τε καὶ χροιᾷ ἡ δουλικὴ μορφὴ περιορίζεται. ([in the form of God] he is not made into an image inasmuch that the divine is beyond comprehension (κατάληψιν) . On the other hand he took the form of a slave and so he is made into an εἰκών, because in the holding (κατάληψιν) of him in both touch and colour his servant form is contained.)

σχήματα), and bodies (τὰ σώματα). Throughout *Antirr* III.A, in a systematic way, Theodore shows how Scripture attributes each of these categories to Christ.

Before the iconoclast objections begin, Theodore presents the dogma he will defend, as follows.[549] Uncircumscription (τὸ ἀπερίγραπτον) is characteristic of God's οὐσία, circumscription (τὸ περιγραπτὸν) of man's οὐσία. Christ is from (ἐξ) both and is known from two sets of properties (ἐκ δυοῖν ἰδιωμάτων) and from two φύσεων.[550] If Christ is from two οὐσία he must have the properties of both: circumscription and uncircumscription. If he only has one of these properties he is only of the οὐσία of which he has the property. (Εἰ δὲ θάτερον μόνον, μιᾶς ἄρα ἐστὶν οὐσίας ἧς ἔχει τὸ ἰδίωμα, ὅπερ ἀσεβές). The properties (ἰδιώματα) of each nature are said to be of the 'same order' (ὁμόστοιχα)[551] and no property of the same order can be separated from the series. Properties of a nature are the common characteristics that bind a group of individual hypostases into a single intelligible whole, forming and expressing their common οὐσία. They are a complete set and one property cannot be removed from the set.[552] Thus, uncircumscription is one of the properties from the set expressing the divine οὐσία. Circumscribability is one of the properties from the set expressing the human οὐσία.

In *Antirr* III.A.8 Theodore argues via *reductio* that we do not understand that the Word has been changed (μεταπεποιῆσθαι) into flesh, but that the Word 'has become (γεγενῆσθαι) flesh while remaining on the height of his divinity.'[553]

---

[549] *Antirr* III.A.1-14; Migne *PG* 99.389C-396C.
[550] Throughout this tight argument of *Antirr* III, the English translation of Roth (1981) is unreliable. She translates 'in' two natures, for 'ἐκ' 'from' two natures and misses Theodore's orderly progression.
[551] *Antirr* III.A.12; Migne *PG* 99.393D.
[552] *Antirr* III.A.3; Migne *PG* 99.392B.
[553] *Antirr* III.A.8; Migne *PG* 99.393AB.

So far Theodore's reasoning has been uncontested, but now the iconoclast raises his first objection. If agreed by tradition (παραδόξως) that Christ took up flesh in his own ὑπόστασις, it was humanity in general (καθόλου), not a particular person: flesh without distinguishing features (ἀχαρακτήριστον). On the contrary, Theodore argues that 'generalities have their existence in particular individuals (τὰ γὰρ καθόλου ἐν τοῖς ἀτόμοις τὴν ὕπαρξιν). Therefore humanity is not in Christ, if it does not subsist in him as in an individual.' The notion of Christ's assumption of 'humanity in general' is a form of Manichaeism.[554]

In the first paragraph of his *Isagoge*, Porphyry's third question was 'Do [general concepts] have an existence separate from sensible objects or do they exist only in them?' Whether or not one thinks that Theodore addresses the metaphysical question of the difference between the more Platonic *universalia ante res* (universals prior to the sensible objects) and the more Aristotelian *universalia in rebus* (universals in the objects), it is clear that epistemologically the general concept is only able to be seen or contemplated in an individual (καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ ὡς ἐν ἀτόμῳ θεωρουμένην). That is, the general concept needs the particular substance in order for it to be expressed (regardless of its order of existence). This priority of knowing is affirmed even by the sixth century Alexandrian Neoplatonic commentators who insist on the ontological priority of universals.[555] As explained above, this is the tradition which would be available to Theodore through the popular compendia in ninth century Byzantium. There Theodore would learn that 'universals are necessarily subordinated to the function of our mind in apprehending and expressing them (νοεῖν καὶ λέγειν αὐτά).'[556]

---

[554] *Antirr* III.A.15; Migne *PG* 99.396D,397A.
[555] See Benakis (1992).
[556] Benakis (1992), 83.

This notion will be important for Theodore not only as informing his argument here, but it also will become a dominant theme in the final stages of the *Antirr*. He asserts:

Οἷς μὲν τὰ καθόλου ὁρᾶται, νοῦς καὶ διάνοια· οἷς δὲ τὰ καθ" ἕκαστα, ὀφθαλμοὶ, οἱ τὰ αἰσθητὰ βλέποντες. Εἰ οὖν τὴν καθόλου ἡμῶν φύσιν ὁ Χριστὸς ἀνέλαβε, μὴ ἐν ἀτόμῳ δὲ θεωρουμένην, νῷ μόνῳ ἐστὶ θεωρητὸς καὶ διανοίᾳ ψηλαφητός.[557]
(Generalities are seen with the mind and thought; particular individuals are seen with the eyes, which look at perceptible things. If, therefore, Christ assumed our nature in general, not contemplated in an individual manner, he can be contemplated only by the mind and touched only by thought.)

But Theodore insists that Scripture describes Christ within all the accidental categories which characterize a particular individual. He refers to the post resurrection incident with Thomas in John 20 and concludes, 'Therefore Christ is perceptible, tangible, and visible with bodily eyes; and therefore he is circumscribed.' Οὐσία, says Theodore, designates the nature which individuals have in common, 'When I say 'man' I mean the common οὐσία. When I add 'a,' I mean ὑπόστασις ....'[558]

The definition of the individual becomes crucial. Theodore defines ὑπόστασις as:

τὴν ἰδιοσύστατον τοῦ δηλουμένου ὕπαρξιν. περιγραφὴν ἐξ ἰδιωμάτων τινῶν συγκειμένην, καθ᾽ ἃς ἀλλήλων οἱ τῆς αὐτῆς κεκοινωνηκότες φύσεως διαφέρουσιν· οἷον Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος.[559]
(the self-subsisting existence of that which is signified: the circumscription consisting of certain properties, by which those who share the same nature differ

[557] *Antirr* III.A.16. Migne *PG* 99.397A.
[558] Ανθρωπον εἰπὼν, τὴν κοινὴν οὐσίαν δηλῶ. Προσθεὶς δὲ, Τίς, ὑπόστασιν ...
[559] *Antirr* III.A.17; Migne *PG* 99.397B.

one from another, for example Peter and Paul.)

The distinctions made, the examples cited and language used in this discussion are dependent upon the opening paragraphs of Basil's 38th letter (generally attributed to Gregory Nyssa).[560] The 38th Letter teaches that the ὑπόστασις individualizes the οὐσία while the οὐσία subsists only in particular ὑπόστασις. Thus they are interdependent. The ὑπόστασις cannot be thought of without the οὐσία. The οὐσία only exists in the ὑπόστασις. The individual thing consists of οὐσία plus ὑπόστασις. In keeping with this line of reasoning in the 38th Letter, Theodore picks up the language of the 38th Letter and explains that a particular person can be called by a common noun as well as by the proper name: 'in respect to what he shares with the individuals of the same species, [Paul] is called 'man'; but insofar as he differs in his ὑπόστασις, he is called 'Paul' ....'[561]

This interdependency of οὐσία and ὑπόστασις of the 38th Letter is further addressed in a letter of Theodore to John Grammaticus, Fatouros 492. John has disagreed with Theodore about the definition of τὸ ὑποκείμενον, or what constitutes an individual thing or person. τὸ ὑποκείμενον is defined by Lampe (1961) as generally equivalent to ὑπόστασις. Theodore refers to Leontius of Byzantium, Basil and Dionysius as he explains:

For the ὑποκείμενον, says Leontius the blessed who has the most beautiful

---

[560] For an influence not so direct, but typical of Cappadocian thought, see also Gregory Nyssa's commentary on Gen 1,27a (*De Hominis Opificio* 16). Generally following Philo's notion of a two stage creation, Gregory's first stage is that of the universal or intelligible. Theodore does not necessarily accept such a two stage creation of the sensible, nor even the prior existence of universals, but notice in Gregory's *De Hominis Opificio* the distinctions of ὁ τὶς/ὁ καθόλου in a tradition Theodore knew well. Gregory says, 'When the word says that God made man, the whole of humanity is indicated by the indefiniteness of the expression. For it is not named now Adam alongside the creature, as the history says in the following: but the name for the created man is not the particular (ὁ τὶς), but the universal (ὁ καθόλου).'
[561] *Antirr* III.A.18; Migne *PG* 99.397C.

268

interpretation, is said to be the οὐσία with hypostasis (μετὰ ὑποστάσεως). Does not Basil the Great speak about the Holy Trinity 'not in ὑποκείμενον'? But even the all wise Dionysius says somewhere, 'many in the accidents[562] , one in the ὑποκείμενον (πολλὰ τοῖς συμβεβηκόσιν, ἓν τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ). But the accidents are not in the universal οὐσία (οὐκ ἐν τῇ καθόλου οὐσίᾳ), but in the hypostasis which is seen (ἐν τῇ ὑποστάσει τεθεώρηται); as you know.' Moreover, then, in saying 'many in accidents, one in ὑποκείμενον,' he understood the ὑποκείμενον to be the οὐσία with hypostasis (μετὰ ὑποστάσεως). ...the ὑποκείμενον is nothing other than οὐσία with hypostasis (μετὰ ὑποστάσεως).

Christ has assumed human nature (οὐσία) in general, yet he assumed it as contemplated in an individual manner[563] (τὴν ἐν ἀτόμῳ θεωρουμένην) and so he is differentiated from all other persons by his hypostatic properties (τοῖς ὑποστατικοῖς ἰδιώμασιν). Thus he is circumscribed (περιγραφόμενος).

The second ἀπορίαι is the charge of Nestorianism that if the human nature assumed by Christ (whose nature is invisible and formless) is given form by circumscription (εἰ σχηματισθείη διὰ περιγραφῆς), then a second person (πρόσωπον) will be admitted in the ὑπόστασις of Christ. In other words, since there can be no nature devoid of hypostatic determination, the human nature assumed by Christ must bring its own ὑπόστασις with it (in which it subsists) or there is nothing to be taken up. The response of Theodore is careful and precise, building upon the distinctions already made:

---

[562] συμβεβηκός

[563] Or 'seen in an individual person'. Yet notice in *Antirr* III.A.16 the uses of βλέπω and θεωρέω. Particular individuals are seen with the eyes: Christ is contemplated in an individual manner (ἐν ἀτόμῳ θεωρουμένην). This phrase is Theodore's usual way of speaking of Christ's taking up of human nature within the ὑπόστασις of the Logos.

269

τὴν τοῦ Λόγου ὑπόστασιν κοινὴν γενέσθαι τῷ δύο φύσεων ὑπόστασιν ... ἐν αὐτῇ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν ὑποστήσασαν, μετὰ τῶν ἀπὸ τῶν λοιπῶν ὁμοειδῶν ἀφοριζόντων αὐτὴν ἰδιωμάτων εἰκότως τὴν αὐτὴν τοῦ λόγου ὑπόστασιν ἀπερίγραπτον μὲν φαίημεν κατὰ τὴν τῆς θεότητος φύσιν· περιγεγραμμένην δὲ κατὰ τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς οὐσίαν· οὐκ ἐν ἰδιοσυστάτῳ καὶ ἰδιοπεριγράφῳ προσώπῳ παρὰ τὴν τοῦ Λόγου ὑποστασιν, ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτῇ τὴν ὕπαρξιν ἐσχηκυῖαν· ὡς ἂν μὴ εἴη φύσις ἀνυπόστατος· καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ ὡς ἐν ἀτόμῳ θεωρουμένην καὶ περιγραφομένην.[564]

(the ὑπόστασις of the Word became a common ὑπόστασις of the two natures, granting the human nature subsistence in it, with the properties that differentiate it from all other persons. With reason we say that the one and the same hypostasis of the Word is uncircumscribable according to the nature of his divinity but circumscribed according to his essence like ours. This human nature does not have its existence in a self-subsisting and self-circumscribed person apart from the ὑπόστασις of the Word, but has its existence in that ὑπόστασις (lest there should be a nature without ὑπόστασις), and in it is contemplated in an individual manner and is circumscribed.)

The iconoclast now brings forward the specific objection of Constantine V which is articulated in the ὅρος of the 754 Council that the portrayal of the human nature of Christ in an εἰκών either leads to the "separation" of the natures as in Nestorius or to the "confusion" of the natures as in Arius, Dioscorus, Eutyches, and Severus. The iconoclast suggests that the only way that the portrayal of Christ would be allowable is if both natures were able to be portrayed 'unseparated' and 'unconfused' at the same time, which is impossible.

Theodore's response again lies in the distinctions already articulated: it is not the

---

[564] *Antirr* III.A.22; Migne *PG* 99.400D.

nature of a person which is portrayed in an εἰκών, but that which makes a person an individual, his ὑπόστασις. A nature (general concept) must be contemplated in a ὑπόστασις (ὑποστάσει τεθεωρημένη):

> For how could a nature be depicted, unless it is concretely seen in a ὑπόστασις. For example, Peter is not portrayed insofar as he is animate, rational, mortal, and capable of thought and understanding: for this does not define Peter only, but also Paul and John, and all those of the same species. But insofar as he adds along with the common definition certain properties, such as a long or short nose, curly hair, a good complexion, bright eyes, or whatever else characterizes his particular appearance, he is distinguished from the other individuals of the same species (ὁμοειδῶν).[565]

Because the natures themselves are not portrayed, but the individual in whom the natures subsist and are manifested, the natures are neither separated nor confused in the devotional εἰκών.[566]

Constantine had objected that the portrayal of Christ in an εἰκών did not include the portrayal of his soul. Theodore continues:

> Moreover though he [Peter] consists of body and soul, he does not show the property of soul in the appearance of his form: how could he, since the soul is

---

[565] Porphyry's *Isagoge* may be recognized here as a source of Letter 38 upon which this is dependent. Peter replaces Porphyry's example of Socrates. Cf. *Isagoge* 8, 15;,16; 9,11ff.

[566] Fatouros 380, written in 818, directly leans upon the philosophical expression and Scriptural citations of *Antirr* III.A, both 'according to Scripture and common syllogism': 'Because Christ at the same time is perfect God and perfect man, he is able to be called according to either of those natures from which he consists, and it can be said that he is thought of correctly according to one or the other nature; the individual properties of both natures in the unity of hypostasis are neither diminished nor confused (μειουμένης ἢ συμφυρομένης).'

invisible? The same applies to the case of Christ. It is not because he is man simply (along with being God) that he is able to be portrayed, but because he is differentiated from all others of the same species by his hypostatic properties.[567]

The natures from which Christ is composed (συνετέθη φύσεων) are not circumscribed. But circumscription is the property of one of those natures. We only know that the nature (οὐσία) is present through our perception of its true properties: 'The true properties of the natures make known the natures of which they are the properties.'[568]

The ὑπόστασις is the Logos who thus is the subject of all that pertains to Christ in the flesh, including his suffering and death. One ὑπόστασις of the Holy Trinity becomes also the ὑπόστασις of human nature, which apart from that ὑπόστασις (from the definitions already accepted) does not exist at all. Theodore points to the orthodox response to the Theopaschites and applies it to the present discussion:

> If it is heretical to say that, because Christ is crucified in the flesh, the Godhead also suffers (for that is the teaching of the Theopaschites): then likewise it is heretical to say that, because he is circumscribed in the flesh, the Godhead is also circumscribed (for this is the teaching of the iconoclasts)[569]

Up to this point Theodore has spoken only of Christ as being composed 'from' or 'of' two natures in the one ὑπόστασις of the divine Logos. But this also means that he is 'in' both natures (this is the precise language of Chalcedon).[570] Theodore begins his

---

[567] *Antirr* III.A.34; Migne *PG* 99.405B
[568] Τὰ ἀληθῶς ἰδιώματα τῶν οὐσιῶν, ὧν εἰσιν ἰδιώματα, γνωρίσματα·
[569] *Antirr* III.A.33; Migne *PG* 99.405A.
[570] First mentioned in *Antirr* III.A.37; Migne *PG* 99.408A.

discussion in *Antirr* III.A with the 'from' for two reasons. First, this was Constantine's preferred approach. Nicephorus tells us that Constantine does not use the Chalcedonian formula ἐν δυσὶ φύσεσιν.[571] Because Constantine falls into error by bringing the two natures together in a way which violates their integrities, Theodore wants to demonstrate how the natures come together in a way which maintain their integrity. Second, Theodore begins with a discussion of Christ's Person 'from' two natures to emphasize that the hypostatic union does not imply any pre-existence of the humanity of Christ. At this point in his discussion Theodore adds the 'in' of the Chalcedonian formula, to emphasize the permanence of the two natures in the union. He represents the fourth Council as proclaiming the single hypostasis of our Lord Jesus Christ from two and in two φύσεσι (ἡ τετάρτη ἐκ δύο καὶ ἐν δυσὶ φύσεσι καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἑνικὴν τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐδογμάτισεν).[572] Christ is double and composite.[573] (Χριστὸς δὲ διπλοῦς τε ὢν καὶ σύνθετος).[574] Only as such can Christ be the true mediator:

> Christ, who is the mediator between God and man, and who ... combines the extremes into a union of natures (εἰς ἑνότητα φυσικὴν συνάπτοντα τὰ ἄκρα) by a just judgement, must be uncircumscribable (ἀπερίγραπτον) in spirit but circumscribed (περιγραπτὸν) in body. Otherwise, if he favoured the one, namely uncircumscribability, and did not maintain the other, namely circumscription,

---

[571] Ἐν δυσὶ δὲ αὐτὸν φύσεσιν, οὐδαμῶς τέως εἰπὼν φαίνεται. Migne *PG* 100.300D.
[572] Fatouros 532.40-42. Although Chalcedon spoke of 'in two natures', the next two hundred years of reflection on the definition had led to the consensus that the meaning of Chalcedon is accurately expressed by the phrase 'from and in two natures', as Theodore here describes.
[573] This is what Constantine effectively denied.
[574] *Antirr* III.A.44; Migne *PG* 99.409C.

unharmed, he would fail to be a just mediator (μεσίτης δίκαιος).[575]

Fatorous 463 (821-26) is a tidy summary of this doctrine:

> And he is wholly God and wholly man, bearing wholly and without defect in him the
> natures of each (τὰ τῶν ἑκατέρων φύσεων) out of which he is composed (ἐξ ὧν
> συνετέθη), thus he is said to be very God and very man in the properties of one
> hypostasis (ἐν μιᾷ ὑποστάσει τὰ ἰδιώματα): circumscribable and uncircumscribable,
> on the one hand according to his divinity and on the other hand according to his
> humanity. For these are his properties (τὰ ἰδιώματα), according to which he is on
> the one hand uncircumscribed in that he is of the Holy Trinity, but on the other
> hand circumscribed in being from us. And in this he is believed to be the mediator
> between God and man, as joining the extremes (τὰ ἄκρα) in himself, and through his
> divine nature (δι' ἑαυτοῦ θείας φύσεως) giving us fellowship as sons of God, so let
> us consider and so let us speak the wonder and the praise of all things!

