

CLAUDIO SCHIANO^a

Photius, the Aftermath of the Struggle against the Icons, and the Problem of the Glorious Body in the *Library*

ABSTRACT: Photius's *Library* contains numerous references to issues that had sparked theological debates in earlier centuries, starting with Origenism and the problem of the resurrected body. They are not due to mere scholarly curiosity, for this topic repeatedly challenged the sensibilities of Photius and many of his associates. The question arises whether Photius, in his role as patriarch, tried to draw doctrinal boundaries to counter hidden but somehow still active social groups that wanted to resume the fight against icons.

KEYWORDS: Photius; Iconoclasm; Glorious Body; Origenism; Relics

METHODOLOGICAL PREMISE

Anyone browsing through the almost shapeless mass of documents in Photius's *Library* in search of a *fil rouge* will notice how often the patriarch refers to the connection between the human soul and the body or to the nature of sacred bodies, especially the body of Christ after the resurrection. This does not occur in a single chapter or part of the work, but such interest is scattered throughout the *Library*. In many of the texts that Photius considers, the question of the nature of the sacred body or the resurrected body is related to the controversies sparked by Origen and those theologians who continued to think along his path. Origenism experienced a lively flare-up in the sixth century, when it caused not only ideological but also political and material clashes¹. Much blood was shed, especially in Palestine, and a significant offshoot of the controversy reached Egypt and Constantinople towards the end of the sixth century, when a very peculiar interweaving of Aristotelian logic and Christian theology led John Philoponus to revive the debate with two new theories that were soon condemned as heresies: Tritheism on the one hand, and on the other, the idea that the body after the resurrection will be an entirely new body, numerically distinct from the living one². While only one chapter of the *Library* (a short but very harsh one) is devoted to Origen, in particular to his *De principiis*—which is not to say that Photius has only a limited interest in this

^a Claudio Schiano: Università degli Studi di Bari Aldo Moro, Dipartimento di Ricerca e Innovazione Umanistica, Piazza Umberto I 1, 70121 Bari (Italy); claudio.schiano@uniba.it

¹ Cf. F. DIEKAMP, Die origenistischen Streitigkeiten im sechsten Jahrhundert und das fünfte allgemeine Concil. Münster 1899; D. HOMBERGEN, The Second Origenist Controversy. A New Perspective on Cyril of Scythopolis' Monastic Biographies as Historical Sources for Sixth-Century Origenism. Roma 2001; A. LOUTH, The Collection Sabbaitica and Sixth-Century Origenism, in: Origeniana Octava. Origen and the Alexandrian Tradition, ed. L. Perrone. Leuven 2003, II 1167–1175; D. KRAUSMÜLLER, Origenism and Anti-Origenism in the Late Sixth and Seventh Centuries, in: Evagrius and His Legacy, ed. J. Kalvesmaki – R. DarlingYoung. Notre Dame (Indiana) 2016, 288–316.

² On the theology of John Philoponus, a brief and effective summary is provided by H. CHADWICK, Philoponus the Christian Theologian, in: Philoponus and the Rejection of Aristotelian Science, ed. R. Sorabji. London 2010, 83–96. Cf. also H. MARTIN, Jean Philopon et la controverse trithéite du VI^e siècle, in: Studia Patristica V. Papers presented to the Third International Conference on Patristic Studies, ed. F.L. Cross. Berlin 1962, III 519–525; A. VAN ROEY, Les fragments trithéites de Jean Philopon. *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 11 (1980) 135–163; IDEM, Un traité cononite contre la doctrine de Jean Philopon sur la résurrection, in: ANTIDŌRON. Hommage à Maurits Geerard pour célébrer l'achèvement de la Clavis Patrum Graecorum. Wetteren 1984, I 123–139; U.M. LANG, Notes on John Philoponus and the Tritheist Controversy in the Sixth Century. *Oriens Christianus* 85 (2001) 23–40; B. LOURIE, John Philoponus on the Bodily Resurrection. *Scrinium* 9 (2013) 79–88.

theologian, just as there is no chapter on Plato or Aristotle, whose influence on Photius cannot be underestimated—most of the texts Photius reads on this subject are related to the long-running debate and are a valuable treasure for us, since he is our only source: in the centuries before Photius there is little or no interest in them³, and after Photius there are definitely no more references to them.

This being the case, the question arises as to why Photius felt such a strong fascination with the subject, even though there is no evidence that Origenism and related questions about the resurrection were an issue during his lifetime. The assumption maintained here is that this was due to iconoclasm, or rather the philosophical premises of some of the questions raised by the foes of icons. It may come as a surprise that Photius felt compelled to fight a heresy that had already been defeated some decades earlier. Be that as it may, the close attention Photius paid to the connection between matter and form in the Godhead can be taken as evidence that his concern about a resurgence of the iconoclasts was genuine and not at all opportunistic, and this may shed some light on a rather obscure area of opposition to religious power in the middle decades of the ninth century in Constantinople.

As is well known, there is much scholarly debate about whether this alarm by Photius was genuine or merely a propaganda hoax to reassert the patriarch's shaky power, threatened by several outside forces. In contrast to Dvornik⁴, Cyril Mango held that Photius "harped on Iconoclasm at every possible opportunity" to position himself politically, but that there was no real threat from a possible resurgence of iconoclasm⁵. On this point, Chadwick is right when he says that Mango's "judgement is more likely to be true in political than in religious terms"⁶: Photius's attention to examining the primarily philosophical, secondarily scriptural and theological basis of the iconoclastic theses testifies, as we shall see, to a genuine and deep concern. A concern, it should be said, that he shared with many of his connections, especially in the ranks of the clergy. Dvornik noted that some of the chapters of the *Amphilochia* dealing with images overlapped with letters addressed to prominent figures in the Orthodox hierarchy in the capital and the provinces⁷: the need for polemical means to effectively rebut these harmful opinions must have been felt not only in Constantinople, but in many areas of the Byzantine Empire and beyond. Of course, it cannot be ruled out that Photius was *also* pursuing a political agenda—on the contrary, it is very likely that this was the case—, but the political use of doctrinal issues, the sharpening of theological tools to combat what he perceived as a threat to the Church and the Empire, only confirms how deeply this concern was embedded in his thinking. And this is not to say that this threat actually endangered the steadiness

³ K. PARRY, Providence, Resurrection, and Restoration in Byzantine Thought, Eighth to Ninth Centuries, in: *Studia Patristica* XCVII. Papers presented at the Seventeenth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 2015, ed. M. Vincent. Vol. 23. Leuven – Paris – Bristol 2017, 295–304: 303, assumes that polemical references to John Philoponus's *On the Resurrection* are to be recognized in Maximus the Confessor and John of Damascus: if so, they are hidden, barely discernible references.

⁴ F. DVORNIK, The Patriarch Photius and Iconoclasm. *DOP* 7 (1953) 67–97.

⁵ C. MANGO, The Liquidation of Iconoclasm and the Patriarch Photios, in: *Iconoclasm. Papers given at the Ninth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies. University of Birmingham, March 1975*, ed. A. Bryer – J. Herrin. Birmingham 1977, 133–140. This opinion is also shared by D. STRATOUDAKI-WHITE, Patriarch Photios and the Conclusion of Iconoclasm. *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 44 (1999) 341–355; W.T. TREADGOLD, Photius Before His Patriarchate. *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 53 (2002) 1–17: 17; R. PRICE, Acta, Treatises, and Hagiography, in: *A Companion to Byzantine Iconoclasm*, ed. M. Humphreys. Leiden – Boston 2021, 230–260: 236–237.

⁶ H. CHADWICK, *East and West: The Making of a Rift in the Church from Apostolic Times until the Council of Florence*. Oxford 2003, 145 n. 13. Cf. also C. BEVEGNI, Le due omelie di Fozio sull'eresia ariana. Motivi peculiari e spunti di ricerca, in: *Lingua e teologia nel Cristianesimo greco*, ed. C. Moreschini – G. Menestrina. Brescia 1999, 271–297: 279–280; G. STRANO, Forme e significati dei riferimenti alle eresie nell'epistolario di Fozio. *RSBN* 47 (2010) 177–194: 180–181.

⁷ DVORNIK, The Patriarch Photius and Iconoclasm 86.

of power: only a glance at the past would show a few centuries later how inconsistent these polemical remnants of the iconoclasts were.

The pattern we will now discuss in more detail is based on a hypothesis: that what we read in the so-called *Library* was not amassed in a short period of time, but is a lifelong work in which not only Photius, but many of his friends and students were involved. The traditional, outdated view is that Photius wrote the entire work long before his elevation to the patriarchal throne (858)⁸, while the prevailing opinion today is precisely that the *Library* summarizes (part of) the fruits of a lifetime's reading, at least up to the first deposition (870), most probably even beyond⁹. A more recent attempt to confirm the traditional view is unconvincing¹⁰: in this case, we would have to assume that Photius read a huge amount of books in his twenties and thirties (or even much more than what is in the *Library*, since it supposedly contains only the books whose reading sessions his brother Tarasius missed). If this opinion were correct, the reading of the books and the compilation of the reading notes would be very close in time to the raging of the iconoclastic storm and Photius's obsessive focus on the dogmatic roots of a long-dead heresy would require less explanation. I will not go into detail here about the date of the *Library*. However, the prefatory letter of the *Library* which claims that Photius was about to set out on a legation "to the Assyrians" when he wrote the work, has a metaphorical meaning¹¹, so it is not necessary to identify a historically fulfilled diplomatic mission in which Photius is supposed to be involved. Halkin's argument (ch. 252 of the *Library* describes a hagiographical text based on John Hymmonides's *Life of Gregory*, written between 873 and 876) cannot be dismissed so easily¹². Moreover, relating the compilation, rescue and reordering of the *schedē/schedaria* that make up the *Library* (most likely, without the author's final supervision) to the troubled events of the deposition, the anti-Photian council and the subsequent resistance of Photius and his acolytes in a hostile environment better explains the chaotic form of the work and its inconsistencies.

⁸ A very early date of composition of the *Library* is assumed by P. LEMERLE, *Le premier humanisme byzantin*. Paris 1971, 37–42 and 179–180 (around 838) and TREADGOLD, *Photius Before His Patriarchate* 11 (around 845).

⁹ A brief survey of the problem is in L. CANFORA, «Thesaurus insignis, non liber», in: Fozio. Biblioteca, ed. N. Bianchi – C. Schiano. Pisa 2019, XI–LXIV.

¹⁰ C.M. MAZZUCCHI, *Restauro e interpretazione dell'epistola a Tarasio*. *Aevum* 95 (2021) 441–464. The scholar falls back on a (clearly later and by no means explicit) source, known since Cardinal Hergenröther's studies, in order to prove the plausibility of Photius as ambassador to the Arabs around 845/846.

¹¹ L. CANFORA, *Libri e biblioteche*, in: *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*. 2: *La ricezione e l'attualizzazione del testo*, dir. G. Cambiano – L. Canfora – D. Lanza. Roma 1995, 11–93: 31–43; IDEM, *Τελετή, non τελευτή*, in: *Poesia e religione in Grecia*. Studi in onore di G. Aurelio Privitera, ed. M. Cannatà Fera – S. Grandolini. Napoli 2000, 137–140: 139; F. RONCONI, *The Patriarch and the Assyrians: New Evidence for the Date of Photios' Library*. *Segno e testo* 11 (2013) 387–395; IDEM, *Pour la datation de la Bibliothèque de Photius: la Myriobiblos, le patriarche et Rome*, in: *Byzanz und das Abendland II*. *Studia Byzantino-Occidentalia*, ed. E. Juhász. Budapest 2014, 135–153; CANFORA, «Thesaurus insignis, non liber» XXX–XLI. Cf. also M. LOSACCO, *Photius, la Bibliothèque, et au-delà: l'état de la recherche, l'usage des classiques et les préfaces du corpus*, in: *Autour du Premier humanisme byzantin et des Cinq études sur le XI^e siècle*. Quarante ans après Paul Lemerle, ed. B. Flusin – J.-C. Cheynet. Paris 2017, 235–308: 260–261; and the contribution by F. Ronconi in this volume (*The Library and the Mystagogia*. Genetic pathways compared, §1.1). Canfora and Ronconi apparently disagree on the identification of the hidden reference for the "ambassade to the Assyrians" (*4Kgs* 18–19 and *Ps* 79, according to Christian exegesis; or *Hos* 5, 13 and 7, 11), but every reader of Byzantine texts knows how many levels of interpretation can be assumed in the case of enigmatic references to Holy Scripture, i.e., how many different biblical contexts can arise simultaneously in the mind of an author.

