THE ICONOCLASTIC COUNCIL OF ST. SOPHIA (815) AND ITS DEFINITION (*HOROS*)

PAUL J. ALEXANDER

CONTENTS

The substance of this paper was delivered orally at the Dumbarton Oaks Symposium in April 1951. In its present form it owes much to the discussion which followed, as well as to the suggestions of Professor E. Kantorowicz, of the Institute for Advanced Study, who was kind enough to read the typescript. To my friend and colleague Brooks Otis, I am indebted for advice on several problems and for his patience with the galley proofs. The final draft of this paper was written while the author held a John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Fellowship and was a member of the Institute for Advanced Study.

THE purpose of this paper is to present a fresh appraisal of the Second Iconoclastic Period. So far as I can see, modern scholarship is in complete agreement in its views on the Iconoclastic Controversy in the ninth century. The Russian historian F. I. Uspenski called the iconoclasm of the Second Period "already spiritually exhausted." According to Ostrogorsky, the iconoclasts of the ninth century "lacked the intellectual freshness which had been characteristic of Iconoclasm in the eighth century." "The new Iconoclasm produced no new ideas. It resigned itself to repeating the old theses of its teachers" which were now "formulated more vaguely, diluted, and robbed of their previous vigor." Elsewhere Ostrogorsky even attributes to the Iconoclastic Council of 815 senile impotence, "epigonenhafte Impotenz." These views, propounded by the man who had made the most profound and brilliant study of the Second Iconoclastic Period and who was furthermore one of the very few who had had access to some of the unpublished manuscript material dealing especially with the Second Period, were pretty generally acclaimed and underlie the more popular books on the Iconoclastic Controversy. To Martin "in these later stages of the controversy the philosophical and theological arguments were subsidiary to the appeal to authority." [1] And if everybody is agreed that there was very little originality on the iconoclastic side during the Second Period, it stands to reason that scholars often do not have a very high opinion of the orthodox writers of the Second Period who undertake the refutation of the supposedly traditional iconoclastic arguments.

In the course of my work on the Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople,[2] I have come to the conclusion that the current view cannot stand the test of critical examination. I shall attempt to show in this paper that the iconoclasm of the Council of St. Sophia, far from being the weak replica of the First Period, far from being tainted with "senile impotence" and with "the exclusive reliance on authority," is on the contrary the philosophical climax of the entire Controversy. During this period the attention of both sides, iconoclasts and iconophiles, centers around one fundamental problem: the nature of the true religious image. Here was the most basic aspect of the entire problem that had hardly been touched upon during the eighth century. So long as it was not taken up, discussed, and settled in one sense or the other, the Controversy was concerned with relatively superficial aspects of the problem. It was only in the ninth century that iconoclasts and iconophiles came to grips with the real issue, and the theo-

logians of the ninth century show real originality in the way in which they probe its depth.

Little need be said here about the life of the man to whom we are indebted for what we know about the position of the iconoclasts of 815 and who devoted his entire adult life and his writings to a militant refutation of iconoclasm: the Patriarch Nicephorus. He was born at Constantinople during the reign of the famous iconoclastic Emperor, Constantine V. His father, an Imperial Secretary, was an ardent image-worshipper and was exiled by the Emperor because of his religious convictions. Thus iconoclasm was the great issue that overshadowed Nicephorus' life from the days of his childhood. The young man received a most careful education, and when he was grown up received an appointment in the Imperial Secretariate. In this capacity, he was the subordinate of Tarasius, whose successor he was to be on the patriarchal throne. Young Nicephorus attended the Seventh Ecumenical Council of 787 where he probably acted as mandator, i.e., as a spokesman for the palace. Several years after the Council Nicephorus retired from the court, founded a monastery on the other side of the Straits, and devoted himself to ascetic exercises. Later on the Patriarch Tarasius appointed him director of one of the Church's largest charitable institutions in Constantinople, and in 806 he became Patriarch of Constantinople, thanks largely to pressure exercised on the clergy by the Emperor Nicephorus. During his patriarchate, Nicephorus clashed on various occasions with the monastic party led by Theodore Abbot of Studios. However, when in 813 Leo V the Armenian ascended the imperial throne and soon began to favor iconoclasm, Nicephorus and the monastic party put up a common front against this new outbreak of the heresy. Nicephorus was deposed and exiled to the monastery which he had founded. The exiled Patriarch decided to continue his fight by turning to the literary field.[3] From the new outbreak of the Controversy shortly before 815 to his death in 828 Nicephorus wrote a large number of treatises, all of which attack specific documents written or adduced by the iconoclasts in favor of their views. It is unnecessary to draw up the impressive list of his theological works which were directed against the arguments of Constantine V, against certain patristic texts quoted by the iconoclasts such as those of Eusebius, Epiphanius, Macarius, and so forth. These texts have been published by cardinals Mai and Pitra. Here we are interested exclusively in an unpublished treatise by Nicephorus which is the climax of his literary activity, as well as the most complete treatment of the issues involved.

This last and most important work by Nicephorus had a very long title: "Criticism and Refutation of the unlawful, undefined and truly spurious

Definition set forth by men who seceded from the Catholic and Apostolic Church and adhered to a foreign way of thinking, to the destruction of the saving dispensation granted by God the Word." The very title of the work gives a hint of its content; for at least since the days of Irenaeus [4] works of an anti-heretical nature had gone under the title of Ἔλεγχος καὶ Ἀνατροπή, *Detectio et Eversio*, "Criticism and Refutation." In the case of Nicephorus the heresy which he combatted was of course iconoclasm. So far as I know, only two manuscripts, both at Paris, the *Graecus* 1250 (B) and the *Coislinianus* 93 (C), contain this treatise. In 1939 these two manuscripts, as well as manuscripts of other treatises by Nicephorus, were examined at the Bibliothèque Nationale by one of the oldest and most learned friends of Dumbarton Oaks, my late teacher, Professor R. P. Blake. According to Professor Blake, somebody in the ninth century made a two-volume edition of Nicephorus' theological works. The Ἔλεγχος καὶ Ἀνατροπή appeared in the second tome. The Paris manuscripts *Graecus* 1250 and *Coisl.* 93 derive from that second volume and date, according to Professor Blake, from the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries, respectively – although another excellent paleographer was inclined to assign them to the fourteenth and twelfth centuries.[5] I have copied the entire treatise from *Paris. Gr.* 1250 and collated parts of *Coisl.* 93. The treatise as a whole is still unedited, though the Benedictine Banduri had planned a publication in the early 1700's, Serruys another early in our century, and a young Russian scholar, J. D. Andreev, a third in the 1920's.[6] However, the treatise quotes at length from the *Definition* of the Iconoclastic Council of 815, and these quotations were edited in our own century first by D. Serruys and later in a brilliant book by Ostrogorsky.[7] This method of picking the heretical raisins and leaving the orthodox cake was of course entirely unfair to Nicephorus' treatise. What is more, the raisin-pickers overlooked a great deal, roughly one half, of the heretical material and consequently arrived at half-baked and even erroneous conclusions.[8]

Let me explain what I have in mind by examining for a moment the structure of the unpublished treatise. It clearly falls into two major parts, and the raisin-pickers have concentrated their attention exclusively upon the first part. In this first part the author quotes large sections of the *Definition* issued by the Iconoclastic Council of 815 and refutes it sentence by sentence. The second and longer part of the treatise is the refutation of a florilegium of patristic quotations compiled by the iconoclastic bishops of 815. That such a florilegium was compiled is clear from the *Scriptor Incertus de Leone Armeno*,[9] as well as from indications in Nicephorus' treatise. The treatise makes it clear, furthermore, that in it the patristic quotations col-

lected by the iconoclasts appear in the order in which they were attached to the *Definition* of 815 and that none of the quotations is omitted. It is this patristic florilegium attached to the *Definition* of 815 that has been neglected by previous students of Nicephorus and which will allow us to draw certain conclusions which the text of the *Definition* alone would hardly justify.[10]

We must now consider for a moment the treatise to which we are indebted for our quotations. It is clear first of all that it was not completed prior to the murder of Leo the Armenian on Christmas Day 820.[11] It was written therefore when the Patriarch was in exile. There is some uncertainty about the conditions under which it was written. Later in the century, Photius referred in one of his letters to the relative freedom that Nicephorus had enjoyed in his exile under Leo V, especially to the fact that he had free access to books.[12] This is borne out by the Ἔλεγχος καὶ Ἀνατροπή, where Nicephorus not only quotes from a great number of patristic texts but on occasion even is able to consult several manuscripts of the same work and to derive from them variant readings.[13] In another passage, however, he abstains from pronouncing on the genuineness of a quotation on the grounds that he had been unable to obtain a manuscript of the work in question. He gives as his reason the fact that he was "already locked up in a very safe prison, was in no way granted freedom, certainly not to set foot outside, but not even to send out word."[14] In view of this somewhat conflicting evidence, we must assume that at times he was more severely guarded than at others. We may imagine the exiled Patriarch residing in the monastery which he himself had founded and dedicated to St. Theodore not far from Chalcedon. There he must have lived, sometimes in complete isolation, at other times in relative comfort, always pondering the great issue of iconoclasm which had overshadowed his life and especially his entire tenure of the patriarchal office.

What was the content of that famous *Definition* of 815 which the first part of the Ἔλεγχος καὶ Ἀνατροπή was meant to "criticize and overthrow"? It praised the Isaurian Emperors and the Iconoclastic Council of 754 for its fight against religious images and reënacted its canonical legislation. The Council of 754, so the bishops of 815 said, gave a long period of peace to the Church until it was ruined by the womanly simplicity of the Empress Irene and the Council of 787. Then the Lord took pity upon the world sunk into a flood of sin and sent it a second Noah (the Emperor Leo V). The Iconophiles, following the heresies condemned by the six ecumenical councils, either circumscribed the divine nature together with the human nature by painting the image of Christ, or separated the two. The bishops of 815 concluded by condemning the worship of the spurious images, invalidated the

decisions of 787, accepted those of 754, and declared the making of images to be devoid of worship and useless – while at the same time, in a spirit of compromise, expressly abstaining from calling them idols.

Such is the content of the famous *Definition* of 815. While a new edition of this *Definition* is needed,[15] it is clear that a new study of the first part of Nicephorus' treatise will not add much to our knowledge of the *Definition*. If one looks only at the *Definition*, one will have to admit that it is an exceedingly tame and disappointing document. The iconoclastic bishops say as little as possible on their own authority: they summarize and approve the iconoclastic *Definition* of 754, they summarize and reject the orthodox *Definition* of 787. Into their summaries they insert skillfully a review of the principal arguments used against religious images by the earlier iconoclasts. Only certain epithets give an inkling of what we shall recognize as the Council's main thesis: the Saints are called "sharers in the form [of Christ]" (frg. 9 τοὺς συμμόρφους αὐτοῦ ἁγίους), the icons are called "soulless" (frg. 13 ἀψύχοις εἰκόσι). Only once in the *Definition* does the Council of St. Sophia speak on its own authority, a fact which is clear even stylistically from the use of the first person plural:

> 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 (τῶν ψευδωνύμων εἰκόνων).[16]

These epithets and this pronouncement – I repeat that it is the only one where the iconoclastic bishops speak in their own name – contains only one real objection to religious images: they are called "spurious." To a ninth-century Byzantine who studied only the *Definition* (and not the florilegium) of 815, this charge of the spuriousness of pictorial images can have meant only one thing: a repetition of a famous argument used earlier by Constantine V and by the Council of Hiereia that a pictorial image of Christ was "spurious" and that the true image was the bread and wine of the Eucharist.[17] It will be seen presently that this was not at all the real doctrine of the Council of 815, yet there can be no doubt that in their *Definition* the bishops of the Council of St. Sophia take cover behind the shield of conciliar authority. It should be added that 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.[18] In a word, the *Definition* was expressed *fortiter in modo, fortiter in re theologica, sed suaviter in re ecclesiastica.* There can be no doubt that the iconoclastic bish-

ops of 815 thought that by relying in their *Definition* on conciliar authority and by abstaining from charging their opponents with specific heresies, they might have an easier time in winning them over to their side.

Let us now examine with some care the patristic florilegium refuted in the second part of Nicephorus' treatise. It quoted a passage from each of the following sources: [19]

Apostolic Constitutions (frg. 17)
Asterius of Amaseia, Homilia I: *De Divite et Lazaro* (= *P.G.* XL, 168 B) (frg. 18)
A certain Leontius (frg. 19)
Theodotus of Galatia (frg. 20)
Basil of Seleucia (frg. 21)
Amphilochius of Iconium, *Encomium on St. Basil* (= *Oriens Christianus* XXXI [1934] 68 sq.) (frg. 22)
Basil the Great, *First Homily on the Creation of Man in the Image of God* (= *P.G.* XLIV, 273A–B) (frg. 23)
Gregory of Nyssa (frg. 24)
Gregory Nazianzen (frg. 25)
John Chrysostom, *In Romanum Martyrem* (= *P.G.* L, 616) (frg. 26)
John Chrysostom, *Homily on Abraham* (frg. 27)
John Chrysostom, *On the Gaoler* (frg. 28)
A letter by the ascete Nilus to Olympiodorus (*P.G.* LXXIX, 577) (frg. 29)
A great number of passages attributed to Epiphanius (frgs. 30A–D)

In our analysis of this florilegium we are interested primarily in the following questions: What objections to religious images are the patristic quotations contained therein supposed to convey to the reader? And do these objections tally with those expressed (or at least alluded to) in the *Definition* itself? To facilitate an answer to these questions, it will be advisable to reduce the patristic material of the florilegium in order to be able to recognize its purpose. Now if we wish to penetrate to the core of iconoclastic thought in 815, it will obviously be advisable to study most carefully those quotations of the florilegium that had not been used before by the Council of Hiereia. I shall henceforth designate such passages as "new passages." If anywhere, the motivation and tendencies of iconoclastic thought in 815 should appear in these "new passages," i.e., in our fragments 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30 B, 30 C, 30 D.[20] Of these "new" quotations, the passages from the *Apostolic Constitutions* (frg. 17), from John Chrysostom's *De Abraham* (frg. 27), from Nilus' letter to Olympiodorus

(frg. 29), and from Epiphanius' letters to the Emperor Theodosius (frg. 30 C) and to Johannes of Aelia (frg. 30 D), do not seem to contain any idea that was not already contained in the passages used by the Council of Hiereia. Of the other "new passages," the most important and most elaborate was undoubtedly that taken from Epiphanius' *Treatise against Those Who Are Engaged in Making, after the Fashion of Idols, Images in the Likeness of Christ, the Mother of God, Martyrs, Angels and Prophets* (frg. 30 B). Here is the claim that images of the saints do not honor but rather dishonor them. Here, as in the *Definition* itself, the images are called "spurious" (ψευδώνυμοι). Here is the request to set up the Apostles' commandments as their images through the virtues (οὐκοῦν εἰκόνας αὐτῶν [i.e., τῶν Ἀποστόλων] τὰς αὐτῶν ἐντολὰς δι' ἀρετῶν στήσωμεν) — which I understand to mean that, to portray the Apostles, one has to acquire their virtues and obey their commands. And we also have here the assertion that the Apostles never commanded anybody to look at their images in memory of their form (ἰδέα). Pictorial representations of Christ and the saints are "spurious" images (ψευδώνυμοι εἰκόνες), in reality they are not images at all, according to Epiphanius. Why not? Because, according to 1 John 3:2, as quoted by Epiphanius, "when He appears, we are to be like Him," and, according to Romans 8:29 (the wording of which Epiphanius changed slightly to suit his purposes), the saints "would share in the shape of the Son of God." If that was so, i.e., if the saints were somehow like Christ, then a pictorial representation of saints was possible only if it was possible for Christ. Was it possible for Christ? Obviously not, for he is incomprehensible and uncircumscribable, otherwise he would not be like the Father and would be unable to give life to the dead. Christ, Epiphanius says, can be worshipped only "in the spirit and in truth," and any pictorial representation of him is a "pseudonymous image," a "spurious" image. The same must be said of the saints, whose true image is not a pictorial portrait but the imitation of their virtues.

