



Church Councils and Patristic Authority the Iconoclastic Councils of Hieria (754) and St. Sophia (815)

Paul J. Alexander

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. 63. (1958), pp. 493-505.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0073-0688%281958%2963%3C493%3ACCAPAT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-0>

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology is currently published by Department of the Classics, Harvard University.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/dchu.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CHURCH COUNCILS AND PATRISTIC AUTHORITY

THE ICONOCLASTIC COUNCILS OF HIEREIA (754) and ST. SOPHIA
(815)

BY PAUL J. ALEXANDER

DURING the Iconoclastic Controversy considerable attention was paid in the Byzantine Empire to the views of the Church Fathers concerning religious images. Ecclesiastical councils in particular relied heavily on patristic authority. In recent years publications of new texts as well as scholarly investigations of known documents have shed light on the attitude of councils, both iconophile and iconoclastic, towards the writings of the Fathers. On the following pages an attempt will be made to define on the basis of some of the new evidence the relation of two iconoclastic councils towards patristic authority and to describe the handling of patristic manuscripts by these councils and by their drafting committees. My hope is that Professor Werner Jaeger, who has collected in Harvard's Institute of Classical Studies and elucidated in his editions and monographs the manuscript tradition of several Church Fathers, will be interested in a similar search and study of patristic manuscripts undertaken by churchmen of the eighth and ninth centuries.

Shortly after Easter 815 an ecclesiastical council assembled at St. Sophia in Constantinople to reconsider the problem of religious images. It was presided over by Theodotus, Patriarch of Constantinople, and speedily discharged its business in three meetings. At its last session a Decree condemning religious images and their worship and also including a *florilegium* of patristic quotations was read, approved by the members and signed by the Emperor.¹ This document revealed a high degree of dependence upon a similar Decree issued by the earlier iconoclastic Council of Hieréia (754). The Decree of Hieréia had been divided into four parts: a "doctrine" containing the conciliar decision against images, a biblico-patristic *florilegium* supporting Iconoclasm, disciplinary canons, and a set of anathemas.² The Decree of St. Sophia explicitly approved and accepted the decisions of the earlier council.³ Moreover, the principal arguments advanced or implied by the Decree of St. Sophia were derived from that of Hieréia. Indeed, both councils objected to images of Christ on christological grounds and to images of

Christ and of Saints as unable to render the essential holiness of the prototypes.⁴ The dependence of the Council of St. Sophia on the earlier council was not limited to the realm of ideas. It also extended to the armor of patristic authorities and the later Council took over several quotations from its eighth-century predecessor.⁵

There can be no doubt that the later iconoclastic council relied heavily in thought and patristic apparatus on the work done in the eighth century, yet a close examination of its Decree shows that the person or more probably the committee responsible for its drafting had recourse to other documents in addition to the Decree of Hiereia. In the first place, for several quotations contained in the patristic *florilegium* of St. Sophia the drafting committee supplied more adequate information concerning the title of the works from which they were taken. Thus a passage quoted in the Decree of Hiereia from St. John Chrysostom without identification of the particular work of this prolific writer was attributed in the Decree of St. Sophia to this author's *On the Gaoler*.⁶ Similarly, a quotation assigned in the Decree of Hiereia to Epiphanius of Cyprus without further identification reappears in the *florilegium* of St. Sophia as a citation from that author's *Testament*.⁷ Moreover, it is likely that the identification of Amphilochius of Iconium's *Enkomion on Basil the Great*, from which both councils quoted, was due to the drafting committee of the ninth century.⁸

This Committee furthermore not infrequently expanded the text of patristic excerpts taken over from the earlier *florilegium*. Thus a much more generous extract from Amphilochius of Iconium's *Enkomion on Basil*, just mentioned, appeared in the *florilegium* of St. Sophia.⁹ The same is true of the excerpt from St. John Chrysostom's *On the Gaoler*.¹⁰ One may conclude, therefore, that the drafting committee, for all its dependence on the *florilegium* of Hiereia, relied on additional sources of information and derived from them the more precise attributions as well as the expanded text of some quotations. These additional sources must have been either manuscripts of the patristic works quoted or *florilegia* other than that contained in the Decree of Hiereia. Is it possible, therefore, to discover more precisely the mode of operation and sources used by the drafters active at Constantinople in 814/5?