Theodore sums up his Christological argument in *Antirr* III.A by pointing to Luke's
account of the Transfiguration, where it is recorded that the 'invisible one had an
appearance or likeness, the formless one had a form, and the measureless one came within
a measure.'[576]

Theodore has argued for the circumscribability of Christ from Chalcedonian

---

[575] *Antirr* III.A.51; Migne *PG* 99.413A. In Fatouros 305, Theodore tells that the consequence of Christ's
not being circumscribed is that Adam has not been restored and death has not been swallowed up. 'If then
he has not been circumscribed, then it is not from her virgin's blood that he shaped a temple for himself,
but rather he would bear a heavenly body, as it seemed to the heretic Marcellos and other impious ones
before him. This would mean that his mother was not his true mother but one falsely so called, and that he
was not similar (ὅμοιος) to us but different. Furthermore, that Adam has not been restored. For how can
the earthy be resurrected in a body of a different kind? It is understood that like is saved by like (τῷ ὁμοίῳ
τὸ ὅμοιον). It would also follow that death is not swallowed up ... .'
[576] *Antirr* III.A.53; Migne *PG* 99.413C.

principles. Things which have different natures cannot have the same properties: 'as they differ in the principle of their οὐσία, so also they differ in the mode of their properties.'[577]

The natures of Christ are different in kind and not consubstantial (ἑτερογενῶν καὶ οὐχ ὁμοουσίων). It follows from this that Christ must be recognized from his two properties (ἐκ δύο ἂν εἴη καὶ ἰδιωμάτων γνωριζόμενος). He is both uncircumscribed and circumscribed and must be recognized in both, or else one of his two natures will be denied.

As with all of his theological writings, this discussion of Christology is related directly to Theodore's teaching on the practical life of prayer, worship and the spiritual struggles of the ascetic life. Many of his subsequent letters in which we find substantial image theology were written primarily as catacheses,[578] responses to those who have asked for clarification about the εἰκών question,[579] to correct those who have revealed fundamental misunderstandings about the relation of the natures, properties and person of Christ,[580] and even in letters primarily sent to encourage those who are detained.[581] In his letters, Theodore clearly makes use of his Christological argument in *Antirr* III.A. to support εἰκών doctrine and the necessity of offering προσκύνησις to the Christ-εἰκών.

---

[577] 'ἀλλ' ὥσπερ τὸν τῆς οὐσίας λόγον ἀπεσχοινισμένον ἔχουσιν· οὕτω καὶ τὸν τῆς ἰδιότητος τρόπον.' *Antirr* III.A.58; Migne *PG* 99.416D.

[578] See Fatouros 64. The Abbot Gregory has asked Theodore to write a catechetical discourse for his monks. Also see Fatouros 221, written about the same time as *Antirr* III, as a catechesis to his monks in exile, very Christological in tone.

[579] Fatouros 380 is written to Naukratios to prepare him for the possibility of another meeting with John Grammaticus.

[580] See Fatouros 496. After correcting the Christology of the Abbot Eustratios, Theodore concludes: 'Understand clearly from this truth that the one circumscribing Christ does not give λατρεία to man, as Nestorius claims, neither gives λατρεία to the creature according to Arius, as you babbled ignorantly, but without letting go of true Christian orthodoxy, as does the one who refuses to circumscribe in the manner of the Manichees or equally in the manner of the Paulicians. The former by the voice of the uncircumscribed one leading to a naked God, making the notion of becoming a man a phantasm. The latter is the same voice of the uncircumscribed, as one who shares the body and blood of a naked man as Paul claims, and not of God truly having been made a man.'

[581] Fatouros 305, quoted above, written to an Abbot in detention in 818.

This Christological argument is unique in the entire image debate. Pelikan (1974) sees only Nicephorus' understanding of the controversy and misses the whole argument of Theodore's *Antirr* III. Citing Nicephorus, 'a picture does not circumscribe a man, even though he is circumscribed; nor does circumscription depict him, even though he is capable of being depicted,' Pelikan is convinced by his reading of Nicephorus that: 'The issue of circumscription was in fact a false issue.'[582] To the contrary, Theodore thinks that Christ's circumscribability is the key to the entire debate and provides the grounding for an *apologia* for the εἰκών.

Schönborn (1994) is more aware of Theodore's argument in *Antirr* III and comments on the vast difference between the approaches of Theodore and Nicephorus. He cites Nicephorus' answer to Constantine's objection that the image cannot portray Christ's divinity:

> [The image] does not solely make present the visible form of Christ's humanity ... but also the Logos himself, even though he is not (together with Christ's humanity) 'circumscribed' and depicted as to his own inner nature, since he is invisible and totally one; but since, on the level of the person, he is one and indivisible, therefore he [the Logos], too, is called to mind [through the image].[583]

Theodore would not be satisfied with this qualified answer ('the Logos' is 'made present' and 'called to mind') but rather would insist that the Person of Christ and ὑπόστασις of

---

[582] Pelikan (1974), 130. He goes on to say that this is confirmed by the fact that circumscription was certainly not a problem for Theotokos and the saints. However, it was very much an issue, precisely because the Theotokos or saint was imaged in an εἰκών which depicts her or his glorified body. Thus Christ's circumscription and the legitimacy of portraying Christ in the εἰκών was still the test case for all holy images.

[583] Migne *PG* 100.256AB, cited and translated in Schönborn (1994), 217.

the Logos is able to be portrayed because he is circumscribable by the property of one of his natures. Schönborn notes that Nicephorus does not deal with Christ's circumscribability, but rather focuses entirely on a demonstration that Christ's *humanity* can be 'circumscribed' and therefore depicted.[584] 'Whenever he speaks of the 'imprinted individuality [*charaktēr*]' of Christ, he speaks of the *charaktēr* of Christ's body, of his human nature.'[585] Schönborn knows that this is not the question urged by Constantine (i.e. how can the εἰκών portray the Person of Christ?[586]), and Nicephorus' avoidance leaves the issue unresolved. What is needed to reply to Constantine is a Christology which shows that the Person of Christ is circumscribable. Theodore has provided exactly that in *Antirr* III.A.

In this section Theodore has presented the established Christology worked out and articulated fully by the seventh century. There is nothing here that could not be found, for example, in the *Doctrina Patrum*. This presentation of Christology is longer than the remaining three parts of the *Antirr* III combined. These concluding sections will offer the implications of established Christology for the relation of Christ to his devotional εἰκών and the necessary offering of προσκύνησις to that εἰκών.

The concluding sections will therefore have a different character than *Antirr* III.A. As I have described in earlier chapters, there is no established dogma in the tradition pertaining to the devotional εἰκών or the προσκύνησις due to it. In Fatouros 463, after suggesting that Christ cannot be offered προσκύνησις unless he is believed to be offered προσκύνησις in his εἰκών (the precise theme of these concluding three sections), he asserts:

---

[584] He cites Migne *PG* 100.261A, 285A, 301D, 305A.
[585] Schönborn (1994), 218, citing Migne *PG* 100.313D-316A.
[586] Migne *PG* 100.293A, 297A, 301C.

Thus, O man of God, is the truth as it has been taught by the apostles and prophets and God-inspired Fathers, even if not in these very words, but through the truth of a careful examination of their sayings. Because some seeds produce all the dogmatic meanings in the concepts (understandings) of divine utterances.

The 'very words' of dogma about the Person of Christ are available for Theodore in the tradition, and he has outlined his findings in *Antirr* III.A. On the other hand, such definitive and actual expression of dogma concerning the devotional εἰκών and the προσκύνησις due to it are not to be found in the tradition. Nevertheless, Theodore understands that the seeds firmly planted in that tradition will bear fruit for his generation, if harvested through 'the truth of a careful examination of their sayings.' These concluding three sections begin to spell out the implications of established Christology for image theology.

Christ and his artificial image (ἡ τεχνητὴ εἰκών)

Antirr III.B consists of seven brief syllogistic arguments, two of which are *reductios* and five positive. Its argument relies heavily on the Christological analysis of *Antirr* III.A . Theodore begins:

> Whatever is artificial imitates something natural ... Therefore there is an artificial image of Christ, as he is the natural image of the mother who bore him.[587]

---

[587] *Antirr* III.A.1; Migne *PG* 99.417A.

The natural image is ἀπαράλλακτός in essence and likeness as is Christ to his Father in respect to divinity and as is Christ to his mother in terms of humanity. The artificial image is the same as its prototype in likeness, but different in essence, like Christ and his εἰκών.[588]

When the iconoclast objects that if Christ has an artificial image of his mother then he ought to have an artificial image of his Father as well, Theodore reminds him of the relation of properties to natures, and of the two natures to one another in the ὑπόστασις, all of which has been clarified previously in *Antirr* III.A. Denying the integrity of Christ's human nature 'destroys the divine economy.'

An εἰκών can be copied from an εἰκών. Christ the Son is the divine εἰκών of his Father. Because of his circumscribability, we not only generally can partake of the divine work of making images, but we can portray the very εἰκών of Christ who is himself the divine εἰκών of the Father.[589] 'Christ, since he became like us, has an artificial εἰκών which refers to him by a relation of likeness... he has an εἰκών exactly resembling him which reveals the shared likeness...'[590] Since the shared likeness is the relation of the Christ-εἰκών to the whole Person of Christ (i.e. not just to his human nature), the προσκύνησις which passes from the εἰκών to the prototype is not divided.

Antirr III.B brings together the language of Deny's *EH* ('...the truth in the likeness, the archetype in the image, each in the other, except for the difference in substance.') and Basil's *De Spiritu Sancto* 18.45 ('...so even is our giving of honour one and not many, because the honour of the image passes to the prototype.') to allow the following statement:

---

[588] A clear reference to Dionysius *EH*, 4.3.
[589] *Antirr* III.A.3; Migne *PG* 99.417C.
[590] *Antirr* III.A.3,4; Migne *PG* 99.417D,420A.

Οὐκοῦν ἔχει καὶ εἰκόνα, ἧς ἡ ἀναφορὰ τῆς προσκυνήσεως ἐπ' αὐτὸν διαβαίνουσα, οὐδέποτε μερισμῷ δόξης διέσχισται.

Therefore he has an εἰκών, and its reference of προσκύνησις which passes over to him is never cut off by a division of glory.

This is the last time that Theodore will use the verb διαβαίνειν in connection with this Basil passage. The reason for this is made clear by his later letters which present the development of Theodore's thought following the writing of *Antirr* III.C & D. *Antirr* III.C is an argument to defend Theodore's bold language of hypostatic identity which he introduced in Fatouros 57.

The one indivisible veneration of Christ and his image

The first iconoclast objection is that the likeness which is in the εἰκών is always deficient in some way and fails to show precisely the likeness of the prototype. Therefore the προσκύνησις received by the prototype must be equally deficient to the deficiency of the likeness. This objection is overcome through an understanding that the prototype is not essentially in the εἰκών:

> Rather, the prototype is in the εἰκών by the similarity of hypostasis, which does not have a different principle of definition for the prototype and for the εἰκών.[591] ... the εἰκών has one and the same veneration with the prototype, in accordance with the identity of likeness. ... when we venerate the εἰκών, we do not introduce another kind of veneration different from the veneration of the prototype.[592]

[591] *Antirr* III.A.1; Migne *PG* 99.417D,420D.
[592] *Antirr* III.A.22; Migne *PG* 99.417D,421A.

280

The unity of veneration offered to the εἰκών and prototype is not affected by the lack of skill of the artist, a damaged depiction, or the impaired condition of the material on which the εἰκών appears. As long as the ὑπόστασις is recognizable, the veneration is one. In another work Theodore mentions that once an εἰκών has lost its χαρακτήρ, it will be thrown into the fire 'like any useless piece of wood'. [593] The examples of the mirror and the signet ring in Fatouros 57 adequately made the point. The metaphor of the 'imprint in the seal' will serve as the conclusion to Theodore's entire argument in *Antirr* III.D.9,10. In his last extant letter in 826, Theodore quotes from a previous letter, 'we offer προσκύνησις to Christ himself and not to the material representation technically fashioned in the εἰκών.'[594] It is solely the εἰκών of the prototype that appears in the depiction which is offered προσκύνησις, not the depiction itself.[595] Nothing of the οὐσία of the εἰκών receives any προσκύνησις at all. Because the εἰκών has the identical form as the prototype: 'the objects of veneration are not two, but one and the same, the prototype in the εἰκών.'[596]

Since the discussion here revolves around the unity of προσκύνησις Theodore feels free to introduce the example of the τύπος of the cross. The τύπος can be of various sizes, shapes, descriptions, conditions and styles, yet the προσκύνησις offered to the prototype is always one and the same. The προσκύνησις is not offered to whatever deficiencies might be present in the τύπος of the cross, but to the prototype, the life-

---

[593] "Ελεγχος καὶ ἀνατροπὴ τῶν ἀσεβῶν ποιημάτων. Migne 99.464D. The same point is made by Leontius of Neapolis, *Contra Judaeos*, Migne *PG* 93.1597C, and John of Damascus, *Orationes*, 2.19, Kotter 3.118.

[594] Fatouros 532 as quoted from 528.

[595] Cf. Plato's *Sophist*, 234d ff., and 241d regarding the image having no existence at all other than being similar to the model.

[596] *Antirr* III.C.5; Migne *PG* 99.417D,421D.

giving cross itself:

> the veneration of Christ Himself and of Christ in the εἰκών is one and the same. ...the εἰκών of Peter appears in Peter, just as Peter appears in his own εἰκών. Therefore the εἰκών of Christ is not differently venerated from Christ himself, but is venerated in the same way, as it has an exact resemblance and likeness to him.

Theodore reasons that in the Trinity the προσκύνησις offered to the Father and the Son is equal and the same, even though they are separate hypostases. Likewise, though the Christ-εἰκών and Christ are different in the principle of their essence (κατὰ τὸν οὐσίας λόγον), their προσκύνησις is also equal and the same, in accordance with the unity of hypostatic likeness (κατὰ τὸ μονικὸν τῆς ὑποστατικῆς ὁμοιώσεως). Theodore gives a number of expressions of hypostatic identity, each of which implies an identity of προσκύνησις:

> If ... he who has seen the εἰκών of Christ has seen Christ in it, we certainly must say that as the εἰκών of Christ has the same likeness, so also it has the same veneration of Christ.

> Since the likeness is one, the veneration of both must also be one.[597]

> The εἰκών of Christ is nothing else but Christ, except obviously for the difference of essence ... It follows that the veneration of the εἰκών is veneration of Christ.

---

[597] We see here that the truth of Dionysius *EH* in the light of Theodore's Christological argument, has a tendency to go beyond Basil's διαβαίνει. It seems to be no longer a 'passing over' but an offering of προσκύνησις to Christ who is immediately in the image.

This concept of hypostatic unity becomes a common theme in the letters, as follows:

The prototype is made clear in the εἰκών (ἐν εἰκόνι ἐκφαίνεται τὸ ἀρχέτυπον) and Christ is offered προσκυνήσις in the εἰκών. Thus in saying 'in the εἰκών' each is made known in the other (ἐν ἑτέρῳ ἕτερον δεδήλωται) and each is offered προσκυνήσις in/through the other (δι'ἄλλου ἄλλο).[598]

Thus also Christ is both seen and offered προσκύνησις in his εἰκών. ... these are two because of the difference of their substance, but not different in their similarity of hypostases (καίτοι γε ταῦτα δύο τῇ διαφορότητι τῆς οὐσίας, οὐ τῇ ὁμοιότητι τῆς ὑποστάσεως).[599]

There are then these two, both the εἰκών and the prototype, and the difference is not in the hypostasis, but according to the principle of οὐσία.
(ἐπειδὴ ταῦτα δύο, εἰκών τε καὶ πρωτότυπον, καὶ ἡ διαφορότης οὐκ ἐπὶ τῆς ὑποστάσεως, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸν τῆς οὐσίας λόγον.)[600]

The final challenge of the iconoclast is a return to a theme of Constantine V and the ὅρος of the 754 Council that the offering of προσκύνησις to the εἰκών is forbidden in John 4.24 which insists that those who worship God must offer him προσκύνησις in spirit and in truth. Theodore claims that the iconoclast has failed to maintain the distinction between θεολογία and οἰκονομία. It is true that in speaking of θεολογία the Father can only be worshipped in spirit and in truth (in the Holy Spirit and in Christ who is the Truth), but the offering of προσκύνησις to the Christ-εἰκών is a matter of the

---

[598] Fatouros 409.
[599] Fatouros 551.
[600] Fatouros 546.44-46.

οἰκονομία. The Christ-εἰκών is inseparable from Christ, like the shadow of a body. Yet

this same Christ receives the προσκύνησις which is offered to him in the εἰκών: 'Christ

together with whom we offer προσκύνησις to the Father and the Holy Spirit. (... Χριστός·

ἐφ' ᾧ συμπροσκυνεῖται ὁ Πατὴρ, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον.)'[601]

In this third part of *Antirr* III, Theodore has shown how the identity of hypostatic

likeness guarantees that in the order of the οἰκονομία, the προσκύνησις offered to the

devotional Christ-εἰκών is one and entire with that received by Christ. The Christ-εἰκών

does not have its own ὑπόστασις but is only an εἰκών by virtue of the one ὑπόστασις of

the Person of Christ which is the ὑπόστασις of the Logos. Thus, the προσκύνησις is

offered to Christ's ὑπόστασις, which is to say that it is offered and received by Christ

himself directly in the εἰκών. Simultaneously, because of the two natures in the one

ὑπόστασις of the Logos, it becomes the single offering of λατρεία to the Holy Trinity in

the order of θεολογία.

Although the themes of this section are echoed repeatedly in Theodore's later

letters, it is not surprising that the letter in which these themes are taken up and given

most careful attention (Fatouros 528) is a letter to John Grammaticus, the chief theologian

of the iconoclasts.[602] In a previous letter to Naukratios, Theodore describes him as 'John

the impious'.[603] John had likely read Fatouros 57 (Theodore's letter to Plato c. 810), but

the immediate cause of Fatouros 528 was John's disagreement with the dogma expressed

in a letter of Theodore to an Athanasius (Fatouros 428). This letter had suggested the

---

[601] *Antirr* III.C.15; Migne *PG* 99.428B.
[602] There is considerable disagreement about the date of this letter. Alexander and Grumel suggest a date before 814, thinking that the introductory remarks identify Plato as still living. This is impossible since Fatouros 528 contains a lengthy direct quotation from Fatouros 428, written c. 816-826. That Fatouros 528 is a careful document is confirmed by the fact that Theodore quotes this letter in his final letter in 826 to the Emperor Michael (Fatouros 532) in a summary of iconophile doctrine.
[603] Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἀσεβοῦς. Fatouros 380.5,6.

same notion with which *Antirr* III.C concludes, using two variations of the verb συμπροσκυνεῖν which appears here. After a brief extract from Fatouros 428 (set apart by quotation marks), Theodore's defence to John of the use of this verb follows:

'You say "How is it that the εἰκών of Christ is not given λατρεία, but only Christ [is given λατρεία] who is offered προσκύνησις in it [the εἰκών], although one act of προσκύνησις is offered to both?"[604] This is so because when the προσκύνησις is offered to Christ himself, it is λατρεία which is given. When I offer προσκύνησις to him [Christ], I offer προσκύνησις in common and together with the Father and the Holy Spirit (προσκυνῶν δὲ αὐτὸν Χριστὸν δῆλον ὅτι συμπροσεκύνησα τὸν πατέρα ὁμοῦ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα.)...the offering of προσκύνησις before Christ himself is thought of and called λατρευτική, so in as much as it is both the thought of and the offering of προσκύνησις to Christ, these are both thought of and offered together with both the Father and the Spirit. (ἂν νοοῖτο καὶ λέγοιτο, ἐπ' αὐτοῦ δὲ Χριστοῦ λατρευτική, ὡς συνεπινοουμένου τε καὶ συμπροσκυνουμένου τοῦ τε πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος.)'

My friend ... the preposition 'συν' supports its unity relating to its nature (φυσικήν) while showing forth the distinction of the hypostases, even as this is sung by all Christians in our symbol of faith[605]; and on the other hand, to give no place to the preposition 'συν' in reference to the offering of προσκύνησις to both Christ and his εἰκών. For if what has already been said[606] made the one hypostasis to be divided into two hypostases, it would carry us into the impiety of creature worship. ... 'And in other words,' the all wise Dionysius says, 'the one is in the other excepting the difference τῆς οὐσίας.' Thus in speaking of the difference in οὐσία it is clear that

---

[604] Fatouros suggests here a reference to Dionysius ep. 4.1 (PG 3.1072A).
[605] The Nicene Creed '... who with the Father and the Son ....'
[606] In the above quoted letter.