So much about the passage from Epiphanius. The remaining "new passages" underline the thesis of Epiphanius' treatise (and of the Council of St. Sophia) that pictorial representations of Christ and the saints are not true images. The quotation from Asterius of Amaseia (frg. 18) forbids pictorial representations of Jesus Christ and ordains the listener "to carry Christ in his soul and to carry the incorporeal Word about in his mind (νοητῶς)." The passage from Leontius (frg. 19) points out that painters rightly disagree regarding the image (εἰκών) of Christ because it was different at different stages of his life and that the likeness (ὁμοιωσίδιον) can be acquired only in the heart. The passage from Basil of Seleucia (frg. 21) states that the

only way of commemorating the saints is by reading about them, not by "the evil art of these figures." In interpreting Genesis 1:26 on the creation of Man in the image and likeness of God, Basil the Great (frg. 23) is said to make a distinction between "image" and "likeness." A painter's "image" is "lying vain and idle," whereas creation in God's "likeness" gave Man the power of becoming like God. The purport of this quotation was to show that St. Basil did not have a very high opinion of Man's creation in the "image" of God but saw the dignity of Man in the power given to him by divine grace to make himself resemble God through his own efforts – a view in harmony with the iconoclastic contention that the true representation of Christ and of the saints was the virtuous man. The quotation from Gregory of Nyssa (frg. 24) emphasizes the supra-corporeal nature of Christ. The sentences from John Chrysostom's *In Romanum Martyrem* (frg. 26) insist that Christ cannot be perceived by the senses and that he is concerned exclusively with human *souls* and their salvation.

The "line" indicated by the "new passages" is, therefore, clear: pictures of Christ and of the saints are "spurious," and their only true image is the virtuous Christian worshipping God in his heart.[21]

Now the reader will recall that the one contention made in the *Definition* of St. Sophia on the authority of the Council itself was that pictorial images are "spurious." It is certainly no mere accident that the entire patristic florilegium is an elaboration of that thesis.[22] It now is clear, also, that the point about the spuriousness of pictorial images made in the *Definition* was not a replica of the earlier thesis of Constantine V and of the Council of Blachernae that the only true image of Christ was the bread and wine of the Eucharist. Theologically, that doctrine, making of the Eucharist an image of Christ rather than his body itself, was dangerous ground which had given an altogether too easy weapon to the iconophiles. The doctrine of the spuriousness of pictorial images means something entirely different to the Council of St. Sophia from what it had meant to the Council of Hiereia – although the term remains the same: the true image of Christ is no longer the Eucharist but Man endowed with the Christian virtues.[23]

If the interpretation of the Council of St. Sophia as given here has any merits, then the iconoclasts of the Second Period were indeed not merely repeating the arguments of their predecessors of Hiereia. The bishops of St. Sophia are concentrating as explicitly as possible on what had been by implication, as Ostrogorsky had seen,[24] the central problem of the Controversy since the days of Constantine V: the nature of the true image. To Constantine V the true image had to be consubstantial with the original: *καὶ εἰ καλῶς, ὁμόουσιον αὐτὴν [τὴν εἰκόνα] εἶναι τοῦ εἰκονιζομένου.*[25] For the Council of St.

Sophia, the "true image" of Christ and the saints was not any kind of pictorial representation. The only true image was, in the language of the quotation from Basil the Great (frg. 23), Man who "with permission of God, made himself resemble God." Here was an iconoclastic doctrine that, philosophically speaking, was immeasurably more profound than that of the earlier period, although by implication it was still based on the same premise. This premise was that the image had to be consubstantial with the original. The Christological arguments first advanced by Constantine V and then taken up by the Council of Hiereia were more basic from a theological point of view; they connected the image controversy with the earlier Christological disputes. But they applied exclusively to the image of Christ. Constantine V once had said, in one of his programmatic speeches, that if he could convince his listeners that the image of Christ was inadmissible, it would be easy for him to repeat the operation for other religious images.[26] Actually, the case for iconoclasm was more easily made in the case of the image of Christ than for that of the saints – though it is very far from my purpose to belittle the ingenuity of Constantine's formulation of the Christological argument. It was after all obvious to every Christian that Christ was more than an ordinary human being, and the pictorial representation of Christ was therefore theologically at least questionable. But such a way of thinking was not applicable to the saints. To invalidate pictorial representations of Christ *and* saints, it was necessary to strike much deeper, to develop a philosophy of religious representation, and this is precisely what the Council of St. Sophia did. True, the Council availed itself of a doctrine implied and even of the terminology used in the works of Constantine V. To this extent, therefore, it is true that the spirit of Constantine V triumphed in 815. But the Council of St. Sophia spelled out in detail the implications of Constantine's philosophy of religious representation, of course without specifically referring to it. A religious personality, Christ or a saint, could be represented only by something consubstantial with this personality. From this it followed that the pictorial image of a religious personality, Christ or saint, was not a true representation but "spurious" and therefore inadmissible.

So far we have deduced the meaning of the Council of St. Sophia from its *Definition* and from its patristic florilegium, without paying attention to Nicephorus' refutation. In fact, our interpretation is confirmed when we turn to the Ἔλεγχος καὶ Ἀνατροπή. The very title of the treatise is illuminating:

Criticism and Refutation of the unlawful, undefined and truly spurious *Definition* set forth by men who seceded from the Catholic and Apostolic Church and adhered to a

foreign way of thinking, to the destruction of the saving dispensation granted by God the Word.[27]

Every word of this title is chosen with deliberation. I have commented before (p. 39) on the implications of the words "Criticism and Refutation." It is also obvious what is meant with the charge that the iconoclasts were destroying the "saving dispensation granted by God the Word." This is the traditional claim of the iconophiles that the iconoclasts, by rejecting Christ's image, were denying the Incarnation. But how are we to interpret the contention that the *Definition* of the Council of St. Sophia is "unlawful, undefined and truly spurious"? Is this mere rhetoric, or do we have here basic contentions of the militant Patriarch? It would seem to me that these three adjectives sum up Nicephorus' main objections to the *Definition* of 815. The *Definition* is ἄθεσμος or unlawful: the meaning of this charge is explained particularly at the beginning of the treatise. The *Definition* is unlawful, first, because the bishops assembled at St. Sophia had signed a written promise "on the altar of God and in the face of God and the angels and the entire congregation of the Church" not to assemble in holy synods (B 175a). Nicephorus secondly considers the *Definition* "lawless" because, as he says in the text of the treatise, it raised a dogmatic issue, but Rome and the patriarchs were not represented at the Council (B 175b). The charge of "lawlessness" against the *Definition* thus has the very specific meaning that no local synod at Constantinople could nullify the decision of an Ecumenical Council. The typically Byzantine pun that the *Definition* is "ill-defined" (ἀόριστος) has an equally precise meaning. In the body of the treatise, Nicephorus criticizes the iconoclasts for being entirely negative, for rejecting the iconophile position without offering anything of their own:

> But they define nothing. They demolish and reject the other view. . . But they neither affirmed nor constructed anything of their own, for they had nothing to affirm . . . and the lie is undefined and unsubstantial, and they could not stop it. Their *Definition* has only the power of denial and negation but possesses in no way at all a principle of affirmation. Therefore it may not even be called a *Definition* if definitions properly so called proceed from affirmations and from assertions and reveal what the subject is rather than what it is not. For a definition is a brief saying revealing the essence of the subject . . .[28]

From this excerpt it is clear that Nicephorus called the *Definition* "undefined" because it merely rejected that of the Seventh Ecumenical Council without saying anything positive of its own. Now we remember that there is indeed some reason for this criticism. Most of the *Definition* of 815 was taken up with the rejection of the *Definition* of Nicaea and the reaffirmation

of that of the Council of Hiereia. We noted, however, one significant exception: the *one* thing that the Council of Blachernae does on its own authority is that it calls the images "spurious." Is it not significant that Nicephorus applies to the iconoclastic *Definition* of 815 the very epithet "truly spurious" which his opponents had fastened upon pictorial images? Does this not indicate that Nicephorus considered this iconoclastic thesis, i.e., that pictorial images were not "true" images, one of the most important lines of attack used by his opponents, comparable in its importance only with the Christological implications of the iconoclastic position? Is it not as if Nicephorus wanted to say in his title: "You call religious images 'spurious.' I tell you, and I shall demonstrate to you in the body of my treatise, that they are true images. What is 'really spurious' is your own *Definition.*" In view of the occurrence of the epithet in the title of the treatise, where every word, as we have seen, is heavy with meaning, this does not seem to me an unwarranted inference. In fact, most of the treatise is devoted to a rejection of two lines of argumentation: the one based on Christological doctrine, and the other based on the new doctrine of the true image. At first sight it might seem that the refutation of the Christological doctrine takes up much more space than that of the doctrine of the true image. Strictly speaking, the refutation of the spuriousness of pictorial images takes up only three folios out of a total of one hundred and sixty (in manuscript B), while Nicephorus returns to the issue of Christology repeatedly and at great length. But after all it should be kept in mind that the *Definition* itself dealt with the spuriousness of pictorial images in exactly one word and that the real burden of the charge was elaborated upon in the florilegium of patristic quotations. In reality, then, the entire second part of Nicephorus' treatise – or ninety-five out of a total of one hundred and sixty folios – is devoted to the refutation of the doctrine of the true image. Nicephorus' refutation thus seems to bear out the thesis of this paper concerning the real meaning of the iconoclastic Council of St. Sophia.

One last remark before we conclude our discussion of the iconoclastic side and turn our attention to the iconophiles. It remains puzzling that the iconoclasts of 815 relegated the positive side of their contention to the florilegium and only hinted at it in the *Definition.* One may speculate why this was done. In the first place, it was good strategy to "define" as little as possible, and since the object of the *Definition* was negative – the rejection of religious images – there was no need to make the positive side of the iconoclastic views a part of the formal *Definition.* But secondly, there simply was no conciliar authority for the positive side of the doctrine of the true image, and the iconoclasts of St. Sophia thought – probably rightly – that in order

to prevail it was expedient not to advance, in the formal *Definition*, beyond the positions covered by the authority of the Council of Hiereia.

If, then, the distinction between false and true images is the major new attack of the iconoclasts of the ninth century, the question arises: How did Nicephorus meet it? Nicephorus begins by stating that to call Christ's pictorial image false (ψευδής) is equivalent to saying that every image of Christ is false: "But there never could be the absurd argument which would deny that a thing endowed with real existence and naturally capable of representation by image could not be delineated in one particular way but admit that it could be represented in some other way." [29] If the iconoclasts were right, then neither Man in general nor the priest in particular would be in the image of Christ.

The only trouble with this counter-argument is that the argument which it calls "absurd" is precisely the thesis of the iconoclasts – and you do not refute an argument by calling it names. As if he realized the insufficiency of his effort, Nicephorus therefore goes on with his refutation. An image is a likeness (ὁμοίωμα), and as such it belongs to the logical category of relation. The similarity between thing represented and representation binds them together in form though they differ in nature. Consequently, where there is similarity, the two things that resemble each other come into being together and are destroyed together.[30] If you have the portrait of an emperor and if the emperor is a true emperor, then his image will be a true image; but if he is a false emperor, then his portrait will be false. In fact, the image of a false thing is not an image at all, like centaurs and goat-stags. Now in evaluating this counter-argument of Nicephorus, *difficile est saturam non scribere*, so full is it of the most elementary logical blunders. It just is not true that there can be no falseness of the image without falseness of the original: the process of pictorial representation can certainly "distort" the truth contained in the original. And if Aristotle had said in the *Categories* [31] that correlatives come into existence simultaneously and that they cancel each other, he of course did not mean that they depended upon each other in their *existence* but merely in their *relation*. Neither Aristotle nor his Byzantine commentators would have said, as Nicephorus claims, that if an image of Christ was false Christ himself was false, or did not exist, but merely that in this case Christ was no longer the original for *this particular kind of image*. But whatever the validity of Nicephorus' counter-arguments, we are here interested primarily in the fact that he applies to the problem of religious images a concept of Aristotelian logic, i.e., the category of relation.

The application of Aristotelian philosophy to the problem of images does not stop here. To disprove the spuriousness of the religious images, Niceph-

orus further relies on the Aristotelian doctrine of causation. Nicephorus knows five meanings of the word "cause," of which three agree with Aristotle's own: the efficient, the material, and the final cause. But in the place of Aristotle's formal cause there appear the instrumental and the exemplary cause.[32] For his present argument Nicephorus uses exclusively the exemplary cause. The exemplary cause of Christ's pictorial image is Christ himself or his form, and the iconoclasts by calling the images "spurious" destroy the corporeal form or pattern itself after which the image is modeled.[33]

The question naturally arises: How does Nicephorus deal with the positive side of the iconoclastic argument, i.e., with the contention that the true image of the saints is the reproduction of their virtues? So far as I can see, he deals with it only twice, namely, in connection with the quotations from Theodotus of Galatia (frg. 20) and from Amphilochius of Iconium (frg. 22). If the virtues of the saints can be reproduced, so Nicephorus says in discussing the first quotation, this should all the more be true of their bodies. The virtues are activities exercised by the bodies of the saints. Their bodies are therefore active, productive, causes, and prior, while the virtues are passive, receptive, effects, and secondary. The virtues of the saints reveal their capabilities, but their form (ἰδέα) reveals *the saints themselves* and is therefore more worthy of honor.[34] This defense, which is again couched in the language of the schools, would emphasize the physical over the spiritual aspects of the religious personality, but the point should perhaps not be pressed unduly since this was hardly Nicephorus' intention. Similarly, in refuting the passage from Amphilochius of Iconium, Nicephorus points out that the bodies of the saints bear witness to the condition of their souls and are the instruments of their sainthood. He adds that the sense of sight is the foremost and most impressive of the senses[35] – a statement for which again there was ample precedent in Aristotle and in the philosophy of the Byzantine schools. On the whole, one must admit that Nicephorus' refutation of the principal iconoclastic thesis is not convincing. His treatise is learned and applies to a theological problem concepts of Aristotelian logic and physics. It is incisive and decisive where the genuiness and interpretation of a Biblical or patristic passage is concerned. Yet neither the argument from the category of relation, nor that from causation, nor that from the relationship of body and virtues seems a valid answer to the iconoclastic argument of the spuriousness of pictorial images.