¹² F. HALKIN, *La date de composition de la "Bibliothèque" de Photius remise en question*. *AnBoll* 81 (1963) 414–417; cf. also V. MARAGLINO, *Reconsidering the Date of Photius' Bibliotheca: the Biographical Tradition of Gregory the Great in Chapter 252*. *Ancient Society* 37 (2007) 265–278. A different opinion is held by B. HEMMERDINGER, *Le «codex» 252 de la Bibliothèque de Photius*. *BZ* 58 (1965) 1–2: he believes that a lost Greek *Vita* was the source both for *BHG* 721 (which was read and described by Photius) and for John Hymmonides' *Life*; cf. also MAZZUCCHI, *Restauro e interpretazione* 452–453. This opinion, which is of course not unreasonable, must assume as real two things that supposedly no longer exist today: a comprehensive Greek *Vita* and its Latin translation, allegedly compiled by Anastasius the Librarian and used by John Hymmonides.

GHOSTS IN THE LIBRARY

The first example to be examined is found in a pagan text. Most of ch. 242 (Damascius's *Life of Isidore*) consists of extracts that often prevent the reconstruction of a linear narrative sequence; many of them are so short and out of context, and sometimes even filled with incomplete sentences, that understanding the sequence of events is often made difficult, even though the main manuscript, Marc. Gr. Z 450 [Diktyon 69921], presents the text as an uninterrupted and coherent narrative. Treadgold argues that this is because "these selections were chosen not for their content but for their style"¹³. I strongly doubt that this is true of most of them: many references, such as that to Ptolemy as "the best guide in the astronomical sciences"¹⁴, should be explained in the light of the interests (e.g. scientific) that were cultivated in Photius's circle. The prevalence (not exclusivity) of a stylistic interest can only be assumed for the last part of the chapter, where Photius himself claims to apply such a selective criterion to the extracts gathered there¹⁵. While claiming that there is no absolute demarcation between "Sachexzerpte" and "Stilexzerpte", Tomas Hägg suggests as a difference that stylistic excerpts are not reproduced in coherent paragraphs because the excerptor makes no effort to connect them¹⁶. To be fair, this also applies to a considerable part of the "Sachexzerpte" in ch. 242, where Photius is more interested in some other topics that we still need to identify than in the narrative flow.

The following sentence may be considered for our purpose.

ὁ τοίνυν τεθνηκώς, ὁ εὐτυχῆς οὗτος νῦν, ἡ ψυχὴ φημί καὶ τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς εἶδωλον, παρέστη μοι ἀναφανδὸν ἐπὶ τοῦδε τοῦ σκίμποδος ἀνακειμένῳ¹⁷.

This one who is now blessed, the dead man, suddenly appeared to me (I mean his soul and the image of his soul) while I was lying on this little bed.

The connection with what precedes and follows is very loose, although Athanassiadi boldly tries to figure out some coherence in this text and implies that the dead man should be Proclus, who is assumed to be alluded to as "the leading sage" in the following statement¹⁸. It is almost impossible to determine this: even if we can trust Photius to have largely maintained the order of the original text—especially in the series of extracts chosen for their content—nothing can ensure that the scattered sentences come from coherent contexts¹⁹.

Why then did Photius (or one of his associates in the *Lesekreis*) select this statement if he was not even interested in understanding or reporting *who* the dead man was? The only specifics Photius wanted to salvage from the original text are these two: the fact that the man, however dead, is *now* in a state of bliss (εὐτυχῆς) transformed into a kind of pagan holiness, and the fact that the image of the deceased appears to the speaker as visible and real, not just like a deceptive dream, as

¹³ W.T. TREADGOLD, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca of Photius*. Washington D.C. 1980, 43.

¹⁴ Photius, *Bibl.* 242, 345b = Damascius, *Vita Isid.* fr. 97G (ed. P. ATHANASSIADI, *Damascius. The Philosophical History*. Athens 1999, 236) = fr. Epitoma 145 (ed. C. ZINTZEN, *Damascii Vitae Isidori reliquiae*. Hildesheim 1967, 198).

¹⁵ Photius, *Bibl.* 242, 349b–353a ("omitted expressions which, because of their stylistic beauty, must be filed together with the excerpts"). This arrangement is similar to other chapters, such as ch. 241 (Apollonius of Tyana), on which cf. Th. HÄGG, *Photius at Work: Evidence from the Text of the Bibliotheca*. *GRBS* 14 (1973) 213–222. On the different treatment of "Sachexzerpte" and "Stilexzerpte" in ch. 241, cf. also IDEM, *Photios als Vermittler antiker Literatur. Untersuchungen zur Technik des Referierens und Exzerprierens in der Bibliothek*. Uppsala 1975, 24–39 and *passim*.

¹⁶ HÄGG, *Photios als Vermittler* 39.

¹⁷ Photius, *Bibl.* 242, 346a = Damascius, *Vita Isid.* fr. 98A (238 ATHANASSIADI) = fr. Epitoma 148 (202 ZINTZEN).

¹⁸ ATHANASSIADI, *Damascius* 239–241. The identification is suggested even more clearly by ZINTZEN, *Damascii Vitae Isidori Reliquiae* 202 *in apparatus*.

¹⁹ ATHANASSIADI, *Damascius* 66, admits that the editor who wants to reconstruct Damascius's original text should be bolder and take the opportunity to emancipate himself from the "chain" of Photius's textual order.

the position of the speaker lying on a bed may suggest²⁰. It is also relevant that the preceding statement in Photius's text speaks of the "wasting away of the body" (τὴν τοῦ σώματος ἀπορροήν) of someone, perhaps the "young man" for whom Proclus fears. The consistency of the visible body, living or dead, seems to be an important concern for the collector of these seemingly unrelated text fragments.

In the same collection of extracts there is also a brief reference to the battle of the Catalaunian Plains, which took place in 451 AD between the Romans and the Huns²¹: again, it is not clear why this should be significant in the life of Isidore, but it is the occasion for Damascius to report and for Photius to record that when the combatants fell, their bodies were dismissed and their souls continued to stand and fight with the opponents, who still had both bodies and souls; and Damascius and Photius recount many other circumstances in which similar battles took place with "shadowy apparitions of souls floating about in the air" (ἐν ἀέρι διαφοιτῶντα ψυχῶν ἅττα σκιοειδῆ φαντάσματα)²²:

ἐπειδὴ πεπτώκασιν οἱ μαχόμενοι τοῖς σώμασιν ἀπειπόντες ἔτι ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἴσταντο πολεμοῦντες ἐπὶ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ὅλας καὶ νύκτας, οὐδὲν τῶν ζώντων εἰς ἀγῶνα ἀπολειπόμενοι, οὔτε κατὰ χεῖρας οὔτε κατὰ θυμόν. [...] Καὶ ἀρχαῖα δὲ ἄλλα τοιαῦτα φάσματα πολέμων μέχρι νῦν φαίνεσθαι φησι, πλὴν ὅτι ταῦτα τὰ μὲν ἄλλα, ὅσα ζῶντες ἄνθρωποι κατὰ πόλεμον δρῶσιν, οὐδὲν ὑστερεῖν, φθέγγεσθαι δὲ οὐκ ἐπὶ μικρόν²³.

While the bodies of the combatants had failed when they fell, they continued to fight with their souls for three days and nights, lacking neither physical strength nor bravery in comparison with the living. [...] Several of these ancient war phantoms have been experienced down to modern times, and apart from being mute, these dead fighters behaved exactly as living men do in battle.

Such accounts may be dismissed as mere paradoxography—and it is well known that paradoxography is a very persistent interest in Photius's *Library*—but I would argue that it is not just that.

Similar considerations have been made for the patriarch's approach to Greek novels, such as Heliodorus's *Aethiopica*, where Photius seems to consider "not narrative structure or dramatic spectacle but raw story-material", i.e. "historical and paradoxographical material" such as necromancy²⁴. On the Christian side, the lives of the saints allow analogous conclusions: they are usually scrutinized in the *Library* primarily for their historical setting or for their portrayal of the martyr-

²⁰ The immediately preceding context within Photius's excerpts is about a dream: in this case, the dreamer is Proclus himself, while the actor of the dream is his disciple Marinus, so that the dream clearly has a prophetic meaning.

²¹ The clash between the weakening Christian empire and the violent barbarian troops, perceived by contemporaries as epoch-making, gave rise to many legends in which saints, bishops and intrepid virgins play the leading roles: cf. S. MACDOWALL, *Catalaunian Fields AD 451. Rome's last great battle*. Oxford 2015, 43–47.

²² The reference to Plato, *Phaedo* 81d (ὥφθη ἅττα ψυχῶν σκιοειδῆ φαντάσματα, οἷα παρέχονται αἱ τοιαῦται ψυχαὶ εἰδῶλα, "shadowy phantoms, images produced by such souls, were seen") is definitely no coincidence: Plato's *phantasmata* show up near graves and tombs because they were too bound to material bodies in life and are unable to completely detach themselves after death; Damascius's (and Photius's) phantoms are said to "roam in the air" but continue to do what they did in life, namely fight.

²³ Photius, *Bibl.* 242, 339b = Damascius, *Vita Isid.* fr. 50 (142 ATHANASSIADI) = fr. Epitoma 63 (92 ZINTZEN). Phantom battles are a fairly common type of miracle story: more often, however, they are repetitions of battles fought in the distant past (such as that on the plain of Marathon, 490 BC, where every night "neighing horses and fighting men are heard", as recounted by Pausanias I 32, 4) or even portents of battles to come (such as in Augustine, *Civ.* II 25). What is special about the story Damascius tells here is the simultaneity of the battle between the living and the dead.

²⁴ P.A. AGAPITOS, *Narrative, Rhetoric, and 'Drama' Rediscovered: Scholars and Poets in Byzantium Interpret Heliodorus*, in: *Studies in Heliodorus*, ed. R. Hunter. Cambridge 1998, 125–156: 131–132. On crucifixions, apparent deaths and resurrections in the novels summarized by Photius, cf. also N. BIANCHI, *Cross and Crucifixion in Iamblichus' Novel*, in: *Death, Sanctity and the Cross. Crucified Saints in Image and Text*, ed. B. Crostini – A.J. Lappin. Roma 2022, 107–122: 118–120.

dom of exemplary witnesses to the faith²⁵, but sometimes other objectives are pursued. In the seventh-century *Life of St John Chrysostom* by George of Alexandria, for example, the episode of the appearance of the apostle Paul dictating to the unsuspecting saint the commentary on his own letters is mentioned among the political themes that moved Chrysostom's life²⁶. It cannot be argued that Photius devotes much space to this episode in the overall balance of his summary of the *Life*, but it is relevant that while ch. 27 of the *Life* of George inserts the matter into the account of John's intercession with the emperor on behalf of a high official who had been slandered and stripped of his dignity²⁷, Photius omits this much more realistic and historically significant detail and concentrates on the miraculous appearance of the apostle. It should not be overlooked that the story establishes a close connection between the icon of Paul that Chrysostom addresses in his conversation and the image of the apostle that Proclus (but not Chrysostom himself) sees behind the bishop²⁸: a clear indication of the icon's function as mediator between matter and spirit.

In the *Life of Gregory the Great*, the Pope notices at the banquet a thirteenth guest whom no one but he can see and whose appearance "is not only different from the others, but constantly changes in an astonishing way", and he turns out to be an angel sent by God to protect him²⁹: this account takes up most of the chapter³⁰. In the *Life of Metrophanes and Alexander*, the daughter of bishop Spyridon, Irene, who died a virgin, speaks out from her tomb and reveals where she has hidden a treasure entrusted to her³¹. In the detailed summary of the book of the monk Job, Photius recalls a biblical passage (*Jos* 5, 13) in which Joshua sees a man armed with a spear, understands that he is a supernatural being ("one of the intelligible spirits") and asks whether he is an angel or a demon³².