285

he showed the identity of the hypostasis (ὑποστάσεως) in the expression 'the one is in the other.' ... But when the letter adds ὑποστατικῇ,[607] this distinctly shows that there is not another ὑπόστασις from that of Christ in his εἰκών, but that it is the ὑπόστασις of Christ himself, that is to say, his χαρακτήρ, that through the εἴδει of his μορφῆς, both is expressed in the εἰκών and is offered προσκύνησις. And this entire discussion is vigorously affirmed by those with a sound understanding.

Theodore interprets the Dionysian passage as saying that the ὑπόστασις of the Christ-εἰκών is the same as the ὑπόστασις of Christ, 'the one [ὑπόστασις] is in the other [ὑπόστασις].' The epistemological implications have been quoted above from Fatouros 409, 'each is made known in the other (ἐν ἑτέρῳ ἕτερον δεδήλωται) and each is offered προσκυνήσις in/through the other (δι' ἄλλου ἄλλο).' The Dionysian passage is given an interpretation through the introduction of the notion of the ὑπόστασις such that the phrase 'excepting the difference of οὐσία' becomes all important. In every other aspect, the εἰκών and Person of Christ share the same ὑπόστασις, which is the ὑπόστασις of the Logos. Thus the προσκύνησις offered to the Christ-εἰκών is offered to Christ directly, because he is in the εἰκών. But the προσκύνησις which is offered to the εἰκών (or, as he corrects himself in a later letter, not to the εἰκών but to Christ himself) is received as λατρεία by Christ, together with the Father and the Holy Spirit (as *Antirr III.*C concludes and Theodore explains to John in Fatouros 528). This follows from the logic of the Christological doctrine established in *Antirr* III.A.

There are three letters later than the *Antirr* in which the Dionysian and Basilian passages are quoted together; Fatouros 380, 393 and 408,[608] each of which combines an

---

[607] 'relating to ὑπόστασις'.
[608] These passages are never quoted together in *Antirr* I & II.

interpretation of the Dionysian passage making the notion of διαβαίνειν, or 'passing over' of the προσκύνησις from εἰκών to prototype redundant. Christ receives προσκύνησις directly in the devotional Christ-εἰκών. Yet because this same Christ is of the οὐσία of the Father and the Son, the προσκύνησις is immediately that of the entire Holy Trinity as well. It is in order to make this movement of the προσκύνησις from the Christ-εἰκών to the Trinity (from the οἰκονομία to the θεολογία) clear that Theodore replaces διά- with ἀνά- as the preface to βαίνειν. Basil had used the verb διαβαίνειν to speak of the passing of the single and undivided honour from the Son to the Father. He also spoke of the same lateral movement from the image of the emperor to the emperor himself. The doctrine of the Christ-εἰκών requires a new language to maintain the single truth of the tradition. In this case it requires the change of a prefix of a verb in a well known passage of Basil to protect the integrities of the natures of Christ, the one προσκύνησις of the Logos, the role of Christ as mediator, and the appropriate distinction of and relation between the οἰκονομία and the θεολογία.

We do not err by depicting him at all times

Theodore has shown that 'in respect to the identity of the hypostatic likeness (τὸ ταυτὸν τῆς ὑποστατικῆς ὁμοιώσεως), the veneration is made identical in accordance with the one complete similarity in both.'[609] In the conclusion of his argument Theodore meets the final objection of the iconoclast to the identity of hypostatic likeness of Christ and Christ-εἰκών. Since the undivided προσκύνησις of εἰκών and prototype has been grounded upon the identity of the ὑπόστασις of Christ with that shown in the εἰκών, then the identity of the ὑπόστασις (without οὐσία) in the εἰκών and that of Christ must be

[609] *Antirr* III.D.7; Migne *PG* 99.432B.

firmly established. If the iconoclast can drive a wedge between the ὑπόστασις of the Christ-εἰκών and Christ, the thesis of the common offering of προσκύνησις will be lost.

Theodore began *Antirr* III with a discussion of Christology in which he showed that the ὑπόστασις of Christ has the property of bodily circumscription (περιγραπτὸς σώματι) with a human form (χαρακτήρ). Further, this χαρακτήρ has a particular μορφή which is unique to Christ. This unique μορφή distinguishes Christ from all other persons and appears in the Christ-εἰκών. Thus, of the Christ-εἰκών and Christ, there is not a different principle of definition (οὐκ ἔστιν ἕτερος λόγος τῆς διορίσεως),[610] but only a different principle of essence (λόγος τῆς οὐσίας). The Person of Christ and the Christ-εἰκών share in one hypostatic likeness (μία ἡ ὑποστατικὴ ὁμοίωσις).[611]

The iconoclast rejects this reasoning and opens *Antirr* III.D with the objection that Theodore's argument demands an identity of hypostatic likeness (τὸ ταυτὸν τῆς ὑποστατικῆς ὁμοιώσεως[612]) of Christ-εἰκών and Christ which is indefensible. After all, asserts the iconoclast, the Christ-εἰκών was produced in time after Christ himself appeared. Since they are not simultaneous, and thus different in this way, the ὑπόστασις of the εἰκών is not simply that of Christ himself, and therefore they cannot share one offering of προσκύνησις.

Theodore counters with an argument drawn from definitions and examples both cited previously in the *Antirr* and familiar in the well known logical compendia, in which he shows that the εἰκών and prototype share a simultaneous existence. As soon as Christ appeared, his εἰκών, like his shadow, existed by implication and potential. Theodore points to the standard common examples of those things which belong to the category of

---

[610] *Antirr* III.A.1; Migne *PG* 99.420C.
[611] Fatouros 430.
[612] *Antirr* III.D.7; Migne *PG* 99.432B.

related things (τῶν πρός τι):

> The prototype and the image belong to the category of related things, like the double and the half. For the prototype always implies the εἰκών of which it is the prototype, and the double always implies the half in relation to which it is double. ... For there would not be a prototype if there were no εἰκών; there would not even be any double, if some half were not understood. But since these things exist simultaneously, they are understood and subsist together. ... The prototype and the εἰκών have their being, as it were, in each other. With the removal of one the other is removed, just as when the double is removed the half is removed along with it. If therefore, Christ cannot exist unless his εἰκών exists in potential, and if, before the εἰκών is produced artistically, it subsists always in the prototype: then the veneration of Christ is destroyed by anyone who does not admit that his εἰκών is also venerated in him.[613]

The Christ-εἰκών does not subsist in the material image in which it is signified or represented, but it 'points toward' the actual εἰκών which can never be separated from the prototype, for it is related to it by definition.[614] In a letter to John Grammaticus Theodore explains this in terms of Aristotelian logic:

> 'And in other words,' the all wise Dionysius says, 'the one is in the other excepting the difference τῆς οὐσίας.' Thus in speaking of the difference in οὐσία it is clear that he showed the identity of the hypostasis (ὑποστάσεως) in the expression 'the one is in the other.' By means of this expression the offering of προσκύνησις is considered to be according to σχέσις. Relation (ἡ σχέσις), as one says, belongs to

---

[613] *Antirr* III.D.5; Migne *PG* 99.429CD.

[614] Nicephorus, on the other hand, speaks of their participation not in each other, but a common participation in the relation itself, 'τῳ κοινῇ μετέχειν τῆς σχέσεως.' (224).

the relative terms (τῶν πρός τί ἐστιν). They come into being simultaneously and turn toward one another, in such manner as the archetype to the image. For the one is not possible without the other, as things which exist together (τὰ ἅμα), philosophically speaking. The letter adds 'or equivocal' (ἤγουν ὁμωνυμική);[615] for certainly this expression has the same significance. For the 'name' is the name of that which is named. For which reason this is the principle of those things related to one another (τῶν πρός τι): as we are taught according to philosophical definition that things are said to be named 'equivocally' (ὁμώνυμα) if the name alone is common. On the other hand, the definition (λόγος τῆς οὐσίας) corresponding to the name differs for each, as for Christ himself and the depiction of Christ.[616] But when the letter adds ὑποστατικη,[617] this distinctly shows that there is not another hypostasis from that of Christ in his εἰκών, but that it is the hypostasis of Christ himself, that is to say, his χαρακτήρ, that through the εἴδει of his μορφῆς, both is expressed in the εἰκών and is offered προσκύνησις.[618]

Next, the iconoclast objects that if the εἰκών is already present in Christ as prototype potentially, then since it is seen and offered προσκύνησις in him it is superfluous to depict the εἰκών otherwise. This leads Theodore to a meditation upon Christ as seal (σφραγὶς) and a discussion about the necessity of the Christ-εἰκών in the οἰκονομία. Christ loses his humanity if he does not have his εἰκών transferred from his χαρακτήρ, shaped in some material (ἔν τινι ὕλη), and seen and offered προσκύνησις in that εἰκών. Unless Christ is stamped (ἀποτυπουμένη) in some material, he is idle and ineffective (ἀεργὸς καὶ ἀνενέργητός). 'For the failure to go forth into a material imprint

---

[615] 'that is to say homonymous'
[616] '[This sentence] is an almost literal quotation of the first sentence of the Categories. Also, Theodore is evidently pleased to use even Aristotle's example of things equivocal, that of man and his portrait, by applying it to Christ and His image.' Alexander (1957b), 196 n.1.
[617] 'relating to hypostasis'.
[618] Fatouros 528.

eliminates his existence in human form (ἀνθρωπόμορφον).'[619] These comments are addressed fully in a letter to Naukratios several years later:

But if someone should say: 'Since I ought to offer προσκύνησις to [Christ] in spirit, it is redundant/pointless to offer προσκύνησις to him in his εἰκών,' he should know that with this he also denies the intelligible (νοερῶς) offering of προσκύνησις to Christ. You see, if the mind cannot contemplate him in his human likeness (εἰ μὴ γὰρ ὁ νοῦς ἐνοπτρισθείη ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπου), seated at the right hand of the Father, then it could not know any offering of προσκυνήσις at all, since it thereby denies that the Word has become flesh. But his faithful εἰκών is a witness to the fact that he has taken on the likeness of man (ὡμοιῶσθαι αὐτὸν ἀνθρώπω). For it is received in the tradition that if he is offered προσκύνησις in the εἰκών, Christ has been given προσκύνησις, as the contrary is true in its rejection. Abgar received faith and offered προσκυνήσις to Christ intelligibly (νοερῶς), but he offered προσκυνήσις even more to him in his manifestation in the εἰκών of his prototype sent from Christ himself (ἐν τῇ πρὸς αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ πεμφθείση αὐτῷ ἀχειροποιήτω εἰκόνι). Whereby Christ has been offered προσκυνήσις both in that [εἰκών] according to the likeness (ὁμοιωματικῶς) and at the same time intelligibly (νοερῶς). Thus now, but in the final age to come it will be by a direct seeing of divinity (αὐτοπτικῶς). "With the visible manifestation of God," as the all-wise Dionysius says, "we shall be filled in all-holy contemplation (ἐν πανάγνοις θεωρίαις), illuminating us (shining around us) with the glorious shining forth, as [it illuminated] the disciples, at the divine Transfiguration. For we participate in his intelligible illumination by the mind free from passion and earthly things. (τῆς δὲ νοητῆς αὐτοῦ φωτοδοσίας ἐν ἀπαθεῖ καὶ αὔλω τῷ νῷ μετέχοντες.)[620]

---

[619] *Antirr* III.D.10; Migne *PG* 99.433A.
[620] Fatouros 409.

The final remarks of this letter, including the significant citation of Dionysius the Areopagite shall guide us in our consideration of the concluding theme of *Antirr* III and the entire treatise, which is a meditation on I Corinthians 13.12, 13, ' For now we see in a mirror dimly, but then face to face. Now I know in part; then I shall know even as I have been fully understood. So faith, hope, and love abide.'[621]

In *Antirr* III.D.13 Theodore compares the contemplation of the devotional Christ-εἰκών with that of the obscure and imperfect vision of an ancient mirror. In such a mirror, the expectation is not that there will be an exact one to one correspondence of each detail of the prototype or subject, but only that the εἰκών reveal the identity of the prototype through recognition of the prototype by its form. Regardless of the ways in which the imperfections of the mirror distort the form of the εἰκών, recognition of Christ in the εἰκών is the determining notion. This partial vision is contrasted with the future vision of God which is that of a supreme union in which there shall be a different mode of knowledge, direct and 'face-to-face.' For the present however, the devotional Christ-εἰκών shows forth the divine life in the same manner that Christ revealed his Father during his earthly life. The Person of Jesus Christ both reveals and hides his divine-human nature, by doing human things divinely and divine things humanly. The revelation of God in Christ was not the revelation of a human 'nature' taken up into divinity, but the revelation of the Person of Christ who is the God-man. Theodore suggests that the Christ-εἰκών likewise reveals the full ὑπόστασις of the Person of Christ. This allows the possibility that the baptized Christian who has made progress in asceticism and contemplates before an εἰκών might have a similar experience to that of the disciples at the Transfiguration. Glimpses of a future face-to-face knowledge and the 'direct seeing of

[621] *Antirr* III.D.12; Migne 434D.

292

divinity' (ἡ θεοπτία) are possible even in this life for the one who achieves *apatheia*.[622] In one of his post-821 catecheses,[623] Theodore tells us that the 'mystery of the Transfiguration hints at the restoration in the age to come ... so the elect will be with him in the kingdom of heaven, enjoying his ineffable manifestation as God and inexpressible joy.' But just as Peter, James and John were granted this vision while alive, so this vision is granted to all those 'whose way of life is pure and undefiled.' This leads Theodore to encourage the faithful not to grow slack and allow the soul to be defiled by λογισμοί, but rather to 'love this beauty [of a pure soul] and guard this loveliness.' Finally, in his closing comments Theodore describes how the worshipper contemplates the ὑπόστασις of the liturgical, doctrinal and devotional εἰκών under the three aspects of faith, hope and love.

The εἰκών is defined under the aspect of *faith* in that Christ or the saint depicted is a historical figure within the οἰκονομία. The Christ-εἰκών is a bodily likeness of the Incarnate God-man. The εἰκών of the saint shows forth the bodily likeness or χαρακτήρ of one who has achieved deification in Christ. The εἰκών of the saint shows one who has 'put on' Christ.

The εἰκών is defined under the aspect of *hope* in that Christ is the natural and eternal image of the Father and it is in His image and likeness that mankind was created. The Christian 'contemplates' Christ's glorified humanity which is the hope for all

---

[622] Alfeyev (2002), 217, 224 denies that this theme is present in Theodore's writings, but interprets Theodore to limit θεοπτία to the life after death. Alfeyev is correct in pointing out that Theodore teaches most often that the ascetic struggle, sufferings and the 'bloodless martyrdom' of the Christian have their reward after death. On the other hand, Fatouros 387 and 409 speak of θεοπτία as the ultimate experience of πρᾶξις and θεωρία in this life. Alfeyev seems unaware that Fatouros 387 directly supports his suggestion that Theodore might have refused to write about the possibility of a direct vision of God in order to provide people with a secure hope for the future, not wanting to discourage those who did not achieve such a vision in this life.

[623] *PC* 20.

baptized Christians and the goal of ascetic practice. In his reference to the Transfiguration through his citation of Denys the Areopagite in Fatouros 409 quoted above, Theodore suggests that the Christ-εἰκών can reveal apophatically what must remain hidden to the active human intellect. In this sense every Christ-εἰκών has the potential to be a 'Transfiguration experience' for the one who has progressed in ascetic practice. In his commentary on the Transfiguration less than two centuries previous, Maximus anticipates Theodore's apology for the devotional Christ-εἰκών:

> For he accepted to be unchangeably created in form like us and through his immeasurable love for humankind to become the type and symbol of Himself, and from Himself symbolically to represent Himself, and through the manifestation of Himself to lead to Himself in His complete and secret hiddenness the whole creation, and while he remains quite unknown in his hidden, secret place beyond all things, unable to be known or understood by any being in any way whatever, out of his love for humankind he grants to human beings intimations of Himself in the manifest divine works performed in the flesh.[624]

Theodore has established in *Antirr* III.A that the one ὑπόστασις of the Person of Christ includes all properties of both natures. The exact likeness of that ὑπόστασις which is shown in the Christ-εἰκών is that of the Christ who is perfect man and perfect God. It is not Christ's humanity which is shown in the εἰκών (nor his divinity), but his Person (which includes both natures). Because Christ the God-man is a subject both for θεολογία as well as for οἰκονομία, both apophatic and cataphatic language is appropriate to him. Likewise, because the Christ-εἰκών is the exact likeness of the ὑπόστασις of the Logos,

---

[624] *Ambigua* 10.31c, Louth (1996a) page 132.

apophatic and cataphatic language must be applied to the εἰκών. Each devotional εἰκών of a saint shows his or her historical body in its deified state, proclaiming this bodily deification as the practical goal of every Christian worshipper. Maximus asserts that the purpose of this movement of deification is so that 'the whole of man might participate in God, so that as the soul is united with the body, God might be accessible to the soul's participation in him, and so that through the soul and the body ... man might be wholly deified, deified by the grace of God incarnate while yet remaining by nature wholly man both in body and soul, and becoming God by grace, wholly, both in body and soul.'[625]

Finally, the devotional εἰκών is defined under the aspect of *love* in that the desire of every worshipper is not knowledge, nor even deification for its own sake, but loving union with the triune God in and through the εἰκών. Theodore stresses in these concluding thoughts of the *Antirr*, and throughout his letters, that the mental contemplation of Christ is not sufficient for our salvation: 'If merely mental contemplation were sufficient, it would have been sufficient for him to come to us in a merely mental way. (Εἰ γὰρ ἀρκεῖ ἡ κατὰ νοῦν μόνον θεωρία, ἦρκει ἄν ἐν τοσούτῳ αὐτὸν χωρῆσαι πρὸς ἡμᾶς)[626] Rather, what draws the Christian to his Lord is the sight of his loving deeds and his sacrificial sufferings, 'so as to behold Christ himself crucified.'[627] This desire for the one whose love for us is demonstrated in his Incarnation is asserted by Gregory of Nyssa in several passages in which he reflects on the future 'face to face knowledge' of I Cor 13,12.

---

[625] *Ambigua* 7.1088C. Cited by Zhivov (1987), 370. See also the comment by Sherrard (1967) re. the images of the saints that 'testify not only to the reality of the Incarnation, but also to the reality of that sanctification in the spirit which is as it were the purpose of the Incarnation. ... These portraits are not portraits of men and women in their 'fallen' state. They are portraits of a deified humanity ...who participate in the here and now of the new heaven and the new earth. What they show forth is the state of being which it is, or should be, the worshipper's desire to achieve through his initiation into the Christian mystery' (61).

[626] *Antirr* I.7; Migne *PG* 99.336D.

[627] *Antirr* III.D.13. Migne *PG* 99.436A.