We must now return to the general problem to which this paper is devoted and try to summarize our conclusions. Was the Second Period of Iconoclasm really one of "spiritual exhaustion," of "senile impotence," of mere reliance on authority, of slavish imitation of the First Period? We have

seen how this misinterpretation of the evidence arose. It is due to the simple fact that in order to be conciliatory and to make the best use of conciliar authority the Council of St. Sophia, in its *Definition*, did indeed to a large extent simply repeat and approve what had been said by the Council of Hiereia. But we know now that the real thesis of the Council was developed in the florilegium, and that during the Second Period of Iconoclasm the emphasis lay elsewhere than before. True, somewhere or other, in the *Definition* or in the florilegium, every single one of the old arguments used by the earlier iconoclasts is repeated. This is particularly true of the famous Christological argument. True also that the new "line" of 815, in its formulation, "The pictorial image is spurious," reminds one of Constantine V and of the Council of Hiereia with their doctrine of the Eucharist as the only true image of Christ. The difference lies, however, in the new *positive* meaning implied by this term and made explicit in the patristic florilegium: for the Council of St. Sophia the only true image of Christ and of the saints is Man endowed with the Christian virtues. It is on this point that the Council of St. Sophia places the emphasis, and the final judgment on the Council and, with it, on the iconoclasm of the ninth century, must be based on the answer to the question: How original was that position itself? Here everything depends on what one calls "original." If we mean by it a position never taken by anybody before, we must state categorically that it was not original at all. For Origen, in the third Christian century, the problem of a Christian art had hardly existed, yet he had justified the Christian opposition to pagan cult images, in a passage to which Jean Daniélou and Professor Florovsky have recently called attention, by exactly the same argument as that used by the iconoclasts in 815:

> [Our] cult-statues and fitting offerings to God are not fabricated by uneducated craftsmen but are rendered clear and formed within us by the Word of God: the virtues, which are imitations of "the first born of all creation" (Col. I 15) in Whom are the patterns of justice, prudence, courage, wisdom, piety and of the other virtues. Therefore cult-statues are in all those who, in accordance with the Divine Word, furnish for themselves justice and courage and wisdom and piety and the furnishings of the other virtues. . . And in each of those who, to the best of their ability, imitate Him even in this respect there is the cult-statue "in the likeness of the Creator" (Col. III 10) which they furnish by contemplating God with a pure heart when they have become imitators of God (Ephes. V 1). And in short, all Christians attempt to erect the aforesaid altars and the cult-statues mentioned before, not those that are without soul and without perception and that let greedy demons reside in objects without soul, but those that receive the Spirit of God, coming to rest upon the aforementioned cult-statues of virtue and upon him who is "in the likeness of the Creator" as Its own [kindred]; thus the Spirit of Christ will also settle upon "those who share in His shape" (*τοῖς, ἵν' οὕτως ὀνομάσω, συμμόρφοις*, cf. Rom. VIII 29), to use that expression. . .[36]

From the Alexandrian School the view of the virtuous human soul as the image of Christ was taken up by the Fathers of the Church, notably by Gregory of Nyssa, however with the difference that the pagan statue, which for Origen had been *replaced* by the true Christian man, now appears merely as a literary simile.[37]

An examination of the *Definition* (including the florilegium) of St. Sophia, thus, seems to point toward a connection of the iconoclasts of 815 with Origenism.[38] This brings to mind a recent study of iconoclasm by Professor Florovsky to which the present writer is greatly indebted. In it Professor Florovsky inferred, from the use of Eusebius' *Letter to the Empress Constantia* by the iconoclasts in the eighth century and from its unquestionably Origenist flavor, that the inspiration of iconoclasm was Origenist.[39] We now have an incomparably broader basis for Florovsky's thesis: the decisions of the Council of St. Sophia in 815 are steeped in the thought and argumentation with which we are familiar from the passage quoted from Origen. Let us not forget, however, that among certain iconoclasts, notably with the Emperor Constantine V, there are clear indications of Monophysite tendencies.[40] Let us remember also that the notion of the virtuous man as the true image of the deity was older than Origen, who took it from Clement of Alexandria and shared it with his pagan contemporaries Plotinus and Porphyry.[41] Both the Origenist and the Monophysite labels of iconoclasm, therefore, seem somewhat narrow, and its true nature can perhaps be seen best if we consider what Origenism, Monophysitism, and iconoclasm have in common: they put undue emphasis (from the orthodox point of view) on the divine aspect of Christ at the expense of his humanity. Origenism, Monophysitism, and iconoclasm, thus, are — and this was again suggested by Florovsky — manifestations of that strand of Hellenic mentality to which the concept of "Christ crucified" seemed "foolishness" (I Corinthians 1:23) and which made piety a concern for the inner man.

The main thesis of the Council of St. Sophia, then, was not "original," in the sense that it had never been stated before — though it certainly had not been stated in this way by the iconoclasts of the First Period. But I am afraid that if originality is defined so strictly there will be very little originality left. In the history of thought, originality does not lie only in the first formulation of a thesis. There can be real originality where a thesis first proclaimed more or less incidentally by others is made the foundation stone for the solution of a new set of problems. This is what happened in the Second Period of Iconoclasm with the doctrine of the true Christian cult-statues formulated by Origen. The iconoclasts of the Second Period are certainly not indebted to the First Period for their principal thesis. True to

Hellenic tradition, the iconoclasts of the Second Period use Origen's doctrine of the true Christian cult-statue as a basis for an elaborate attack on Christian religious images. Here was real originality,[42] just as there had been originality in Constantine V's connecting the image problem with Christology. Originality may be claimed not only for the iconoclastic but also for the iconophile side, which, in order to meet the new "line," relied on Aristotelian philosophy. The spiritual force of iconoclasm was therefore far from spent in the ninth century. In fact, the full depth of the attack on religious images was not probed prior to the Council of St. Sophia. The opposition to the pictorial images of the saints, for example, could be put on the same footing as that to images of Christ only after the problem of the nature of religious images as such had been raised. This fresh and vigorous attack, as is frequent in the history of thought and particularly of religious thought, produced an original and learned, if not altogether convincing and final, defense on the part of the image-worshippers, and particularly the literary masterpieces of Theodore of Studios and of Nicephorus of Constantinople.

HOBART AND WILLIAM SMITH COLLEGES
Geneva, New York

NOTES

1. F. I. Uspenski, as quoted by A. A. Vasiliev, *Histoire de l'empire byzantin*, I (Paris, 1932) 380; Georg Ostrogorsky, *Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Bilderstreites*, Historische Untersuchungen 5 (Breslau, 1929) p. 56; also *Geschichte des byzantinischen Staates*, Byzantinisches Handbuch, in Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft XII, 1, 2 (Munich, 1940) p. 141; Edward James Martin, *A History of the Iconoclastic Controversy* (London, 1930) 190; Emile Amann, *L'Epoque carolingienne*, Histoire de l'Eglise 6 (Paris, 1947) 230: "Jean [Hylilas] se fit ouvrir les bibliothèques et les chartriers tant des couvents que des églises: il n'y trouva que les actes du concile de Hiéria; depuis trois quarts de siècle la critique des iconoclastes n'avait pas fait de progrès." In the last resort, all these statements go back to the iconophile *Scriptor Incertus de Leone Armeno*, *P.G.* CVIII, 1025 A–B, who asserts that the committee charged by the Emperor Leo V to compile a florilegium of iconoclastic quotations did not make progress until they found the florilegium attached to the *Definition* of the Iconoclastic Council of Hiereia (754) and looked up the passages quoted there. Although, in this paper, I shall have to disagree repeatedly with findings of Ostrogorsky, I want to record here my indebtedness to his publications, without which my work would have been impossible.

2. I hope to complete, in the near future, a biography of this author, as well as an edition of his unpublished main work, the Ἔλεγχος καὶ Ἀνατροπή.

3. The biographical data are based on Ignatius Diaconus' *Vita Nicephori* written within one generation after the death of the saint and published by Carl de Boor in the appendix to his edition of Nicephorus' *Opuscula Historica* (Leipzig, 1880) 130–217.

4. The full title of Irenaeus' *Contra Haereses* was Ἐλέγχου καὶ Ἀνατροπῆς τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως βιβλία πέντε; cf. the edition by W. Wigan Harvey, I, 1.

5. R. P. Blake, "Note sur l'activité littéraire de Nicéphore I[er] Patriarche de Constantinople," *Byzantion* XIV (1939) 1–15; Paul Maas, "Die ikonoklastische Episode in dem Brief

des Epiphanius an Johannes," *B.Z.* XXX (1929–30) 279–286, esp. 279. Maas's ninth-century archetype is possibly identical with the edition in two volumes the existence of which was proved by Blake. Robert Devreesse, who does not cite Blake's paper, assigns *Coisl.* 93 to the eleventh or twelfth century (*Le Fonds Coislin*, Paris, 1945).

6. On Banduri's projected edition see his *Conspectus* (most conveniently in *P.G.* C, 17–38). On Andreev's project, Ostrogorsky, *Studien*, 47.

7. Daniel Serruys, "Les Actes du concile iconoclaste de l'an 815," Ecole Française de Rome, *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* XXIII (1903) 345–351; and Ostrogorsky, *Studien*, 48–51.

8. In this article, as I must sadly confess, I have myself sinned in the same way as others before me. I can only plead that the paper is based on a careful transcript and study of the entire treatise.

9. *Scriptor Incertus de Leone Armeno*: see above, note 1. A. Ehrhard (in Karl Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur* etc., Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft IX, 1 [2d ed., Munich, 1897] p. 68) thought that the florilegium was lost. Banduri as well as Serruys recognized that the florilegium was preserved. Ostrogorsky, *Studien*, 58 f: "Auf die eigentlichen Bestimmungen des Konzils folgt eine Kette von solchen Zeugnissen aus den Kirchenvätern. . . Auf die Wiedergabe all dieser Zeugnisse glaubte ich verzichten zu können. . ." By omitting the florilegium, Ostrogorsky came to an erroneous appraisal of the Council of St. Sophia, as we shall see.

10. First part of Nicephorus' treatise: B fols. 173a–235b and C fols. 1a–66a. Second part: B fols. 235b–332a and C fols. 66a–158b. In B fol. 237a, immediately preceding the first quotation of the iconoclastic florilegium, we find the following line: *ἀρχὴ τῆς τῶν χρήσεων ἀνατροπῆς*; while C fol. 66b has in the margin: *ἀρχὴ τῶν χρήσεων*. The formulae introducing each quotation of the florilegium are printed in the Appendix and will show that Nicephorus is quoting *all* the quotations in the order in which they appeared in the florilegium.

11. Nicephorus, *Ἔλεγχος καὶ Ἀνατροπή*, on Leo V: *εἰς οἷον τέλος τὰ ἐπικεχειρημένα ἐκβέβηκε, τὸ θυσιαστήριον μέγα κεκράξεται, ὃ καὶ ζῶν κακῶς καθαιρῶν ἐβεβήλου καὶ ἀναιρούμενος ἐνδίκως τῷ λύθρῳ τῶν ἐναγῶν αἱμάτων πλέον ἔχρανέ τε καὶ κατεμόλυνεν, ἄξια ὄντως τὰ ἐπίχειρα τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν ὕβρεως δεξάμενος ὁ ἀλιτήριος* (B fol. 174a, C missing). Again Nicephorus says (C fol. 35a–b, lost in B), in answering frg. 11 of the *Definition* (see Appendix) and after characterizing Leo V in harsh terms as a persecutor: *καὶ ὧδε* [i.e., as follows] *ὡς ἀληθῶς εἰπεῖν εὔκαιρον· εἰ μὴ Κύριος Σαβαὼθ διὰ σπλάγχνα ἐλέους καὶ οἰκτιρμῶν αὐτοῦ ἐπέβλεψεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἁγίου κατοικητηρίου αὐτοῦ καὶ κατηλέησεν καὶ ἐβοήθησεν ἡμῖν καὶ τὸν ἐπαναστάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ σάλον καὶ κλύδωνα παραδόξως κατηύνασεν καὶ τῇ καταιγίδι τῆς ἀποστασίας καὶ δυσσεβείας ἐπιτάξας εἰς αὔραν γαληνιῶσαν ἔστησεν καὶ τῶν συμφορῶν τούτων τὸν αἴτιον, τὴν πάντων τῶν κακῶν ποριμωτάτην φύσιν, ψήφοις θεοκρίτοις μετελθὼν ὧν ἦν ἄξιος ἐκποδὼν ἐποιήσατο, οὐδὲν ἐκώλυεν τοὺς κατὰ τήνδε τὴν ἀρχὴν ἅπαντας μεγίστῳ καὶ ἐξαισίῳ περιπεσόντας ναναγίῳ εἰς βυθὸν ἀπιστίας κατολισθεῖν*. These are allusions to the murder of Leo V in the Palace Chapel of St. Stephen on the morning of Christmas 820 (see J. B. Bury, *A History of the Eastern Roman Empire* [London, 1912] 52 f.) and to the tolerant religious policy of Michael II.

12. Photius, *Epistulae*, I 16 (*P.G.* CII, 768 B).

13. I quote an instance primarily *editorum Gregorii Nysseni in usum*. The Council of St. Sophia quoted a passage from Gregory of Nyssa, without further identification, as follows: *μηκέτι τὴν σωματώδη καὶ δουλικὴν μορφὴν ἐν τῇ σεαυτοῦ πίστει ἀνατυπώσῃ, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὄντα καὶ ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχοντα καὶ Θεὸν ὄντα Λόγον, τοῦτον προσκύνει, καὶ μὴ τὴν τοῦ δούλου μορφήν* (B 278a, C 107b). Nicephorus remarks (B 279b, C 109b): *γινώσκειν δὲ χρὴ ὡς ἔν τισι τῶν ἀντιγράφων φέρεται· τὸν ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὄντα καὶ Θεὸν ὄντα, τοῦτον προσκύνει λαβόντα τὴν τοῦ δούλου μορφήν*.

14. In discussing the authenticity of an *Encomium on Basil* attributed by the Council of 815 to Amphilochius of Iconium (frg. 22), Nicephorus says: *ἡμῖν γὰρ οὐκ ἐξεγένετο, καίτοι πολλὰ καμοῦσιν, ὅτι μὴ ἐνὶ μόνῳ ἀντιγράφῳ, καὶ τούτῳ νεογράφῳ, περιτυχεῖν ἐν φρουραῖς ἀσφαλεστάταις ἤδη ἐγκαθειργμένοις καὶ μηδαμοῦ ἐλεύθεριάζειν συγκεχωρημένοις, οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ πόδα προτείνειν πώποτε* (B 275a, C 105a).

15. In the Appendix the reader will find a new edition of the *Definition* of 815. I had

originally thought to reprint that of Ostrogorsky. Soon, however, I convinced myself that in certain respects Serruys' edition was better than that of Ostrogorsky. Ostrogorsky's fragments 5, 6, and 7, which he was so proud (*Studien*, p. 48) to have added to those collected by Serruys, are in reality quotations by Nicephorus from the Council of Hiereia (754). This is made quite clear by the trend of Nicephorus' argument (which it would take too long to sketch here). The fragments 5, 6, and 7 are even printed among the Acts of the Seventh Council of Nicaea (787), (frg. 5 Ostrogorsky = Mansi XIII 324 D–E, 328C; frg. 6 Ostrogorsky = Mansi XIII 221C; frg. 7 Ostrogorsky = Mansi XIII 225D, 229A, D–E). Serruys seems to have realized this: "C'est ainsi qu'il [Nicephorus] reproduit en partie les actes de 754" (p. 346). Ostrogorsky's error was due, partly, to insufficient study of Nicephorus' presentation, partly to the fact that frg. 5 is written in B, and frg. 7 in both manuscripts, in the way in which fragments from the Council of 815 are normally presented in these manuscripts. Frg. 6 is marked in neither manuscript as belonging to the Council of St. Sophia. For these reasons it was impossible simply to repeat Ostrogorsky's edition. On the other hand, I could not use Serruys' text since Ostrogorsky had correctly added two fragments (frgs. 4 and 11 my numbering = frgs. 3 and 13 Ostrogorsky). Also I, myself, was able to add two fragments (frgs. 1 and 12) which had escaped both Serruys and Ostrogorsky because they are only Nicephorus' paraphrases (not verbatim quotations) of lost passages from the *Definition* of 815. I also have corrected a few minutiae. I have no illusion that in a task where such outstanding scholars have erred I shall be able to present the final text. That will have to wait until after the critical edition of Nicephorus' treatise is completed. All quotations, in this paper, from the *Definition* (including the florilegium) of 815 will be numbered according to my own edition to be found in the Appendix, but, to make comparisons easier, the reader will find in the Appendix a concordance of the three editions.