Moreover, in some chapters the theme of relics and their miraculous effect on reality is hinted at: reading two different authors, Asterius and Eulogius, Photius comes across the episode of the dead man who was thrown on the tomb of Elisha and was revived solely by contact with the bones of the prophet (*2Kgs* 13, 21)³³. The martyr Demetrius, whose *Life and martyrdom* is reported in ch. 255, was hastily buried, but miracles and healings kept gushing out of his tomb³⁴. In the *Mysta-*

²⁵ Th. HÄGG, Photius as a Reader of Hagiography: Selection and Criticism. *DOP* 53 (1999) 43–58.

²⁶ Photius, *Bibl.* 96, 80b.

²⁷ George of Alexandria, *Vita Chrys.* 27 (ed. F. HALKIN, Douze récits byzantins sur saint Jean Chrysostome. Bruxelles 1977, 142–148).

²⁸ Cf. M.M. MITCHELL, The Archetypal Image: John Chrysostom's Portraits of Paul. *The Journal of Religion* 75 (1995) 15–43; P. HOLLOWAY, Portrait and Presence: a Note on the visio Procli (George of Alexandria, *Vita Chrysostomi* 27). *BZ* 100 (2007) 71–83. In the midst of iconoclasm, John of Damascus, *Or. de imag.* I 61, II 57, III 54 (ed. B. KOTTER, Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos. Berlin 1975, III 161–162) cites the *visio Procli* from the hagiographical text of George of Alexandria as evidence of the antiquity of image worship; further citations in Nicephorus, *Ref.* 99 (ed. J.M. FEATHERSTONE, Nicephori patriarchae Constantinopolitani Refutatio et eversio definitionis synodalis anni 815. Turnhout – Leuven 1997, 180), and in the *Doctrina Patrum* (ed. F. DIEKAMP, *Doctrina Patrum de Incarnatione Verbi*. Münster 1907, 330). A renowned iconographic tradition spread the fame of the *visio Procli*.

²⁹ Photius, *Bibl.* 252, 466b–467b.

³⁰ Photius's chapter actually focuses only on two edifying episodes about the angel disguised as a beggar, precisely because the Greek *Vita*, which the patriarch summarizes here, contains only these two episodes: cf. V. MARAGLINO, Un bios greco anonimo di Gregorio Magno (*BHG* 720–721). *Vetera Christianorum* 59 (2022) 141–155. It is significant, however, that "even a *Life* without much historical information could interest Photius" (HÄGG, Photius as a Reader 52).

³¹ Photius, *Bibl.* 256, 471a–b (cf. F. WINKELMANN, *Vita Metrophanis et Alexandri BHG* 1279. *AnBoll* 100 [1982], 147–183: 166–167). The episode is also narrated by Socrates Scholasticus I 12, Rufinus, *Hist. eccl.* X 5 and Sozomenus I 11, 4. While in the hagiographical account of the *Life of Metrophanes and Alexander* only Irene's voice is heard from her grave, Socrates says that the virgin "rises again, appears to her father" and then "passes away again" because the old Spyridon had prayed to God "to show him in advance the promised resurrection".

³² Photius, *Bibl.* 222, 199b.

³³ Photius, *Bibl.* 271, 503a; 280, 544a. In the latter context, the name of the prophet Elisha is not mentioned; Eulogius (and through him Photius) recalls the episode to explain that "there is an inherent power in the bones of the saints".

³⁴ Photius, *Bibl.* 255, 469b. On the particular condition of the body of the civic martyr Demetrius, cf. J.C. SKEDROS, Saint Demetrios of Thessaloniki. Civic Patron and Divine Protector 4th – 7th Centuries CE. Harrisburg 1999, 85–104: there is no

gogy, Photius alludes to Gregory the Great's *Dialogues*, in which he catches Gregory asking whether "the energies of miracles are to be found in a part of the relics of the saints or in their whole bodies"³⁵; and the pope's answer is that where there are not the bodies but only some relics of the saints, the miracles shine forth in greater splendour and marvellousness, so that even the weakest people should not doubt the efficacious presence of the saints.

What aroused Photius's interest in dealing with ghostly apparitions and with the miraculous properties of the saints' relics? The crucial point seems to be the status of the body and soul after death but before resurrection; or, in other words, how the soul, if disembodied, can still be active. This is a purely philosophical problem, if a strict Aristotelian (which Photius is not) were to maintain that the soul, which is the first act of the body, should not exist without the body, except for God, who is pure actuality that transcends matter. Hylomorphism was something that Christian eschatology had to deal with.

ORIGENIST-LIKE DOUBTS ABOUT THE FLESHLY RESURRECTION

In Christian theology, the subject has been vigorously debated, especially since Origen was confronted with the problem of the nature of the resurrected body, i.e. what distinguishes it from the living body: if the resurrected body of Christ has qualities beyond the capabilities of the flesh, since it can pass through closed doors, is its substance to be considered different and pertaining to another body, not the same one that is dead?³⁶ The controversy over Origenism shines through in many passages of the *Library* and in other works by Photius: the anonymous author of an *Apology for Origen* shared the idea that "souls assume different bodies", as Photius contemptuously notes³⁷; Theognostus of Alexandria is said to "fantasize, like Origen, about angels and demons" and to rail against the circumscription of Christ³⁸; the first of a group of wide chapters summarizing the works of Methodius of Olympus deals with Methodius's polemic against Origen concerning the resurrection and Origen's conception of the resurrected body³⁹, but the following chapters also contain controversial points against the Alexandrian theologian, for example, on the relationship between God and matter, i.e. whether God can be circumscribed⁴⁰.

Photius devotes a great deal of space to the discussion triggered by the publication of John Philoponus's *On the Resurrection* in the last decades of the sixth century: it is one of the last works of the Aristotelian commentator, perhaps even his last, and sparked a fierce confrontation within the

evidence of the saint's relics scattered throughout the Byzantine Empire available for veneration, but a very strong popular belief is that his body lies under the ciborium of his church in Thessalonica. Demetrius was world famous for his relics' nursing manna, although Photius does not mention this detail, which was probably a later tradition.

³⁵ Photius, *Myst.* 84. On the overlap between *Bibl.* 252 and *Myst.* 84, cf. also Ronconi in this volume (§ III).

³⁶ I am not referring only to what Origen actually said or wrote—a subject that scholars have debated fiercely, especially in the field of eschatology, and it may even be questionable to claim that Origen expressed a clear idea on the issue (cf. M. SIMONETTI, Alcune osservazioni sull'interpretazione origeniana di Genesi 2,7 e 3,21. *Aevum* 36 [1962], 370–381)—but also and above all to what later came to be defined as Origenism, a magmatic pile of theses more or less loosely associated with Origen and ranging from the fourth to the sixth century: cf. A.-J. FESTUGIÈRE, De la doctrine "origéniste" du corps glorieux sphéroïde. *Revue des Sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 43 (1959) 81–86; G. DORIVAL, Origène et la résurrection de la chair, in: *Origeniana Quarta*, ed. L. Lies. Innsbruck – Wien 1987, 291–321; A. SCOTT, Origen and the Life of the Stars. A History of an Idea. Oxford 1991, 150–164; B.E. DALEY, What did "Origenism" mean in the sixth century? in: *Origeniana Sexta. Origène et la Bible*, ed. G. Dorival – A. Le Boulluec. Leuven 1995, 627–638.

³⁷ Photius, *Bibl.* 117, 91b.

³⁸ Photius, *Bibl.* 106, 87a. On Theognostus and Origen, cf. E. PRINZIVALLI, Magister Ecclesiae. Il dibattito su Origene fra III e IV secolo. Roma 2002, 50–57; EADEM, Le metamorfosi della scuola alessandrina da Eracla a Didimo, in: *Origeniana Octava. Origen and the Alexandrian Tradition*, ed. L. Perrone. Leuven 2003, II 911–937: 925–931.

³⁹ Photius, *Bibl.* 234, 293a–301b.

⁴⁰ Photius, *Bibl.* 236, 305a.

Egyptian Monophysite Church, between the Cononites and the Philoponians⁴¹. A short series of excerpts from the refutation of Philoponus's *On the Resurrection*, written by his opponents, Conon of Tarsus and Eugenius of Seleucia, was most likely collected by Photius himself (or by his *Lesekreis*) and for some reason escaped the attention of those who collected materials for the *Library* in Marc. Gr. Z 450⁴². Philoponus seems to take up the problems raised by Origen and rethink them from a logical-philosophical point of view: if the definition of man is “a rational and mortal animal”⁴³ and “rational” and “mortal” are to be regarded as inseparable qualities, then when man is resurrected and his body is deprived of its mortality, he loses one of his “inseparable qualities” and his resulting substance becomes strictly, or rather numerically, different⁴⁴.

Another, rather extensive and rather curious chapter goes back to the same set of questions: the author under study here is the otherwise unknown “Tritheist” Stephen Gobar, whose intellectual profile places him among the Philoponians⁴⁵. His work is a collection of *sic et non*⁴⁶, of opposing theses on more than fifty topics: Origenist and Philoponian themes, especially on the resurrection body and many other eschatological issues, are recognizable.

Echoes and overlaps on these themes can also be detected between the *Library*, the *Amphilochia* and the *Mystagogy*: as Filippo Ronconi has shown⁴⁷, the latter works underwent the same genetic process as the *Library*, namely the accumulation and conflation of *schedaria*, and it therefore stands to reason that the same doctrinal or cultural issues prompted Photius, on the one hand, to collect reading notes from the books he had read and, on the other hand, to outline philosophical and/or theological attempts to solve the problems he faced, mainly for pedagogical reasons⁴⁸. In *Genesis* 3, 21, for example, we read that Adam and Eve were provided with “garments of skin” after the Fall. According to one common interpretation, these garments were their perishable bodies that were recreated once sin caused the loss of immortality and incorruption. But if this is true—asks Photius in the *Amphilochia*—does this mean that Adam and Eve did not have fleshly bodies before, but immaterial or spiritual ones? The patriarch warns that such claims could be voiced by “Origen and the chorus of Origenists”:

ἀπλῶς ἡ τῶν ὄντων δημιουργία πᾶσα καὶ πρόοδος καὶ τὸ τῆς θείας κηδεμονίας περὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον φιλόανθρωπόν τε καὶ θαυμάσιον, καὶ τὰς κατὰ διαδοχὴν δὲ τῆς γενέσεως ἀρχὰς εἰς

⁴¹ The names of the two opposing sides are mentioned by Timothy of Constantinople, *Rec. haer.* III 10–11 (PG 86A, 60–64). This controversy is the focus of chs. 21, 22, 23, 24; further discussions for and against Philoponus's theology are found in chs. 38, 43, 50, 55, 75, 215, 240.

⁴² In addition to the well-known case of the fragments of Philostorgius in the ms. Oxon. Barocc. 142 [Diktyon 47429], ff. 243–261, other extravagant materials pertaining to the *Library* have been identified in recent years: cf. A. CORCELLA, Nuovi frammenti della Biblioteca storica di Diodoro Siculo. *Quaderni di storia* 89 (2019) 147–203; C. SCHIANO, Artemidoro sul Nilo (fr. 90 Stiehle): falsificazione umanistica o prodotto dell'officina di Fozio? *Byz* 90 (2020) 271–308. Cf. also Ronconi in this volume (§ I.3). The only available information on the still unpublished Greek extracts from the Cononite confutation against Philoponus, scanty as it may be, can be found in J. PARAMELLE, Christianisme byzantin. *École pratique des hautes études. V^e section. Sciences religieuses. Annuaire* 91 (1982–1983) 407–415: 408–410: I am going to publish the extracts together with a thorough reconstruction of their textual transmission and the historical and theological context of the controversy. A completely independent set of extracts, probably from the same work of Conon and Eugenius and translated into Syriac, is described by VAN ROEY, *Un traité cononite*.