Gregory speaks of the love for the prototype:

> ... this hope constantly inflamed his desire to see what was hidden because of all that he had attained at each stage. Thus it is that the ardent lover of beauty, constantly receiving an image, as it were, of what he longs for, wants to be filled with the very impression of the archetype. The bold demand of the soul that climbs the hills of desire tends towards the direct enjoyment of Beauty, and not merely through mirrors or reflections. In refusing Moses' request, the voice of God in a sense grants it, by pointing out in a few words an infinite abyss of contemplation.[628]

The vision of God in the devotional Christ-εἰκών is accomplished by a refusal or denial which both reveals and maintains the hiddenness of the divine at the same time. To see God face-to-face is the assertion that although the divine remains incapable of being understood by the finite soul, the divine is capable of being experienced. I have noted above how Theodore begins the entire *Antirr* with a radical statement of the apophatic nature of all language pertaining to θεολογία: 'We do not even know that the Godhead exists.'[629] But apophaticism has to do with more than language. The process by which the human soul comes to receive a vision of God or 'intelligible illumination' (νοητῆς φωτοδοσίας)[630] is also that of passing through a succession of cataphatic and apophatic moments of θεωρία. More than this, the process of purification of the soul through the intensifying negation itself accomplishes the deification of the worshipper. In the final anathema of *Antirr I* Theodore says that whoever refuses to approach the Christ-εἰκών because it will not benefit him until he is first purified from all sin, 'he is a fool'. The

---

[628] Gregory of Nyssa, *Life of Moses*, II, 231-233. Cited by Mateo-Seco (1997), 156.
[629] *Antirr* I.2.
[630] Fatouros 409 as quoted above.

successive negations of θεωρία before an εἰκών become the purification of the discursive thinking of the earth bound soul. 'Vision' is not simply intellectual, but involves the progressive deification of the whole person in the experience of the divine. In his review of Fr. Staniloae's general discussion of apophatic and cataphatic language in Denys, John Chrysostom and the Cappadocians, Louth (1997b) points out that denial does not undermine the continuing affirmation of the image:

> to rise above the things of the world does not mean that these disappear; it means, through them, to rise beyond them. And since they remain, the apophatic knowledge of God does not exclude affirmative rational knowledge ... In apophatic knowledge the world remains, but it has become transparent of God. This knowledge is apophatic because the God who now is perceived cannot be defined; he is experienced as a reality which transcends all possibility of definition.[631]

In Fatouros 380 Theodore says, 'Is not the εἰκών useful and uplifting? It is a reflection of face-to-face vision and a kind of moonlike light, to use an appropriate paradigm, an εἰκών pointing to the light of the sun'[632] Theodore uses similar language in a sermon on the feast of the κοίμησις.[633] He draws the attention of the congregation to an εἰκών of the Theotokos and reflects: 'Today the spiritual moon, shining with the light of God, has come into heavenly conjunction with the "sun of righteousness." ... At this moment her natural form, radiant as the sun, is hidden; yet her light shines through her painted εἰκών (τῇ σκιαγραφικῇ αὐτῆς εἰκόνι), and she offers it to the people for the life-giving kiss of relative veneration (σχετικῆς προσκυνήσεως).' The εἰκών points to the

---

[631] Cited by Louth (1997b), 262.
[632] Translation by Louth.
[633] Migne *PG* 99.720-729.

ὑπόστασις of the glorified Theotokos. It shares nothing of her essence. Yet in denying that an εἰκών can show her true light, we are made to think of that divine light. Likewise, continues Theodore, she is now speechless but beyond speechlessness and beyond the concept of speech itself, yet as we surrender to her we hear her speak and intercede for all of humankind: 'Now those lips, moved by God's grace to articulate sounds, grow silent, but she opens her [spiritual] mouth to intercede eternally for all her race. Now she lowers those bodily hands that once bore God, only to raise them, in incorruptible form, in prayer to the Lord on behalf of all creation.' This meditation on the εἰκών of the Theotokos takes place within the Liturgy where the process of cataphatic and apophatic reflection is made clear by the spiritual logic and movement of the Liturgy itself. Signs of God's goodness (bread and wine) become his true Body and Blood to be received by the communicant, effecting the loving union and causing his progressive deification.

In Fatouros 380 Theodore is clearly taking up the language which Denys the Areopagite used in relation to Scripture and Liturgy ('a reflection of face-to-face vision and a kind of moonlike light ... pointing to the light of the sun') and suggesting that the liturgical, doctrinal and devotional εἰκών has become another revealed and formal means by which the worshipper receives a Dionysian spiritual uplifting (ἀναγωγή) 'to the simple and unified contemplations.'[634] Theodore claims that the full fruit of pious contemplation (ἱερὰν θεωρίαν) is to be discovered in and through the image (διὰ τοῦ μιμήματος) in the very same way that a very great spiritual contemplation rises to the prototype (ἐπὶ τὸ ἀρχέτυπον ἡ πνευματικὴ θεωρία ἄνεισι). The face-to-face vision of God is granted to those who have purified the soul through ascetic progress in their

---

[634] ἐπὶ τὰς ἀπλᾶς καὶ ἡνωμένας ἀνάγεται θεωρίας. *Divine Names* 4.9; Migne 3.705B.

longing to be united with the God whom they behold depicted before them in an εἰκών, 'Christ Himself crucified.'[635]

---

[635] *Antirr* III.D.13; Migne *PG* 436A.

CONCLUSION

The spirits of Philo and Farrer have been with us throughout our consideration of the Christ-εἰκών in Middle Byzantine thought, and they are present particularly in Theodore's summarizing meditation. The two concluding themes of Theodore in the final two columns of the *Antirr* in Migne[636] are the Philonic theme of seal and imprint (Christ as the seal and the Christ-εἰκών as his imprint), and a meditation on I Corinthians 13.12, the focal Scripture verse of Farrer's Bampton Lectures of 1948 and the subsequent title of those published lectures, *The Glass of Vision.*

The Christ-εἰκών is clearly what Farrer would call the 'master-image'. This is clearly witnessed in the Christ-εἰκών as Pantocrator or universal ruler with his retinue of angels in the dome of the Byzantine church which dominated the church interior iconic history of salvation. The Christ-εἰκών legitimizes the imaging of any saint, and sets before the baptized Christian the faith in the God-man and good hope of one's own deification, both of which are prompted by a desiring love for God the Trinity which seeks the Divine Presence. The desire of love (ἔρως τῆς ἀγάπης) of the Christian soul for divine union is sparked, enflamed and fueled by the Christ-εἰκών which depicts the infinite and eternal Love of the Father for the worshipper. This contemplative union or mystical illumination is received in this life only by the soul prepared through πρᾶξις and gone out of itself through θεωρία. We have seen how the Christ-εἰκών plays a central role in both πρᾶξις and θεωρία. Finally, the Christ-εἰκών is the master-image not only because the redemption of the human soul is pre-figured in that εἰκών, but the final transfiguration of the entire

---

[636] Migne *PG* 99.433, 436.

cosmos is represented as well. The Christ-εἰκών is the making present of the one who gathers up every atom of creation in his redeeming love. In the Festal Menian we read of this cosmic dimension in the liturgical texts for Epiphany:

> Christ is baptized:
>
> He comes up out of the waters,
>
> And with him he carries up the universe.[637]

> For thou by thine own will hast brought all things out of nothingness into being, by thy power thou dost hold together the creation, and by thy providence thou dost govern the world. Of four elements hast thou compounded the creation: with four seasons hast thou crowned the circuit of the year. All the spiritual powers tremble before thee. The sun sings thy praises; the moon glorifies thee; the stars supplicate before thee; the light obeys thee; the deeps are afraid at thy presence; the fountains are thy servants. Thou hast stretched out the heavens like a curtain; thou hast established the earth upon the waters; thou hast walled about the sea with sand. Thou hast poured forth the air that living things may breathe ... So by the elements, by the angels and by men, by things visible and invisible, may thy most holy Name be glorified, together with the Father and the Holy Spirit, now, and ever, and unto the ages of ages. Amen.[638]

The master-image is not the birth, the baptism, the cross, the resurrection, or the judgement of Christ. Rather, it is the Christ-εἰκών itself which makes present the Person of the Incarnate Lord, the ὑπόστασις of the Logos, the Eternal Image of the Father.

In his early image letter c.810 to his spiritual father Plato, Fatouros 57, Theodore

---

[637] Ware and Mother Mary (1969), 361.
[638] Ware and Mother Mary (1969), 356, 358.

introduces the metaphor of the seal and impression (σφραγίς καὶ ἐκτύπωσις) to describe the relation of Christ to his εἰκών, using the same vocabulary as Philo.[639] The metaphor is effective to the extent that it both allows the meaning of the seal to be communicated but protects the seal from any taint of the intelligible world or ὕλη which receives, and becomes, the impression. For Philo, the 'ἰδέα ἰδεῶν' or Logos, can be stamped only in the world of intelligible ideas (i.e., the Logos is not incarnate) which then further descend and manifest themselves in the sensible. For Theodore the ὑπόστασις of the glorified Incarnate Christ is stamped in the ὕλη which receives it. For Philo the metaphor is part of his overall scheme to keep an infinite distance between the ineffable divinity and the sensible. For Theodore, the Christ-εἰκών is the demonstration that that distance has been overcome in the Person of Jesus Christ. Not only is the Logos formal and final cause, as for Philo, but for Theodore Christ the Logos also is efficient cause in the thoroughgoing providence which extends to sensible creation.

The refocus of the distracted will upon its own redemption in the Person of Christ, shown forth in the Christ-εἰκών, becomes the means by which grace visits the person, renews the image in baptism, purifies the passions through ascetic struggle, achieves θεωρία and is granted θεοπτία. Theodore concludes: 'There could not be an effective seal which was not impressed on some material. Therefore Christ also, unless He appears in an artificial image, is in this respect idle and ineffective. ... For the failure to go forth into a material imprint eliminates His existence in human form. ... Christ's image becomes more conspicuous to all when it appears by imprinting itself in materials.'[640]

The writings of Theodore Stoudite reveal a Byzantine abbot in the monastic

---

[639] See also *Antirr* I.9.
[640] *Antirr* III.D.9, 10, 12; Migne *PG* 99.432D, 433AB.

tradition for whom dogma and prayer are one. The practice of the ascetic struggle, prayer and worship (*lex orandi*) is the purpose of theological argument, right doctrine and legislated dogma (*lex credendi*). We have seen how Theodore engaged in theological debate only when the spiritual and pastoral care for his flock demanded it. When their ability to pray and worship was threatened by false image doctrine he entered the controversy without reserve. Dogma and prayer are not two things but one. The affirmation of orthodox theology, the promotion of the definition of Christ in all the Councils, the clarification of the implications of the Chalcedonian doctrine of the person of Christ in the acknowledgement of two wills and two natures in the one hypostasis of Christ, and so on, mean nothing if they do not assist us in our prayers and living. Thus Theodore says of the iconoclasts in Letter 301:

> For it is not concerning the natures or wills of Christ or anything like this that these dispute, in which the error is according to thought, not at all giving a demonstration perceptively, but now with those thinking conceptually and according to sight, the error is clearly impiety. For they are not deviant in saying that it is not possible to make an εἰκών of Christ only, but they have the same perverse opinion regarding the Theotokos and all the saints in that they destroy all depictions, as they dogmatize that the divine representations are the error and destruction of souls.

In a long letter written to the Emperor just a few months before his death in 826, Theodore sums up the doctrine of the Christ-εἰκών, beginning with a cataloguing of the results of the Councils and showing the veneration of the Christ-εἰκών to be the fruit of orthodoxy. We are not surprised that on his death bed Theodore should challenge and appeal to yet another of the several emperors he dared to confront in his life. In the body

303

of the letter Theodore quotes his foundational citation from Deny's *EH* 4.3, significant in that just the year before Michael had made a present to Pope Lewis of a copy of the Dionysian corpus. In the conclusion of the letter Theodore boldly has the emperor imagine himself in a church with a typical programme of liturgical images. It is as if Theodore is there with the Emperor, pointing to each of the εἰκών in turn. Although it was to be seventeen years before images were finally and formally accepted, these closing words of what is likely the final letter of the Abott of Stoudios anticipates the victory and leaves no room for pessimism.

> According to the telling of the Apostle even that all things have been filled with blessed light, coming from the one who says 'I am the light come into the world.' Of what sort are the things which are perceived? Lo, on the one hand, this is the one who was born in a grotto and who was glorified by the angels, verily lifted up into the arms of his mother and offered προσκύνησις by the magi. Then as a young boy he was seen sitting among the doctors. Then he was baptized by the Precursor. He did miracles with the apostles. He mounted the cross, gave up the ghost, was dead, risen, ascended into heaven. In all these things therefore, everything has been contemplated by means of images. At this particular time, along with the apostles who were eyewitnesses, we can say reasonably, 'we have seen his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth.'

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Theodore the Stoudite: Primary Texts and Translations

Greek editions

Opera Varia

Migne, J.P. (ed.) (1860) *Patrologia Graeca*, volume 99, Paris.

Letters

Fatouros, G. (ed.) (1991a) *Theodori Studitae Epistulae: Pars prior, prolegomena et textum epp. 1-70*, Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 31/1, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Fatouros, G. (ed.) (1991b) *Theodori Studitae Epistulae: Pars altera, textum epp. 71-564 et indices*, Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 31/2, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Parva Catecheses

Auvray, E. (ed.) (1891) Τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ ὁμολογητοῦ Θεοδώρου ἡγουμένου τῶν Στουδίου μικρὰ κατήχησις. *Sancti patris nostri confessoris Theodori Studitis praepositi parva catechesis*, Paris.

Magna Catechesis

Cozza-Luzi, J. (ed.) (1905) *Sancti Theodori Studitae Sermones Magnae Catecheseos*, in A. Mai, *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca* 10.1, Rome.

Poems

Speck, P. (ed.) (1968) *Jamben auf Vershiedene Gegenstände. Einleitung, kritischer Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Other

Efthymiis, S. (1993) 'La Panégyrique de S. Théophane le Confesseur par S. Théodore Stoudite: Édition critique du texte intégral', in *Analecta Bollandiana* 111, 259-90.

Modern Language Translations of Theodore's writings

Constas, N. (trans.) (1991) *The Testament*, Washington: Monastery of the Holy Cross.

Mohr, A.-M. (trans.) (1993) *Théodore Stoudite: Petites catéchèses*, Paris.

Roth, C. (trans.) (1981) *On the Holy Icons*, Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press.

Other Primary Texts and Translations

Anthology, Councils, Florilegium, Hagiography, History and Liturgy.

ANTHOLOGY OF TEXTS

Hennephof, H. (1969) *Textus Byzantini Iconomachiam Pertinentes*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.

COUNCILS AND CANONS

Mansi, G. (ed.) (1759-98) *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, Florence, Venice, Paris.

Tanner, N.P. (ed.) (1990) *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 2 vols., London: Sheed & Ward.

Mansi, I.D. (1767) *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio* XIII, 205-364, Florence.

754 and 787 Councils

Sahas, D. (trans.) (1986) *Icon and Logos: Sources in Eighth-Century Iconoclasm*, Toronto.

754 and 815 Councils

Geischer, H. (1968) *Der byzantinische Bilderstreit. Texte zur Kirchen und Theologiegeschichte*, vol. X, Guterloh.

Libri Carolini

Bastgen, H. (ed.) (1924) *Libri Carolini, sive, Caroli Magni Capitulare de imaginibus*, *MGH, Concilia, tomus 2, supplementum*, Hannhoverae: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani.

Freeman, A. (ed.) (1998) *Opus Caroli regis contra synodum, MGH, Concilia, tomus 2, supplementum* 1, Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung.

Council of 11 March 843

Jean Gouillard (ed.) (1967) *Le Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie: édition et commentaire*, *Travaux et memoires* 2, Paris.

FLORILEGIUM

Diekamp, F. (ed.). (1981) *Doctrina patrum de Incarnatione Verbi (Ein griechisches Florilegium aus der Wende des 7. und 8. Jahrhunderts)* (Munster, 1907), sec. ed. B. Phanourgakis and E. Chrysos (eds.), Münster.

HAGIOGRAPHY

Cunningham, M. (ed.) (1991) *The Life of Michael the Synkellos: Text, Translation and Commentary*, Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises.

Mango, C. (ed. and trans.) (1997) *The correspondence of Ignatios the Deacon: text, trans. and commentary by C. Mango with the collaboration of Stephanos Efthymiadis*

Talbot, A.-M. (ed.) (1995) *Holy Women of Byzantium: Ten Saints' Lives in English Translation*, Washington D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks.

Talbot, A.-M. (ed) (1998) *Byzantine Defenders of Images: Eight Saints' Lives in English Translation*, Washington D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks.

Van de Vorst, C. (1913) 'La Translation de S. Théodore Studite et de S. Joseph de Thessalonique', *Analecta Bollandiana* 32, 27-61.

HISTORY
Cameron, A. and Herrin, J. (eds.) (1984) *Constantinople in the Early Eighth Century:* The Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai, *Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Leiden: E.J. Brill)

Mango, C. (trans.) (1997) *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor*, trans. with introduction and commentary by C. Mango and R. Scott with the assistance of G. Greatrex, Oxford: OUP.

Theophanis Chronographia, ed. C. de Boor, 2 vols, Leipzig, 1883-5; reprinted Hildesheim, 1963.

History of the Armenians, trans. with commentary by R.W. Thomson, 1976, Albany, N.Y., State University of New York Press. Greek text in G. Lafontaine, *La version Grecque ancienne du livre arménien d'Argathange. Édition critique.*

Nicephorus, Breviarium historicum/Short History, Greek and English; text, trans. and

commentary by C. Mango, Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 1990.

LITURGY

Brightman, F. (1896) *Liturgies Eastern and Western. Being the Texts Original or Translated of the Principal Liturgies of the Church*, Oxford.

Thomas, J and Hero, A. (ed.) (2000) *Byzantine monastic foundation documents: a complete translation of the surviving founders' typica and testament*, (trans. by R. Allison), Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection.

Texts of ancient authors in addition to Migne, and modern translations.

ALEXANDER OF APHRODISIAS

Mueller, I (trans.) *Alexander of Aphrodisias, On Aristotle's 'Prior analytics 1.8-13'*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press.

AMMONIUS

Blank, D. (trans.) (1996) *Ammonius, On Aristotle's 'On interpretation 1-8'*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Cohen, S. and Matthews, G. (trans.) (1991) *Ammonius, On Aristotle's 'Categories'*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

ARISTOTLE

Ackrill, J. (trans.) (1978) *Aristotle's Categories and De Interpretatione*, Oxford and New York: The Clarendon Press.

Cooke, H. (ed. and trans.) (1938) *Aristotle, The Organon I: The Categories, On interpretation, Prior analytics*, London: William Heinemann; Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Ross, W. (ed.) (1959) *Aristotelis, De anima*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Smith, R. (trans.) (1989) *Aristotle, Prior analytics*, Indianapolis: Hackett Pub. Co.

BASIL THE GREAT

Courtonne, Y. (ed.) (1957, 1961, 1966) *Saint Basile: Lettres,* 3 vols., Paris.

Geit, S. (ed. and trans.) (1968) *Basile de Césarée: Homélies sur l'Hexaéméron, SC* 26, Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Sesboüé, B., de Durand G.-M., and Doutreleau L. (ed. and trans.) (1982-3) *Basile de Césarée: Contra Eunome, SC* 299 and 305, Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Pruche, B. (ed. and trans.) (1968) *Basile de Césarée: Sur le Saint-Esprit, SC* 17, Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

BEDE

King, J., trans. (1930) *Baedae Opera Historia*, London and New York.

DENYS THE AREOPAGITE

Luibheid, C. and Rorem, P. (trans.) (1987) *Pseudo-Dionysius: the complete works*, New York: Paulist Press

Suchla, B., Heil, G., and Ritter, A. (ed.) (1990-1) *Corpus Dionysiacum*, Berlin and New York: De Gruyter.

DEXIPPUS

Dillon, J. (trans.) (1990) *Dexippus, On Aristotle's 'Categories'*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

DOROTHEOS OF GAZA

Regnault, L. and De Préville (ed.) (1963) *Dorothée de Gaza: Oeuvres Spirituelles*, *SC* 92, Paris.

EVAGRIUS

Bunge, G. (trans.) (1996) *Evagre le Pontique: Traité pratique, ou, Le moine; cent chapitres sur la vie spirituelle*, Bégrolles-en-Mauges: Abbaye de Bellefontaine.

GREGORY NAZIANZEN

Bernardi, J. (ed. and trans.) (1978-95) *Grégoire de Nazianze: Discours*, *SC* 247, 250, 270, 284, 309, 318, 358, 384, 405, Paris.

GREGORY OF NYSSA

Jaeger, W. (ed.) (1921-) *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, Berlin: Leiden.

Musurillo, H. (trans.) (1979) *From glory to glory: texts from Gregory of Nyssa's mystical writings*, selected by J. Daniélou, Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press.