16. Frg. 14.

17. Constantine V, Πεῦσις II, frg. 21 (Ostrogorsky p. 10) καὶ εἰκών ἐστι τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ ἄρτος ὃν λαμβάνομεν, μορφάζων τὴν σάρκα αὐτοῦ, ὡς εἰς τύπον τοῦ σώματος ἐκείνου γενόμενος. Council of Hiereia: Mansi XIII, 261E–264C, quoted by Ostrogorsky pp. 21 f.

18. Frgs. 12–13.

19. Each of these quotations raises problems of attribution, of meaning, and so forth, into which we cannot go at the present time. To give but one example: the passage attributed in the florilegium to Basil (frg. 23) may actually be Gregory of Nyssa's; see E. v. Ivánka, "Die Autorschaft der Homilien . . . " *B.Z.* XXXVI (1936) 46–57. To make communication easier, I shall in this paper speak of "passages from Basil" or "from Gregory" or use the phrase "Basil or Gregory says" where precision would require clumsy formulae such as "passages attributed by the Council of St. Sophia to Basil or to Gregory" or "the Council of St. Sophia attributed to Basil or Gregory the saying . . ." I should like to state here, however, that such formulae should not be construed to imply any opinion regarding authenticity or real meaning. In other words, at the moment we are not interested in the views of Church Fathers such as Basil or Gregory on pictorial images but in an analysis of the view on pictorial images which the Council of St. Sophia attributed, rightly or wrongly, to the Fathers cited.

20. The "old passages," i.e., those already quoted at Hiereia, are our fragments 20 (= Mansi XIII 309E where it is attributed to Theodotus of Ancyra); 22 (= Mansi XIII 301 D where the fragment appears in much shorter form); 25 (= Mansi XIII 297A); 28 (= Mansi XIII 300A); 30 A (= Mansi XIII 292 D–E). Frg. 18 (Asterius of Amaseia) was quoted in 787 (Mansi XIII 305B) but by the Orthodox, not by the iconoclasts. Incidentally, several of the prize pieces of the Council of Hiereia were omitted by the bishops of the Council of St. Sophia. In the first place, no Biblical passage appears in the florilegium as such – though two are quoted in a text attributed to Epiphanius. Secondly, Eusebius' famous *Letter to the Augusta Constantia* was omitted from the florilegium – a fact specifically emphasized by Nicephorus. There were other less important cases of exclusion.

21. A subsidiary (and connected) theme that occurs in many of our passages (20, 21, 22, 28) are declarations in favor of the written and spoken word (over what is perceived by the eyes) which is apt to produce, in the listeners' souls, the true image of Christ. I plan

to deal with this theme, which implies a preference of the sense of hearing over that of sight, in a different context.

22. We see now that the other "epithets" contained in the *Definition* itself (above, p. 41) are also connected with the central thesis of the florilegium. If the *Definition* had called the saints "sharers in the form of Christ" (*τοὺς συμμόρφους αὐτοῦ ἁγίους*), we see here the influence of Epiphanius (frg. 30B, referring to Rom. VIII 29) and his theory of the virtuous man as Christ's image. If the *Definition* had called pictorial images soulless (*ἄψυχος*), just like frg. 28 of the florilegium, the reader is reminded of true images that are not "soulless" but are in fact the souls of the Just. Furthermore, we can now understand why the "old passages" (above, note 20) were taken over from the florilegium of Hiereia: frgs. 20, 22, and 25 were indeed precious supports for the central thesis of 815, while frg. 30A was probably taken over simply because it was iconoclastic and was attributed to the same witness as the most important piece in the entire dossier of 815 (frg. 30B). The last reasons probably account also for the inclusion of frgs. 30C and 30D, which are unconnected with the central thesis of 815. What motives prompted the inclusion of frgs. 17, 27, and 29, I am unable to say.

23. The Council of Hiereia had expressed, in one of its anathemas, what was to become the central thesis of the Council of St. Sophia, Mansi XIII 345C: *εἴ τις τὰς τῶν ἁπάντων ἁγίων ἰδέας ἐν εἰκόσιν ἀψύχοις καὶ ἀναύδοις ἐξ ὑλικῶν χρωμάτων ἀναστηλοῦν ἐπιτηδεύοι μηδεμίαν ὄνησιν φερούσας, ... 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.* Yet the emphasis, in 754, lay on the Christological issues.

24. Ostrogorsky, *Studien*, 40–45.

25. Frg. 2 (*ibid.*, p. 8).

26. Frg. 24 (*ibid.*, p. 11).

27. B 173b (lost in C): *Ἔλεγχος καὶ ἀνατροπὴ τοῦ ἀθέσμου καὶ ἀορίστου καὶ ὄντως ψευδωνύμου ὅρου τοῦ ἐκτεθέντος παρὰ τῶν ἀποστατησάντων τῆς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ ἀλλοτρίῳ προσθεμένων φρονήματι ἐπ' ἀναιρέσει τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σωτηρίου οἰκονομίας.*

28. C 56b–57a (B lost): *ἀλλ' ὁρίζονται μὲν οὐδὲν, τὸ ἀλλότριον δὲ ἀνασκευάσαντες καὶ ἀποπεμψάμενοι . . . ἴδιον ἔθεντο παντελῶς οὐδὲν οὐδὲ κατεσκεύασαν· οὐ γὰρ εἶχον ὃ θήσουσιν . . . τὸ γὰρ ψεῦδος ἀόριστον καὶ ἀνύπαρκτον καὶ οὐκ ἔχον ὅποι ποτὲ στήσεται. δύναμιν γοῦν ἀποφάσεως καὶ στερήσεως ὁ κατ' αὐτοὺς ὅρος μόνον περιεχει, θέσεως δὲ οὐδαμῶς ὅλως λόγον κέκτηται ὥστε κινδυνεύειν μηδὲ ὅρον ὀνομάζεσθαι, εἴπερ οἱ κυρίως ὅροι ἐκ τῶν θέσεων μᾶλλον καὶ καταφατικῶν λόγων προΐασιν καὶ τὸ τί εἶναι ἀλλ' οὐ τὸ τί μὴ εἶναι τὸ ὑποκείμενον δηλοῦντες· ὅρος γάρ ἐστιν λόγος σύντομος δηλωτικὸς τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ ὑποκειμένου πράγματος . . .*

29. B 223a, C 50a: *ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἄν τις ἀναφανείη ποτὲ ἀποκληρωτικὸς λόγος ὃς ἐπὶ τῶν ἀληθῶς ὄντων καὶ εἰκονίζεσθαι πεφυκότων τὸ μὲν οὕτω γράφεσθαι κωλύσειεν, ἑτέρως δὲ εἰκονίζεσθαι συγχωρήσειεν.*

30. B 223b, C 50b: *ἐντεῦθεν λοιπὸν ἐφ' ὧν τὰ ὅμοια πρόκειται, τῷ κοινῷ μετέχειν τῆς σχέσεως συνεισάγεσθαι ὡς τὰ πολλὰ καὶ συναναιρεῖσθαι κατὰ τὸ εἶδος τοῦ λόγου τούτου συμβήσεται.*

31. Aristotle, *Categories*, 7b 15–19.

32. B 224b, C 51b: *τὸ αἴτιον τῶν πολλαχῶς λεγομένων οἱ περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐσχολακότες φασίν· ποιητικόν τε γὰρ εἶναι καὶ ὀργανικόν παραδειγματικόν τε αὖ καὶ ὑλικὸν καὶ ἔτι πρὸς τούτοις τελικόν.* Note that Aristotle himself, in *Physics* II 3, 1946 b 26, uses *εἶδος* and *παράδειγμα* as synonyms to designate the formal cause (*τὸ εἶδος καὶ τὸ παράδειγμα, τοῦτο δ'ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ τί ἦν εἶναι*). Yet the separate mention of the exemplary cause together with the instrumental cause in Nicephorus ought to make it possible to define more closely the handbook of Aristotelian philosophy used by Nicephorus in this and his other writings.

33. B 224b–225a, C 51b–52a: *ἐπεὶ οὖν καὶ ἡ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ* (om B) *Χριστοῦ εἰκὼν τεχνητή τέ* (om B) *ἐστι καὶ χειρόκμητος, ἵνα τἆλλα παρῶμεν νῦν, παραδειγματικὸν αἴτιον οὐχ ἕτερόν τι ἢ αὐτὸν τὸν Χριστὸν κέκτηται ἤτοι τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν εἶδος. οἱ τοίνυν τοῦ ψεύδους καθηγημόνες διὰ τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης* [i.e., *'ψευδώνυμος'*] *λυμαίνονται τῷ τοῦ αἰτίου λόγῳ, ταὐτὸν δὲ εἰπεῖν ἀναιροῦσι τὸ σωματικὸν εἶδος αὐτὸ καθ' ὃ ἡ τοιαύτη γραφὴ διακεχάρακται. τούτου δὲ τί ἂν γένοιτο εἰς τὴν τοῦ Λόγου σάρκωσιν δυσφημότερον;*

34. B 261b, C 91b: *εἰ γὰρ αἱ ἀρεταὶ τῶν ἁγίων οἱονεὶ (οἷον C) εἰκόνες ἔμψυχοι διὰ τῶν γεγραμμένων δείκνυνται, τὰ κατορθοῦντα τὰς ἀρετὰς σώματα πόσῳ δικαιότερον κατὰ τὰς ἰδέας (εἰδέας C) αὐτῶν εἰκονίζεσθαι; ὅσῳ καὶ σῶμα πράξεως ἀναγκαιότερόν τε καὶ τιμιώτερον ὡς τὰ μὲν ἐνεργοῦντα τὰ δὲ ἐνεργούμενα, καὶ τὰ μὲν ἀποτελοῦντα τὰ δὲ ἀποτελούμενα, καὶ αἴτια καὶ πρῶτα αἰτιατῶν καὶ δευτέρων τῶν* (om B) *ἔργων ὄντων. εἰ γοῦν μὴ ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχοι, καὶ οἶκος καὶ ναῦς καὶ κλίνη τοῦ κατασκευάσαντος οἰκοδόμου καὶ τέκτονος τιμιωτέρα. καὶ αἱ μὲν ἀρεταὶ οἷα πράξεις (πράξις* C) *τυγχάνουσαι περὶ τὰ σώματα τὸ ἐπιεικὲς καὶ πρακτικὸν αὐτῶν παραδηλοῦσιν, αἱ ἰδέαι (εἰδέαι* C) *δὲ αὐτὰ τὰ σώματα ἤγουν αὐτοὺς τοὺς ἁγίους ἡμῖν ἐμφανίζουσιν ὁποῖοί τε ὄντες ἐτύγχανον καὶ ὅπως εὐανδρίας εἶχον καὶ γενναιότητος.*

35. B 273a–274a, C 102b–103b: *ταῦτα (ταύτῃ* B) *δὴ καὶ τὰ σώματα οἷς ὡς ὀργάνοις χρησάμενοι τῶν ψυχῶν τὸ γενναῖον καὶ ἀήττητον παράστημα ἐπεδείξαντο* [i.e., *οἱ ἅγιοι*]*· οὐ γὰρ ἄν τις εἴποι ὡς σωμάτων δίχα διήθλησαν . . . εἰ γοῦν τῶν ἁγίων τὰς πράξεις ἀποσεμνύνειν προῄρησο, ἐτίμησας ἄν καὶ τὰ σώματα . . . ἔτι καὶ τὰ τούτων ἐκτυπώματα διὰ χρωμάτων τε καὶ ὡς ἑτέρως γραφόμενα . . . οὐ γὰρ ἀκοῆς ὄψις δευτέρα ἢ ἀσθενεστέρα οὐδὲ ἀμυδρότερον τῶν οἰκείων αἰσθητῶν ἀντιλαμβάνεται . . . ἴσμεν γὰρ δήπου ἅπαντες ὅτι γε ὄψις τῶν αἰσθητηρίων τὸ τιμιώτατον καὶ ἀναγκαιότατον τρανέστερόν τε καὶ ὀξυωπέστερον (τρανεστέραν τε καὶ ὀξυωπεστέραν?) τῶν ὑποπιπτόντων αἰσθήσει σχοίη ἄν τὴν ἀντίληψιν (τῶν ὑποπιπτόντων . . . ἀντίληψιν* om B)*· καὶ γὰρ τὸ ἀκουστὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ ὁρατοῦ πέφυκε φθάνεσθαι, καὶ θᾶττον ἐφελκύσεται τῶν ἄλλων ἡ ὅρασις ὅσῳ καὶ μᾶλλον τὸ ἐπαγωγὸν ἔχει.* On the hierarchy of the senses, see above, note 21.

36. Origen, *Contra Celsum* VIII 17–18 (ed. Kötschau, vol. II, pp. 234 ff.). *ἀγάλματα δὲ καὶ πρέποντα θεῷ ἀναθήματα, οὐχ ὑπὸ βαναύσων τεχνιτῶν κατεσκευασμένα ἀλλ' ὑπὸ λόγου θεοῦ τρανούμενα καὶ μορφούμενα ἐν ἡμῖν, αἱ ἀρεταί, μιμήματα τυγχάνουσαι τοῦ πρωτοτόκου "πάσης κτίσεως," ἐν ᾧ ἐστι δικαιοσύνης καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ ἀνδρείας καὶ σοφίας καὶ εὐσεβείας καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀρετῶν παραδείγματα. ἐν πᾶσιν οὖν ἐστι, τοῖς κατὰ τὸν θεῖον λόγον σωφροσύνην ἑαυτοῖς κατασκευάσασι καὶ δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἀνδρείαν καὶ σοφίαν καὶ εὐσέβειαν καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀρετῶν τὰ κατασκευάσματα, ἀγάλματα . . . καὶ ἐν ἑκάστῳ δὲ τῶν κατὰ δύναμιν ἐκεῖνον καὶ ἐν τούτῳ μιμησαμένων ἐστὶν ἄγαλμα τὸ "κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος," ὅπερ κατασκευάζουσι τῷ ἐνορᾶν θεῷ καθαρᾷ καρδίᾳ, "μιμηταὶ" γενόμενοι "τοῦ θεοῦ." καὶ ἁπαξαπλῶς πάντες Χριστιανοὶ ὁποίους εἴπομεν βωμοὺς καὶ ὁποῖα παρεστήσαμεν ἀγάλματα πειρῶνται ἱδρύεσθαι, οὐκ ἄψυχα καὶ ἀναίσθητα οὐδὲ δαιμόνων λίχνων ἐφεδρευόντων τοῖς ἀψύχοις δεκτικὰ ἀλλὰ πνεύματος θεοῦ, τοῖς εἰρημένοις ἀγάλμασι τῆς ἀρετῆς καὶ τῷ "κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος" ὡς οἰκείοις ἐπιδημοῦντος· οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῖς, ἵν' οὕτως ὀνομάσω, συμμόρφοις ἐφιζάνει.* Note that even the quotation from Rom. VIII 29 (above, note 22) occurs in Origen. See Jean Daniélou, *Origène* (Paris, 1948) 48, and George Florovsky, "Origen, Eusebius and the Iconoclastic Controversy," *Church History* XIX (1950) 3–22, esp. 17.