⁴³ Cf. Porphyry, *Isag.* 10–11 (ed. A. BUSSE, Porphyrii Isagoge et in Aristotelis Categorias commentarium [CAG IV/1]. Bero- lini 1887).

⁴⁴ VAN ROEY, *Un traité cononite* 136.

⁴⁵ Cf. C. SCHIANO, Stefano Gobar e la controversia sul corpo risorto nella Bibliotheca di Fozio. *Rivista di storia del cristianesimo* 13 (2016) 89–106.

⁴⁶ Cf. A. VON HARNACK, The “Sic et Non” of Stephanus Gobarus. *Harvard Theological Review* 16 (1923) 205–234.

⁴⁷ F. RONCONI, The *Library* and the *Mystagogy*. Genetic pathways compared, in this volume (exp. § I.6).

⁴⁸ An intertextual reading of the *Library* and the *Amphilochia* can offer numerous insights: cf. e.g. T. BRACCINI, Fozio e Giobio. *Rivista di storia del cristianesimo* 13 (2016) 73–87, who starts from ch. 222 of the *Library* (the monk Job) and goes through several of the *Quaestiones ad Amphilochium*.

νοητὴν τινα σκητὴν ἀναφέροντες οὐδὲ τὴν ἰδίαν ὑπαρξιν καὶ οὐσίωσιν ὥφθησαν εὐλαβούμενοι⁴⁹.

The whole creation and production of beings and the wonderous and benign solicitude of God for mankind do not seem to preserve their inner essence and reality since the very initial act of creating the world is transformed into a kind of intellectual set-up.

Photius meets with the same problem when he scrutinizes Stephen Gobar and Methodius in the *Library*⁵⁰.

Another doubt that troubles Photius is why the first chapters of *Genesis* describe the creation of the material world, but not a single word is said about intelligible beings. A chapter in the *Amphilochia* is devoted to this issue, which resurfaces when Photius leafs through the extensive work of the monk Job⁵¹. In addition, Philoponus deals with this subject in the *Commentary on the Hexaemeron*, which Photius explores in two chapters of the *Library*: Philoponus says that the angels were created before the material world and proves this by the fact that “the angels are not bodies, nor are they connected with a body as an instrument, as is our soul”; and other considerations of this kind deal with the connection between the human soul and body⁵². At the beginning of *Amph.* 79, Photius says that “in some other writings of mine an answer to this problem may be found, which lacks neither accuracy nor efficacy”, but this “other writing” is apparently no longer available⁵³, at least not among the works that have come down to us. We can be sure, however, that Photius continued to reflect, to collect testimonies from the Church Fathers and to write on a subject that was very close to his heart.

THE CULT OF THE SAINTS AT STAKE: THE IMPACT OF ICONOCLASM

Another passage is necessary to understand why the connection between soul and material body after death was so crucial in this context. From the third century AD at the latest, the opinion began

⁴⁹ Photius, *Amph.* 70 (ed. L.G. WESTERINK, Photius. *Epistulae et Amphilochia*. Leipzig 1986, V 68–71). The chapter is analysed by P. TZAMALIKOS, *The Real Cassian Revised*. Monastic Life, Greek Paideia, and Origenism in the Sixth Century. Leiden – Boston 2012, 294–296, who takes pains to clarify that the orthodox thesis that Photius attributes to Gregory of Nazianzus against Origen was in fact Origen’s thesis. Photius misunderstanding Origen is only the latest in a long line. On Tzamalikos’s wishful reconstruction of the intellectual profile of the Greek Cassian, one should read the balanced assessments of R. ALCIATI, *Il Cassiano greco di Panayiotis Tzamalikos*. *Rivista di storia del cristianesimo* 11 (2014) 451–478, and the sharper remarks by C. STEWART, *Another Cassian?*. *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 66 (2015) 372–376. Just a brief comment on the hypothesis of TZAMALIKOS, *The Real Cassian Revised* 21; 80 n. 132; 192; 318, and IDEM, *A Newly Discovered Greek Father. Cassian the Sabaite Eclipsed by John Cassian of Marseilles*. Leiden – Boston 2012, 230; 241; 372; 407; 481; 485 n. 238; 567–568; 587; 603–606, that the author of most of the *Amphilochia* chapters is not Photius but the Sabaite monk Cassian whom he purports to identify. Apart from the inherent fragility of a hypothesis based merely (or mostly) on stylistic analogies, the *Amphilochia* show clear traces of Photius’s method of working with extracts from other authors to construct his own argument (e.g. in *Amph.* 70 Theodoretus is used but not mentioned). Therefore, the fact that occasionally the style of another author is echoed in these pages is not at all unexpected and certainly no proof that their author is not Photius.

⁵⁰ Photius, *Bibl.* 232, 288a; 234, 293b.

⁵¹ Photius, *Amph.* 79, V 108–109 (WESTERINK); *Bibl.* 222, 187b–188b. In *Amph.* 79, Photius remarks that the knowledge of the creation of intelligible beings, which precedes the creation of the sensible world, was useless to men, and Moses omitted to mention it because the Jews, who had just been freed from slavery in Egypt, were not prepared to understand it.

⁵² Photius, *Bibl.* 240, 323b (cf. John Philoponus, *Opif.* I 8–9). At the end of ch. 240, Philoponus (Photius) raises the issue of the pre-existence of souls.

⁵³ While Westerink admits that the text to which Photius alludes here cannot be found (“non exstat”), he mentions a passage in *Amph.* 6 (ed. L.G. WESTERINK, Photius. *Epistulae et Amphilochia*. Leipzig 1986, IV 37: “it is by no means surprising that Moses, who saw God, did not tell of the creation of the incorporeal powers because of the coarseness and weakness of his audience, and therefore did not describe the supersensible kingdom of heaven to the masses, who live more with their senses than with their intellect”), which, however, does not match the reference in *Amph.* 79.

to circulate that the soul enters a state of sleep or suspension after death. Towards the end of Philip the Arab's reign, a local synod was convened in Arabia to oppose those who believed that the soul dies and corrupts along with the body and is resurrected at the end of time, and Origen attended this synod to convince these Christians that their belief was false⁵⁴. Their teaching spread, especially in Syria and among the Nestorians, and was a lasting success. Aphrahat says that when a man dies, his soul is buried with the body and loses its ability to perceive sensations, while his heavenly spirit returns to the presence of Christ⁵⁵.

These ideas were undoubtedly a cause for concern, especially because of their implications for the cult of the saints: asking the saints to intercede with God becomes a futile endeavour if their souls are not active but sleeping in anticipation of the final resurrection. Photius is very intrigued by the work of the priest Eustratius of Constantinople⁵⁶ (a disciple of the patriarch Eutychius, who had argued with Gregory the Great, then Roman apocrisarius in Constantinople, about the consistency of the resurrected body, which Eutychius claimed was "subtler than air" and intangible). There is debate among scholars about the reliability of John of Ephesus's claim⁵⁷ that Eutychius was influenced by the contemporary controversy sparked by Philoponus's *On the Resurrection*, but the convergence of themes is undeniable, whether the relationship is direct or not⁵⁸. Eustratius's work aims to defend his master against the charge of heresy and advocates three truths of faith: that disembodied souls are active immediately after the death of man; that these souls can become visible and show themselves to the living through their own ability; that prayers and offerings to the dead are effective in obtaining remission of sins. Photius praises this work as "arguments not to be despised" and selects a single episode: that of the spirit of the Apostle Paul's teacher, Gamaliel, visiting the priest Lucian of Jerusalem and asking him to look after his relics and those of some others, including those of the protomartyr Stephen. Averil Cameron recalled the imperial policy of the late sixth century (exp. Justin II's), which focused on the cult of relics and saints against those who rejected them⁵⁹: Eustratius's work fits perfectly into this context.

⁵⁴ Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* VI 37; cf. Augustine, *De haer.* 83.

⁵⁵ Aphrahat, *Demonstr.* VI 14 (ed. J. PARISOT, *Patrologia Syriaca*. Parisiis 1894, I/1 293). Cf. F. GAVIN, The sleep of the soul in the early Syriac Church. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 40 (1920) 103–120; A. SAMELLAS, Death in the Eastern Mediterranean (50–600 A.D.). Tübingen 2002, 55–57; M. DAL SANTO, Debating the Saints' Cult in the Age of Gregory the Great. Oxford 2012, 237–320. Another synod was convened in Syria (about 580) to condemn the error of those who believed that the soul was mortal (*Hist. Nestor.* 35, PO VII/2 191). Moreover, Photius, *Bibl.* 230, 285b–286a, recalls that Patriarch Eulogius called a council in 589 against the teachings of the Dositheans, who maintained that "the soul is mortal and the world immortal". At a synod in May 790, the Nestorian patriarch of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, Timothy I, condemned those theologians who claimed that the soul retains sentence after death. Through Nestorianism, the doctrine of hypnopsychism found its way into the Islamic world (cf. S. RASSI, Christian Thought in the Medieval Islamic World. 'Abdīshō' of Nisibis and the Apologetic Tradition. Oxford 2022, 213–215).

⁵⁶ Photius, *Bibl.* 171, 117b–118b. On Eustratius's *On the State of Souls after Death* (ed. P. VAN DEUN [CCSG 60], Turnhout – Leuven 2006), cf. N. CONSTAS, An Apology for the Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity: Eustratius Presbyter of Constantinople 'On the State of Souls after Death' (CPG 7522). *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 10 (2002) 267–285; DAL SANTO, Debating the Saints' Cult.

⁵⁷ John of Ephesus, *Hist. eccl.* II 51 (ed. E.W. BROOKS, *Iohannis Ephesini Historiae Ecclesiasticae pars tertia* [CSCO, Script. Syr. 55]. Lovanii 1935, 117; Eng. transl. R. PAYNE SMITH, The Third Part of the Ecclesiastical History of John Bishop of Ephesus. Oxford 1860, 149).

⁵⁸ Y.-M. DUVAL, La discussion entre l'apocrisiaire Grégoire et le patriarche Eutychios au sujet de la résurrection de la chair. L'arrière-plan doctrinal oriental et occidental, in: Grégoire le Grand, publ. par J. Fontaine – R. Gillet – S. Pellistrandi. Paris 1986, 347–366; E. PRINZIVALLI, La polemica antieretica di Gregorio in merito al destino ultimo dell'uomo, in: Gregorio Magno e l'eresia tra memoria e testimonianza, ed. A. Isola. Firenze 2009, 117–130: 122–123; DAL SANTO, Debating the Saints' Cult 27–34.

⁵⁹ AV. CAMERON, The Early Religious Policies of Justin II, in: The Orthodox Churches and the West, ed. D. Baker. Oxford 1976, 51–67: 65–66; EADEM, Images of Authority: Elites and Icons in Late Sixth-Century Byzantium. *Past & Present* 84 (1979) 3–35; cf. also M. DAL SANTO, Imperial Power and Its Subversion in Eustratius of Constantinople's Life and Martyrdom of Golinduch (c. 602). *Byz* 81 (2011) 138–176.

Photius's obsession with such themes is explained by their interference with iconoclastic doctrines. According to iconoclastic principles, the depiction of Christ's face emphasizes His human nature and weakens or even abolishes the divine one. Moreover, since the icon is made of perishable matter, it refers to His material, perishable body and can only inadequately represent the incorruptible, glorious body with which He is to be clothed after the resurrection, for the *Definition* of 754 states that Christ shall be seated with the Father and come to judge the living and the dead, not in the flesh, not without a body, but with a more God-like body (θεοειδεστέρου σώματος)⁶⁰. Emperor Constantine V accused iconophiles of circumscribing in physical space a body that can pass through closed doors⁶¹. In the case of images of saints, i.e. images of people who have not yet been resurrected but are supposed to be, the matter is even more complicated and unfortunately difficult to judge because of the desperate lack of evidence due to the *damnatio memoriae* of the iconoclasts after 842. To be fair, the front of the iconoclasts cannot be described as unified and in perfect harmony: it is true that the decrees of the Council of Hieria condemned those who questioned the cult of the saints⁶², but recent studies have made it clear that a compromise was reached after discussions between the more radical and the more moderate factions. However, the ambiguities and inconsistencies of iconoclastic teachings on the cult of saints and the difficult balance between different traditions and sensibilities, as well as the general devastation of most of the iconoclastic literature, make it difficult for us to understand what the iconoclasts actually thought about the veneration of saints as mediators⁶³.