To answer this question it will be useful to consider two puzzling sentences from the "doctrine" of Hiereia, that is, from that part of the Decree in which the Council was formulating its own views on religious images. These sentences contained in the dogmatic pronouncement of 754 echo the text of two patristic quotations absent from the Decree of Hiereia but incorporated into that of St. Sophia (815). For the first

of these sentences agreement in content and wording with a phrase attributed by the Decree of St. Sophia to Epiphanius of Cyprus was first noticed by Professor George Ostrogorsky.¹¹ It escaped his attention, however, that a similar relationship existed between the sentence immediately following in the "doctrine" of Hierieia and a fragment attributed by the Council of St. Sophia to a dubious work of St. John Chrysostom on Abraham. According to this quotation, the pagan inhabitants of Palestine in the patriarchal period made "images" of the three angels, Abraham, Sarah, the calf and the "fine meal" (*Genesis* 18). Chrysostom (?) protests that he is relating this incident not with the intention of producing faith among the believers through the testimony of pagans: "for we [Christians] do not accept proofs from those outside [the Church]." The same sentence occurs almost *verbatim* in the "doctrine" of Hierieia where it is used as an argument against pictorial representations of the Virgin Mary and the Saints.¹² Professor Ostrogorsky, aware only of the first occurrence and concerned primarily with the writings attributed to St. Epiphanius, suggested that the passage attributed in the *florilegium* of St. Sophia to Epiphanius was a forgery perpetrated in iconoclastic circles in the period between the two iconoclastic councils. This hypothesis, though based not only on the passage from the Council of Hierieia but on a thorough examination of other iconoclastic quotations attributed to St. Epiphanius, was re-examined and rejected by prominent scholars.¹³ In the light of a second instance of borrowing, this time from St. John Chrysostom's (?) *On Abraham*, it would be necessary if one wished to maintain Professor Ostrogorsky's hypothesis to postulate a forger or an atelier of forgers fathering iconoclastic statements not only on St. Epiphanius but also on St. John Chrysostom. Such an assumption, though by no means impossible, should be accepted only after other attempts to explain have failed. Is it not more natural to assume that the patristic passages cited in the Decree of St. Sophia were known at the Council of Hierieia and that in an age respectful of ecclesiastical authority the members of that Council were prone to prefer to their own words formulations derived (or thought to be derived) from patristic authority?

This tendency can be demonstrated in one instance where there is no doubt as to the authenticity of the authority. In an early passage of the Decree of Hierieia the Iconoclasts mention that after Jesus Christ, the Apostles and the Early Church had purged the world of idol-worship, it was re-introduced by the Devil. They express this thought in a fairly literal quotation from Gregory of Nyssa's *Enkomion on his*

Brother Basil, where Gregory had spoken of Arianism as a new form of idol-worship.¹⁴ Nothing in the context of this dogmatic pronouncement indicates that this was a patristic quotation.¹⁵ It was appropriated by the Iconoclasts because Gregory was recognized as an authority in matters theological. No scruples were felt about misapplying to image worship what Gregory had said of Arianism. In another instance, there is verbal agreement between a passage quoted from Theodotus of Ancyra (or Galatia) by both iconoclastic councils and an anathema pronounced by the Council of Hieria.¹⁶ Thus these "hidden quotations", that is, passages quoted from patristic authorities (Gregory, Theodotus) by the Council of Hieria as if they were the Council's own formulations, suggest that other "hidden quotations", such as those from Epiphanius and from Chrysostom *On Abraham*, also were known to be quotations and indeed considered genuine by the Council of Hieria.

Thus, internal evidence furnished by the Decrees of Hieria and St. Sophia permits several conclusions. The Council of Hieria, of whose deliberations only the Decree survives, expressed several of its dogmatic pronouncements in the language of patristic texts not quoted in the *florilegium* of this Council's Decree (Epiphanius, John Chrysostom *On Abraham*, Gregory of Nyssa, Theodotus). It may be inferred that the Decree derived its knowledge of these quotations not directly from the authors to which they were attributed but from an iconoclastic *florilegium*. This inference will be presently corroborated by external evidence. So far as the Council of St. Sophia is concerned, it has been shown that its drafting committee obtained from a source yet to be defined the title of some of the works excerpted by the Iconoclasts, that it presented more generous fragments of other texts, and that it quoted with indication of title the patristic passages, parts of which had appeared as "hidden quotations" in the Decree of Hieria. For the Council of St. Sophia, as for the earlier assembly, external evidence will supplement the conclusions gathered from a study of its Decree and help to define the source or sources of the new data supplied in that document.