37. Gregory of Nyssa, *De perfectione*, ed. W. Jaeger (Leiden, 1952) p. 177 f. = *P.G.* XLVI, 256 A–B: *εἰ δένδρῳ τις ἢ πέτρᾳ προσηγορίαν ἀνθρώπου χαρίσαιτο, ἆρα ἄνθρωπος ἔσται διὰ τὴν κλῆσιν ἢ τὸ φυτὸν ἢ ὁ λίθος; οὐκ ἔστι ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ χρὴ πρῶτον εἶναι ἄνθρωπον, εἶθ' οὕτως ὀνομασθῆναι τῇ προσηγορίᾳ τῆς φύσεως. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν ὁμοιωμάτων αἱ κλήσεις τὸ κύριον ἔχουσι, ὡς εἴ τις ἄνθρωπον λέγοι τὸν ἀνδριάντα ἢ ἵππον τὸ μίμημα, ἀλλ' εἰ μέλλοι τι κυρίως καὶ ἀψευδῶς ὀνομάζεσθαι, ἀληθῆ δείξει πάντως τὴν προσηγορίαν ἡ φύσις. ἡ δὲ ἀναδεξαμένη τὴν μίμησιν ὕλη, ὅπερ ἂν οὖσα τύχῃ, τοῦτο καὶ ὀνομάζεται, χαλκὸς ἢ λίθος ἤ τι τοιοῦτον ἕτερον ᾧ ἐπέβαλεν ἡ τέχνη τὸ εἶδος πρὸς τὸ δοκοῦν σχηματίσασα.* (This text was referred to by Professor Werner Jaeger, of Harvard University, in the discussion following the reading of my paper.)

38. One quotation of the florilegium of 815, that attributed to Leontius (frg. 19), even seems to imply that Christ looked different at different times. This was indeed a characteristic doctrine of Origen (see E. von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, N.F. III [1899] 105 *) which was connected with his theology of the Incarnation. See also Erik Peterson, "Einige Bemerkungen zum Hamburger Papyrus – Fragment der Acta Pauli," *Vigiliae Christianae* II (1949) 142–162, esp. 157 ff. The Persian tradition where the infant Jesus appeared to each of the Magi as being of his own age before he appeared to the three of them together as a baby thirteen days old (see L. Olschki, "The Wise Men of the East in Oriental Traditions," *University of California Publications in Semitic Philology* XI [1951] 375–395, esp. 381–386) is a somewhat special case.

39. For Florovsky's study, see above, note 36. Page 12: ". . . do we have here one of the original sources of the Iconoclastic inspiration, at least in its later theological form? Should we not explain the obvious popularity of the Iconoclastic bias among the learned bishops and clergy . . . on the basis of their Origenist leaning?"

40. Ostrogorsky, *Studien*, 24–29.

41. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.*, VII 5 (vol. III, pp. 21 f. Stählin): *εἴη δ'ἂν οὗτος ὁ γνωστικὸς ὁ πολλοῦ ἄξιος ὁ τίμιος τῷ θεῷ, ἐν ᾧ ὁ θεὸς ἐνίδρευται, τουτέστιν ἡ περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ γνῶσις καθιέρωται. ἐνταῦθα καὶ τὸ ἀπεικόνισμα εὕροιμεν ἄν, τὸ θεῖον καὶ ἅγιον ἄγαλμα, ἐν τῇ δικαίᾳ ψυχῇ, ὅταν μακαρία μὲν αὐτὴ τυγχάνῃ, ἅτε προκεκαθαρμένη, μακάρια δὲ διαπραττομένη ἔργα. ἐνταῦθα καὶ τὸ ἐνίδρυτον καὶ ἐνιδρυόμενον, τὸ μὲν ἐπὶ τῶν ἤδη γνωστικῶν, τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν οἷων τε γενέσθαι, κἂν μηδέπω ὦσιν ἄξιοι ἀναδέξασθαι ἐπιστήμην θεοῦ. πᾶν γὰρ τὸ μέλλον πιστεύειν πιστὸν ἤδη τῷ θεῷ καὶ καθιδρυμένον εἰς τιμὴν ἄγαλμα ἐνάρετον, ἀνακείμενον θεῷ.* Plotinus, *Enneades*, I, VI, 9 (ed. R. Volkmann, vol. I, p. 95): *πῶς ἂν οὖν ἴδοις ψυχὴν ἀγαθὴν οἷον τὸ κάλλος ἔχει; ἄναγε ἐπὶ σαυτὸν καὶ ἰδέ· κἂν μήπω σαυτὸν ἴδῃς καλόν, οἷα ποιητὴς ἀγάλματος, ὃ δεῖ καλὸν γενέσθαι, τὸ μὲν ἀφαιρεῖ, τὸ δὲ ἀπέξεσε, τὸ δὲ λεῖον, τὸ δὲ καθαρὸν ἐποίησεν, ἕως ἔδειξε καλὸν ἐπὶ τῷ ἀγάλματι πρόσωπον, οὕτω καὶ σὺ ἀφαίρει ὅσα περιττὰ καὶ ἀπεύθυνε ὅσα σκολιά, ὅσα σκοτεινὰ καθαίρων ἐργάζου εἶναι λαμπρὰ καὶ μὴ παύσῃ τεκταίνων τὸ σὸν ἄγαλμα, ἕως ἂν ἐκλάμψῃ σοι τῆς ἀρετῆς ἡ θεοειδὴς ἀγλαία, ἕως ἂν ἴδῃς σωφροσύνην ἐν ἁγνῷ βεβῶσαν βάθρῳ* (quoted by Daniélou, *Origène*, 49). For Porphyry, see E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, ed. 2 (Berlin and Leipzig, 1913) 345 (quoting a text from Hierocles which seems to be based on Porphyry).

42. The question arises: Did the doctrine of the Council of St. Sophia prevail down to the end of official iconoclasm in 843? There are some indications that this was not so. If this doctrine was accepted and if therefore the saintly soul was the true image of Christ, then the iconoclasts of St. Sophia and their followers should not have objected to the cult of the saints. Yet an important hagiographical text, which has received far too little attention, the *Vita St. Theophanis* by Methodius Patriarch of Constantinople (ed. V. V. Latyshev, *Zapiski Rossiiskoi Akademii Nauk*, VIII[e] série, XIII, 4, Petrograd, 1918), which was written under Theophilus (*ibid.*, p. ix), contains a lengthy and highly interesting dissertation on the effective intercession of the saints (chs. XXIX–XXXII, pp. 32–35) and the explicit information that it is directed against *contemporary* opponents (ch. XXXII, p. 34, line 18: *αἰσχυνέσθωσαν ἐντεῦθεν οἱ τὰς πρεσβείας τῶν ἁγίων οὐκ ἐκδεχόμενοι κτλ.*). It is probable, therefore, that just as under Constantine V (Ostrogorsky, *Studien*, 29–40), at least some iconoclasts under Theophilus objected not only to the images but also to the cult of the saints. Now V. Grumel, "Recherches récentes sur l'iconoclasme," *Echos d'Orient* XXIX (1930) 99, shows that a third Iconoclastic Council was held at Blachernae under Theophilus and that it once again (above, p. 41) called the Eucharist the true image of Christ. It is possible that under Theophilus official iconoclasm abandoned the position of the Council of St. Sophia (815) and returned to the views of Constantine V, even accepting, unlike the Council of Hiereia (754), his hostility to the cult of the saints.

APPENDIX

DECRETUM CONCILII ICONOMACHI SUB LEONE V ARMENO CONSTANTINOPOLI IN ECCLESIA SANCTAE SOPHIAE HABITI, CUM FLORILEGIO IN CALCE DECRETI ADIECTO.

Libri:

B = *Paris. Graecus* 1250, saec. XIII (XIV?), fols. 173a–332a.

C = *Paris. Coislinianus* 93, saec. XV (XII?), fols. 1a–159a.*

Editiones Impressae:

Serr = D. Serruys, "Les Actes du concile iconoclaste de l'an 815," Ecole Française de Rome, *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, XXIII (1903) 345–351.

Ostr = Georg Ostrogorsky, *Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Bilderstreites*, Historische Untersuchungen 5 (Breslau, 1925) 48–51.

1. (B 176a–b). (*ἐν τούτῳ γοῦν τῷ δοκοῦντι Ὄρῳ εὐθὺς μὲν καὶ ἐκ προοιμίων τὴν ἀσέβειαν οὐ παρρησιάζονται, κατασχηματίζονται δὲ τὴν εὐσέβειαν καὶ καταχρωννύουσί πως τοὺς ἑαυτῶν λόγους ἐπειδὴ τοῦτο φίλον καὶ σύνηθες τοῖς αἱρετίζουσιν· οὕτω γὰρ καὶ Ἀρειανοῖς καὶ Εὐνομιανοῖς καὶ ἄλλοις αἱρεσιώταις γινόμενον ἔγνωμεν· οὓς μιμούμενοι ὥσπερ δὴ κοινωνοῦντες τῇ ἐκείνων κακοδοξίᾳ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐπ' ἀλλοτρίοις καλοῖς ἐγκαλλωπίζονται· τὸ γὰρ φυσικὸν τῆς ἀληθείας κάλλος οὐκ ἔχοντες ὀθνείαις τισὶ καὶ ξέναις σοφιζόμενοι χρῶνται μορφαῖς. . . . μετὰ γὰρ δὴ ταῦτα . . . τὰ τῆς γνώμης παραγυμνοῦσι κνήματα. . .*). om Serr Ostr

2. (B 176b–177a). (*ἄγουσι τοιγαροῦν εἰς μέσους τὸν Λέοντα ἐκεῖνον . . . τὸν ἐκ τῶν Ἰσαύρων τῶν δυσωνύμων ὁρμώμενον . . . , ἔτι μὴν καὶ τὸν ἐκείνου υἱὸν Κωνσταντῖνον. . . . περὶ μὲν οὖν τούτων εἰκαιομυθοῦντες γράφουσι τοιαῦτα ὅτι*) οὗτοι [1] *τὴν εὐσέβειαν τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως ἀσφάλειαν βίου ἡγησάμενοι τὴν τιμὴν τοῦ δι' ὃν τὸ βασιλεύειν ἔλαβον ἐζήτησαν καὶ πολυάνθρωπον πνευματικῶν πατέρων* [2] *καὶ θεοφιλῶν ἐπισκόπων ἀθροίσαντες σύνοδον*

[1] auctor est Nicephorus verbum *οὗτοι* de Leone III et Constantino V dictum esse, sed cum concilium in Hiereia (754) multos annos post excessum Leonis III (+ 741) habitum sit, puto synodum Sanctae Sophiae (815) revera de Constantino V et Leone IV locutam esse (vide frg. 16).

[2] *πατέρων* om Ostr

3. (B 178a, C 15b) *τὴν ἀκέφαλον καὶ ἀπαράδοτον, μᾶλλον δὲ εἰπεῖν ἄχρηστον ποίησιν καὶ προσκύνησιν τῶν εἰκόνων κατέκριναν, τὴν ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ λατρείαν* [1] *προτιμήσαντες,*

[1] *Ev. Joh.* IV 23.

4. (B 183a, C 6b) *ὡς θεοῖς προσεληλυθέναι ταῖς εἰκόσιν αὐτοὺς ἀποφαινόμενοι.* om Serr

5. (B 184a, C 7a, 11b) *ἥτις σύνοδος κυρώσασα καὶ βεβαιώσασα τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων τὰ θεόκλυτα δόγματα καὶ ταῖς ἁγίαις οἰκουμενικαῖς ἓξ* [1] *συνόδοις ἐπακολουθήσασα εὐαγεστάτους κανόνας ἐξέθετο.*

[1] ἓξ ante *οἰκουμενικαῖς* coll C 7a, sed recto 11b.

* Codex C non est ex B descriptus, ut docebat Ostrogorsky, *Studien*, 47 (vide R. P. Blake, *Byzantion* XIV [1939] 14 adn. 1) sed ambo ex archetypo litteris uncialibus scripto fluxerunt (Paul Maas, *B.Z.* XXX [1929–30] 279).

6. (B 194a, C 19b) διὸ καὶ ἀκύμαντος οὐκ ἐν ὀλίγοις ἔτεσιν ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ μεμένηκεν, εἰρηνικώτερον τὸ ὑπήκοον φυλαττομένη,[1]

[1] φυλαττόμενον libri: corr Serr

7. (B 196a, C 21b–22a) ἕως ἂν τὸ βασιλεύειν ἐξ ἀνδρῶν εἰς γυναῖκα μετέπεσε καὶ τῇ γυναικείᾳ ἀφελότητι ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπημαίνετο[1]· ἀπερίσκεπτον γὰρ ἄθροισμα συναγείρασα ἀμαθεστάτοις ἐπισκόποις ἐπακολουθήσασα,

[1] ἐπημαίνετο libri: ἐποιμαίνετο Ostr

8. (B 206a, C 17a) τὸν ἀκατάληπτον Υἱὸν καὶ Λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ κατὰ τὴν σάρκωσιν δι' ἀτίμου[1] ὕλης ζωγραφεῖν ἐδόγματισε,

[1] δι' ἀτίμου Ostr: διὰ ἀτίμου libri (alterum ἀ- fort del C) Serr fort recto.

9. (B 207b–208a, C 62b–33a sic!) τήν τε παναγίαν Θεοτόκον καὶ τοὺς συμμόρφους αὐτοῦ[1] ἁγίους νεκραῖς χαρακτήρων ὄψεσιν ἀναστηλοῦν καὶ προσκυνεῖθαι ἀπαραφυλάκτως ἐξέθετο, εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ καίριον δόγμα τῆς ἐκκλησίας προσκόψασα. καὶ τὴν λατρευτικὴν ἡμῶν προσκύνησιν ἐπιθολώσασα τὰ τῷ Θεῷ πρέποντα τῇ ἀψύχῳ ὕλῃ τῶν εἰκόνων προσάγεσθαι κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν ἐβεβαίωσεν

[1] αὐτοῦ libri: αὐτῶν coniecit A. M. Desrousseaux apud Serr, sed vide *Rom.* VIII 29.

10. (B 208b, C 34a) καὶ ταύτας ἀφρόνως θείας χάριτος ἐμπλέους[1] εἰπεῖν κατετόλμησε, κηρῶν τε ἀφὰς καὶ θυμιαμάτων εὐωδίας ⟨προσενεγκοῦσα⟩[2] σὺν προσκυνήσει βιαίᾳ τοὺς ἀφελεῖς[3] ἀπεπλάνησε

[1] ἐμπλέους libri: ἔμπλεως?
[2] προσενεγκοῦσα addidi: προσφέρουσα add Serr Ostr. vide frg. 15 προσενέγξεις.
[3] ἀσφάλεις C

11. (C 35a) εἰ μὴ Κύριος †ἡμῖν, (λέγοντες), συγκεκρότηκε† καὶ ναναγοῦντα κόσμον. . . .[1] κατακλυσμὸν ἁμαρτίας ἠλέησε καὶ δεύτερον Νώε τοῖς Χριστιανοῖς ἐχαρίσατο, ὃς καὶ τὴν καταιγίδα τῆς αἱρέσεως σὺν τῷ κέντρῳ τοῦ διαβόλου ἀμβλῦναι ἐσπούδασε. om Serr

[1] lacunam ante κατακλυσμὸν statui, quam ex refutatione Nicephori (supra, p. 53, adn. 11) supplere ausus non sum.