In a passage of his *Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, John of Damascus attacks those who invoke the commandment of *Numbers* 19, 11 not to touch the dead bodies because they are unclean, and therefore refuse to venerate the relics⁶⁴. John replies that the saints are not dead because Christ has abolished death, they have only “fallen asleep in hope of the resurrection and in faith in Christ”; if they were dead—he consequently asks—how could they perform miracles? Of course, John supports the thesis of the efficacy of prayers addressed to the icons of the saints, but his reference to the souls of the saints as being asleep could not go unnoticed and unchallenged. A statement in the *Definition* of the Council of Hieria (which took place in 754, only a few years after the death of John of Damascus) must be taken into account:

⁶⁰ J.D. MANSI, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*. Florentiae – Venetiis 1767, XIII 336 = E. LAMBERZ, *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*. s. II, III/3: Concilium Universale Nicaenum Secundum. Concilii Actiones VI-VII. Berlin – Boston 2016, 758–760 (= R. PRICE, *The Acts of the Second Council of Nicaea* (787). Liverpool 2018, II 681). Cf. PARRY, *Providence, Resurrection, and Restoration* 300.

⁶¹ Constantine V, *Theol. quaest.* (Πεύσεις), quoted by Nicephorus, *Antirr.* 3, 38 (PG 100, 437).

⁶² *Anathema* 17 (MANSI, *Sacrorum Conciliorum collectio* XIII 348 = LAMBERZ, *Concilium Universale Nicaenum Secundum* III/3 772 = PRICE, *The Acts* II 682).

⁶³ S. GERO, *Byzantine Iconoclasm during the Reign of Constantine V with Particular Attention to the Oriental Sources*. Louvain 1977, 95–110; V. BARANOV, “Angels in the Guise of Saints”: A Syrian Tradition in Constantinople. *Scrinium* 12 (2016) 5–19.

⁶⁴ John of Damascus, *Exp. fidei* 88 (IV 15) (ed. B. KOTTER, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*. Berlin 1973, II 204–205). Similar considerations are found in the *Questions and Answers* of Anastasius of Sinai and in Ps.-Athanasius, who claim that the sleeping souls of the saints can act as intermediaries because they are “activated by the Holy Spirit”: cf. D. KRAUSMÜLLER, *Contextualizing Constantine V's Radical Religious Policies. The Debate About the Intercession of the Saints and the 'Sleep of the Soul' in the Chalcedonian and Nestorian Churches*. *BMGS* 39 (2015) 25–49: 40–44. This theme is taken up in contemporary anti-Jewish literature, such as the *Disputation of Sergius the Stylite* 13–14 (ed. A.P. HAYMAN, *The Disputation of Sergius the Stylite Against a Jew* [CSCO Script. Syr. 152]. Louvain 1973, 33–43): the Jew accuses the Christian of worshipping the bones of the dead and thus violating the commandment of *Numbers* 19, 11, and the Christian replies by distinguishing between sinners and the righteous because the latter “live in God” and “death has no power over them”. On this, cf. M. KITSOS, *Byzantine Christian Claims of Religious Legitimacy: Jews as Dissident Foils in Adversus Iudaeos Dialogues in Discussions on Icons*, in: *Dissidence and Persecution in Byzantium from Constantine to Michael Psellus*, ed. D. Džino – R.W. Strickler. Leiden – Boston 2021, 161–177: 173–175.

ἢ πάλιν τοὺς μέλλοντας συμβασιλεύειν τῷ Χριστῷ συγκαθέδρους τε γίνεσθαι [...], οὐκ ἐντρέπονται τῇ τοῦ Ἑλλήνος ἀναγράψασθαι τέχνῃ; οὐ θεμιτὸν γὰρ τοῖς ἐλπίδα ἀναστάσεως κεκτημένοις χριστιανοῖς δαιμονολατρῶν ἔθεσι χρᾶσθαι καὶ τοὺς τοιαύτη καὶ τοσαύτη μέλλοντας δόξῃ φαιδρύνεσθαι ἀγίους ἐν ἀδόξῳ καὶ νεκρᾷ ὕλῃ καθυβρίζειν⁶⁵.

And again, those who will reign with Christ and sit with Him on the throne [...], are not (the iconophiles) ashamed to represent them with the techniques of the pagans? It is not proper for Christians who hope for the resurrection to make use of the customs of demon-worshipping peoples and to violate the dignity of the saints who will shine in such glory by using inglorious and dead matter.

As such, this statement seems somehow contradictory: if the saints are now just people like everyone else, lying dead in their fleshly bodies, why are icons, made “with the techniques of the pagans”, considered so offensive? In fact, the argument underlying this is twofold: since the glory of the saints lies in the future, it is assumed that their souls sleep along with their bodies and therefore remain inactive until the promised resurrection, unable to respond to the worship and prayers normally addressed to the icons⁶⁶; the icons, because of their dead matter, do not properly represent the (expected) glory of the saints, once they receive an immortal and glorious body that is not made of perishable flesh.

The second iconoclasm was much more subtle in its theological speculations, and it is not surprising that John of Damascus’s inaccurate observation (about the sleeping souls still being able to perform miracles) inspired some iconoclasts—perhaps a radical group (“les plus radicaux et les plus logiques”) within them, as Dagron claims⁶⁷—to revive and reinforce the doctrine of thnetopsychism or hypnopsychism, and to draw from it the extreme consequences for the cult of the saints.

Such a perspective would deprive the cult of icons and holy relics of all credibility. We do not know for certain whether the relics were the object of the same furious violence that struck the icons. At the Council of Hieria, the question of relics was not even raised and “may have been regarded as theological adiaphora”⁶⁸. Some eighth- or ninth-century sources attribute to Constantine V the act of throwing the relics of Euphemia of Chalcedon into the sea, as well as several other acts of contempt for the sacred relics⁶⁹. Scholars argue about whether the claims of *leipsanoclasm*

⁶⁵ MANSI, *Sacrorum Conciliorum collectio* XIII 277 = LAMBERZ, *Concilium Universale Nicaenum Secundum* III/3 690 = PRICE, *The Acts* II 676. This phrase seems to have been influenced by Epiphanius, *Contra eos qui imagines faciunt* fr. 6 (ed. K. HOLL, *Die Schriften des Epiphanius gegen die Bilderverehrung*, in: *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*. Tübingen 1928, II 357–358); cf. Nicephorus, *Ref.* 171 (271–272 FEATHERSTONE): Πῶς οὖν τοὺς ἐν δόξῃ μέλλοντας φαιδρύνεσθαι ἀγίους ἐν ἀδόξῳ καὶ νεκρῷ καὶ ἀλάλῳ θέλεις ὄραν, τοῦ κυρίου λέγοντος περὶ αὐτῶν: ἔσονται γὰρ φησὶν ὡς ἄγγελοι θεοῦ; “How, then, can you expect to see the saints who will shine in glory in this inglorious, dead and dumb matter, when the Lord says about them, ‘They will be like angels of God?’”. G. OSTROGORSKY, *Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Bilderstreites*. Breslau 1929, 99–101, claimed that Epiphanius’s passage was an iconoclastic forgery perpetrated between 754 and 815, but his doubts have not convinced most scholars. An attempt to place Epiphanius’s iconophobia in the context of the discussions about the image of God triggered by Origen’s teaching was made by E.A. CLARK, *The Origenist Controversy. The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate*. Princeton 1992, 86–104, esp. 103–104.

⁶⁶ Cf. BARANOV, “Angels in the Guise of Saints” 9.

⁶⁷ G. DAGRON, *L’ombre d’un doute : L’hagiographie en question, VI^e–XI^e siècle*. *DOP* 46 (1992) 59–68: 64–66. Cf. also D. KRAUSMÜLLER, *The Problem of the Holy: Iconoclasm, Saints, Relics and Monks*, in: *A Companion to Byzantine Iconoclasm* 464–493: 474–476 (and IDEM, *God or angels as impersonators of saints. A belief and its contexts in the “Refutation” of Eustratius of Constantinople and in the writings of Anastasius of Sinai*. *Gouden Hoorn* 6 [1998–1999], 5–16).

⁶⁸ GERO, *Byzantine Iconoclasm during the Reign of Constantine V* 107.

⁶⁹ This allegation is paired with another, according to which the emperor claimed that “the most holy Theotokos could not render aid after her death, and that neither the holy apostles nor any of the blessed martyrs could intercede for us, since they could intercede for no one but themselves because of their sufferings”: *Contra Const. Caball.* 21 (PG 95, 337). The *Discourse against Constantine Caballinus* is attributed in the manuscript tradition to John of Damascus; the authorship of John of Jerusalem was assumed by B. MELIORANSKIĬ, Georgij Kiprijanin i Ioann Ierusalimljanin, dva maloizvestnykh borca

(“destruction of the relics”), which were only documented after the emperor’s death, are credible⁷⁰. However, if we are to consider Photius’s point of view for our purposes, the patriarch most likely believed that Constantine V’s characterization as a bitter enemy of icons, relics and any other form of veneration of saints could be meaningful and reliable.

A CREEPING RESISTANCE TO THE TRIUMPH OF ORTHODOXY

Photius had personally experienced the storm of iconoclasm in his youth, and as a patriarch he obviously had access to the remains of iconoclastic literature, which would soon disappear and which we are therefore no longer able to read. Thus, he could understand how the philosophical and theological premises of such a pernicious opinion, which endangered the cult of the saints, were rooted in a debate that stretched from the third to the sixth century (and beyond). Not surprisingly, he felt compelled to study it and purge the Orthodox faith of all possible residues of heresy: what we read today in the *Library* and in the *Amphilochia* are often the remnants of this study, as far as sensitive theological questions are concerned⁷¹.

One should not underestimate the importance that the cult of icons and relics had for him, not only on the spiritual but also on the political level. The patriarch used both icons and relics as instruments for his propaganda. Armenian sources report that under Photius’s supervision the relics of St Gregory the Illuminator were discovered in a tomb in Constantinople, along with those of the martyrs Sergius and Bacchus⁷²; and the importance of Gregory for the Armenian religious community and of Armenia for the Patriarchate of Constantinople needs no further comment. The information in the Armenian sources may not be true, but it is relevant that Photius was held accountable for this pious act. Later, in 880, he tried to reconcile with the pope by sending him the relics of the Holy Cross. The solemn restoration and unveiling of the image of the Virgin and Child in Hagia Sophia was celebrated in March 867 with a sermon by Photius on the triumph of Orthodoxy over iconoclasm.

αὕτη δὲ νῦν τὰς ἐπ’ ἐκείναις ταῖς πληγαῖς οὐλὰς εἰς ἔλεγχον τῆς ἰσαυρικῆς καὶ χριστομάχου γνώμης ἐπὶ τοῦ σώματος ἔτι φέρουσα καὶ ταύτας ἀπαλειφομένη καὶ ἀντὶ τούτων τῆς οἰκείας δόξης περιβαλλομένη τὴν λαμπρότητα τὸ ἀρχαῖον τῆς εὐπρεπείας ἀναμορφοῦται ἀξίωμα, πλατὺν τῶν καταφρυαξαμένων αὐτῆς τὸν χλευασμὸν καταχέουσα καὶ τῆς ὡς ἀληθῶς ἀτόπου

za pravoslavie v VIII veke. St. Petersburg 1901, cf. J.M. HOECK, Stand und Aufgaben der Damaskenos-Forschung. *OCP* 17 (1951) 5–60; 26; S. GERO, Byzantine Iconoclasm during the Reign of Leo III. Louvain 1973, 62–67; P. SPECK, Ich bin’s nicht, Kaiser Konstantin ist es gewesen: die Legenden vom Einfluss des Teufels, des Juden und des Moslem auf den Ikonoklasmus. Bonn 1990, 321–440; M.-F. AUZÉPY, L’Adversus Constantinum Caballinum et Jean de Jérusalem. *BSI* 56 (1995) 323–338; PRICE, Acta, Treatises, and Hagiography 240–242.