With regard to the Council of Hieria it is well known that it relied heavily on the writings of the Emperor Constantine V. In the present context a *florilegium* of patristic quotations compiled by the Emperor is of particular importance. The Patriarch Nicephorus read and refuted this *florilegium* in the ninth century and mentioned that it contained among other texts the same quotation from Gregory of Nyssa's *Enkomion on his Brother Basil* which was cited as a "hidden quotation"

in the Decree of Hierieia.¹⁷ In view of the general influence exerted by the Emperor Constantine V upon the Council of Hierieia it is virtually certain that any passage included in his *florilegium*, such as the excerpt from Gregory of Nyssa's *Enkomion on Basil*, was read and considered at Hierieia. Indeed the Council of Hierieia, in some of its early sessions whose records are lost, examined and discussed the patristic evidence relating to images and their worship. This was the general practice of church councils in the seventh and eighth centuries. Moreover, at the Council of Nicaea two repentant Iconoclasts who had attended the Council of Hierieia asserted that at Hierieia passages from Nilus' *Letter to Olympiodorus* and from an apocryphal work on the wanderings of the Apostles had been read.¹⁸ There must have been other patristic passages read before the Council of Hierieia. The compilers of the Decree of Hierieia, of course, attended the meetings of the Council, had access to the records of these meetings as well as to Constantine's *florilegium* and could easily cite in the form of "hidden quotations" patristic passages contained in these documents or incorporate them into the *florilegium* which formed part of the Decree. As a consequence, to members of the Council of Hierieia and to the compilers of its Decree, the "doctrine" of this Council must have sounded like a potpourri of patristic quotations read and debated at earlier sessions.

For the later iconoclastic Council of St. Sophia the internal evidence of the Decree is likewise supplemented by references in narrative sources. The composition of the drafting committee whose existence and activities have been inferred from a comparison of the *florilegia* of St. Sophia and Hierieia is known. It was appointed by the Emperor Leo V, was presided over by an ambitious young abbot and lector, John the Grammarian, who later was to become Patriarch of Constantinople (834-843) under the Emperor Theophilus, and had among its members a bishop, two senators and two monks.¹⁹ The operations of this Imperial Committee are described in an historical work by the *Scriptor Incertus de Leone Armeno*. This account reports how the Emperor Leo V empowered John the Grammarian and his associates "to collect from all quarters the ancient manuscripts preserved in monasteries and churches". Thereupon the Imperial Committee gathered a large number of manuscripts and searched through them. The author then continues: *πλὴν οὐδὲν εὕρισκον οἱ ἀφρόνες ὡνπερ αὐτοὶ κακούργως ἐπέζητουν, ἕως οὐ μετὰ χεῖρας ἔλαβον τῷ συνοδικῷ [τὸ συνοδικὸν] Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ Ἰσαύρου τοῦ καὶ Καβαλλίνου καὶ ἐκ τούτου τὰς ἀρχὰς λαβόντες ἤρξαντο καὶ ἐν τοῖς βιβλίοις εὕρισκειν τὰς χρήσεις ἄσπερ αὐτοὶ ἀφρόνως καὶ ἀνοήτως προέφερον, σημάδια βάλλοντες εἰς τοὺς τόπους*

ἐνθα εὕρισκον, βουλόμενοι πείσαι τὸν ἄφρονα λαὸν ὅτι Ἐν παλαιοῖς βιβλίοις εὔρομεν τοῦ μὴ προσκυνεῖσθαι τὰς εἰκόνας.²⁰

The passage mentions a document which aided the Imperial Committee in locating quotations in "ancient manuscripts" but unfortunately this reference is ambiguous: τὸ συνοδικὸν Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ Ἰσαύρου τοῦ καὶ Καβαλλίνου.²¹ The context makes it clear that the author opposed Constantine V's religious policies, an attitude which is also indicated by his use of the Emperor's nickname ("Horsey"). The author is speaking as a partisan and consequently refers to the document in question not by its official title but by a sarcastic characterization. Technically and officially, a document either emanated from a church council or from an emperor but not from both. The mention of a hybrid such as the "synodical document of Constantine" is obviously part of the sarcasm of the passage. Two interpretations are possible. Either the document was one of the writings of Constantine V, more particularly his *florilegium*; in that case the writer is implying that the Emperor was usurping the functions of a church council. Alternatively, the *Scriptor Incertus* may refer to the *Acta* of Hiereia, more particularly to those sections now lost in which the conciliar discussions of patristic authorities were recorded; if this is the meaning, the writer by connecting the conciliar *Acta* with the name of the ruling emperor is criticizing the Council, as did many orthodox writers, for its subservience to Constantine V.