12. (B 210a, C 36a) (ἀλλὰ γὰρ τοῦ τηλικούτου βυθοῦ τῆς πλάνης ἀνατετραμμένου καὶ ἀνακεκαλυμμένου τινὰς ἐν μέσῳ φευκτὰς καὶ ἀπηχεστάτας φωνὰς κειμένας παραδραμόντες αὐτοὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἑπόμενα ἄπιμεν· μετὰ γὰρ δὴ ταῦτα καὶ ἕπεσθαι αὐτοὺς καὶ ἀποδέχεσθαι τὰς ἱερὰς συνόδους καταφρυάττονται, προσεκτέον δὲ ὅτι ἐνταῦθα ὥσπερ ἐν καταλόγῳ τὰς ἓξ συνόδους ἀπαριθμούμενοι οὗτοι τῆς νῦν αὐτοὺς μαιευσαμένης ἑταιρικῆς φατρίας μνήμην οὐδόλως πεποίηνται . . .) om Serr Ostr

13. (B 210a–b, C 36a–b) (ἐν γοῦν τῷ καταλόγῳ τῶν συνόδων ἃς κατέκριναν αὗται[1] αἱρέσεις προάγοντες τοιάδε τινὰ προσεπιφέρουσιν·) ἀλλὰ ταύτας πάλιν τὰς αἱρέσεις οἱ ταῖς ἀψύχοις εἰκόσι τὴν προσκύνησιν δόντες[2] ἀφορμὴν τῆς πρὶν αὐτῶν ἀτοπίας ἐχαρίσαντο,[3] ἢ συμπεριγράφοντες τῇ εἰκόνι τὸν ἀπερίγραφον, ἢ τὴν σάρκα ἐκ τῆς θεότητος κατατέμνοντες, κακῷ τὸ κακὸν διορθούμενοι· ἀτόπημα γὰρ περιφεύγοντες ἀτοπήματι περιπίπτουσι.

[1] αὗται B: αὑταὶ C
[2] δόσαντες C
[3] nonne corruptum?

14. (B 222a, C 49a–b) ὅθεν ἡμεῖς τὸ ἰθὺ τοῦ[1] δόγματος ἐγκολπωσάμενοι τὴν αὐθαδῶς δογματισθεῖσαν ἄκυρον ποίησιν τῶν ψευδωνύμων εἰκόνων τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐξοστρακίζομεν,

[1] τὸ ἰθὺ τοῦ C: τοιούτου B

15. (B 225a–b, C 52a–b) *οὐ κρίσει ἀκρίτῳ φερόμενοι, ἀλλὰ κρίσιν δικαίαν κατὰ τὴν ἀκρίτως ὑπὸ Ταρασσίου*[1] *ἐκφωνηθεῖσαν τῶν εἰκόνων προσκύνησιν ὁρίζοντες*[2] *ἀνατρέπομεν καὶ τὸν αὐτοῦ σύλλογον ἀθετοῦμεν ὡς ὑπερβάλλουσαν τιμὴν τοῖς χρώμασι χαρισάμενον, κατὰ τὸ πρόσθεν*[3] *εἰρημένον,*[4] *κηρῶν τε καὶ λύχνων ἁφάς, θυμιαμάτων προσενέ⟨γ⟩ξεις, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν σέβασμα λατρείας.*[5]

[1] Ταρασσίου C: Ταρασίου B
[2] lacunam post ὁρίζοντες statuit Ostr, sed ad ἀνατρέπομεν pertinet obiectum τὴν . . . ποίησιν τῶν ψευδωνύμων εἰκόνων (frg. 14)
[3] cf. frg. 10
[4] κατὰ . . . εἰρημένον om Serr
[5] σεβασμαλατρείας libri Ostr: σέβασμα ⟨τὰ πάντα⟩ λατρείας Serr. intelligo reverentiam (σέβασμα = σέβασις) adorationis, sed displicet clausula.

16. (B 226b, C 53a) *τὴν δὲ εὐαγῆ σύνοδον τὴν συγκροτηθεῖσαν ἐν Βλαχέρναις ἐν τῷ ναῷ τῆς παναχράντου Παρθένου ἐπὶ τῶν πάλαι εὐσεβῶν βασιλέων Κωνσταντίνου καὶ Λέοντος ἀσπασίως ἀποδεχόμενοι ὡς ἐκ πατρικῶν δογμάτων ὀχυρωθεῖσαν ἀκαινοτομητὰ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἐμφερόμενα φυλάττοντες ἀπροσκύνητόν τε καὶ ἄχρηστον τὴν τῶν εἰκόνων ποίησιν ὁρίζομεν, εἴδωλα δὲ ταύτας εἰπεῖν φεισάμενοι· ἔστι γαρ καὶ*[1] *κακοῦ πρὸς κακὸν ἡ διάκρισις.*

[1] και sscr C, om libri infra (B 234a, C 64a).

⟨ΧΡΗΣΕΙΣ⟩[1]

[1] XPHCEIC addidi ex B 237a: ἀρχὴ τῆς τῶν χρήσεων ἀνατροπῆς, C 66b (in marg): ἀρχὴ τῶν χρήσεων.

17. (B 236b, C 66b–67a) (*πρωτίστην καὶ κρατίστην κατὰ εἰδώλων προτιθέασι χρῆσιν, ὡς ἐξ ἀποστολικῶν καταρχόμενοι διατάξεων, φάσκοντες ὅτι ἀρχῆθεν αὐτῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐστὶν ἡ διάταξις πρὸς τὸν τῇ ποικιλίᾳ καὶ βαφῇ τῶν χρωμάτων χρώμενον αὖτη*[1].) *Τοίνυν ἔσο τὸν*[2] *δάκτυλον ῥυθμίζων*[3] *ἐπὶ τῇ τοῦ σταυροῦ γραφῇ. φεύγε τὸν ἄκοσμον κόσμον ἵνα μὴ τὸν τῆς παρακοῆς ἐνδύσῃ δερματινὸν χιτῶνα.*[4]

[1] αὖτη scripsi: αὐτῇ libri
[2] ἔσο τὸν B: ἔσονται C
[3] ῥυθμίζοντες (corr) C
[4] *Gen.* III 21.

18. (B 241b, C 71b) (*δεύτερον γὰρ παράγουσιν Ἀστέριον ἐπίσκοπον Ἀμασείας ἐπιγραφόμενον ἐν τῷ πεποιημένῳ αὐτῷ Εἰς τὸν πλούσιον καὶ τὸν Λάζαρον λόγῳ φάσκοντα οὕτως·*) *Μὴ γράφε τὸν Χριστόν· ἀρκεῖ γὰρ αὐτῷ ἡ μία τῆς ἐνσωματώσεως ταπεινοφροσύνη ἣν αὐθαιρέτως δι' ἡμᾶς κατεδέξατο· ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς σου βαστάζων νοητῶς τὸν ἀσώματον Λόγον περίφερε.* P.G. XL 168 B.

19. (B 246a–b, C 76b) (*προάγουσι γὰρ μετὰ ταῦτα Λεοντίου τινὸς λόγον περιέχοντα οὕτως*[1].) *Ἐν δὲ τῷ*[2] *προσεύχεσθαι αὐτὸν ἐγένετο τὸ εἶδος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος καὶ ὁ ἱματισμὸς αὐτοῦ λαμπρῶς ἐξαστράπτων.*[3] *οἷς ἐπιφέρει*[4] *λέγων· καλῶς οἱ χρωματόγραφοι ζωγράφοι μίαν εἰκόνα τοῦ Κυρίου γράφειν οὐ μεμαθήκασιν. ποίαν γὰρ εἰκόνα ἰσχύουσι γράψαι; τὴν ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι ἣν ὁ Ἰορδάνης ἰδὼν ἔφριξεν; ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐν τῷ ὄρει ἣν οὐχ ὑπήνεγκαν κατανοῆσαι Πέτρος καὶ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης; ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ ἣν ὁ ἥλιος κατανοήσας ἐσκοτίσθη; ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐν τῷ τάφῳ ἣν κατανοήσασαι αἱ κάτω δυνάμεις ἔφριξαν; ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει ἣν ὅτε*[5] *οἱ μαθηταὶ θεασάμενοι οὐ συνῆκαν; ἐκπλήττει με σφόδρα εἷς ἕκαστος τῶν*[6] *λεγόντων ὅτι ἐγὼ τὸ ὁμοιωσίδιον*[7] *τοῦ Κυρίου κέκτημαι. θέλεις τὸ ὁμοιωσίδιον*[7] *αὐτοῦ κτήσασθαι;*[8] *ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ σου αὐτὸ κτῆσαι· εἰκόνι γὰρ ἀμήχανον γραφῆναι τὸν Κύριον.*

[1] Λεοντίου Νεαπόλεως τῆς Κύπρου in marg C
[2] τῷ B: τὸ C
[3] *Ev. Luc.* IX 28.
[4] ἐπιφέρει C: ἐπιφέροι ? B
[5] ὅτε non intelligo
[6] τῶν B: om C
[7] ὁμοιωσίδιον: ὁμοιωσείδιον B ὁμοιωσίδην C
[8] κτίσασθαι C

20. (B 254b, C 84b) (*ἐντεῦθεν ἐφ' ἑτέραν χρῆσιν οἱ τῆς Ἰουδαϊκῆς μοίρας ἴενται Θεοδότου τοῦ ἐκ Γαλατίας ἐπιγραφομένην τοὔνομα ἔχουσαν ὧδε·* [1]) *Τὰς τῶν ἁγίων ἰδέας* [2] *οὐκ ἐν εἰκόσιν ἐξ ὑλικῶν* [3] *χρωμάτων διαμορφοῦν παρειλήφαμεν, ἀλλὰ τὰς τούτων ἀρετὰς διὰ τῶν ἐν γραφαῖς περὶ αὐτῶν δηλουμένων οἷόν τινας ἐμψύχους εἰκόνας ἀναμάττεσθαι δεδιδάγμεθα, ἐκ τούτου πρὸς τὸν ὅμοιον αὐτοῖς διεγειρόμενοι ζῆλον. ἐπεὶ εἰπάτωσαν οἱ τὰς τοιάσδε ἀναστηλοῦντες μορφὰς ποίας ἄρα ἐκ τούτων* [4] *καταπολαύοιεν ὠφελείας; ἢ ἐν ποίᾳ διὰ τῆς τούτων ἀναμνήσεως ἀνάγωνται* [5] *πνευματικῇ θεωρίᾳ; ἀλλ' εὔδηλον ὡς ματαία ἡ τοιαύτη ἐπίνοια καὶ διαβολικῆς μεθοδείας εὕρημα.* Vide Mansi XIII 309 E.

[1] *Θεοδότου ἐπισκόπου Ἀγκύρας* in marg C
[2] *εἰδέας* C
[3] *ἐξ ὑλικῶν*: *ἐκ ξυλικῶν* C
[4] *ἐκ τούτων* sscr C
[5] *ἀνάγονται* B

21. (B 266a, C 96a) (*προστιθέασι γὰρ τοῖς προλαβοῦσι Βασίλειόν τινα Σελευκείας ἀρχιερέα παραπλασάμενοι τὰ αὐτὰ τοῖς τοῦ πεποιημένου Θεοδότου κατὰ τῶν ἁγίων κενοφωνοῦντα. ἔχει δὲ τὰ προφερόμενα ὧδε·* [1]). *Τοὺς ἐν ἀρετῇ γοῦν βεβιωκότας οὐ διὰ τῆς ἐν χρώμασι τεχνουργικῆς ἐπιστήμης τιμᾶν δεῖ, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἑλληνικῆς μυθοποιΐας ἀνάπλασμα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς γραφικῆς θεωρίας τούτους εἰς ἀνάμνησιν ἕλκειν καὶ μιμεῖσθαι τὸν ζῆλον. τίς* [2] *γὰρ ἂν γένοιτο τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐκ τῆς τῶν τοιῶνδε μορφωμάτων κακοτεχνίας εὐεργεσία, ἢ τί ἔχοι θεοφιλές τε καὶ τίμιον ἡ τῶν ἀψύχων ὁμοιωμάτων περιεργία;*

[1] *Βασιλείου ἐπισκόπου Σελευκείας* in marg C
[2] *τῆς* C

22. (B 267b, C 97a–b) (*μετὰ δὴ ταῦτα παρατιθέασιν Ἀμφιλοχίου τοῦ ἐξ Ἰκονίου λόγους ἐκ τοῦ πεποιημένου αὐτῷ Ἐγκωμίου εἰς τὸν μέγαν Βασίλειον, ἐν οἷς τὰ* [1] *τοιαῦτα λέγεται* [2].) *Οἱ ἅγιοι οὐ προσδέονται τῶν διὰ γραμμάτων ἡμῶν ἐγκωμίων, ἐγγεγραμμένοι ἤδη τῷ βιβλίῳ τῶν ζώντων, ὧν ἡ δικαιοσύνη παρὰ τῷ* [3] *Θεῷ πεφύλακται. ἡμεῖς δὲ χρῄζομεν τῶν διὰ μέλανος γραμμάτων ὅπως ὁ νοῦς ἡμῶν διαγράφῃ τὴν τούτων μνήμην εἰς κοινὴν ὠφέλειαν καὶ ὦμεν ἀκροαταὶ τούτων, ὅταν διὰ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως τῇ ἀκοῇ παραπέμπωμεν* [4]. *ὡς γὰρ ἐκ μεγάλου θησαυροῦ πρὸς οἰκονομίαν τὰς εὐεργεσίας λαμβάνομεν καὶ πληροῦμεν ἡμῶν τὰ ὑστερήματα ταῖς τούτων πολιτείαις (οὐ γὰρ πληροῦται ἀκοὴ δι' ἐπιθυμίας ἔχουσα ἀκοῦσαι τὴν τούτων τελείωσιν). ἀλλ' οὐ χρώμασι τοῖς πίναξι τὰ σαρκικὰ αὐτῶν πρόσωπα ἐπιμελὲς ἡμῖν ἐκτυποῦν ὅτι οὐ χρῄζομεν τούτων, ἀλλὰ τὴν τούτων ἄθλησιν ἐκμιμούμενοι καὶ τὰς ἀγαθὰς πράξεις δευτεροῦμεν καὶ τὴν πρὸς Θεὸν ἀγάπην διαγράφομεν καί ἐσμεν μιμηταὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν πράξεων αὐτῶν, ἐντιθέντες τῇ γραφῇ τὰς τούτων μνήμας μετὰ θάνατον πρὸς τοὺς ἀκούοντας ὅπως γνῶσι τὴν ἐν κόσμῳ αὐτῶν ἀναστροφήν.*
Graece non extant, sed Syriace habes, vide K. V. Zetterstéen, "Eine Homilie des Amphilochius von Iconium über Basilius von Cäsarea," *Oriens Christianus* XXXI (1934) 68 sq. Vide Mansi XIII 301D.

[1] *τὰ* om C
[2] *Ἀμφιλοχίου ἐπισκόπου τοῦ Ἰκονίου ἐκ τοῦ ἐγκωμίου τοῦ εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Βασίλειον* in marg C
[3] *τῷ* om B
[4] *παραπέμπομεν* C

23. (B 275a, C 105b) (*ἑξῆς δὲ παραφέρουσι φωνὰς τοῦ μεγάλου ὥς φασι Βασιλείου ἐκ τοῦ περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου γενέσεως Εἰς τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα λόγου πρώτου διαγορευούσας* [1] *τοιάδε* [2].) *Εἰ μὴ τὴν τοῦ γενέσθαι καθ' ὁμοίωσιν δύναμιν ἡμῖν ἐχαρίσατο, οὐκ ἂν τῇ ἑαυτῶν ἐξουσίᾳ τὴν πρὸς Θεὸν ὁμοίωσιν ἐδέξαμεθα· νῦν δὲ δυνάμει ἡμᾶς ἐποίησεν ὁμοιωτικοὺς Θεῷ, δύναμιν δὲ δοὺς πρὸς τὸ ὁμοιοῦσθαι Θεῷ ἀφῆκεν ἡμᾶς ἐργάτας εἶναι τῆς πρὸς Θεὸν ὁμοιώσεως ἵνα τέλειος ᾖ* [3] *τῆς ἐργασίας ὁ*

μισθός, ἵνα μὴ ὥσπερ εἰκόνες ὦμεν παρὰ ζωγράφου γενόμεναι εἰκῇ καὶ μάτην κείμεναι· ὅταν γὰρ ἀκριβῶς μεμορφωμένην εἰκόνα ἴδῃς τῇ ποικιλίᾳ τῶν χρωμάτων, οὐ τὴν εἰκόνα ἐπαινεῖς, ἀλλὰ τὸν ζωγράφον θαυμάζεις.[4]

P.G. XLIV, 273 A–B.