⁷⁰ J. WORTLEY, Iconoclasm and Leipsanoclasm: Leo III, Constantine V and the Relics. *BF* 8 (1982) 253–279 [=IDEM, Studies on the Cult of Relics in Byzantium up to 1204. Farnham 2009, no. VII], believes that nothing more than a certain contempt for relics and their efficacy in performing miracles can be discerned. GERO, Byzantine Iconoclasm during the Reign of Constantine V 152–165 and KRAUSMÜLLER, Contextualizing Constantine V’s radical religious policies 48–49 maintain that Constantine V, in the last years of his reign, rejected the belief in the intercessory power of the saints, probably while he revived the doctrine of the sleep of souls.

⁷¹ Another echo of the struggle against iconoclasm in the *Amphilochia* was recognized by V. BARANOV, Amphilochia 231 of Patriarch Photius as a Possible Source on the Christology of the Byzantine Iconoclasts, in: *Studia Patristica LXVIII*. Papers presented at the Sixteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 2011, ed. M. Vincent. Leuven – Paris 2013, 371–379.

⁷² T. GREENWOOD, Basil I, Constantine VII and Armenian Literary Tradition in Byzantium, in: *Reading in the Byzantine Empire and Beyond*, ed. T. Shawcross – I. Toth. Cambridge 2018, 447–466: 454–455. Cf. also J. SHEPARD, Photios’ Sermons on the Rus Attack of 860. The Questions of his Origins, and of the Route of the Rus, in: *Prosopon Rhomaikon*. Ergänzende Studien zur Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit, ed. A. Beihammer – B. Krönung – C. Ludwig. Berlin – Boston 2017, 111–128: 112.

φρενοβλαβείας οἰκτείρουσα. Ταύτην τὴν ἡμέραν εἴ τις ὀρθοδοξίας ἀρχὴν καὶ ἡμέραν, ἵνα μηδὲν ὑπέρογκον εἴπω, καλέσειεν, οὐκ ἂν ἀμάρτοι τοῦ δέοντος⁷³.

Still bearing on her body the scars of those wounds, in reproof of their Isaurian and godless belief, and wiping them off, and in their stead putting on the splendour of her own glory, she now regains the ancient dignity of her comeliness, and sheds the rude mockery of those who have insulted her, pitying their truly absurd madness. If one called this day the beginning and day of Orthodoxy (lest I say something excessive), one would not be far wrong⁷⁴.

More than twenty years lie between the Iconophile Council of 843 and this liberation call of Photius, who claims to be the main person responsible for the success of the reinstatement of the icon (ἐμὸν καὶ τοῦτο καλλώπισμα). This means that during these two decades, groups of iconoclasts were still active and working in the background and that the patriarch Ignatius, Photius's predecessor, had not managed to get rid of them.

Photius went to great lengths to destroy these vestiges of heresy⁷⁵, and one can surmise that he discredited Ignatius for his weak response to the nostalgic iconoclasts. In the fanatically flattering *Life of Ignatius*, the late patriarch is praised by Nicetas for “patiently enduring all the physical abuse of his teacher, who had brought him up with considerable severity to favour the iconoclasts”⁷⁶: this may be an attempt to absolve him of the widespread accusation that he had been trained as an iconoclast and still had connections with iconoclasts. When Photius gathered the bishops and legates from Rome for a synod in the Church of the Holy Apostles in 861, he raised two issues for discussion: the definitive abolition of iconoclasm and the ratification of the deposition of Patriarch Ignatius, who had not been canonically appointed. Pope Nicholas complained that the fight against heresy was only a pretext to gain Roman support for the deposition of Ignatius from the episcopal throne and for Photius's own uncanonical election⁷⁷. Nonetheless, the link between the two issues could not be merely opportunistic, for being too lenient in the fight to defend the icons may have been one of the accusations levelled at Ignatius⁷⁸.

⁷³ Photius, *Hom.* 17, 3 (ed. B. LAOURDAS, Φωτίου ὁμιλῖαι [Phōtiou homiliai]. Thessaloniki 1959, 168). Cf. DVORNIK, The Patriarch Photius and Iconoclasm 90–92.

⁷⁴ Translation by C. MANGO, The Homilies of Photius Patriarch of Constantinople. Cambridge (Mass.) 1958, 291.

⁷⁵ Photius, *Ep.* 214 (ed. B. LAOURDAS, Photius. Epistulae et Amphilochia. Leipzig 1984, II 117–119), is addressed to an unknown Stephen who is “converted to orthodoxy” but—one should say—not converted enough, for Photius lectures him, sometimes harshly (Πρόσχεες, εἰκονομάχε, καὶ μὴ ἐπαισχυνθῆς μαθεῖν δι’ ὧν αἰσχύνῃς φρικτῆς ἀπαλλάττη, “beware, iconoclast, do not be ashamed to confess a truth that will free you from a terrible shame”), about the worship of icons. Same text in *Amph.* 111, V 129 (WESTERINK).

⁷⁶ Nicetas David the Paphlagonian, *Vita Ign.* 9 (ed. A. SMITHIES, Nicetas David, The Life of Patriarch Ignatius. Washington D.C. 2013, 12–13). On the importance of the political agenda for this *Vita*, whose structure and aims are quite anomalous compared to other hagiographical works, cf. S. EFTHYMIADIS, Saints and Secondary Heroes in Byzantine Hagiography, in: Constructing Saints in Greek and Latin Hagiography. Heroes and Heroines in Late Antique and Medieval Narrative, ed. K. De Temmerman – J. Van Pelt – K. Staat. Turnhout 2023, 33–56: 38–39.

⁷⁷ Pope Nicholas I, *Ep.* 11 (“ad omnes fideles”), *PL* 119, 783 [= *Ep.* 84, *MGH*, Epp. VI 441]. Cf. M. MORMINO, Memoria, esegesi, ruolo delle legazioni romane a Costantinopoli (861–866): spunti dalle missive ad res Orientales pertinentes di papa Nicola I (858–867). *Humanities* 4 (2015) 161–181: 164–171.

⁷⁸ According to F. DVORNIK, The Photian Schism: History and Legend. Cambridge 1948, 36–38, the appointment of Ignatius, who was known for his rigorism, as patriarch was an attempt to appease the most extreme monks who demanded the final crushing of the iconoclasts. On the contrary, P. KARLIN-HAYTER, Gregory of Syracuse, Ignatius and Photius, in: Iconoclasm. Papers 141–145, assumes that the appointment of someone who, as hegumene of a monastery, had been in communion with the iconoclasts was the result of the efforts of the empress Theodora to reach a compromise and pacify the conflicting parties. Ó. PRIETO DOMÍNGUEZ, Literary Circles in Byzantine Iconoclasm. Patrons, Politics and Saints. Cambridge 2020, 273–329, notes that during his first patriarchate Ignatius “could not allege that he had played a part in the conflict” against the iconoclasts and could only show fasting and acts of mortification of the flesh. Since Photius had built up a strong narrative of himself (and his ancestors) as a defender of the faith and images, when Ignatius returned to the patriarchate, propaganda was launched by his friends portraying him as a stiff iconodule confessor.

In 867, the council that deposed Photius held a session to condemn Theodore Crithinus, the former bishop of Syracuse, and his followers who insisted on professing their faith against the icons⁷⁹. This report contains a rather puzzling detail: when Theodore was summoned, he apologized to the emperor, who had protected him as long as possible by saving him “from death, exile, imprisonment and starvation”, but insisted on refusing to worship the image of Christ on the coin, appear before the bishops and renounce his faith; he was eventually convicted, while some of his companions publicly anathematized him and were spared⁸⁰. Basil I was aware that by condemning Photius and appointing Ignatius he could be accused of protecting and rekindling the heresy, whose ashes were far from extinguished; so he had to perform an exemplary act to dispel this suspicion. The condemnation of someone who had previously been supported by the emperor was intended as an explicit signal of rupture and discontinuity, to deprive Photius’s friends of a propaganda theme. This concern about possible inadvertent support for heresy must have been shared in Rome, for Anastasius the Librarian set about translating the Acts of the Second Council of Nicaea around 872⁸¹. If iconoclasm was still an issue for Arethas of Cappadocia⁸², it is not surprising that Photius felt it his duty to draw attention to it, even in the last years of his intellectual activity.

Just as Photius, in his homilies devoted to the Arian heresy⁸³, draws a parallel between Arianism and iconoclasm in order to show that the latter pernicious doctrine was neither weak nor without roots in the history of heresies⁸⁴, so his inexhaustible learned temperament prompted him, whenever he had the opportunity, to expound the doctrines concerning the passage of the soul from bodily death to eternal life which had been adduced by the iconoclasts in support of their theses. But while the train of thought that linked Arius and John the Grammarian is clearly expressed in Photius’s written production, this other path remained rather implicit: it nourished his reading and enlivened his theological reflections, but barely emerged as an explicit connection.

⁷⁹ Cf. DVORNIK, *The Patriarch Photius and Iconoclasm* 82–83; J. GOUILLARD, *Deux figures mal connues du seconde iconoclasme*. *Byz* 31 (1961) 371–401; 387–401; PRIETO DOMÍNGUEZ, *Literary Circles* 281–282.

⁸⁰ C. LEONARDI – A. PLACANICA, *Gesta sanctae ac universalis octavae synodi quae Constantinopoli congregata est Anastasio bibliothecario interprete*. Firenze 2012, 265–266; R. PRICE – F. MONTINARO, *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 869–70*. Liverpool 2022, 341–342. Anastasius’s Latin version is much longer and more detailed, while the Greek text is compendious (e.g. Crithinus’s eulogies to the emperor are missing): MANSI, *Sacrorum Conciliorum collectio*. 1771. XVI 388–389.

⁸¹ Th.F.X. NOBLE, *Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians*. Philadelphia 2009, 160.

⁸² DVORNIK, *The Patriarch Photius and Iconoclasm* 96–97. The concern about the connection between the veneration of saints as still living and active souls and the veneration of icons was still felt in the tenth century, when the copyist of one of the codicological units of the ms. Vat. Gr. 511 [Diktyon 67142], ff. 143–204, connects the work of Eustratius with a very rare work of Gregory the Referendary on the image of Edessa (on this text, see A.-M. DUBARLE, *L’homélie de Grégoire le Référendaire pour la réception de l’image d’Édesse*, *REB* 55 [1997] 5–51; R. ROMANO, *Gregorio il Referendario, Sermone intorno all’immagine edessenica* (Cod. Vat. gr. 511, saec. X, ff. 143–150v). *Studi sull’Oriente Cristiano* 18 [2014], 19–37). Indeed, CONSTAS, *An Apology for the Cult of Saints* 284–285, lists several other iconophile texts contained in the same manuscript, along with heresiologies against Bogomils, Paulicians, etc., but these texts are in different codicological units.

⁸³ Photius, *Hom.* 15–16 (139–163 LAOURDAS); MANGO, *The Homilies of Photius* 236–278.

⁸⁴ Cf. DVORNIK, *The Patriarch Photius and Iconoclasm* 87–90; BEVEGNI, *Le due omelie di Fozio sull’eresia ariana* (who notes that what makes Arianism and iconoclasm comparable in Photius’s eyes is not a similarity in doctrine, but an analogous strategy in the ecclesiastical struggle); D.M. GWYNN, *From Iconoclasm to Arianism: The Construction of Christian Tradition in the Iconoclast Controversy*, *GRBS* 47 (2007) 225–251; STRANO, *Forme e significati* 180–185.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

MANUSCRIPTS

Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, ms. Vaticano Greco 511 (*Diktyon* 67142).

Oxford, Bodleian Library, ms. Barocci 142 (*Diktyon* 47429).

Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, ms. Greco Z 450 (*Diktyon* 69921).

PRIMARY SOURCES

Acta Concilii Nicaeni II (oecumenici septimi): J.D. MANSI, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*. Florentiae – Venetiis 1766–1767, XII 951–1154, XIII 1–496; Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum. s. II, III: Concilium Universale Nicaenum Secundum. Concilii Actiones VI–VII, ed. E. LAMBERZ, adiuvante U. DUBIELZIG. 3 vol. Berlin – Boston 2008–2016; R. PRICE, *The Acts of the Second Council of Nicaea (787)*, 2 vol. Liverpool 2018.