Drobner, H. and Viciano, A. (ed.) (2000) *Gregory of Nyssa, Homilies on the Beatitudes: an English version with commentary and supporting studies*, Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Pasquali, G. (ed.) (1998) *Gregorii Nysseni epistulae*, Leiden and Boston: Brill.

JOHN OF DAMASCUS

Kotter, Bonifatius, O.S.B. (ed.). (1975) *Die Schriften Des Johannes Von Damaskos: Contra imaginum calumniatores orationes tres*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

IGNATIOS THE DEACON

Efthymiades, S. (trans.) (1998) *The Life of Patriarch Tarasios by Ignatios the Deacon (BHG 1698)*, Birmingham Byzantine and Ottoman Monographs 4, Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate.

KLIMAKOS, JOHN

Ware, K. (1982) *John Climacus, The Ladder of Divine Ascent,* New York: The Classics of Western Spirituality. (PG 88.631-1164)

MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR

Louth, A. (trans.) (1996a) *Maximus the Confessor*, trans. of selected texts, London and New York: Routledge.

NICEPHORUS

Featherstone, J. (ed.) (1997) *Nicephori Patriarchae Constantinopolitani: Refutatio et Eversio Definitionis Synodalis Anni 815,* Leuven: University Press.

Mondzain-Baudinet, M.J. (trans.) (1989) *Adversus iconomachos: Discours contre les iconoclastes*, Paris: Klincksieck.

ORIGEN

Borret, M. (ed. and trans.) (1967-1976) *Origène: Contra Celsum*, 5 volumes, Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

PHILO

Colson F.H. and Whitaker G.H. (ed. and trans.) (1929-1962) *Philo with an English Translation in Ten Volumes*, London: William Heinemann Ltd.

Marcus, R. (trans.) (1953) *Supplement I: Questions and answers on Genesis*, trans. from the ancient Armenian version of the original Greek, London: Heinemann;

Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Marcus, R. (trans.) (1953) *Supplement II: Questions and answers on Exodus*, trans. from the ancient Armenian version of the original Greek, London: Heinemann; Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

PHOTIOS

Mango, C. (ed.) (1958) *The Homilies of Photius Patriarch of Constantinople* (Dumbarton Oaks Studies 3), Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks research Library and Collection.

PLATO

Cooper, J. (ed.) (1997) *Plato: Complete Works*, Indianapolis and Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company.

PORPHYRY

Strange, S. (trans.) (1992) *Porphyry: On Aristotle's Categories*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Warren, E. (trans.) (1975) *Porphyry the Phoenician, Isagoge*, Toronto: PIMS.

PROCLUS

Dodds, E. (ed. and trans.) (1992) *Proclus: Elements of Theology* (Greek and English), Oxford: OUP.

SIMPLICIUS

Fleet, B.. (trans.) (2002) *Simplicius, On Aristotle's 'Categories 7-8'*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

de Haas, F. and Fleet, B.. (trans.) (2001) *Simplicius, On Aristotle's 'Categories 5-6'*,

Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Gaskin, R. (trans.) (2000) *Simplicius, On Aristotle's 'Categories 9-15'*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Secondary Literature

Abrahamse, D. (1982) 'Magic and Sorcery in the Hagiography of the Middle Byzantine Period', in *Byzantinische Forschungen* 8, 3-17.

Afinogenov, D. (1994.) 'The Rise of the Patriarchal Power in Byzantium from Nicaenum II to Epanagoga, Part I, From Nicaenum II to the Second Outbreak of Iconoclasm', in *Erytheia* 15, 45-65.

Afinogenov, D. (1996a) 'The Rise of the Patriarchal Power in Byzantium from Nicaenum II to Epanagoga, 'Part II, From the Second Outbreak of Iconoclasm to the death of Methodios', in *Erytheia* 17, 43-71.

Afinogenov, D. (1996b) 'Iconoclasm and Ecclesiastical Freedom: Two Approaches in Ninth-Century Byzantium', in Robert Taft (ed.), *The Christian East. Its Institutions and its Thought. A Critical Reflection*, (Rome: Pontificio Instituto Orientale), 591-611.

Ahrweiler, H. (1975) 'The Geography of the Iconoclast World', in A. Bryer and J. Herrin (eds.), *Iconoclasm*, Birmingham: The Centre for Byzantine Studies, 21-28.

Alexakis, A. (1991) 'Codex *Parisinus Graecus* 1115 and Its Iconophile Florilegium', Ph.D. thesis: Oxford University.

Alexakis, A. (1994) 'A Florilegium in the Life of Nicetas of Medicion and a Letter of Theodore of Stoudios', in *DOP* 48, 179-197.

Alexakis, A. (1996) *Codex* Parisinus Graecus *1115 and its Archetype*, Washington D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks research Library and Collection.

Alexander, P. (1952) 'Hypatius of Ephesus: A Note on Image Worship in the Sixth Century', in *Harvard Theological Review* 45, 177-84.

Alexander, P. (1953) 'The Iconoclastic Council of St. Sophia (815) and Its Definition (Horos)', in *DOP* 7, 36-66.

Alexander, P. (1955) 'An Ascetic Sect of Iconoclasts in Seventh Century Armenia', in K. Weitzmann, *Late Classical and Mediaeval Studies in Honor of Albert Mathias Frend Jr*, Princeton, 151-60.

Alexander, P. (1958a) 'Church Councils and Patristic Authority', in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philosophy* 63, 493-505.

Alexander, P. (1958b) *The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople, Ecclesiastical Policy and Image Worship in the Byzantine Empire*, Oxford: OUP.

Alexander, P. (1977) 'Religious Persecution and resistance in the Byzantine Empire of the eighth and ninth centuries: Methods and Justifications', in *Speculum*, 238-264.

Alfeyev, H. (2000) *St. Symeon the New Theologian and Orthodox Tradition*, Oxford: OUP.

Allchin, A. (1987) 'L'icone: perspectives anglicanes', in F. Boespflug and N. Lossky

(eds.), *Nicée II,* Paris, 355-366.

Allen, P. and Jeffreys, E. (eds.) (1996) *The Sixth Century: End or Beginning?, Byzantina Australiensia* 10, Brisbane.

Anastos, M. (1955) 'The Argument for Iconoclasm as Presented by the Iconoclastic Council of 754', in K. Weitzmann (ed.), *Late Classical and Mediaeval Studies in Honor of Albert Mathias Frend Jr.*, Princeton, 177-188.

Anastos, M. (1979a) 'The Ethical Theory of Images Formulated by the Iconoclasts in 754 and 815', in Milton Anastos, *Studies in Byzantine Intellectual History*, London: Variorum Reprints, XI.

Anastos, M. (1979b) 'Leo III's Edict against the Images in the Year 726-27 and Italo-Byzantine Relations between 726 and 730', in Milton Anastos, *Studies in Byzantine Intellectual History*, London: Variorum Reprints, VII.

de Andia, Y. (1996) 'Transfiguration et Théologie Négative chez Maxime le Confesseur et Denys l'Aréopagite', in *Denys l'Aréopagite et sa postérité en Orient et en Occident*, Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 293-328.

de Andia, Y. (1997) 'La Théologie trinitaire de Denys l'Aréopagite', in *SP* XXXII, 278-301.

de Andia, Y. (1998) 'Symbol and Mystery', unpublished paper presented to the Postgraduate Theology seminar, University of Durham, March 1998.

Anton, J. (1968) 'The Aristotelian Doctrine of "Homonyma" in the *Categories* and its Platonic Antecedents', in *Journal of the History of Philosophy* VI, 315-326.

Anton, J. (1969) 'Ancient Interpretations of Aristotle's Doctrine of "Homonyma"', *Journal of the History of Philosophy* VII, 1-18.

Armstrong, A.H. (1963) 'Some Comments on the Development of the Theology of Images', in *SP* IX, 117-126.

Aune, D. (1980) 'Magic in Early Christianity', in W. Haase (ed.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II/23, 2, Berlin, 1507-57.

Auzépy, M.-F. (1987) 'L'iconodoulie: défence de l'image ou de la dévotion à l'image?', in F. Boespflug and N. Lossky (eds.), *Nicée II*, Paris, 157-166.

Auzépy, M.-F. (1990) 'La Destruction de L'icône du Christ de la Chalcé par Léon III: Propagande ou Réalité?', in *Byzantion* LX, 445-492.

Auzépy, M.-F. (1992) 'L'analyse littéraire et l'historien: l'exemple des vies de saints iconoclastes', in *Byzantinoslavica (Revue Internationale des Études Byzantines)* LIII, 57-67.

Auzépy, M.-F. (1995) 'Le Carrière d'André de Crete', in *BZ* 88, 1-12.

Babic', G. (1994) 'Les images byzantines et leurs degrés de signification l'exemple de in l'Hodigitria', in Durand, J. (ed.), *Byzance et les images*, Paris, 189-222.

Bakirtzis, Ch. (1990) 'Byzantine Ampullae from Thessaloniki', in R. Ousterhout, (ed.), *The Blessings of Pilgrimage*, Chicago: Illinois Byzantine Studies, 140-149.

Barasch, M. (1992) *Icon. Studies in the History of an Idea*, New York and London.

Barber, C. (1991) 'The Koimesis Church, Nicaea: The limits of representation on the eve

of Iconoclasm', in *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 41, 43-60.

Barber, C. (1993) 'From Transformation to Desire: Art and Worship after Byzantine Iconoclasm', in *Art Bulletin* 75, 7-16.

Barber, C. (1995) 'From Image into Art: Art after Byzantine Iconoclasm', in *Gesta* 34/1, 5-10.

Barnard, L. (1973) 'The Emperor Cult and the Origins of the Iconoclastic Controversy', in *Byzantion* 43, 13-29.

Barnard, L. (1974) *The Graeco-Roman and Oriental Background of the Iconoclastic Controversy*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Barnard, L. (1975a) 'The Use of the Bible in the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy', in *Theologische Zeitschrift*, 78-83.

Barnard, L. (1975b) 'The Paulicians and Iconoclasm' in A. Bryer and J. Herrin (eds.), *Iconoclasm*, Birmingham: The Centre for Byzantine Studies, 75-84.

Barnard, L. (1975c) 'Byzantium and Islam: The Interaction of Two Worlds in the Iconoclastic Era', in *Byzantinoslavica* 36, 25-37.

Barnard, L. & Bryer, A. (1975) 'The Theology of Images', in A. Bryer and J. Herrin (eds.), *Iconoclasm*, Birmingham: The Centre for Byzantine Studies, 7-14.

Baudinet-Mondzain, M.-J. (1978) 'La Relation Iconique a Byzance au IXe sìecle d'après Nicéphore le Patriarche: un destin de l'aristotélisme', in les *Études philosophiques* 1, 85-106.

Baudinet-Mondzain, M.-J. (1987) 'Autour de quelques concepts philosophiques de l'iconoclasme et de l'iconodoule', in F. Boespflug and N. Lossky (eds.), *Nicée II*(Paris), 135-142.

Baynes, N. (1951/52) 'The Icons before Iconoclasm', in *Harvard Theological Review* XLIV-V, 93 -106.

Baynes, N. (1955) 'Idolatry and the Early Church', in *Byzantine Studies and other Essays*, London: Athlone Press,116-143.

Beck, H.-G. (1969) 'The Greek Church in the Epoch of Iconoclasm', in H. Jedin and J. Dolan (eds.), *Handbook of Church History*, trans. A. Biggs, New York: Herder and Herder, vol III, 26-53.

Beck, H.-G. (1975) *Von der Fragwürdigkeit der Ikone*, Bayerischen Akemie der Wissenschaften, München.

Beierwaltes, W. (1986) 'The Love of Beauty and the Love of God', in A.H. Armstrong (ed.), *Classical Mediterranean Spirituality*, New York: Crossroad, 293-313.

Beierwaltes, W. (1994) 'Unity and Trinity in East and West', in B. McGinn and W. Otten (eds.), *Eriugena: East and West: papers of the Eighth International Colloquium of the Society for the Promotion of Eriugenian Studies: Chicago and Notre Dame, 18-20 October 1991* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press), 209-231.

Belting, H. (1980/81) 'An Image and Its Function in the Liturgy: The Man of Sorrows in Byzantium', in *DOP* 34/35, 1-22.

Belting, H. (1990) *Bild und Kult*, Munich.

Belting, H. (1994) *Likeness and Presence. A History of the Image before the Era of Art*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Belting, H. (1998) 'In search of Christ's Body. Image or Imprint?', in Kessler, H. L. and Wolf, G. (eds.), *The Holy Face and the paradox of Representation*, Villa Spelman Colloquia, vol 6, Bologna: Nuova Alfa Editoriale, 1-13.

Benakis, L. (1982) 'The Problem of General Concepts in Neoplatonism and Byzantine Thought', in *Neoplatonism and Christian Thought*, New York: State University of New York Press, 75-86.

Berthold, G. (1982) 'The Cappadocian Roots of Maximus the Confessor', in F. Heinzer & C. Schönborn (eds.), *Maximus Confessor: Actes du Symposium sur Maximus le Confesseur Fribourg, 2-5 septembre 1980*, Fribourg: Éditions universitaires.

Besançon, A. (1994) *L'image Interdite, Une Histoire intellectuelle de l'iconoclasme*, Paris.

Besançon, A. (2000) *The Forbidden Image: an intellectual history of iconoclasm*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bevan, E. (1940) *Holy Images*, London: G. Allen & Unwin.

Bigham, S. (1995) *The Image of God the Father in Orthodox Theology and Iconography and Other Studies*, California: Oakwood.

Blowers, P. (1991) *Exegesis and Spiritual Pedagogy in Maximus the Confessor. An Investigation of the* Quaestiones Thalassium, Notre Dame: U. Notre Dame Press.

Blumenthal, H. (1993a) 'Some problems about body and soul in later pagan Neoplatonism: do they follow a pattern?', in *Soul and Intellect: Studies in Plotinus and Later Neoplatonism*, Great Britain: USA: Variorum, VIII.

Blumenthal, H. and Clark, E. (1993) 'Iamblichus in 1990', in H.J. Blumenthal and G. Clark (eds.), *The Divine Iamblichus, philosopher and man of gods*, London: Bristol Classical Press, 1-4.

Bobrinskoy, B. (1987) 'L'icone: sacrement du Royaume', in F. Boespflug and N. Lossky (eds.), *Nicée II* (Paris), 367-374.

Bolgar, R. (1981) 'The Classical Tradition: Legend and Reality', in Margaret Mullett & Roger Scott (eds.), *Byzantium and The Classical Tradition*, Birmingham, 7-19.

Bornert, R. (1966) *Les Commentaires Byzantins de la Divine Liturgie, du VII au XV siècle*, Paris.

Brandon, S. (1975) 'Christ in Verbal and Depicted Imagery', in J. Neusner (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism and other Greco-Roman Cults: Part Two, Early Christianity*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 164-172.

Breckenridge, J. (1972) 'The Iconoclasts' Image of Christ', *Gesta* XI/2, 3-8.

Brenk, B. (1980) 'The Imperial Heritage of Early Christian Art', in Kurt Weitzmann (ed), *Age of Spirituality: A Symposium*, New York & Princeton: Metropolitan Museum of Art; distributed by Princton University Press, 39-53.

Breton, S. (1997) 'Sens et Portée de la Théologie de la Théologie Négative', in *Denys l'Aréopagite et sa posterité en Orient et en Occident,* Paris: Institut Études Augustiniennes, 629-643.

Breyer, L. (1957) *Das 8. Jahrhundert (717-813) aus der Weltchronik des Theophanes: übersetzt, eingeleitet und erklärt von Leopold Breyer*, Graz; Wien; Köln: Verlag Styria.

Brock, S. (1975) 'Iconoclasm and the Monophysites', in A. Bryer and J. Herrin (eds.), *Iconoclasm*, Birmingham: The Centre for Byzantine Studies, 53-58.

Brock, S. (1985) 'The Christology of the Church of the East in the Synods of the Fifth to Early Seventh Centuries: Preliminary Considerations and Materials', in G. Dragas (ed.), *Aksum-Thyateira: A Festschrift for Archbishop Methodios*, London.

Brown, P. (1971) 'The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity', in *The Journal of Roman Studies* LXI, 80-101.

Brown, P. (1973) 'A Dark-Age crisis: aspects of the Iconoclastic controversy', in *The English historical Review* CCCXLVI, 1-34.

Brown, P. (1980) 'Art and Society in Late Antiquity', in Kurt Weitzmann (ed), *Age of Spirituality: A Symposium*, New York & Princeton: Metropolitan Museum of Art; distributed by Princton University Press, 7-16.

Brown, P. (1981) *The Cult of the Saints*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Brown, P. (1982) *Society and the holy in late antiquity*, London: Faber and Faber.

Brown, T. (1988) 'The Background of Byzantine Relations with Italy in the Ninth Century: Legacies, Attachments and Antagonisms', *Byzantium and the West c. 850-c,1200*, Amsterdam, 28-45.

Browning, R. (1990) 'An unpublished funeral oration on Anna Comnena', in Richard Sorabji, *Aristotle Transformed: The Ancient Commentators and Their Influence*, New York: Cornell University Press, 393-406.

Brubaker, L. (1989) 'Byzantine Art in the Ninth Century: theory, practice, and culture', in *BMGS* 13, 23-93.

Brubaker, L. (1990) 'The Sacred Image', in R. Ousterhout (ed.), *The Blessings of Pilgrimage* (Chicago: Illinois Byzantine Studies), 1-24.

Brubaker, L. (1992) 'Parallel Universes: Byzantine art history in 1990 and 1991', in *BMGS* 16, 203-233.

Brubaker, L. (1993) 'Life imitates art: writings on Byzantine art history, 1991-1992', in *BMGS* 17, 173-223.

Brubaker, L. (1999) *Vision and Meaning in Ninth-Century Byzantium, Image as Exegesis in the Homilies of Gregory of Nazianzus*, Cambridge.

Bytchkov. V. (1979) 'Die Philosophisch-äesthetischen aspekte des byzantinischen Bilderstreites', in *Philosophia* (Athens), 341-353.

Cameron, A. (1978) 'The Theotokos in Sixth-Century Constantinople: A City finds its Symbol', in *JTS* 29, 79-108.

Cameron, A. (1979) 'Images of Authority: Elites and Icons in Late Sixth-Century Byzantium', in *The Past and Present*, 3-35.

Cameron, A. (1987) 'The Construction of Court Ritual: The Byzantine "Book of Ceremonies"' in David Cannine, *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in*

Traditional Societies, Cambridge: CUP, 106-110.

Cameron, A. (1991) *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse*, University of California Press, 201-229.

Cameron, A. (1992a) 'The Language of Images: The Rise of Icons and Christian Representation', in D. Wood, *The Church and the Arts,* Oxford: Blackwell, 1-42.

Cameron, A. (1992b) 'New Themes and Styles in Greek Literature: Seventh-Eighth Centuries', in *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East; Vol I: Problems in the Literary Source Material*, Princeton: Darwin Press, 81-105.

Cameron, A. (1993) 'The History of the Image of Edessa: the Telling of a Story', in *Okeanos. Essays presented to I. Sevcenko, Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 7, 80-94.

Cameron, A. (1998) 'The Mandylion and Byzantine Iconoclasm', in Kessler, H. and Wolf, G. (eds.) *The Holy Face and the paradox of Representation*, Villa Spelman Colloquia, vol 6, Bologna: Nuova Alfa Editoriale, 33-54.

Cameron, A. (1999) 'On defining the holy man', in J. Howard-Johnston and P. Hayward, *The Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, Oxford: OUP.

Campenhausen, H. (1968) 'The Theological Problem of Images in the Early Church', in *Tradition and Life in the Church*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 171-200.

Charles-Saget. 1993. 'La Théurgie, nouvelle figure de l'ergon dans la vie philosophique', in J. Blumenthal and E.G. Clark, (eds.), *The Divine Iamblichus, philosopher and man of gods*, London: Bristol Classical Press, 107-115.