[1] διαγορεύσας C
[2] τοῦ μεγάλου Βασιλείου ἐκ τῆς Ἑξαημέρου in marg C
[3] τέλιος εἰ C
[4] θαυμάζῃς B

24. (B 277b–278a, C 107b–108a) (ἑπόμενα τούτοις τὸν ἱερὸν Γρηγόριον τὸν Νυσσαέων[1] ἱεράρχην παρακομίζουσιν ὡς οἴονται διδάσκοντα οὕτως[2].) Μηκέτι τὴν σωματώδη καὶ δουλικὴν μορφὴν ἐν τῇ σεαυτοῦ πίστει ἀνατυπώσῃ, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὄντα καὶ ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχοντα καὶ Θεὸν ὄντα Λόγον, τοῦτον προσκύνει, καὶ μὴ τὴν τοῦ δούλου μορφήν.

[1] νυσαέων C
[2] Γρηγορίου ἐπισκόπου Νύσης in marg C

25. (B 282b, C 112b) (ἐπὶ δὲ τὰ ἑπόμενα πρόϊμεν ἐν οἷς ἔκκειται τοῦ θεηγόρου Γρηγορίου ἐκ τῶν Ἐπῶν αὐτοῦ ῥῆσις ἔχουσα τόνδε τὸν τρόπον[1].) Ὕβρις πίστιν ἔχειν χρώμασι, μὴ ἐν καρδίᾳ. ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἐν χρώμασιν εὐχερῶς ἐκπλύνεται, ἡ δὲ ἐν τῷ βάθει τοῦ νοός, ἐκείνη μοι προσφιλής[2].).

Carmina Moralia 31, 39 sq. (*P.G.* XXXVII 913), vide Mansi XIII 297 A–B.

[1] Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου ἐκ τῶν Ἐπῶν in marg C
[2] προσφιλεῖς C

26. (B 284b, C 114a–b) (ἐντεῦθεν ἐπ' ἄλλην ματαιοπονίαν μεταρρυθμίζονται φάσκοντες·) Ἰωάννης δὲ ὁ Χρυσόστομος ἐν τῷ εἰς Ῥωμανὸν τὸν μάρτυρα.[1] Μὴ γὰρ τοίχοις ὁ Χριστὸς περιγράφεται, μὴ γὰρ ὀφθαλμοῖς ὁ ἡμέτερος δεσπότης ὁρᾶται. ὁ ἐμὸς δεσπότης, μᾶλλον δὲ ὁ τῶν ὅλων δεσπότης Χριστὸς οὐρανὸν οἰκεῖ καὶ κόσμον ἡνιοχεῖ, καὶ θυσία τούτῳ ψυχὴ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀνανεύουσα, καὶ μία τούτῳ τροφὴ τῶν πιστευόντων ἡ σωτηρία.

Vide *P.G.* L, 616.

[1] τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου ἐκ τοῦ μάρτυρος Ῥωμανοῦ ἐγκωμίου in marg C

27. (B 286b, C 116b) (τοῖς προηγουμένοις τὰ ἑπόμενα καὶ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐκτεθέντα τοιαῦτα·) Καὶ πάλιν ὁ αὐτός, (φασίν), ἐν τῷ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ τῷ Εἰς τὸν Ἀβραὰμ φάσκει·[1] οἱ δὲ τρεῖς ἄγγελοι ὅτι ἦλθον πρὸς τὸν Ἀβραὰμ καὶ ταῦτα ἐποίησαν ὑπὸ Ἑλλήνων ἀκόντων μαρτυροῦνται. οἱ γὰρ τὴν τῶν[2] Παλαιστινῶν οἰκοῦντες γῆν καὶ εἰκόνας γράφοντες τῶν[3] σεβασμάτων αὐτῶν τρεῖς γράφουσιν ἀγγέλους καὶ τὸν Ἀβραάμ, μετ' αὐτῶν[4] καὶ τὴν Σάρραν καὶ μόσχον καὶ ἄλευρον· καὶ πάντα ὅσα λέγει ἡ Γραφὴ διὰ μέλανος λέγουσιν ἐκεῖνοι δι' ἀγαλμάτων. ταῦτα δὲ εἴρηται ἵνα οὐ τοῖς πιστοῖς δι' ἑλληνικῶν γίνηται ἡ πίστις· ἡμεῖς γὰρ παρὰ τῶν ἔξωθεν οὐ δεχόμεθα τὰς ἀποδείξεις.

[1] τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ εἰς τὸν Ἀβραὰμ λόγου in marg C
[2] τῶν om B
[3] τῶν om C
[4] verba τρεῖς. . . . αὐτῶν om, in marg add (sed ἐαγγέλους) C

28. (B 290b, C 118a) (ἔτι φασὶν ὅτι·) Εἶθ' οὕτως καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λόγῳ τῷ Εἰς τὸν δεσμοφύλακα ἐπιγραφομένῳ λέγει·[1] εἰ γὰρ εἰκόνα τις ἄψυχον ἀναθεὶς παιδὸς ἢ φίλου ἢ συγγενοῦς νομίζει παρεῖναι ἐκεῖνον τὸν ἀπελθόντα καὶ διὰ τῆς εἰκόνος αὐτὸν φαντάζεται τῆς ἀψύχου, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἡμεῖς διὰ τῶν γραφῶν τῆς τῶν ἁγίων ἀπολαύομεν παρουσίας, οὐχὶ τῶν σωμάτων αὐτῶν τὰς εἰκόνας ἔχοντες ἀλλὰ τῶν ψυχῶν· τὰ γὰρ παρ' αὐτῶν εἰρημένα τῶν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν εἰκόνες εἰσίν.

Vide Mansi XIII 300A.

[1] τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ εἰς τὸν δεσμοφύλακα in marg C

29. (B 293b–294b, C 121a–b) (*κατοκνήσειέ τις τάχα τοῖς προσαπαντῶσιν ἐξῆς ἐπιβάλλειν. . . . ἔχει δὲ τὰ παρὰ τῶν ὑπεναντίων* [1] *ῥαδιουργηθέντα οὕτως·* [2]) Νείλου *ἀσκητοῦ πρὸς Ὀλυμπιόδωρον ἔπαρχον.*[3] *νηπιῶδες καὶ βρεφοπρεπὲς ἡ τοιαύτη ἐρώτησις. περὶ πλανήσεως τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν τοῦτο γινόμενον, ἀνδρὸς δὲ φρονίμου τοῦτο μακρὰν ἀπέχει· ἐν γὰρ τῷ ἱερατείῳ κατὰ τὸ πρόσταγμα τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς παραδόσεως σταυρὸν ἐγχαράξας ἀρκέσθητι, δι' οὗ σταυροῦ ἐσώθη πᾶν τὸ ἀνθρώπινον γένος, καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν τοῦ οἴκου λεύκανον.*

Vide *P.G.* LXXIX, 577 D.

[1] *ἐναντίων* C

[2] Νείλου *ἀσκητοῦ ἐκ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς πρὸς Ὀλυμπιόδωρον ἔπαρχον* in marg C

[3] verba Νείλου . . . *ἔπαρχον* om C

30.[1] (B 295b, C 122b–123a) (*καὶ τελευταίας τῆς ἐπιτεχνηθείσης* [2] *αὐτοῖς τερατείας οἱονεὶ σφραγῖδα ἐπιτιθέντες συμπλάσσουσι χρήσεις, εἰς μὲν Ἐπιφάνιον τὸν θεοφόρον τὸν τῆς Κυπρίων κατὰ τὴν ἱερωσύνην ἐξηγησάμενον ψευδῶς καὶ ἀλλοκότως ἀναφέροντες. . .*)

[1] Hic invenies locos Epiphanio adscriptos sicut a concilio in ecclesia Sanctae Sophiae anno 815 habito adlati sunt. saepius autem difficillimum erat discernere utrum Nicephorus disiecta membra Epiphanii prompserit e *Definitione* concilii an ex ipsis operibus Epiphanio adscriptis, quae se praesto habuisse saepe asserit. ubi verba facit Nicephorus de opere quod Κατὰ *τῶν ἐπιτηδευόντων κτλ.* inscribitur (infra frg. 30 B), se adferre dicit, ut videtur, nonnulla ab Iconomachis omissa (Hollii frga. 12–15, Ostrogorskii frga. 15–18). de locis ex *Epistula ad Theodosium* ipsa a Nicephoro excerptis, vide infra ad frg. 30 C adn. 1. editiones *criticas* fragmentorum contra imagines Epiphanio adscriptorum habes a Carolo Holl (*Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte* II, Tübingen, 1928, 356–363) et Georgio Ostrogorsky (*Studien*, 67–75) confectas.

[2] *ἐπιτεχνηθήσεις* C

A. (B 296a, C 123b) (*προχειρίζονται οὖν ὡς δῆθεν Ἐπιφανίου Διαθήκην πρὸς τοὺς τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς αὐτοῦ* [1] *τετυπωμένην, ὧδέ πως ἔχουσαν·* [2]) Προσέχετε *ἑαυτοῖς καὶ κρατεῖτε τὰς παραδόσεις ἃς παρελάβετε. μὴ ἐκκλίνητε δεξιὰ ἢ ἀρίστερα. οἷς ἐπιφέρει· καὶ ἐν τούτῳ μνήμην ἔχετε, τέκνα ἀγαπητά, τοῦ μὴ ἀναφέρειν εἰκόνας ἐπ' ἐκκλησίας μήτε ἐν τοῖς κοιμητηρίοις τῶν ἁγίων, ἀλλὰ διὰ μνήμης ἔχετε τὸν Θεὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, ἀλλ' οὔτε κατ' οἶκον κοινόν· οὐκ ἔξεστι γὰρ Χριστιανῷ δι' ὀφθαλμῶν μετεωρίζεσθαι καὶ ῥεμβασμῷ τοῦ νοός.*

[1] *τῆς αὐτοῦ*: *αὐτοῦ* C

[2] *Ἐπιφανίδου* in marg C

B. (B 298b, C 125b) (*τούτοις ἕτερον αὐτῷ ἐφαρμόζουσι λόγον οὗ ἡ ἐπιγραφή·*) Κατὰ *τῶν ἐπιτηδευόντων εἰδωλικῷ θεσμῷ εἰκόνας εἰς ἀφομοίωσιν Χριστοῦ καὶ τῆς Θεοτόκου, μαρτύρων καὶ ἀγγέλων καὶ προφητῶν.* (B 299a, C 126a) (*γράφει δὲ ἑξῆς ὁ τούτων διδάσκαλος ταῦτα·*) *ἴδωμεν τοὺς κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ πολιτευσαμένους πατριάρχας καὶ προφήτας καὶ μιμησώμεθα αὐτοὺς ἵνα ὄντως καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας υἱοὶ ὀνομασθῶμεν· εἰδόσιν οὖν νόμον λαλῶ.* (B 299b, C 126b) (*φησίν·*) *εἰπάτωσαν δὲ καὶ οἱ ἀδήλως τρέχοντες τίς τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων χειροποίητον προσεκύνησεν ἢ τίς τοῖς ἰδίοις σέβειν παρέδωκεν. τίς τῶν ἁγίων καταλιπὼν τὸν ἀνεκλιπῆ* [1] *πλοῦτον, τὴν εἰς Θεὸν ἐλπίδα ἐν γνώσει, ἑαυτὸν* [2] *ζωγραφήσας προσκυνεῖσθαι ἐκέλευσεν; ὁ ἡγούμενος* [3] *τῶν* [4] *ἐν πίστει Ἀβραὰμ* [5] *οὐχὶ φεύγων τὰ νεκρὰ φίλος ζῶντος Θεοῦ ἐκλήθη; ἢ Μωσῆς οὐχὶ φεύγων τὴν τοιαύτην πλάνην ἠρνήσατο τὴν παροῦσαν ἀπόλαυσιν;* (B 302b, C 129b) (*ἐπισυνάπτει τοιαῦτα·*) *ἀλλ' ἐρεῖς μοι ὅτι οἱ πατέρες εἴδωλα ἐθνῶν ἐβδελύξαντο, ἡμεῖς δὲ τὰς εἰκόνας τῶν ἁγίων ποιοῦμεν εἰς μνημόσυνον αὐτῶν καὶ εἰς τιμὴν ἐκείνων ταῦτα προσκυνοῦμεν. καὶ πάντως γὰρ ταύτῃ τῇ ὑποθέσει ἐτόλμησάν τινες ὑμῶν ἔνδον τοῦ ἁγίου οἴκου τὸν τοῖχον κονιάσαντες χρώμασι διηλλαγμένοις εἰκόνας ἀνατυπώσαντες Πέτρου καὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ Παύλου ὡς ὁρῶ κατὰ τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν ἑκάστης* [6] *τῶν ψευδωνύμων*