Acta Concilii Constantinopolitani IV (oecumenici octavi): J.D. MANSI, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*. Florentiae – Venetiis 1771, XVI 1–534; C. LEONARDI – A. PLACANICA, *Gesta sanctae ac universalis octavae synodi quae Constantinopoli congregata est Anastasio bibliothecario interprete*. Firenze 2012; R. PRICE – F. MONTINARO, *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 869–70*. Liverpool 2022.

Aphrahat, *Demonstrationes*: J. PARISOT, *Patrologia Syriaca*. Parisiis 1894–1907, I/1–2.

Augustine, *De civitate Dei*: Sancti Aurelii Augustini De civitate Dei, curaverunt B. DOMBART et A. KALB (*CCSL* 47–48). Turnhout 1955.

Augustine, *De haeresibus*: Sancti Aurelii Augustini De fide rerum invisibilium [...] De haeresibus, cura et studio [...] R. VAN DER PLAETSE, C. BEUKERS (*CCSL* 46). Turnhout 1969, 286–345.

Damascius, *Vita Isidori*: C. ZINTZEN, *Damascii Vitae Isidori reliquiae*. Hildesheim 1967; P. ATHANASSIADI, *Damascius. The Philosophical History*. Athens 1999.

Disputatio Sergii stylitae: A.P. HAYMAN, *The Disputation of Sergius the Stylite Against a Jew (CSCO Script. Syr. 152–153)*. Louvain 1973.

Doctrina Patrum: F. DIEKAMP, *Doctrina Patrum de Incarnatione Verbi*. Münster 1907.

Epiphanius, *Contra eos qui imagines faciunt*: K. HOLL, *Die Schriften des Epiphanius gegen die Bilderverehrung*, in: *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*. Tübingen 1928, II 351–387: 356–359.

Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica*: Eusèbe de Césarée. *Histoire ecclésiastique*, texte grec, traduction et annotations par G. BARDY (*SC* 31, 41, 55, 73). 4 vol. Paris 1952–1960.

Eustratius, *De statu animarum post mortem*: Eustratii Presbyteri Constantinopolitani De statu animarum post mortem (*CPG* 7522), edidit P. VAN DEUN (*CCSG* 60), Turnhout – Leuven 2006.

George of Alexandria, *Vita Chrysostomi*: F. HALKIN, *Douze récits byzantins sur saint Jean Chrysostome*. Bruxelles 1977.

Historia Nestoriana: *Histoire Nestorienne (Chronique de Séert)*, publiée par A. SCHER, avec le concours de J. PÉRIER (*Patrologia Orientalis* VII/2). Paris 1911.

John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei*: B. KOTTER, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*. Berlin 1973, II.

John of Damascus, *Orationes de imaginibus*: B. KOTTER, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*. Berlin 1975, III.

John of Ephesus, *Historia ecclesiastica*: R. PAYNE SMITH, *The Third Part of the Ecclesiastical History of John Bishop of Ephesus*. Oxford 1860; E.W. BROOKS, *Iohannis Ephesini Historiae Ecclesiasticae pars tertia (CSCO, Script. Syr. 54–55)*. Lovanii 1935–1936.

John of Jerusalem, *De sacris imaginibus contra Constantinum Caballinum*: *PG* 95, 309–344.

John Philoponus, *De opificio mundi*: Joannis Philoponi De opificio mundi, rec. G. REICHARDT. Lipsiae 1897; Johannes Philoponos, *De opificio mundi*. Über die Erschaffung der Welt, übersetzt und eingeleitet von C. SCHOLTEN, 3 vol. Freiburg 1997.

Nicephorus, *Antirrhetici adversus iconomachos*: *PG* 100, 205–533.

Nicephorus, *Refutatio et eversio definitionis synodalis anni 815*: J.M. FEATHERSTONE, *Nicephori patriarchae Constantinopolitani Refutatio et eversio definitionis synodalis anni 815*. Turnhout – Leuven 1997.

Nicetas David the Paphlagonian, *Vita Ignatii*: A. SMITHIES, *Nicetas David, The Life of Patriarch Ignatius*. Washington D.C. 2013.

Nicholas I, *Epistulae*: *PL* 119, 769–1182; Nicolai I. papae epistolae, ed. E. PERELS, in: *Epistolae Karolini aevi (MGH, Epistolae VI)*. Berolini 1925, IV 257–690.

Pausanias, *Descriptio Graeciae*: Pausania. Guida della Grecia, introduzioni, testo e traduzione di D. Musti e altri. 10 vol. Roma 1982–2017.

Photius, *Amphilochia et Epistulae*: Photius. *Epistulae et Amphilochia*, rec. B. LAOURDAS – L.G. WESTERINK. 6 vol. Leipzig 1983–1988.

Photius, *Bibliotheca*: Photius, *Bibliothèque*, texte établi et traduit par R. HENRY (Index par J. SCHAMP). 9 vol. Paris 1959–1991; Fozio, *Biblioteca*, edizione rinnovata ed ampliata, ed. N. BIANCHI – C. SCHIANO. Pisa 2019.

- Photius, *Homiliae*: B. LAOURDAS, Φωτίου ὁμιλίαι [Phōtiou homiliai]. Thessaloniki 1959; C. MANGO, The Homilies of Photius Patriarch of Constantinople. Cambridge (Mass.) 1958.
- Photius, *Mystagogia*: Fozio. Mistagogia del Santo Spirito, edizione critica, ed. V. POLIDORI. Roma 2018.
- Plato, *Phaedo*: Platon. Phédon, notice de L. ROBIN, texte établi et traduit par P. VICAIRE. Paris 1983.
- Porphyry, *Isagoge*: Porphyrii Isagoge et in Aristotelis Categorias commentarium, edidit A. BUSSE (CAG IV/1). Berolini 1887.
- Rufinus, *Eusebii Historiae ecclesiasticae continuatio*: Eusebius Werke, Bd. 2: Die Kirchengeschichte, ed. E. SCHWARTZ, die lateinische Übersetzung des Rufinus bearb. von Th. MOMMSEN (GCS IX/2). Leipzig 1908, 957–1040.
- Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica*: Socrate de Constantinople. Histoire ecclésiastique, texte grec de l'édition G.C. HANSEN, traduction par P. PÉRICHON et P. MARAVAL, introduction et notes par P. MARAVAL (SC 477, 493, 505, 506). 4 vol. Paris 2004–2007.
- Sozomenus, *Historia ecclesiastica*: Sozomène. Histoire ecclésiastique, texte grec de l'édition J. BIDEZ, introduction par B. GRILLET et G. SABBAAH, traduction par A.-J. FESTUGIÈRE, annotation par G. SABBAAH (SC 306, 418, 495, 516). 4 vol. Paris 1983–2008.
- Timothy of Constantinople, *De receptione haereticorum*: PG 86A, 12–68.
- Vita Metrophanis et Alexandri*: F. WINKELMANN, Vita Metrophanis et Alexandri BHG 1279. *AnBoll* 100 (1982) 147–183.

SECONDARY LITERATURE

- P.A. AGAPITOS, Narrative, Rhetoric, and 'Drama' Rediscovered: Scholars and Poets in Byzantium Interpret Heliodorus, in: *Studies in Heliodorus*, ed. R. Hunter. Cambridge 1998, 125–156.
- R. ALCIATI, Il Cassiano greco di Panayiotis Tzamalikos. *Rivista di storia del cristianesimo* 11 (2014) 451–478.
- M.-F. AUZÉPY, L'Adversus Constantinum Caballinum et Jean de Jérusalem. *BSI* 56 (1995) 323–338.
- V. BARANOV, Amphilochia 231 of Patriarch Photius as a Possible Source on the Christology of the Byzantine Iconoclasts, in: *Studia Patristica LXVIII*. Papers presented at the Sixteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 2011, ed. M. Vincent. Leuven – Paris 2013, 371–379.
- V. BARANOV, "Angels in the Guise of Saints": A Syrian Tradition in Constantinople. *Scrinium* 12 (2016) 5–19.
- C. BEVEGNI, Le due omelie di Fozio sull'eresia ariana. Motivi peculiari e spunti di ricerca, in: *Lingua e teologia nel Cristianesimo greco*, ed. C. Moreschini – G. Menestrina. Brescia 1999, 271–297.
- N. BIANCHI, Cross and Crucifixion in Iamblichus' Novel, in: *Death, Sanctity and the Cross. Crucified Saints in Image and Text*, ed. B. Crostini – A.J. Lappin. Roma 2022, 107–122.
- T. BRACCINI, Fozio e Giobio. *Rivista di storia del cristianesimo* 13 (2016) 73–87.
- AV. CAMERON, The Early Religious Policies of Justin II, in: *The Orthodox Churches and the West*, ed. D. Baker. Oxford 1976, 51–67.
- AV. CAMERON, Images of Authority: Elites and Icons in Late Sixth-Century Byzantium. *Past & Present* 84 (1979) 3–35.
- L. CANFORA, Libri e biblioteche, in: *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*. 2: La ricezione e l'attualizzazione del testo, dir. G. Cambiano – L. Canfora – D. Lanza. Roma 1995, 11–93.
- L. CANFORA, Τελετή, non τελευτή, in: *Poesia e religione in Grecia*. Studi in onore di G. Aurelio Privitera, ed. M. Cannatà Fera – S. Grandolini. Napoli 2000, 137–140.
- L. CANFORA, «Thesaurus insignis, non liber», in: Fozio. Biblioteca, ed. N. Bianchi – C. Schiano. Pisa 2019, XI–LXIV.
- H. CHADWICK, East and West: The Making of a Rift in the Church from Apostolic Times until the Council of Florence. Oxford 2003.
- H. CHADWICK, Philoponus the Christian Theologian, in: *Philoponus and the Rejection of Aristotelian Science*, ed. R. Sorabji. London 2010, 83–96.
- E.A. CLARK, The Origenist Controversy. The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate. Princeton 1992.
- N. CONSTAS, An Apology for the Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity: Eustratius Presbyter of Constantinople 'On the State of Souls after Death' (CPG 7522). *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 10 (2002) 267–285.
- A. CORCELLA, Nuovi frammenti della Biblioteca storica di Diodoro Siculo. *Quaderni di storia* 89 (2019) 147–203.
- G. DAGRON, L'ombre d'un doute : L'hagiographie en question, VI^e–XI^e siècle. *DOP* 46 (1992) 59–68.
- B.E. DALEY, What did "Origenism" mean in the sixth century? in: *Origeniana Sexta. Origène et la Bible*, éd. G. Dorival – A. Le Boulluec. Leuven 1995, 627–638.
- M. DAL SANTO, Imperial Power and Its Subversion in Eustratius of Constantinople's Life and Martyrdom of Golinduch (c. 602). *Byz* 81 (2011) 138–176.
- M. DAL SANTO, Debating the Saints' Cult in the Age of Gregory the Great. Oxford 2012.
- F. DIEKAMP, Die origenistischen Streitigkeiten im sechsten Jahrhundert und das fünfte allgemeine Concil. Münster 1899.
- G. DORIVAL, Origène et la résurrection de la chair, in: *Origeniana Quarta*, ed. L. Lies. Innsbruck – Wien 1987, 291–321.
- A.-M. DUBARLE, L'homélie de Grégoire le Référendaire pour la réception de l'image d'Édesse. *REB* 55 (1997) 5–51.
- Y.-M. DUVAL, La discussion entre l'apocrisiaire Grégoire et le patriarche Eutychios au sujet de la résurrection de la chair. L'arrière-plan doctrinal oriental et occidental, in: *Grégoire le Grand*, publ. par J. Fontaine – R. Gillet – S. Pellistrandi. Paris 1986, 347–366.
- F. DVORNIK, The Photian Schism: History and Legend. Cambridge 1948.