Cholij, R. (2002) *Theodore the Stoudite: The Ordering of Holiness*, Oxford: OUP.

Clark, E. (1992) 'Image and Images: Evagrius Ponticus and the Anthropomorphite Controversy', in *The Origenist Controversy: the cultural construction of an early Christian debate*, Princeton, 43-84.

Congourdeau, M.-H. (1993) 'Les Pères dans la foi', in Mohr, A.-M. (trans.), *Théodore Stoudite: Petites catéchèses*, Paris.

Connor, C. (1991) *Art and Miracles in Mediaeval Byzantium*, Princeton.

Cormack, R. (1975a) 'The Arts during the Age of Iconoclasm', in A. Bryer and J. Herrin (eds.), *Iconoclasm*, Birmingham: The Centre for Byzantine Studies, 35-44.

Cormack, R. (1975b) 'Painting after Iconoclasm', in A. Bryer and J. Herrin (eds.), *Iconoclasm*, Birmingham: The Centre for Byzantine Studies, 147-164.

Cormack, R. (1985) *Writing in Gold, Byzantine Society and its Icons*, London: G. Philip.

Cormack, R. (1990) 'Byzantine Aphrodisias. Changing the symbolic map of a city', in *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Association* 216, ns36, 26-41.

Cormack, R. (1997) *Painting the Soul. Icons, Death Masks and Shrouds*, London: Reaktion Books.

Corrigan, K. (1992) *Visual Polemics in the Ninth-Century Byzantine Psalters*, Cambridge: CUP.

Corrigan, K. (1996) 'Essence and Existence in the Ennes', in Lloyd Gerson (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Plotinus*, Cambridge: CUP, 105-129.

Coulter, J. (1976) *The Literary Microcosm: Theories of Interpretation of the Later Neoplatonists,* Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Crone, P. (1980) 'Islam, Judeo-Christianity and Byzantine Iconoclasm', in *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 2, 59-95.

Cunningham, M. and Allen, P. (1998) *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics,* Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Cunningham, M. (2002) *Faith in the Byzantine World,* Illinois: Inter Varsity Press.

Cutler, A. (1975) 'The Byzantine Psalter: Before and after Iconoclasm', in A. Bryer and J. Herrin (eds.), *Iconoclasm,* Birmingham: The Centre for Byzantine Studies, 93-102.

Dagron, G. (1981) 'Le saint, le savant, l'astrologue: Étude de thèmes hagiographiques á travers quelques recueils de "Questions et réponses" des V-VII siècles', in *Hagiographie Cultures et Sociétés, IV - XII siècles,* Paris, 143-155.

Dagron, G. (1984a) 'Le culte des images dans le monde byzantine', in Gilbert Dagron, *La romanité chrétienne en Orient,* London: Variorum Reprints, XI.

Dagron, G. (1984b) 'Frontières et Marges: le jeu du Sacre à Byzance', in Gilbert Dagron, *La romanité chrétienne en Orient,* London: Variorum Reprints, XII.

Dagron, G. (1991) 'Holy Images and Likeness', in *DOP* 45, 23-33.

Dagron, G. (1994) 'L'image de culte et le portrait', in J. Durand (ed.), *Byzance et les images, Cycle de conférences organisé au musée du Louvre par le Service culturel du 5 octobre au 7 décembre 1992* (Paris), 121-150.

Daley, B. (1976) 'The Origenism of Leontius of Byzantium', *JTS* XXVII,pt2 (Oct), 333-369.

Daley, B. (1991) 'A Richer Union: Leontius of Byzantium and the Relationship of Human and Divine in Christ', in *SP* XXIV, 239-265.

Daley, B. (1997) 'Divine Transcendence and Human Transformation: Gregory of Nyssa's Anti-Appolinarian Christology', *SP* XXXII, 87-95.

Daley, B. (1998) *On the Dormition of Mary: Early Patristic Homilies*, New York: Saint Vladimir's Seminary Press.

Daniélou, J. (1961) *From Glory to Glory. Texts from Gregory of Nyssa's Mystical Writings*, London: J. Murray.

Damian, T. (1993) 'The Icons: Theological and Spiritual Dimensions According to St. Theodore of Studion', Ph.D. thesis, Fordham University.

Demoen, K. (1997) 'The Philosopher, the Call Girl and the Icon: Theodore the Stoudite's (ab)use of Gregory Nazianzen in the iconoclastic controversy', in *La spiritualité de l'univers byzantin dans le verbe et l'image: Instrumenta Patristica* 30, Turnhout, 69-83.

Demoen, K. (1998) 'The Theologian on Icons?', in *BZ* 91/1, 1-19.

Dennis, G. (1996) 'Popular Religious Attitudes and Practices in Byzantium', in Robert Taft, *The Christian East: Its Institutions and Its Thought*, Roma, 245-263

Devreesse, R. (1950) 'Une Lettre de S. Théodore Stoudite Relative au Synode Mœchien

(809)', in *Analecta Bollandiana* LXVIII, 44-57.

Dickie, M. (1995) 'The Fathers of the Church and the Evil Eye', in Henry Maguire (ed.), *Byzantine Magic*, Washington D.C., 9-34.

Dillon, J. (1990) 'Image, Symbol and Analogy: Three Basic Concepts of Neoplatonic Allegorical Exegesis', in *The Golden Chain*, Brookfield, Vt.: Variorum, 247-262.

Dobschütz, E. (1899) *Christusbilder: Undersuchungen zur Christlichen Legende,* Leipzig.

Drijvers, H. (1998) 'The Image of Edessa in the Syriac Tradition', in Kessler, H. and Wolf, G. (eds.), *The Holy Face and the paradox of Representation*, Bologna: Nuova Alfa Editoriale, 13-32.

Dufrenne, S. (1987) 'La manifestation divine dans l'iconographie byzantine de la Transfiguration', in F. Boespflug and N. Lossky (eds.), *Nicée II* (Paris), 185-208.

Duncan-Flowers, M. (1990) 'A Pilgrim's Ampulla from the Shrine of St. John the Evangelist at Ephesus', in R. Ousterhout, (ed.), *The Blessings of Pilgrimage*, Chicago: Illinois Byzantine Studies, 125-139.

Dvornik, F. (1953) 'The Patriarch Photius and Iconoclasm', *DOP* 7, 67-98.

Ebbesen, S. (1990) 'Philoponus, "Alexander" and the origins of medieval logic', in Richard Sorabji, *Aristotle Transformed: the ancient commentators and their influence*, New York: Cornell University Press, 445-461.

Edwards, M. (1993) 'Two Images of Pythagoras: Iamblichus and Porphyry', in J. Blumenthal and E. Clark, (eds.), *The Divine Iamblichus, philosopher and man of gods*, London: Bristol Classical Press, 159-172.

Efthymiis, S. (1998) *The Life of the Patriarch Tarasios by Ignatios the Deacon,* Great Britain and USA: Variorum.

Efthymiis, S. (1995) 'Notes on the Correspondence of Theodore the Stoudite', in *Revue des Études Byzantines* 53, 141-163.

Elliger, W. (1930) *Die stellung der alten Christen zu den Bildern in den ersten vier Jahrhunderten,* Leipzig.

Ellverson, A. (1981) *The Dual Nature of Man, A study in the Theological Anthropology of Gregory of Nazianzus,* Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Elsner, J. (1988) 'Image and Iconoclasm in Byzantium', in *Art History* 11/4, 471-491.

Epstein, A. (1975) '"The Iconoclast" Churches of Cappocia', in A. Bryer and J. Herrin (eds.), *Iconoclasm,* Birmingham: The Centre for Byzantine Studies, 103-112.

Evans, D. (1970) *Leontius of Byzantium: An Origenist Christology,* Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Studies 13.

Evans, D. (1991) 'Die Abhängigkeit des Theodoros Stoudites als Epistolographen von den Briefen Basileios' des Grossen', in *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 41, 61-72.

Farrer, A. (1948) *The Glass of Vision,* Westminster: Dacre Press.

Featherstone, J. (1982) 'A Note on Penances Prescribed for Negligent Scribes and Librarians in the Monastery of Stoudios', in *Scriptorium* 36, 258-60.

Featherstone, J. (1984) *The Refutation of the Council of 815 by the Patriarch Nicephorus.* PhD Thesis. Harvard.

Finley, P. (1977) 'Antecedents of Byzantine Iconoclasm: Christian Evidence Before Constantine', in Joseph Gutman (ed.), *The Image and the Word. Confrontations in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*, Missoula, 27-47.

Finney, P. (1994) *The Invisible God: The Earliest Christians on Art*, Oxford: OUP.

Florovsky, G. (1950) 'The Iconoclastic Controversy', in *Christianity and Culture*, volume II of Collected Works, 101-119 (also appeared as 'Origen, Eusebius, and the Iconoclastic Controversy', *Church History* XIX/2, 77-96).

Florovsky, G. (1974) 'The Anthropomorphites in the Egyptian Desert', in *Christianity and Culture*, vol II of Collected Works, 89-96.

Florovsky, G. (1987) *The Collected Works of Georges Florovsky*, vol X, *The Byzantine Ascetic and Spiritual Fathers*, Belmont, MA, 1987.

Fögen, M. (1995) 'Balsamon on magic: From Roman secular law to Byzantine canon law', in H. Maguire, (ed.), *Byzantine Magic*, Washington D.C., 99-115.

Forsman, R. (1983) '"Apprehension" in *Finite and Infinite*, in J. Eaton and A. Loes, *For God and Clarity. New Essays in Honor of Austin Farrer*, Pennsylvania: Pickwick Publications, 111-130.

Fortin, E. (1962) 'The "Definitio Fidei" of Chalcedon and Its Philosophical Sources', in *SP* V, 489-498.

Franses, H. (1992) 'Symbols, Meaning, Belief: Donor Portraits in Byzantine art,' Ph.D.

diss., London University, 37-60.

Frazee, Charles. (1981) 'St. Theodore of Stoudios and Ninth Century Monasticism in Constantinople', in *Studia Monastica* 23, 27-58.

Freedberg, D. (1975) 'The Structure of Byzantine and European Iconoclasm', in A. Bryer and J. Herrin (eds.), *Iconoclasm*, Birmingham: The Centre for Byzantine Studies, 165-177.

Freedberg, D. (1982) 'The Hidden God: Image and Interdiction in the Netherlands in the Sixteenth Century,' in *Art History* 5/2, 132-153.

Freedberg, D. (1989) *The Power of Images: Studies in the history and theory of response*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Freeman, A. (1985) 'Carolingian Orthodoxy and the Fate of the Libri Carolini', in *Viator* 16, 65-108.

Freeman, A. (1994) 'Scripture and Images in the *Libri Carolini*', in *Testo e immagine nell'alto Medioevo: 15-21 aprile 1993,* Spoleto: Presso la Sede del Centro, 165-195.

Galavaris, G. (1981) *The Icon in the Life of the Church*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Gardner, A. (1904) 'Some Theological Aspects of the Iconoclastic Controversy', in *The Hibbert Journal* II, 360-374.

Gardner, A. (1905) *Theodore of Studium,* London: Edward Arnold. Reprinted, New York: Burt Franklin Reprints, 1964.

Gendle, N. (1986) 'Leontius of Neapolis: a Seventh Century Defender of Holy Images', in *SP* XVIII, 135-139.

Gendle, N. (1981) 'The Role of the Byzantine Saint in the Development of the Icon Cult', in Sergei Hackel (ed.), *The Byzantine Saint*, London, 181-186.

Gero, S. (1973a) *Byzantine Iconoclasm during the Reign of Leo III*, Louvain.

Gero, S. (1973b) 'The Libri Carolini and the Image Controversy', in *GOTR* XVIII/1&2, 7-34.

Gero, S. (1974) 'Notes on Byzantine Iconoclasm in the Eighth Century', in *Byzantion* XLIV, 23-42.

Gero, S. (1975a) 'Hypatius of Ephesus on the Cult of Images', in J. Neusner (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 208-216.

Gero, S. (1975b) 'The Eucharistic Doctrine of the Byzantine Iconoclasts and Its Sources', in *BZ*, 68, 4-22.

Gero, S. (1977a) 'Byzantine Iconoclasm and Monachomachy', in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 28/3, 241-248.

Gero, S. (1977b) *Byzantine Iconoclasm during the Reign of Constantine V*, Louvain.

Gero, S. (1977c) 'Byzantine Iconoclasm and the Failure of a Medieval Reformation', in Joseph Gutmann (ed.), *The Image and the Word*, Missoula, 49-62.

Gersh, S. (1978) *From Iamblichus to Eriugena*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Giakalis, A. (1994) *Images of the Divine*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Gill, J. (1966) 'St. Theodore the Stoudite against the Papacy', *Byzantinische Forschungen* I, 115-123.

Gill, J. (1968) 'An unpublished letter of St. Theodore the Studite', *OCP 34*, 62-9.

Gockel, M. (2000) 'A Dubious Christological Formula? Leontius of Byzantium and the *Anhypostasis - Enhypostasis* Theory', *JTS*, ns51.2, 515-532.

Golitzin, A. (2000) 'A Contemplative and a Liturgist: Father Georges Florovsky on the *Corpus Dionysicum*', in *Saint Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, 131-161.

Goodenough, E. (1940) *An Introduction to Philo Judaeus*, New Haven.

Gouillard, J. (1967) 'Le Synodikon de L'orthodoxie: édition et commentaire', J. Gouillard (ed.), *Travaux et memoires* 2, Paris.

Gouillard, J. (1969) 'Art et littérature théologique à Byzance au lendemain de la querelle des images', in *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale (Xe-XIIe siècles)* XII, Poitiers: Université de Poitiers, 1-13.

Gouillard, J. (1981a) 'Contemplation et Imagerie Sacrée dans le Christianisme Byzantin', in *La vie religieuse à Byzance*, London.

Gouillard, J. (1981b) 'Aux origines de l'iconoclasme: le témoignage de Gregoire II', in *La vie religieuse à Byzance*, London.

Gouillard, J. (1981c) 'L'Eglise d'Orient et la primauté romaine au temps de l'iconoclasme', in *La vie religieuse à Byzance*, London.

Gouillard, J. (1981d) 'Hypatios d'Éphèse ou du Denys the Areopagite a Théodore
Stoudite', in   La vie religieuse à Byzance, London.

Grabar, A. (1951) 'La Representation de l'intelligible dans l'art Byzantin du Moyen Age',
in Actes du VIe Congrès International d'Etudes Byzantines II, Paris, 127-143.

Grabar, A. (1957) L'iconoclasme byzantin. Dossier archéologique, Paris: Flammarion.

Grabar, A. (1967) The Art of the Byzantine Empire: Byzantine Art in the Middle Ages, New
York: Greystone Press.

Grabar, O. (1975) 'Islam and Iconoclasm', in A. Bryer and J. Herrin (eds.), Iconoclasm,
Birmingham: The Centre for Byzantine Studies, 45-52.

Gray, P. (1979) The Defense of Chalcedon in the East (451-553), Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Gray, P. (1982) 'Neo-Chalcedonianism and the Tradition: From Patristic to Byzantine
Theology', in Byzantinische Forschungen 8, 61-70.

Gray, P. (1989) '"The Select Fathers": Canonizing the Patristic Past', in SP XXIII, 21-36.

Gray, P. (1996) 'Through the Tunnel with Leontius of Jerusalem: The Sixth-Century
Transformation of Theology', in P. Allen & E. Jeffreys (eds.),The Sixth Century:
End or Beginning?, Brisbane, 187-196.

Greenfield, R. (1988) Traditions of Belief in Late Byzantine Demonology, Amsterdam:
A.D.Hakkert.

Griffith, R. (1997) 'Neo-Platonism and Christianity: Pseudo-Dionysius and Damascius'

in *SP* XXIX, 238-243.

Griffith, S. (1985) 'Theodore Ab⁓u Qurrah's Arabic Tract on the Christian Practice of Venerating Images', in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 105.1, 53-73.

Griffith, S. (1986) 'Greek into Arabic: Life and Letters in the Monasteries of Palestine in the Ninth Century; the example of the "Summa Theologiae Arabica"', in *Byzantion* 56, 117-38.

Griffith, S. (1992) 'Images, Islam and Christian Icons', in Pierre Canivet et J.P. Rey-Coquais (eds.), *La Syrie de Byzance a L'Islam, VII-VIII Siècles*, Damas, 121-138.

Grillmeier, A. (1987). *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol 2, *From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590-604)*, Part 1 *Reception and Contradiction. The development of the discussion about Chalcedon from 451 to the beginning of the reign of Justinian*, London-Oxford.

Grondijs, L.-H. (1978) 'Images De Saints D'Après la Théologie Byzantine du VIIIe Siècle', in *Actes du VIe Congrès International d'études byzantines Paris, 27 juillet-2aout 1948*, Kraus Reprint.

Grumel, V. (1921) 'L'iconologie de saint Théodore Stoudite', in *Échos d'Orient* XX, 257-68.

Grumel, V. (1935) 'L'iconologie de saint Germain de Constantinople', in *Échos d'Orient* 34, 162-66.

Grumel, V. (1937a) 'Jean Grammaticos et saint Théodore Stoudite', in *Échos d'Orient* 36, 181-189.

Grumel, V. (1937b) 'Chronologie des patriarches iconoclastes du IXe siècle', in *Échos d'Orient* XXXIV, 162-166.

Grumel, V. (1959) 'Le 'Douze chapitres contre les Iconomagues' de Saint Nicephore de Constantinople', in *Revue des Études Byzantines* 17, 127-35.

Guillou, A. 1994. 'Le monde des images à Byzance', in A. Guillou and J. Durand (eds.), in *Byzance et les images*, France, 13-39.

Haddad, R. (1982) 'Iconoclasts and Mut'azila. The Politics of Anthropomorphism', in *GOTR* 27, 287-305

Hadot, I. (1986) 'The Spiritual Guide', in A. Armstrong (ed.), *Classical Mediterranean Spirituality*, New York: Crossroad, 436-459.

Hadot, P. (1986) 'Neoplatonist Spirituality', in A. Armstrong (ed.), *Classical Mediterranean Spirituality*, New York: Crossroad, 230-263.

Hahn, C. (1990) 'Loca Sancta Souvenirs: Sealing the Pilgrim's Experience', in R. Ousterhout, (ed.), *The Blessings of Pilgrimage*, Chicago: Illinois Byzantine Studies, 86-96.

Haldon, J. (1977) 'Some Remarks on the Background to the Iconoclast Controversy', *Byzantinoslavica* 38, 161-184.

Haldon, J. (1990) 'Forms of representation: language, literature and the icon', in *Byzantium in the Seventh Century*, Cambridge: CUP, 403-435.

Hammerschmidt, E. (1956) 'Eine Definition von *Hypostasis* und *Ousia* während des 7. allgemeinen Konzils: Nikaia II 787', in *Ostkirchen Studien* 5, 52-55.

Hanson, R. (1982) 'The Transformation of Images in the Trinitarian Theology of the Fourth Century', in *SP* XVII/1, 97-115.

Harrison, V. (1992), *Grace and Human Freedom according to St. Gregory of Nyssa*, Lewiston/Queenston/Lampeter: The Edwin Mellon Press.

Harvey, S. (1981) 'The Politicisation of the Byzantine Saint', in S. Hackel (ed.), *The Byzantine Saint*, London, 37-42.

Hatlie, P. (1995) 'Theodore of Studios, Pope Leo III and the Joseph Affair (808-812): New Light on an Obscure Negotiation', in *OCP* 61, 407-423.

Hatlie, P. (1996a) 'The Politics of Salvation: Theodore of Stoudios on Martyrdom (*Martyrion*) and Speaking Out (*Parrhesia*)', in *DOP* 50, 263-287.

Hatlie, P. (1996b) 'Women of Discipline during the Second Iconoclastic Age', *BZ* 89, 37-44.