Although it must be admitted that *synodikon* is an unusual term for the *Acta* of a church council,²² the second of the alternatives is more probable.²³ In the first place a hagiographic text of the early ninth century, the *Life of St. Stephen the Younger* written in 806 by a disciple of Stephen, speaks of the Decree of Hiereia alternately as emanating from the Council or from the Emperors Constantine and Leo.²⁴ Secondly, during the months when the Imperial Committee was investigating the manuscripts, the Patriarch Nicephorus, aware of the threatening explosion and in all probability of the objectives pursued by the Imperial Committee, forbade members of the clergy to engage in discussions over the Emperor Constantine's opinions and over patristic passages collected by that Emperor. But he was still hopeful that a compromise could be found and therefore suggested that a new enquiry into image worship could be undertaken and even a new ecumenical council summoned "if certain conciliar books have been found".²⁵ The "conciliar books" were the *Acta* of Hiereia. In all probability, therefore, the Imperial Committee made use of the *Acta* of Hiereia rather than of Constantine's *florilegium*.

The Imperial Committee improved upon the Patriarch's suggestion by using the newly found *Acta* of Hieria as a guide to the manuscripts of the patristic texts from which the Council had quoted. This procedure was useful from three points of view. In the first place, as the Patriarch Nicephorus at a time when he still expected a peaceful argument had suggested, this was a convenient way of re-opening the issue of religious images without openly disavowing the Council of Nicaea (787) — and Leo V like the Patriarch Nicephorus may have hoped in 813/4 that he would not be driven to this disavowal. The Decree read and approved at the final session of Hieria had been officially repudiated at Nicaea in 787, but the patristic authorities adduced and debated during the early sessions of the Council of Hieria and recorded in the *Acta* could properly be re-examined without fear of the objection: *res iudicata est*. It could be argued by Leo V and his advisers that the Empress Irene and the Patriarch Tarasius had submitted to the Council of Nicaea only part of the evidence issued by the Council of Hieria (the Decree) and that a new enquiry and decision should be based on a complete survey of patristic utterances. Secondly, at the Council of Nicaea the iconoclastic Council of Hieria had been severely taken to task for not producing manuscripts of the authorities quoted and for having read the quotations from "tablets" prepared *ad hoc*.²⁶ The passage from the *Scriptor Incertus* shows that iconoclastic circles in the ninth century took this criticism to heart and that Leo V had charged his Imperial Committee with the task of producing ancient and authoritative manuscripts containing the *ipsissima verba* of the Fathers quoted at Hieria. Thus the Imperial Committee was searching less for new patristic quotations than for the manuscript evidence of the passages already read at Hieria. Finally, the procedure adopted by the Imperial Committee allowed for a second display of the full patristic evidence in favor of Iconoclasm. It is true that most of this material was derived from the *Acta* of Hieria, yet these *Acta* had been relegated by Canon 9 of the Second Nicaenum to the collection of heretical books in the Patriarchal Library and were therefore inaccessible to all but a few members of the clergy. Thus the mode of operation developed by the Imperial Committee from a suggestion originally made by the iconophile Patriarch Nicephorus was bound to be of considerable advantage to the iconoclastic cause.

There remains only one problem raised by the passage from the *Scriptor Incertus*: precisely what help did the Imperial Committee derive from the *synodikon* of Constantine V? In other words, what is the meaning of the phrase used by the *Scriptor Incertus*: ἐκ τούτου τὰς

ἀρχὰς λαβόντες? Ever since Combefis' (?) translation in the seventeenth century this was interpreted to mean that the Imperial Committee "started out" or "took its departure" from the *synodikon*.²⁷ This interpretation rests on the assumption that originally the Imperial Committee wished to proceed without the help of earlier iconoclastic *florilegia* but did not possess sufficient learning; therefore it resigned itself to borrow quotations from the Iconoclasts of the eighth century. The sequence of the passage in the *Scriptor Incertus* shows that this assumption misconstrues the objectives of the Imperial Committee. Its purpose was not so much to find new patristic texts (although it may not have rejected new evidence) but to discover ancient patristic manuscripts for the authors quoted in earlier documents. "They wished to persuade the senseless rabble by saying: We have found it declared in ancient manuscripts that images should not be worshipped." As has been stated, one of the reasons for this procedure was the criticism leveled against the Council of Hiereia that it had not produced the manuscript evidence.²⁸ The passage from the *Scriptor Incertus* shows that iconoclastic circles in the ninth century took this criticism seriously and that the Emperor Leo V had charged the Imperial Committee with the task of supplying ancient and authoritative manuscripts containing the patristic quotations which had been read from "tablets" at Hiereia.