- F. DVORNIK, The Patriarch Photius and Iconoclasm. *DOP* 7 (1953) 67–97.
- S. EFTHYMIADIS, Saints and Secondary Heroes in Byzantine Hagiography, in: *Constructing Saints in Greek and Latin Hagiography. Heroes and Heroines in Late Antique and Medieval Narrative*, ed. K. De Temmerman – J. Van Pelt – K. Staat. Turnhout 2023, 33–56.
- A.-J. FESTUGIÈRE, De la doctrine “origéniste” du corps glorieux sphéroïde. *Revue des Sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 43 (1959) 81–86.
- F. GAVIN, The sleep of the soul in the early Syriac Church. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 40 (1920) 103–120.
- S. GERO, Byzantine Iconoclasm during the Reign of Leo III. Louvain 1973.
- S. GERO, Byzantine Iconoclasm during the Reign of Constantine V with Particular Attention to the Oriental Sources. Louvain 1977.
- J. GOILLARD, Deux figures mal connues du seconde iconoclasm. *Byz* 31 (1961) 371–401.
- T. GREENWOOD, Basil I, Constantine VII and Armenian Literary Tradition in Byzantium, in: *Reading in the Byzantine Empire and Beyond*, ed. T. Shawcross – I. Toth. Cambridge 2018, 447–466.
- D.M. GWYNN, From Iconoclasm to Arianism: The Construction of Christian Tradition in the Iconoclast Controversy. *GRBS* 47 (2007) 225–251.
- Th. HÄGG, Photius at Work: Evidence from the Text of the Bibliotheca. *GRBS* 14 (1973) 213–222.
- Th. HÄGG, Photios als Vermittler antiker Literatur. Untersuchungen zur Technik des Referierens und Exzerpieren in der Bibliothek. Uppsala 1975.
- Th. HÄGG, Photius as a Reader of Hagiography: Selection and Criticism. *DOP* 53 (1999) 43–58.
- F. HALKIN, La date de composition de la “Bibliothèque” de Photius remise en question. *AnBoll* 81 (1963) 414–417.
- B. HEMMERDINGER, Le «codex» 252 de la Bibliothèque de Photius. *BZ* 58 (1965) 1–2.
- J.M. HOECK, Stand und Aufgaben der Damaskenos-Forschung. *OCP* 17 (1951) 5–60.
- P. HOLLOWAY, Portrait and Presence: a Note on the visio Procli (George of Alexandria, Vita Chrysostomi 27). *BZ* 100 (2007) 71–83.
- D. HOMBERGEN, The Second Origenist Controversy. A New Perspective on Cyril of Scythopolis’ Monastic Biographies as Historical Sources for Sixth-Century Origenism. Roma 2001.
- P. KARLIN-HAYTER, Gregory of Syracuse, Ignatios and Photios, in: *Iconoclasm. Papers given at the Ninth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies. University of Birmingham, March 1975*, ed. A. Bryer – J. Herrin. Birmingham 1977, 141–145.
- M. KITSOS, Byzantine Christian Claims of Religious Legitimacy: Jews as Dissident Foils in *Adversus Iudaeos* Dialogues in Discussions on Icons, in: *Dissidence and Persecution in Byzantium from Constantine to Michael Psellos*, ed. D. Džino – R.W. Strickler. Leiden – Boston 2021, 161–177.
- D. KRAUSMÜLLER, God or Angels as Impersonators of Saints. A Belief and its Contexts in the “Refutation” of Eustratius of Constantinople and in the Writings of Anastasius of Sinai. *Gouden Hoorn* 6 (1998–1999) 5–16.
- D. KRAUSMÜLLER, Contextualizing Constantine V’s Radical Religious Policies. The Debate About the Intercession of the Saints and the ‘Sleep of the Soul’ in the Chalcedonian and Nestorian Churches. *BMGS* 39 (2015) 25–49.
- D. KRAUSMÜLLER, Origenism and Anti-Origenism in the Late Sixth and Seventh Centuries, in: *Evagrius and His Legacy*, ed. J. Kalvesmaki – R. Darling-Young. Notre Dame (Indiana) 2016, 288–316.
- D. KRAUSMÜLLER, The Problem of the Holy: Iconoclasm, Saints, Relics and Monks, in: *A Companion to Byzantine Iconoclasm*, ed. M. Humphreys. Leiden – Boston 2021, 464–493.
- U.M. LANG, Notes on John Philoponus and the Tritheist Controversy in the Sixth Century. *Oriens Christianus* 85 (2001) 23–40.
- P. LEMERLE, Le premier humanisme byzantin. Paris 1971.
- M. LOSACCO, Photius, la Bibliothèque, et au-delà: l’état de la recherche, l’usage des classiques et les préfaces du corpus, in: *Autour du Premier humanisme byzantin et des Cinq études sur le XI^e siècle. Quarante ans après Paul Lemerle*, ed. B. Flusin – J.-C. Cheynet. Paris 2017, 235–308.
- B. LOURIÉ, John Philoponus on the Bodily Resurrection. *Scrinium* 9 (2013) 79–88.
- A. LOUTH, The Collection Sabbaitica and Sixth-Century Origenism, in: *Origeniana Octava. Origen and the Alexandrian Tradition*, ed. L. Perrone. Leuven 2003, II 1167–1175.
- S. MACDOWALL, Catalaunian Fields AD 451. Rome’s last great battle. Oxford 2015.
- C. MANGO, The Liquidation of Iconoclasm and the Patriarch Photios, in: *Iconoclasm. Papers given at the Ninth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies. University of Birmingham, March 1975*, ed. A. Bryer – J. Herrin. Birmingham 1977, 133–140.
- V. MARAGLINO, Reconsidering the Date of Photius’ Bibliotheca: the Biographical Tradition of Gregory the Great in Chapter 252. *Ancient Society* 37 (2007) 265–278.
- V. MARAGLINO, Un bios greco anonimo di Gregorio Magno (BHG 720–721). *Vetera Christianorum* 59 (2022) 141–155.
- H. MARTIN, Jean Philopon et la controverse trithéite du VI^e siècle, in: *Studia Patristica V. Papers Presented to the Third International Conference on Patristic Studies*, ed. F.L. Cross. Berlin 1962, III 519–525.
- C.M. MAZZUCCHI, Restauro e interpretazione dell’epistola a Tarasio. *Aevum* 95 (2021) 441–464.
- B. MELIORANSKIĬ, Georgij Kiprianin i Ioann Ierusalimljanin, dva maloizvestnykh borca za pravoslavie v VIII veke. St. Petersburg 1901.
- M.M. MITCHELL, The Archetypal Image: John Chrysostom’s Portraits of Paul. *The Journal of Religion* 75 (1995) 15–43.

- M. MORMINO, Memoria, esegesi, ruolo delle legazioni romane a Costantinopoli (861–866): spunti dalle missive ad res Orientales pertinentes di papa Nicola I (858–867). *Humanities* 4 (2015) 161–181.
- Th.F.X. NOBLE, Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians. Philadelphia 2009.
- G. OSTROGORSKY, Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Bilderstreites. Breslau 1929.
- J. PARAMELLE, Christianisme byzantin. *École pratique des hautes études. V^e section. Sciences religieuses. Annuaire* 91 (1982–1983) 407–415.
- K. PARRY, Providence, Resurrection, and Restoration in Byzantine Thought, Eighth to Ninth Centuries, in: *Studia Patristica XCVII. Papers Presented at the Seventeenth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 2015*, ed. M. Vinzent. Vol. 23. Leuven – Paris – Bristol 2017, 295–304.
- R. PRICE, Acta, Treatises, and Hagiography, in: *A Companion to Byzantine Iconoclasm*, ed. M. Humphreys. Leiden – Boston 2021, 230–260.
- Ó. PRIETO DOMÍNGUEZ, Literary Circles in Byzantine Iconoclasm. Patrons, Politics and Saints. Cambridge 2020.
- E. PRINZIVALLI, Magister Ecclesiae. Il dibattito su Origene fra III e IV secolo. Roma 2002.
- E. PRINZIVALLI, Le metamorfosi della scuola alessandrina da Eracla a Didimo, in: *Origeniana Octava. Origen and the Alexandrian Tradition*, ed. L. Perrone. Leuven 2003, II 911–937.
- E. PRINZIVALLI, La polemica antieretica di Gregorio in merito al destino ultimo dell'uomo, in: *Gregorio Magno e l'eresia tra memoria e testimonianza*, ed. A. Isola. Firenze 2009, 117–130.
- S. RASSI, Christian Thought in the Medieval Islamic World. 'Abdīshō' of Nisibis and the Apologetic Tradition. Oxford 2022.
- R. ROMANO, Gregorio il Referendario, Sermone intorno all'immagine edessenica (Cod. Vat. gr. 511, saec. X, ff. 143–150v). *Studi sull'Oriente Cristiano* 18 (2014) 19–37.
- F. RONCONI, The Patriarch and the Assyrians: New Evidence for the Date of Photios' Library. *Segno e testo* 11 (2013) 387–395.
- F. RONCONI, Pour la datation de la Bibliothèque de Photius: la Myriobiblos, le patriarche et Rome, in: *Byzanz und das Abendland II. Studia Byzantino-Occidentalia*, ed. E. Juhász. Budapest 2014, 135–153.
- A. SAMELLAS, Death in the Eastern Mediterranean (50–600 A.D.). Tübingen 2002.
- C. SCHIANO, Stefano Gobar e la controversia sul corpo risorto nella Bibliotheca di Fozio. *Rivista di storia del cristianesimo* 13 (2016) 89–106.
- C. SCHIANO, Artemidoro sul Nilo (fr. 90 Stiehle): falsificazione umanistica o prodotto dell'officina di Fozio? *Byz* 90 (2020) 271–308.
- A. SCOTT, Origen and the Life of the Stars. A History of an Idea. Oxford 1991.
- J. SHEPARD, Photios' Sermons on the Rus Attack of 860. The Questions of his Origins, and of the Route of the Rus, in: *Prosopon Rhomaikon. Ergänzende Studien zur Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit*, ed. A. Beihammer – B. Krönung – C. Ludwig. Berlin – Boston 2017, 111–128.
- M. SIMONETTI, Alcune osservazioni sull'interpretazione origeniana di Genesi 2,7 e 3,21. *Aevum* 36 (1962) 370–381.
- J.C. SKEDROS, Saint Demetrios of Thessaloniki. Civic Patron and Divine Protector 4th – 7th Centuries CE. Harrisburg 1999.
- P. SPECK, Ich bin's nicht, Kaiser Konstantin ist es gewesen: die Legenden vom Einfluss des Teufels, des Juden und des Moslem auf den Ikonoklasmus. Bonn 1990.
- C. STEWART, Another Cassian? *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 66 (2015) 372–376.
- G. STRANO, Forme e significati dei riferimenti alle eresie nell'epistolario di Fozio. *RSBN* 47 (2010) 177–194.
- D. STRATOUDAKI-WHITE, Patriarch Photios and the Conclusion of Iconoclasm. *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 44 (1999) 341–355.
- W.T. TREADGOLD, The Nature of the Bibliotheca of Photius. Washington D.C. 1980.
- W.T. TREADGOLD, Photius Before His Patriarchate. *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 53 (2002) 1–17.
- P. TZAMALIKOS, A Newly Discovered Greek Father. Cassian the Sabaite Eclipsed by John Cassian of Marseilles. Leiden – Boston 2012.
- P. TZAMALIKOS, The Real Cassian Revised. Monastic Life, Greek Paideia, and Origenism in the Sixth Century. Leiden – Boston 2012.
- A. VAN ROEY, Les fragments trithéites de Jean Philopon. *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 11 (1980) 135–163.
- A. VAN ROEY, Un traité cononite contre la doctrine de Jean Philopon sur la résurrection, in: *ANTIDŌRON. Hommage à Maurits Geerard pour célébrer l'achèvement de la Clavis Patrum Graecorum*. Wetteren 1984, I 123–139.
- A. VON HARNACK, The "Sic et Non" of Stephanus Gobarus. *Harvard Theological Review* 16 (1923) 205–234.
- J. WORTLEY, Iconoclasm and Leipsanoclasm: Leo III, Constantine V and the Relics. *BF* 8 (1982) 253–279 (= IDEM, Studies on the Cult of Relics in Byzantium up to 1204. Farnham 2009, no. VII).