Hatlie, P. (1999a) 'Spiritual Authority and Monasticism in Constantinople during the Dark Ages (650-800)', in J. Drijvers & J. Watt (eds.), *Portraits of Spiritual Authority: Religious Power in Early Christianity, Byzantium and the Christian Orient*, Leiden, Boston & Köln: E.J. Brill, 195-222.

Hatlie, P. (1999b) 'Friendship and the Byzantine Iconoclast Age', in J. Haseldine (ed.), *Friendship in Medieval Europe*, United Kingdom: Sutton Publishing Limited.

Hausherr, I. (1926) *Saint Théodore Studite, l'homme et l'ascète, OC* 6/1, Rome.

Hausherr, I. (1935) 'Les grands courants de la spiritualité orientale' in *OCP* 1, 114-138.

Hausherr, I. (1990) *Spiritual Direction in the Early Christian East*, Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications.

Henry, P. (1968) 'Theodore of Studios: Byzantine Churchman', Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University.

Henry, P. (1974) 'Initial Eastern Assessments of the Seventh Oecumenical Council', in *JTS* XXV, 75-92.

Henry, P. (1976) 'What was the Iconoclastic Controversy About?', *Church History* 45, 16-31.

Henry, P. (1977) 'Images of the Church in the Second Nicene Council and in the Libri Carolini', in K. Pennington and R. Somerville (eds.), *Law, Church, and Society: Essays in Honour of Stephen Kuttner*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 237-252.

Henry, P. (1984) 'The Formulators of Icon Doctrine', in P. Henry (ed.), *Schools of Thought in the Christian Tradition*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 75-89.

Henry, P. (1989) 'Emperor, Abbot, Patriarch, Pope: Determining Orthodoxy in the Aftermath of Iconoclasm', *SP* XXIII.

Herrin, J. (1975) 'The Context of Iconoclast Reform', in A. Bryer and J. Herrin (eds.), *Iconoclasm*, Birmingham: The Centre for Byzantine Studies, 15-20.

Herrin, J. (1982) 'Women and the Faith in Icons in Early Christianity', in R. Samuel & G.

Stedman Jones (eds.), *Culture, Ideology and Politics,* London; Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 56-83.

Herrin, J. (1987) *The Formation of Christendom,* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hunt, E. (1987) 'The Traffic in Relics: Some Late Roman Evidence', in S. Hackel (ed.), *The Byzantine Saint,* London, 171-180.

Hussey, J. (1986) *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire,* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Jewel, J. (1968) *The Works of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury, 1522-1571, in five volumes,* New York: Johnson Reprint Corp.

Jones, W. (1977) 'Art and Christian Piety, Iconoclasm in Medieval Europe', in J. Gutmann (ed.),*The Image and the Word,* Missoula, 75-105.

Kaegi, W. (1982) 'The Byzantine Armies and Iconoclasm', in *Army, Society and Religion in Byzantium,* London: Variorum Reprints, 48-70.

Kalavrezou, I. (1990) 'Images of the Mother: When the Virgin Mary Became *Meter Theou', DOP* 44, 165-172.

Karlin-Hayter, P. (1975) *Gregory of Syracuse, Ignatios and Photios,* in A. Bryer and J. Herrin (eds.), *Iconoclasm,* Birmingham: The Centre for Byzantine Studies, 141-146.

Karlin-Hayter, P. (1994) 'A Byzantine Politician Monk: Saint Theodore Studite', *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 44, 217-232.

Karras, V. (1997) 'The Incarnational and Hypostatic Significance of the Maleness of Jesus Christ according to Theodore of Studios', *SP* XXXII, 320-324.

Kartsonis, A. (1986) *Anastasis. The Making of an Image*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kartsonis, A. (1994) 'The Emancipation of the Crucifixion', in A. Guillou and J. Durand, *Byzance et les images*, France, 151-187.

Kavanagh, A. (1984) 'Eastern Influences on the *Rule* of Saint Benedict', in T. Verdon (ed.), *Monasticism and the Arts*, New York, 53-62.

Kazhdan, A. (1985) 'Hermitic, cenobitic and secular ideals in Byzantine hagiography of the ninth century' in *GOTR*, 30, 473-87.

Kazhdan, A. and Maguire, H. (1991a) 'Byzantine hagiographical texts as sources on art', *DOP* 45.

Kazhdan, A. & Talbot, A.-M. (1991b). 'Women and Iconoclasm', *BZ*, 84/85, 391-408.

Kessler, H. (1998) 'Configuring the Invisible by Copying the Holy Face', in Kessler, H. L. and Wolf, G. (eds.) *The Holy Face and the Paradox of Representation*, Bologna: Nuova Alfa Editoriale, 129-152.

Kessler, H. (2000) *Spiritual Seeing: Picturing God's Invisibility in Medieval Art*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Kitzinger, E. (1954) 'The Cult of Images in the Age Before Iconoclasm', in *DOP* 8, 84-150.

Kitzinger, E. (1955) 'On Some Icons of the Seventh Century', in *Late Classical and Mediaeval Studies in Honor of Albert Matthias Frend Jr*, Princeton: Princton University Press, 132-150.

Kitzinger, E. (1976) 'Byzantine Art in the Period between Justinian and Iconoclasm', in *The Art of Byzantium and the Medieval West*, Indiana and London.

Kitzinger, E. (1977) *Byzantine Art in the Making: main lines of stylistic development in Mediterranean art, 3rd-7th century*, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Kitzinger, E. (1980) 'Christian Imagery: Growth and Impact', in K. Weitzmann (ed), *Age of Spirituality: A Symposium*, New York and Princeton: Metropolitan Museum of Art and Princton University Press, 141-164.

Koch, P. (1939) 'Christusbild-Kaiserbild', in *Benediktinische Monatschrift* XXI, 3/4, 85-105.

Koch, P. (1938) 'Zur Theologie der Christusikone', *Benediktinische Monatschrift*, XX, 32-47, 168-175, 281-288, 437-452.

Ladner, G. (1931) 'Der Bilderstreit und die Kunst-Lehren der byzantinischen und abendländischen Theologie', in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 50, 1-23.

Ladner, G. (1940) 'Origin and Significance of the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy', in *Mediaeval Studies* II, 127-49.

Ladner, G. (1953) ' The Concept of the Image in the Greek Fathers and the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy', *DOP* 7, 2-34.

Lampe, G.W.H. (1961) *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

Lang, U. (1998) 'Anhypostatos-Enhypostatos: Church Fathers, Protestant Orthodoxy, and Karl Barth', *JTS* ns49, 630-57.

Lange, G. (1969) *Bild und Wort: Die katechetischen Funktion des Bildes in der griecheschen Theologie des 6 bis 9 Jahrhunderts*, Würzburg: Echter-Verlag.

Lanne, E. (1987) 'Rome et Nicée II', in F. Boespflug and N. Lossky (eds.), *Nicée II*, Paris, 219-228.

Larchet, J. (1996) *La Divinisation de l'homme selon Saint Maxime le Confessor*, Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf.

Lardiero, C. (1993) 'The critical patriarchate of Nicephorus of Constantinople (806-815): Religious and Secular Controversies', Ph.D. thesis, The Catholic University of America.

Lebon, J. (1927) 'Une ancient opinion sur la condition du corps du Christ dans la morts', in *Revue d'Ecclésiastique* 23, 5-43, 209-241.

Lemerle, P. (1986) *Byzantine Humanism: The First Phase*, trans. H. Lindsay and A. Moffatt, Canberra: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies.

Leroy, J. (1958a) 'Les Petites Catéchèses de S. Théodore Stoudite', in *Muséon* LXXI, 329-358.

Leroy, J. (1958b) 'La Reforme Studite', in *Il Monachesimo Orientale, OCA* 153, Roma, 182-214.

Leroy, J. (1961a) 'Un Témoin Ancien des Petites Catéchèses de Theodore Studite',

Scriptorium XV, 36-60.

Leroy, J. (1961b) 'Saint Théodore Studite', in *Théologie de la vie monastique*, Paris.

Leroy, J. *(*1969) *Studitisches Mönchtum. Spiritualität und Lebensform*, Graz,Wien, and Köln: Verlag Styria.

Leroy, J. (1979) 'L'Influence de saint Basile sur la réforme Studite d'après les Catéchèses', in *Irénikon* 52, 491-506.

Lilla, S. (1996) 'Denys l'Aréopagite, Porphyre et Damascius', *Denys l'Aréopagite et sa postérité en Orient et en Occident*, 117-152.

Littlewood, A. (1976) 'An "Ikon of the Soul": the Byzantine Letter', in *Visible Language*, X/3, 197-226.

Liz, J. (1996) *Light and Colour in Byzantine Art*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Llewellyn, P. (1975) 'The Roman Church on the Outbreak of Iconoclasm', in A. Bryer and J. Herrin (eds.), *Iconoclasm*, Birmingham: The Centre for Byzantine Studies, 29-34.

Loerke, W. (1984) '"Real Presence" in Early Christian Art', in T. Verdon (ed.) *Monasticism and the Arts*, New York, 29-51.

Louth, A. (1981) *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition. From Plato to Denys*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Louth, A. (1986) 'Pagan Theurgy and Christian Sacramentalism in Denys the Areopagite', in *JTS* 37/2, 432- 438.

Louth, A. (1989) *Denys the Areopagite*, London: Geoffrey Chapman.

Louth, A. (1993a) 'St Gregory the Theologian and St Maximus the Confessor: the shaping of tradition', in S. Coakley and D.A. Pailin (eds), *The Making and Remaking of Christian Doctrine: Essays in Honour of Maurice Wiles*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 117-30.

Louth, A. (1993a) 'St Denys the Areopagite and St Maximus the Confessor: a question of influence' in *SP* 27, 166-74.

Louth, A. (1996b) 'St Denys the Areopagite and the Iconoclast Controversy', in Y.De Andia (ed.), *Denys l'Aréopagite et sa postérité en Orient et en Occident,* Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 327-337.

Louth, A. (1997a) 'St. Maximus the Confessor between East and West', in *SP* XXXII, 332- 345.

Louth, A. (1997b) 'Review Essay: The Orthodox Dogmatic Theology of Dumitru Staniloae,' in *Modern Theology* 13.2, 253-267.

Louth, A. (1997c) *Wisdom of the Byzantine Church. Evagrios of Pontos and Maximos the Confessor*, 1997 Paine Lectures in Religion, University of Missouri-Columbia Department of Religious Studies, Missouri: University of Missouri, Columbia.

Louth, A. (1998a) 'Apophatic Theology: Denys the Areopagite', in *Hermathena* 165, 71-84.

Louth, A. (1998b) 'Recent research on St Maximus the Confessor: A Survey', in *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 42.1, 67-84.

Louth, A. (1998c) 'Dogma and Spirituality in St Maximus the Confessor' in P. Allen, R. Canning and L. Cross (eds), *Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church*, Queensland, Australia: Centre for Early Christian Studies.

Louth, A. (1998d) 'St. John Damascene: Preacher and Poet', in M. Cunningham and P. Allen (eds.), *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics*, Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Lowden, J. (1997) *Early Christian and Byzantine Art*, London: Phaidon Press.

Luna, C. (1987) 'La Relation chez Simplicius', in I. Hadot (ed.), *Simplicius: Sa vie, son œuvre, sa survie*, Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 113-147.

Lynch, J. (1975) 'Leontius of Byzantium: A Cyrillian Christology', *Theological Studies* 36, 455-471.

MacCormack, S.G. (1981) *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Madden, N. (1993) 'Composite Hypostasis in Maximus Confessor', in *SP* XXVII, 175-197.

Magoulias, H. (1967) 'The Lives of Byzantine Saints as Sources of Data for the History of Magic in the Sixth and Seventh Centuries A.D.: Sorcery, Relics and Icons', in *Byzantion* 37, 228-69.

Maguire, E. (1989) Maguire,H., and Duncan-Flowers,M., *Art and Holy Powers in the Early Christian House*, Urbana: The University of Illinois Press.

Maguire, H. (1977) 'The Depiction of Sorrow in Middle Byzantine Art', *DOP* 31, 125-74.

Maguire, H. (1990) 'Garments Pleasing to God: The Significance of Domestic Textile Designs in the Early Byzantine Period', *DOP* 44, 215-24.

Maguire, H. (1994) 'From the evil eye to the eye of justice: the saints, art and justice in Byzantium', in A.E. Laiou and D.Simon (eds.), *Law and Society in Byzantium, Ninth-Twelfth Centuries*, Washington, D.C., 217-39.

Maguire, H. (ed.). (1995) *Byzantine Magic,* Washington D.C.

Maguire, H. (1996) *The Icons of their Bodies. Saints and their images in Byzantium*, Princeton.

Mango, C. (1975a) *Byzantine Literature as a Distorting Mirror,* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Mango, C. (1975b) 'Historical Introduction', in A. Bryer and J. Herrin (eds.), *Iconoclasm*, Birmingham: The Centre for Byzantine Studies, 1-6.

Mango, C. (1975c) 'The Liquidation of Iconoclasm and the Patriarch Photios', in A. Bryer and J. Herrin (eds.), *Iconoclasm*, Birmingham: The Centre for Byzantine Studies, 133-140.

Mango, C. (1984) 'The Availability of Books in the Byzantine Empire, A.D. 750-850', in *Byzantium and its Image*, London: Variorum Reprints.

Mango, C. (1991) 'Greek Culture in Palestine after the Arab Conquest', in *Scritture, Libri e Testi Nelle Aree Provinciali doe Bisanzio*, 149-160.

Mango, C. (1992) 'Diabolus Byzantinus', in *DOP* 46, 215-23.

Mango, C. (1984) 'A Byzantine Hagiographer at work: Leontios of Neapolis', in I. Hutter, ed., *Byzanz und der Westen*, Vienna, 25- 41

Marcais, G. (1932) 'La question des images dans l'art musulman', in *Byzantion* 7, 161-183.

Marin, L'Abbé. (1906) *Saint Theodore*, Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre.

Marion, J. (1987) 'Le prototype de l'image', *Nicée II, 787-1987*, Paris, 451-470.

Markus, R. (1978) 'The Cult of Icons in Sixth-Century Gaul', *JTS* 29, 151-156.

Markus, R. (1994) 'Augustine on magic, A neglected semiotic theory', *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 40, 375-384.

Martin, E. (1930) *A History of the Iconoclastic Controversy*, New York: Macmillan.

Marx, P. (1998) 'Visual Perception and Cognition in the Theology of Icons of John of Damascus', *Diakonia* 31 no 1, 61-66.

Mateo-Seco, L. (1997) 'I Cor 13,12 in Gregory of Nyssa's Theological Thinking,' in *SP* XXXII, 153-162.

Mathew, G. (1963) *Byzantine Aesthetics*, London: J. Murray.

Mathews, T. (1986) 'Psychological Dimensions in the Art of Eastern Christendom',

Mathews, T. (1990) 'The Transformation Symbolism in Byzantine Architecture',

Mathews, T. (1998) *Byzantium: From Antiquity to the Renaissance*, New York: Abrams.

McGuckin, J. (1993) 'The Theology of Images and the Legitimation of Power in Eighth Century Byzantium', *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 37.1, 39- 58.

McGuckin, J. (1997) 'The Vision of God in St. Gregory Nazianzen', in *SP* XXXII, 145-152.

McCormick, M. (1994) 'Diplomacy and the Carolingian Encounter with Byzantium down to the Accession of Charles the Bald', in B. McGinn and W. Otten (eds.), *Eriugena: East and West*, Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 15-48.

McGinn, B. 1994. 'Introduction', in B. McGinn and W. Otten (eds.), *Eriugena: East and West,* Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1-12.

Meyendorff, J. (1968) 'L'Image du Christ d'après Théodore Stoudite', in *Synthronon,* Paris, 115-117.

Meyendorff, J. (1970) *Christ in Near Eastern Thought*, London.

Meyendorff, J. (1984) 'Byzantium as Centre of Theological Thought in the Christian East', in *Schools of Thought in the Christian Tradition*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 65-74.

Meyendorff, J. *(*1989) *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions: The Church 450-680 A.D.*, Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press.

Meyendorff, J. (1994) 'Remarks on Eastern Patristic Thought in John Scottus Eriugena', in B. McGinn and Willemien Otten (eds.), *Eriugena: East and West:,* Notre Dame:

University of Notre Dame Press, 51-68.

Millet, G. (1910) 'Les Iconoclasts et la Croix a Propos D'une Inscription de Cappoce', in *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 24, 96-109.

Moffatt, A. (1975) 'Schooling in the Iconoclast Centuries', in A. Bryer and J. Herrin (eds.), *Iconoclasm*, Birmingham: The Centre for Byzantine Studies, 85-92.

Mondzain, M.-J. (1996) *Image, Icone, Economie*, Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Moorhead, J. (1985) 'Iconoclasm, The Cross and the Imperial Image', in *Byzantion* 55, 165-179.

Moorhead, J. (1986) 'Byzantine Iconoclasm as a problem in art history', *Parergon* ns4, 1-18.

Morris, R. (1995) *Monks and Laymen in Byzantium, 843-1118*, Cambridge: CUP.

Mosshammer, A. (1997) 'Gregory of Nyssa and Christian Hellenism', in *SP* XXXII, 170-195.

Mouriki, D. (1971) 'The Portraits of Theodore Studites in Byzantine Art', in *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 20, 249-280.

Moutafakis, N. (1993) 'Christology and its Philosophical Complexities in the Thought of Leontius of Byzantium', in *History of Philosophy Quarterly*, vol 10.2, 99-119.

Mullett, M. (1981) 'The Classical Tradition in the Byzantine Letter', in M. Mullett and R. Scott (eds.), *Byzantium and the Classical Tradition*, Birmingham, 75-93.

349

Mundell, M. (1975) 'Monophysite Church Decoration', in A. Bryer and J. Herrin (eds.), *Iconoclasm*, Birmingham: The Centre for Byzantine Studies, 59-74.

Munitiz, J. (1974) 'Synoptic Greek Accounts of the Seventh Council', in *Revue des études byzantines* 32, 147-186.

Murray, A. (1983) 'Peter Brown and the Show of Constantine', in *The Journal of Roman Studies* 73, 191-203.

Murray, C. (1977) 'Art and the Early Church', in *JTS* nsXXVIII/2, 303-345.

Murray, C. (1981) *Rebirth and Afterlife: a study of the transmutation of some pagan imagery in early Christian funerary art*, British Archaelogical Reports International Series 100.

Murray, C. (1989) 'Artistic idiom and doctrinal development', in Rowan Williams (ed.) *The Making of Orthodoxy: essays in honour of Henry Chadwick,* Cambridge: CUP, 288-307.

Neil, B. (2000) 'The Western Reaction to the Council of Nicaea II', in *JTS* ns51.2, 533-552.

Nikolau, T. (1976) 'Die Ikonenverehrung als Beispiel ostkirchlicher Theologie und Frömmigheit nach Johannes von Damaskos', in *Ostkirchliche Studien* 25, 138-65.

der Nerssessian, S. (1994/5) 'Une Apologie des Images au VIIe Siècle', in *Byzantion* 17.

Noble, T. (1987) 'John of Damascus and the History of the Iconoclastic Controversy', in *Religion, Culture and Society in the Early Middle Ages: Studies in Honour of*

Richard E, Sullivan, Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 95-116.

O'Connell, P. (1972a) 'The "Letters" and "Catecheses" of St. Theodore Studites', in *OCA* XXXVIII, 256-559.

O'Connell, P. (1972b) *The Ecclesiology of St. Nicephorus I (758-828)*, Rome: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium.

Oehler, K. (1964) 'Aristotle in Byzantium', in *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 5.2, 133-146.

Oikonomides, N. (1991) 'The Holy Icon as an Asset', in *DOP* 45, 35-44.

Osborne, C. (1987) 'The repudiation of representation in Plato's Republic and its repercussions', in *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 213/ns33, 53-74.

Ostrogorsky, G. (1964) *Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Bildserstreites*, Breslau. Photographic reprint of 1929.

Otten, W. (1994) 'Eriugena's Periphyseon: A Carolingian Contribution to the Theological Tradition', in B. McGinn and W. Otten (eds.), *Eriugena: East and West*, Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 69-93.