εἰκόνων ὑπὸ τῆς μωρίας τοῦ ζωγράφου κατὰ τὸν νοῦν αὐτοῦ τυπωθεῖσαν. καὶ πρῶτον μὲν οἱ νομίζοντες ἐν τούτῳ τιμᾶν τοὺς ἀποστόλους μαθέτωσαν ὅτι ἀντὶ τῆς τιμῆς πλέον αὐτοὺς ἀτιμάζουσι. Παῦλος γὰρ τὸν ψευδώνυμον ἱερέα ἐνυβρίσας [7] τοῖχον κεκονιαμένον ἀπεφήνατο.[8] οὐκοῦν εἰκόνας αὐτῶν τὰς αὐτῶν ἐντολὰς δι' ἀρετῶν στήσωμεν. ἀλλ' ἐρεῖς ὅτι εἰς ὑπόμνησιν τῆς ἰδέας αὐτῶν τὰς εἰκόνας αὐτῶν [9] θεωροῦμεν. καὶ ποῦ γάρ σοι ταῦτα προενετείλαντο; προηγιασάμεθα γὰρ τοὺς τοιούτους ὅτι ἀγνοίᾳ φερόμενοι κοπιῶσιν εἰκῇ. (B 304a, C 131a) (διὸ ἐπὶ τοῖς προκειμένοις εὐθὺς μετοιχόμεθα· φάσκει γὰρ οὑτωσί·) οἴδαμεν γὰρ, φησίν Ἰωάννης,[10] ὅτι [11] ὅταν φανερωθῇ ὅμοιοι αὐτῷ ἐσόμεθα, καὶ Παῦλος [12] δὲ [13] τοὺς ἁγίους συμμόρφους τοῦ Ὑιοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκήρυξεν. (B 305a, C 132a) (ὁ δὲ τῆς ἀποστατικῆς παρανοίας εἰσηγητὴς τοῖς προηγουμένοις παρατίθεται ταῦτα·) πῶς οὖν τοὺς ἐν δόξῃ μέλλοντας φαιδρύνεσθαι ἁγίους ἐν ἀδόξῳ καὶ νεκρῷ καὶ ἀλάλῳ θέλεις ὁρᾶν, τοῦ Κυρίου λέγοντος περὶ αὐτῶν· ἔσονται γάρ, φησίν, ὡς ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ.[14] (B 307a, C 134a) (ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τοῦ ἄφρονος μέτειμι ἔνθα φράζει·) πῶς δὲ καὶ ἀγγέλους πνεύματα ὑπάρχοντας καὶ ἀεὶ ζῶντας ἐν νεκροῖς γράφων προσκυνεῖς, τοῦ προφήτου [15] λέγοντος· ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα [16] καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγα. (B 307b, C 134b–135a) (καὶ λέγει·) ἤκουσα δὲ ὅτι καὶ τὸν ἀκατάληπτον Ὑιὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τινες γράφειν ἐπαγγέλλονται, ὃ φρῖξαί ἐστι τὸ ἀκοῦσαι καὶ τὸ πιστεῦσαι βλάσφημον. (B 213a, C 140b) (ἐξῆς δ' ἂν εἴη τὰ ὑπερτεθέντα τῆς χρήσεως τούτοις ἐπισυνάπτειν, ἐν οἷς ἰουδαΐζων φάσκει τοιάδε·) ποῦ γάρ σοι διέταξε ἐλθὼν ἐπὶ τῆς [17] γῆς ποιῆσαι ὅμοιον αὐτοῦ καὶ προσκυνεῖν ἢ ὁρᾶν; αὕτη ἡ διάταξις τοῦ πονηροῦ, δῆλον ἵνα καταφρονήσῃς Θεοῦ. (B 314a, C 141b) (ἀκόλουθον ἐν οἷς ταῦτα παρεγγυᾶται ὁ κενὸς οὗτος διδάσκαλος ὑποτιθέμενος.[18]) δεῖ οὖν αὐτῷ ζῶντι προσκυνεῖν, ὡς εἶπεν, ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ.[19] (B 315b, C 143a) (τοῖς δὲ ἑξῆς προκειμένοις τῆς παρούσης χρήσεως καὶ ἐπιβάλλειν αἰσχρὸν καὶ σιωπᾶν οὐκ ἀνεκτόν. ἔχει γὰρ οὕτως·) μὴ οὖν ἡ γάγγραινα νομὴν ἕξει· [20] ὁ Θεὸς γὰρ ἐν πάσῃ τῇ παλαιᾷ καὶ καινῇ ταῦτα ἀναιρεῖ ἀκριβῶς λέγων· [21] Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις, λέγων· ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει Κύριος, καὶ ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ.[22] οὐ δυνάμεθα οὖν δυσὶ κυρίοις δουλεύειν,[23] ζῶντι καὶ νεκρῷ· ἐπικατάρατος γάρ, φησίν, ὃς κτίσμα παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα προσκυνήσει· [24] πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα περιέχει αὐτὸς καὶ οὐ περιέχεται ὑπό τινος.

[1] ἀνελλιπῆ B ἀνεκλιπὴ C
[2] αὐτὸν C
[3] ἡγούμενον C
[4] τὸν C
[5] αβρααν C
[6] ἑκάστην B
[7] ἐνυβριάσας ? C
[8] *Act.* XXIII 3.
[9] τὰς εἰκόνας αὐτῶν om C
[10] I *Joh.* III 2.
[11] ὅτι om B
[12] *Rom.* VIII 29.
[13] δὲ om B
[14] *Ev. Marci* XII 25.
[15] *Ps.* CIII 4.
[16] πνεῦμα C
[17] τῆς om B
[18] ὑποτίθεται B
[19] *Ev. Joh.* IV 34.
[20] ἕξη C cf. II *Tim.* 2:17
[21] *Ev. Matth.* IV 10.
[22] *Rom.* XIV 11.
[23] *Ev. Matth.* VI 24.
[24] *Rom.* I 25.

C. (B 316a, C 143b) (ἐπακολουθεῖ γὰρ ἐκ τῆς πρὸς Θεοδόσιον τὸν βασιλέα Ἐπιφανίου δῆθεν ἐπιστολῆς χρῆσις. . . .) [1] (B 324b, C 152a) (ἐντεῦθεν ἐπὶ τὰς λοιπὰς τῶν ἐν τῷ ὅρῳ αὐτῶν προσκειμένας χρήσεις ἐπισκεψόμενοι ἄπιμεν ἐν αἷς γράφεται τοιάδε·) τίς ἤκουσε τοιαῦτα πώποτε; τίς τῶν παλαιῶν πατέρων Χριστοῦ εἰκόνα ζωγραφήσας ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἢ ἐν οἴκῳ ἰδίῳ κατέθετο; τίς ἐν βήλοις θυρῶν τῶν ἀρχαίων ἐπισκόπων Χριστὸν ἀτιμάσας ἐζωγράφησεν; τίς τὸν Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ Μωσέα τε καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς προφήτας καὶ πατριάρχας, ἢ Πέτρον ἢ Ἀνδρέαν ἢ Ἰάκωβον ἢ Ἰωάννην ἢ Παῦλον ἢ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀποστόλους ἐν βήλοις ἢ ἐν τοίχοις ζωγραφήσας οὕτως παρεδειγμάτισε καὶ ἐθριάμβευσεν; (B 326a–b, C 153b–154a) (τοῖς προγεγραμμένοις συντάττουσι ταῦτα·) οὐχ ὁρᾷς, θεοφιλέστατε βασιλεῦ, τὸ ἔργον οὐ πρέπον Θεῷ; διὸ παρακαλῶ, βασιλεῦ θεοσεβέστατε καὶ μισοπόνηρε, πᾶσαν [2] πλάνην ἐλέγχων τῷ ἔν σοι ζήλῳ Θεοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ διὰ στερεᾶς σου νομοθεσίας μετὰ προστίμου

ὁριζομένης εἰ δυνατόν — πιστεύω δὲ ὅτι ἐὰν θέλῃς [3] ἐν Θεῷ δύνασαι — ὅπως τὰ βῆλα ὅπου ἂν [4] εὑρεθῇ ἔχοντα ψευδῶς μὲν ὅμως δὲ ἢ ἀποστόλων ἢ προφητῶν ζωγραφίας ἢ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Χριστοῦ, ταῦτα πάντα συλλεγέντα ἀπὸ ἐκκλησιῶν ἢ βαπτιστηρίων ἢ οἰκιῶν ἢ μαρτυρίων εἰς ταφὴν πτωχῶν προχωρήσει,[5] τὰ δὲ ἐν τοίχοις διὰ χρωμάτων λευκανθῆναι· τὰ δὲ ἐν μουσαρίῳ προληφθέντα γραφῆναι, ἐπειδὴ δὲ [6] δυσχερές ἐστι τὸ τοιοῦτον ἀνασκεύασμα, ἐν τῇ δοθείσῃ σοι ὑπὸ τοῦ [7] Θεοῦ σοφίᾳ εἰδέναι πῶς προστάξεις. εἰ μὲν δυνατὸν ταῦτα ἀνασκευασθῆναι, εὖ ἂν ἔχοι· εἰ δὲ ἀδύνατον, ἀρκεσθῆναι τοῖς προγεγονόσι,[8] καὶ μηκέτι τινὰ ζωγραφεῖν οὕτως· καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἡμέτεροι πατέρες οὐδεν ἄλλο ἔγραφον, εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον, τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸν σταυρόν, ἐν ταῖς ἑαυτῶν [9] θύραις καὶ πανταχοῦ.

[1] Hic adfert Nicephorus et alia fragmenta epistulae Epiphanii ad Theodosium (Holl, frga. 19, 20, 21, 28, 31; Ostrogorsky, frga. 22, 28–30). quae autem non ex 'florilegio' concilii anno 815 habiti, sed ex epistula ipsa prompsisse testatur: ἀλλὰ τί δεῖ πλειόνων πόνων ἢ πολλὰ κάμνειν καὶ πράγματα ἑαυτοῖς παρέχειν, ἐξὸν τοῖς κατὰ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν γεγραμμένοις ἀκριβέστερον ἐπιβαλόντας ἐκεῖθεν ἐλεῖν ὅστις ποτὲ ἦν ὁ ταύτης πατήρ (B 322b, C 150a–b). deinde (B 324b, C 152a) ad 'florilegium' his verbis redit: ἐντεῦθεν ἐπὶ τὰς λοιπὰς τῶν ἐν τῷ ὄρῳ αὐτῶν προσκειμένας χρήσεις ἐπισκεψόμενοι ἄπιμεν.

[2] πᾶσαν bis scr C
[3] θέλεις C
[4] ἐὰν C
[5] προχωρήσεις C
[6] δὲ om C
[7] τοῦ om C
[8] ex προγεγραμμένοις corr C
[9] αὐτῶν B

D. (B 327a–328a, C 154–155a) (λοιπὴ γὰρ καὶ τελευταία τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς παρενηνεγμένων παρομαρτεῖ χρήσεων ἥτις [1] ὡς Ἐπιφανίου πεπλαστούργηται πρὸς Ἰωάννην τὸν Ἀιλίας [2] ἐπίσκοπον ἐπιγεγραμμένη ἐπιστολὴ ἀπαγγέλλουσα [3] τοιαῦτα·) Ὁ δὲ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης ποιήσει μεθ' ἡμῶν κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ φιλανθρωπίαν εἰς τὸ συντριβῆναι τὸν Σατανᾶν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας ἡμῶν τῶν Χριστιανῶν καὶ ἀποδιωχθῆναι πᾶσαν πρόφασιν πονηρὰν εἰς τὸ μὴ σχισθῆναι [4] τὸν σύνδεσμον ἐξ ἡμῶν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀνυποκρίτου ἀγάπης καὶ εἰρήνης καὶ ὀρθῆς πίστεως καὶ ἀληθείας. ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἤκουσα ὅτι τινὲς ἐγόγγυσαν καθ' ἡμῶν ὅτι ἐν τῷ διαβαίνειν ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τὸν ἅγιον τόπον τῆς Βεθὴλ τοῦ συναγελασθῆναι [5] τῇ σῇ τιμιότητι ὡς ἤλθομεν εἰς τὴν κώμην τὴν λεγομένην Ἀναυθὰ θεασάμενοι λύχνον καιόμενον καὶ ἐρωτήσαντες ἔγνωμεν ἐκκλησίαν εἶναι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ. εἰσερχόμενοι δὲ τοῦ εὐχὴν ἐπιτελέσαι εὕρομεν βῆλον ἐν τῇ θύρᾳ βαπτὸν ἐν ᾧ ἐζωγράφητο ἀνδροείκελόν τι εἰδωλοειδές· ὃ ἔλεγον τάχα ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἦν τὸ ἐκτύπωμα ἢ ἑνὸς τῶν ἁγίων· οὐ γὰρ μέμνημαι. ἐγὼ θεασάμενος καὶ εἰδὼς ὅτι μύσος ἐστὶν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ τοιαῦτα [6] εἶναι διέρρηξα αὐτὸ καὶ συνεβούλευσα ἀμφιάσαι ἐν αὐτῷ πένητα τελευτήσαντα. οἱ δὲ γογγύσαντες ἔλεγον· ἔδει αὐτὸν ἀλλάξαι ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων τὸ βῆλον πρὶν ἢ αὐτὸ [7] σχίσῃ.[8] καίτοι γε ἐμοῦ ὑποσχομένου ὅτι ἀντ' αὐτοῦ ἀποστελῶ [9] ἕτερον, ἐβράδυνα δὲ τοῦ ἀποστεῖλαι διὰ τὸ ἀναγκαῖόν με ζητεῖν· προσεδόκων γὰρ ἀπὸ Κύπρου ἀποστέλλεσθαί μοι. νῦν οὖν ὅπερ εὗρον ἀπέστειλα. καταξίωσον οὖν κελεῦσαι τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ τῆς παροικίας δέξασθαι παρὰ τοῦ ἀναγνώστου [10] τὸ ἀπεσταλμένον. καὶ παρακαλῶ, πρόσταξον ἵνα μὴ τοιαῦτα ἁπλοῦται ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις· πρέπει γὰρ τῇ σῇ τιμιότητι περὶ πάντων φροντίζειν καὶ ἀκριβολογεῖν [11] περὶ τῶν συμφερόντων τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ τοῖς λαοῖς.[12]

[1] εἴτις C
[2] Ἀιλείας C
[3] ἀπαγγέλουσα B
[4] σχεσθῆναι B
[5] συναγελασθεῖναι C
[6] ταῦτα B
[7] αὐτὸς B αὐτῷ C
[8] σχίσει B

[9] ἀποστέλλω C

[10] ἀναγνώσ C

[11] ἀκριβεὶ λόγον C

[12] Docet V. Grumel (*Echos d'Orient* XXIX, 1930, 98) Theodorum Studitam, in opere quod inscribitur Ἔλεγχος καὶ ἀνατροπὴ τῶν ἀσεβῶν ποιημάτων Ἰωάννου, Ἰγνατίου, Σεργίου καὶ Στεφάνου τῶν νέων Χριστομάχων. . . . , ὁμοῦ τε καὶ τῆς ἀσεβοῦς ὑπογραφῆς (*P.G.* XCIX, 435) subscriptionem episcoporum iconomachorum anni 815 servavisse (*ibid.*, 465 A–B). sed si ita est, videri non potest cur Theodorus subscriptionem concilii una cum opusculis iconomachis refutaverit. veri similius puto poetas illos subscriptionem a se compositam, subscriptionem ipsius concilii fortasse imitantem, in calce opusculorum suorum addiddisse. sed cum res incerta esset, textum subscriptionis hic adiungendum esse putavi: Ὑπογραφή. Τῇ ἀποστολικῇ καὶ πατρικῇ διδασκαλίᾳ ἑπόμενος καὶ τῇ τῆς ἐκκλησίας θεσμοθεσίᾳ πειθόμενος τάς τε ἁγίας καὶ οἰκουμενικὰς ἓξ συνόδους ἀποδεχόμενος καὶ τὴν ἐν Βλαχέρναις κροτηθεῖσαν σύνοδον καὶ τὴν ταύτης ἐπικυρωτικὴν ἀθροισθεῖσαν καὶ τοῖς ὑπ' αὐταῖς ἐκτεθεῖσιν ὀρθοδόξοις δόγμασιν ἑπόμενος καὶ ἐμμένων τούς τε παρ' αὐτῶν ἀποβληθέντας ἀποβαλλόμενος καὶ τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτῶν δεχθέντας (δειχθέντας Migne) ἀποδεχόμενος πᾶσαν εἰκονικὴν ποίησίν τε καὶ προσκύνησιν ἀθετῶν, τὸν δὲ ὑπὸ Ταρασίου σύλλογον ἀποβαλλόμενος καὶ τοὺς μὴ οὕτως ἔχοντας ἀναθεματίζων ὑπέγραψα ἰδιοχείρως.

CONSPECTUS EDITIONUM

Ed. Serruys	Ed. Ostrogorsky (fragmenta numerantur secundum Ostr.)	Ed. Alexander (fragmenta numerantur secundum editionem meam)
vacat	vacat	1
habet	1	2
habet	2	3
vacat	3	4
habet	4	5
vacat	5	vacat [1]
vacat	6	vacat [1]
vacat	7	vacat [1]
habet	8	6
habet	9	7
habet	10	8
habet	11	9
habet	12	10
vacat	13	11
vacat	vacat	12
habet	14	13
habet	15	14
habet	16	15
habet	17	16
vacat	vacat	17–30 (florilegium)

[1] Vide supra p. 53 f., adn. 15.