Otten, W. (1997) 'The Texture of Tradition: The Role of the Church Fathers in Carolingian Theology', in Irena Backus (ed.), *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Ouspensky, L. (1987) 'Icon and Art', in B. McGinn and J.Meyendorff (eds.), *Christian Spirituality, Origins to Twelfth Century*, New York: Crossroads, 382-394.

Ouspensky, L. (1992) *The Theology of the Icon*, Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press.

Ozoline, N. (1987) 'La théologie de l'icone', in *Nicée II, 787-1987*, Paris, 403-420.

de Passalacqua, A. (1992) 'A Comparative Study of the Theological Approaches of Saint John of Damascus and Saint Theodore of Studion to the Iconoclastic Heresy', in *Following the Star from the East*, Ottawa: Sheptytsky Institute, 136-153.

Pargoire, J. (1900) 'Saint Iconophiles, Michel de Synnes, Pierre de Nicée; Athanase de Panlopétrion', in *Échos d'Orient* 4, 347-56.

Pargoire, J. (1902) 'Saint Théophane le Chronographe et ses rapports avec saint Théodore Stoudite', in *Vizantijskij Vremennik* 9, 31-102.

Pargoire, J. (1903) 'La Bonita de Saint Théodore Stoudite', in *Echos d'Orient* 6, 207-12.

Parry, K. (1989) 'Theodore Stoudites and the Patriarch Nicephorus on Image-making as a Christian Imperative', *Byzantion* 59, 164-183.

Parry, K. (1996) *Depicting the Word*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Patlagean, E. (1981) 'Sainteté et Pouvoir', in Sergei Hackel (ed.), *The Byzantine Saint,* London, 88-105.

Patlagean, E. (1988) 'Les Studites, L'empereur et Rome: Figure Byzantine d'un Monachisme Réformateur', in *Bisanzio, Roma e L'Italia Nell'alto Medioevo: Centro Italiano di Studi Sull'alto Medioevo XXXIV,* Spoleto, 429-465.

Payton, J. (1999) 'John of Damascus on Human Cognition: An Element in his Apologetic for Icons', in *Church History* 65, 173-183.

Peers, G. (1997) 'Imagination and angelic epiphany', *BMGS* 21, 113-131.

Peers, G. (2001) *Subtle Bodies: Represention of Angels in Byzantium*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Pelikan, J. (1973) '"Council or Father or Scripture": The Concept of Authority in the Theology of Maximus Confessor', in *The Heritage of the Early Church, Essays in Honour of Georges Florovsky*, Rome.

Pelikan, J. (1971) *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)*, vol. I of *The Christian Tradition*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pelikan, J. (1974) *The Spirit of Eastern Christendom 600-1700*, vol. II of *The Christian Tradition*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pelikan, J. (1978) *The Growth of Medieval Theology 600-1300:* vol. III of *The Christian Tradition*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pelikan, J. (1982) 'The Place of Maximus Confessor in the History of Christian Thought', in F. Heinzer & C. Schönborn (eds), *Maximus Confessor*, Suisse.

Pelikan, J. (1990) *Imago Dei: the Byzantine apologia for icons*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Pelikan, J. (1993) *Christianity and Classical Culture*, New Haven & London: Yale University Press.

Perczel, I, (1995) 'La bibliothèque du Denys the Areopagite l'Aéopagite',in *Annuaire EPHE, Section sciences religieuses* 104, 395-402.

Perczel, I, (2000) 'Pseudo-Dionysius and the *Platonic Theology*', in A. Segond et C. Steel (eds.), *Proclus et la Theologie Platonicienne*, Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Perl, Eric D. (1994) 'Metaphysics and Christology in Maximus Confessor and Eriugena', in B. McGinn and W. Otten (eds.), *Eriugena: East and West,* Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 253-270.

des Places, E. (1982) 'La théologie négative du Denys the Areopagite ses antécédents platoniciens et son influence au seuil du Moyen Age', in *SP* XVII/1, 81-92

Praechter, K. (1990) 'Review of the *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca*', in R. Sorabji (ed.), *Aristotle Transformed: The Ancient Commentators and Their Influence*, New York: Cornell University Press, 31-54.

Prosser, G. (1991) 'A Defence of Icons during the Messalian Controversy', in *SP* XXV, 93

Resnick, I. (1985) 'Idols and Images: early definitions and controversies', in *Sobernost* 7.2, 35-51.

Rees, S. (1939) 'The *De Sectis*: A Treatise attributed to Leontius of Byzantium', in *JTS* 50, 346-360.

Rees, S. (1968) 'The Literary Activity of Leontius of Byzantium', in *JTS* XIX, 229-242.

Ringrose, K. (1979) 'Monks and Society in Iconoclastic Byzantium', in *Byzantine Studies/Etudes Byzantines* 6/1-2, 130-51.

Rist, J. (1992) 'Pseudo-Dionysius, Neoplatonism and the Weakness of the Soul', in H. Westra (ed.), *From Athens to Chartres: Neoplatonism and Medieval Thought*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 135-161.

Rodley, L. (1994) *Byzantine Art and Architecture. An Introduction*, Cambridge: CUP.

Rorem, P. (1984) *Biblical and Liturgical Symbols within the Pseudo-Dionysian Synthesis*, Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies.

Roueché, M. (1974) 'Byzantine Philosophical Texts of the Seventh Century', *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 23,

Roueché, M. (1980) 'A middle Byzantine Handbook of Logic Terminology', in *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 29, 71-98.

de Ruk, L. (1992) 'Causation and Participation in Proclus: The pivotal Role of Scope Distinction in His Metaphysics', in E. Bos & P. Meijer (eds.), *On Proclus and His Influence in Medieval Philosophy*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1-34.

Runciman, S. (1975) *Byzantine Style and Civilization*, Baltimore: Penquin.

Runia, D. (1986) *Philo of Alexandria and the* Timaeus *of Plato*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Russell, J. (1995) 'The Archaeological Context of Magic in the Early Byzantine Period', in Henry Maguire (ed.), *Byzantine Magic*, Washington D.C., 35- 50.

Sabev, T. (1994) 'L'Iconoclasme', in Durand, J. (ed.), *Byzance et les images,* Paris, 329-369.

Saffrey, H. (1982) 'New Objective Links Between the Pseudo-Dionysius and Proclus', in D. O'Meara, *Neoplatonism and Christian Thought*, Albany, N.Y.: International Society for Neoplatonic Studies.

Saffrey, H. (1986) 'The Piety and Prayers of Ordinary Men and Women in Late Antiquity', in A.H. Armstrong (ed.), *Classical Mediterranean Spirituality*, New York: Crossroad, 195-213.

Saffrey, H. (1997) 'Theology as Science (3rd - 6th centuries)', in *SP* XXIX, 321-339.

Sahas, D. (1987) 'Ὕλη and φύσις in John of Damascus's Orations in defense of the icons', in *SP* XXIII, 66-73.

Sahas, D. (1986) *Icon and Logos: Sources in Eighth-Century Iconoclasm*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Sahas, D. (1987) 'Icone et anthropologie chrétienne. La pensée de Nicene II', in F. Boespflug and N. Lossky (eds.), *Nicée II*, Paris, 434-450.

Sari-Mendelovici, H. (1990) 'Christian Attitudes toward Pagan Monuments in Late Antiquity and Their Legacy in Later Byzantine Centuries', in *DOP* 44, 145-163.

von Schäferdiek, K. (1980) 'Zu Verfasserschaft und Situation der Epistula Constantiam de imagine Christi', in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 91, 177-186.

Schoemann, J. (1941) 'Eikon in den Schriften des h. Athanasius', in *Scholastik* 16, 335-350.

Schoemann, J. (1943) 'Gregors von Nyssa theologische Anthropologie als Bildtheologie', in *Scholastik* 18, 31-53.

von Schönborn, C. (1982) 'La sainteté de l'icône selon S. Jean Damascène', in *SP* XVII/1, 188-193.

von Schönborn, C. (1976a) *L'Icône du Christ*, Fribourg.

von Schönborn, C. (1976b) 'La "Lettre 38 de Saint Basile" et le problème Christologique de L'iconoclasme' in *Revue des sciences philosophiques et theologiques* 60, 446-450.

von Schönborn, C. (1994) *God's Human Face: The Christ-Icon*, San Francisco: Ignatius Press. Translation of Schönborn (1976).

Schreiner, P. (1976) 'Legende und Wirklichkeit in der Darstellung des byzantinischen Bilderstreites', in *Saeculum* 27/2, 165-179.

Schreiner, P. (1988) 'Der Byzantinische Bilderstreit: Kritische Analyse Der Zeitgenössischen Meinungen Und Das Urteil Der Nachwelt Bis Heute', in *Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano au Studi sull'alto medioero* 34.1, 319-407.

Schulz, H. (1986) *The Byzantine Liturgy: Symbolic Structure and Faith Expression*, New York: Pueblo Pub. Co.

Scorvanes, L. (1996) *Proclus. Neo-Platonic Philosophy and Science*, Edinburgh.

Scouteris, C. (1984) '"Never as gods": icons and their veneration', in *Sobernost* 6.1.

Scouteris, C. (1987) 'La personne du Verbe Incarné et l'icone', in F. Boespflug and N. Lossky (eds.), *Nicée II*, Paris, 121-134.

Sefton, D. (1987) 'The Popes and the Holy Images in the eighth century', in T. Noble and J. Contreri (eds.), *Religion, Culture and Society in the Early Middle Ages*, Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 117-130.

Sendler, E. (1981) *L'icône, image de l'invisible*, Paris.

Sevenko, I. (1975) 'Hagiography of the Iconoclast Period', in A. Bryer and J. Herrin (eds.), *Iconoclasm*, Birmingham: The Centre for Byzantine Studies, 113-132.

Sevcenko, N. (1991) 'Icons in the Liturgy', in *DOP* 45, 45-58.

Sevcenko, N. (1994) 'Close Encounters: Contact between Holy Figures and the Faithful as Represented in Byzantine Works of Art', in J. Durand, (ed.), *Byzance et les images,* Paris, 255-85.

Shaw, G. (1985) 'Theurgy: Rituals of Unification in the Neoplatonism of Iamblichus', in *Traditio* XLI, 1-28.

Shaw, G. (1988) 'Theurgy as Demiurgy: Iamblichus' Solution to the Problem of Embodiment', in *Dionysius* XII, 37-59.

Shaw, G. (1993) 'The Geometry of Grace: A Pythagorean Approach to Theurgy', in J. Blumenthal and E. Clark, (eds.), *The Divine Iamblichus, philosopher and man of gods*, London: Bristol Classical Press, 116-137.

Shaw, G. (1995) *Theurgy and the Soul: The Neoplatonism of Iamblichus*, University Park, Pa: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Shaw, G. (1999) 'Neoplatonic Theurgy and Dionysius the Areopagite', in *The Journal of Early Christian Studies* 7:4, 573-599.

Shepherd, A. (1982) 'Proclus' Attitude to Theurgy', in *The Classical Quarterly* XXXII, 212-224.

Shepherd, M. (1980) 'Christology: A central Problem of Early Christian Theology and Art', in K. Weitzmann (ed), *Age of Spirituality: A Symposium*, New York: Princeton: Metropolitan Museum of Art; distributed by Princton University Press, 101-120.

Sherrard, P. (1967) 'The Art of the Icon' in A.M. Allchin, *Sacrament and Image*, London: Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Segius.

Shults, F. (1996) 'A Dubious Christological Formula: From Leontius of Byzantium to Karl Barth', *Theological Studies* 57, 431-446

Sideris, T. (1979) 'The Theological Arguments of the Iconoclasts during the Iconoclastic Controversy', *Byzantine Studies/Etudes Byzantines* 6/1-2, 178-92.

Smith, A. (1974) *Porphyry's Place in the Neoplatonic Tradition: A study in post-Plotinian Neoplatonism*, The Hague.

Smith, A. (1993) 'Iamblichus' Views on the Relationship of Philosophy to Religion in *De Mysteriis*', in J. Blumenthal and E. Clark (eds.), *The Divine Iamblichus, philosopher and man of gods*, London: Bristol Classical Press, 74-86.

Sorabji, R. (1990) 'The Ancient Commentators on Aristotle', in R. Sorabji, *Aristotle Transformed: The Ancient Commentators and Their Influence*, New York: Cornell University Press, 1-30.

Speck, P. (1978) *Kaiser Konstantin VI. Die Legitimation einer fremden und der Versuch*

einer eigenen Herrschaft, München.

Spidlik, T. (1987) 'Le concept de l'image chez les Pères jusqu'au Concile Nicée II', *SP* XXIII, 74-86.

Staniloae, D. (1994) *The Experience of God. Vol 1, The Revelation and knowledge of the Triune God*, Brookline, Mass.: Holy Cross Orthodox Press.

Staniloae, D. (2000) *The Experience of God. Vol 2, The world: Creation and deification*, Brookline, Mass.: Holy Cross Orthodox Press.

Starr, J. (1933) 'An Iconodule Legend and Its historical Basis', *Speculum*, 500-503.

Steel, C. (1978) *The Changing Self. A Study on the Soul in Later Neoplatonism: Iamblichus, Damasius & Priscanus*, Brussels: Paleis der Acemiën.

Steel, C. (1993) 'L'Âme: Modele et Image', in J. Blumenthal and E. Clark, (eds.), *The Divine Iamblichus, philosopher and man of gods*, London: Bristol Classical Press, 14-29.

Stith, R. (1992) 'Images, Spirituality and Law', in *Following the Star from the East*, Ottawa: Sheptytsky Institute, 120-135.

Taft, R. (1980) 'The Liturgy of the Great Church: An Initial Synthesis of Structure and Interpretation on the Eve of Iconoclasm', in *DOP* 34/35, 45-75.

Taft, R. (1993) *The Liturgy of the Hours in East and West*, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press.

Tambiah, S. (1990) *Magic, Science, Religion, and the Scope of Rationality*, Cambridge:

CUP.

Thon, N. (1979) *Ikone und Liturgie*, Trier: Paulinus-Verlg.

Thorne, G. (1989) 'The Structure of Philo's Commentary on the Pentateuch', in *Dionysius* XIII, 17-50.

Thümmel, H. (1984) 'Brief an Kaiserin Konstantia', *Klio* 66, 210-22.

Thümmel, H. (1992) *Die Frühgeschichte der Ostkirchlichen Bilderlehre*, Berlin.

Thümmel, H. (1993) 'Das Florileg des Niketos von Medikion für die Bilderverehrung', *BZ*, 41-43.

Thunberg, L. (1965) *Microcosm and Mediator. The Theological Anthropology of Maximus Confessor*, Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup and Ejnar Munksgaard.

Thunberg, L. (1997) '"Circumincession" once more: Trinitarian and Christological Implications in an Age of Religious Pluralism', in *SP* XXIX, 364-372.

Thunberg, L. (1982) 'Symbol and Mystery in St. Maximus the Confessor', in F. Heinzer & C. Schönborn (eds), *Maximus Confessor: Actes du Symposium sur Maximus le Confesseur Fribourg, 2-5 septembre 1980*, Fribourg: Éditions universitaires, 285-308.

Tougard, A. (1891) 'La Persécution Iconoclaste d'après la Correspondence de Saint Théodore Stoudite', in *Revue des Questions Historiques* nsVI, 80-118.

Travis, J. (1984) *In Defense of the Faith: The Theology of Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople*, Brookline M.A.: Hellenic College Press.

Treadgold, W. (1988) *The Byzantine Revival, 780-842*, California: Stanford University Press.

Trilling, J. (1983) 'Sinai Icons: another look', in *Byzantion* 53, 300-11.

Turner, D. (1995) *The Darkness of God*, Cambridge: CUP.

Turner, V., Turner, E. (1978) *Image and Pilgrimage in Christian Culture*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Uthemann, K.-H. (1996) 'Christ's Image versus Christology: Thoughts on the Justinian Era as Threshold of an Epoch', in P. Allen and E. Jeffreys (eds), *The Sixth Century - End or Beginning?*, Brisbane, 197-223.

Van de Vorst, C. (1914) 'Le petite catéchese de s. Théodore Stoudite', in *Analecta Bollandiana* 33, 31-51.

Van den Ven, P. (1955-57) 'La patristique et l'hagiographie au concile de Nice en 787', in *Byzantion* 25-27, 325-62.

Vasiliev, A. (1932) *Histoire de l'empire byzantin*, I, Paris, 1932.

Vaihé, S. (1902) 'Saint André de Crète', *Echos d'Orient* 5, 378-87.

Vikan, G. (1982) *Byzantine Pilgrimage Art*, Washington.

Vikan, G. (1984) 'Art, Medicine and Magic in Early Byzantium', *DOP* 38, 65-86.

Vikan, G. (1990) 'Pilgrims in Magi's clothing: The Impact of Mimesis on Early

Byzantine Pilgrimage Art' in R. Ousterhout, (ed.), *The Blessings of Pilgrimage*, Chicago: Illinois Byzantine Studies, 98-107.

Wallace-Hadrill, J. (1983) *The Frankish Church*, Oxford: OUP.

Wallach, L. (1977) *Diplomatic Studies in Latin and Greek Documents from the Carolingian Age*, Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Walter, C. (1982) *Art and Ritual of the Byzantine Church*, London: Variorum Publications.

Ware, K. (1990) 'The meaning of the Divine Liturgy for the Byzantine worshipper', in Rosemary Morris (ed.), *Church and People in Byzantium*, Birmingham: Birmingham University Press, 7-28.

Ware, K. (1971) 'The Value of the Material Creation', in *Sobornost* 6, 154-165.

Ware, K. (1997) ' "My helper and my enemy": the body in Greek Christianity', in S. Coakley (ed.) *Religion and the Body*, Cambridge, CUP, 90-110.

Ware, K. (1982) 'Introduction' in *John Climacus, The Ladder of Divine Ascent*, New York: The Classics of Western Spirituality.

Ware, K. (1978) 'The meaning of the Great Fast' in K. Ware, K. and Mother Mary, *The Lenten Triodion*, London and Boston: Faber and Faber.

Ware, K. and Mother Mary (1969) *The Festal Menian*, London.

Welch, A. (1977) 'Epigraphs as Icons: The Role of the Written Word in Islamic Art', in Joseph Gutmann (ed.), *The Image and the Word. Confrontations in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*, Missoula, 63-74.

Wendt, C. (1949) 'Bilderlehre und Ikonenverehrung: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der alten Ikonenmalerei', in *Zeitschrift für Religions und Geistesgeschichte*, 23-33.

Westerink, L. (1962) *Anonymous Prolegomena to Platonic Philosophy*, Amsterdam: North Holland Pub. Co.

Westerink, L. (1980a) *Texts and studies in Neoplatonism and Byzantine literature: collected papers*, Amsterdam: A.M. Hakkert.

Williams, R. (1999) 'Troubled Breasts: The Holy Body in Hagiography', in J. Drijvers and J. Watt (eds), *Portraits of Spiritual Authority*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 63-78.

Williams, J. (1999a) 'The Apophatic Theology of Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite I' in *The Downside Review* 408, 157-172.

Williams, J. (1999b) 'The Apophatic Theology of Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite II' in *The Downside Review* 409, 235-250.

Williams, J. (2000) *Denying Divinity*, Oxford, OUP.

Williams, J. (2001) 'The Incarnational Apophasis of Maximus the Confessor' in *SP* 37, 631-635.

Wilson, N.G. (1983) *Scholars of Byzantium*, London.

Wortley, J. (1982) 'Iconoclasm and Leipsanoclasm: Leo III, Constantine V and the Relics', in *Byzantinische Forschungen* 8, 253-79.

Zachhuber, J. (2000) *Human Nature in Gregory of Nyssa*, Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill.

Zhivov, V.M. (1987) 'The Mystagogia of Maximus the Confessor and the Development of the Byzantine Theory of the Image', in *Saint Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 31, 349-376.