In the light of these considerations it will be possible to give a more satisfactory interpretation to the phrase: ἐκ τούτου τὰς ἀρχὰς λαβόντες. At the beginning, the Imperial Committee must have been guided in its search among the manuscripts by the Decree of Hiereia — the only iconoclastic document easily accessible in the ninth century because of its incorporation into the *Acta* of the Second Nicaenum. Even a modern scholar armed with printed editions and bibliographical tools would find it difficult to locate the manuscript evidence for all the "hidden" and "open" patristic quotations and allusions contained in that document. The Imperial Committee faced with this difficulty therefore consulted the *synodikon*. What did it obtain from it? The answer to that question is: τὰς ἀρχὰς, which should be translated: the *incipits*. The *incipit* or in Greek ἀρχή was a frequent and reliable way of identifying a work of literature.²⁹ Like the *Acta* of the Second Nicaenum Constantine's *synodikon*, whether this Emperor's *florilegium* or the full *Acta* of Hiereia, must have identified the works quoted by means of their *incipits*. It is easy to see why the work of the Imperial Committee proceeded swiftly and expeditiously once the provenance of the quotations had been clarified.³⁰

The results of this paper may be summarized as follows:

(1) Of the *Acta* of Hiereia only the final Decree (*ῥπος*) survives.

(2) This Decree of Hiereia contains a brief biblico-patristic *florilegium* but even other parts of the Decree, such as the "doctrine" and "anathemas" in which the Council formulated its own teachings, frequently borrow both their ideas and their expression from patristic texts.

(3) Some of these "hidden quotations" were not incorporated into the *florilegium* issued by the Council of Hiereia. They had been read, however, and discussed during the early sessions of the Council. Many of them had first appeared in the *florilegium* compiled by the Emperor Constantine V.

(4) At the Seventh Ecumenical Council of Nicaea, the Decree of Hiereia was read in an open meeting and refuted in a document prepared by the Patriarch Tarasius. The Council of Nicaea, furthermore, criticized the Council of Hiereia for not having produced manuscripts of the patristic passages read during its sessions.

(5) In the early ninth century, manuscripts of Constantine's writings and of the full text of the *Acta* of Hiereia were difficult to procure but copies survived in the Patriarchal Library at Constantinople where they were preserved among the heretical books. The Decree of Hiereia alone was easily available because it was quoted among the *Acta* of the Seventh Ecumenical Council.

(6) In 814 the Emperor Leo V contemplated a revival of Iconoclasm. He instructed a committee presided over by John the Grammarian to prepare for a new discussion of image worship by empowering this committee to bring to Constantinople manuscripts of the Church Fathers which belonged to ecclesiastical libraries and by instructing it to find in these manuscripts passages which supported the iconoclastic views.

(7) The Imperial Committee experienced considerable difficulty in its attempt at finding the manuscript evidence on the basis of the Decree of Hiereia and of the patristic manuscripts gathered at Constantinople. Then an earlier iconoclastic *florilegium*, called *συνοδικόν* by the *Scriptor Incertus* (either the Emperor Constantine V's *florilegium* or more probably the full *Acta* of Hiereia) was discovered, perhaps in the Patriarchal Library. The Patriarch Nicephorus, still hopeful of a peaceful solution, suggested that the newly discovered manuscript could form the basis for a new enquiry into image worship. The Emperor Leo and his advisers, reacting to the criticisms raised at Nicaea against the Council of Hiereia, decided to base the new enquiry on manuscripts of

the patristic texts favoring Iconoclasm rather than on the earlier *florilegium*. The recently discovered *συνοδικόν*, by supplying the *incipits* of the patristic works to be quoted, guided the Imperial Committee through the labyrinth of patristic manuscripts. It enabled the Imperial Committee to find many patristic quotations that had not appeared in the Decree of Hiereia, to improve on the identification of some passages quoted in the earlier document and in some instances to supply fuller excerpts than the Decree of Hiereia had done.

(8) The patristic quotations selected by the Imperial Committee were read at the first session of the Council of St. Sophia, presumably from the ancient patristic manuscripts collected.

(9) With minor additions and subtractions the patristic *florilegium* attached to the Decree of the Council of St. Sophia represents the results of the labors performed by the Imperial Committee.

NOTES

1. For information on the Council of St. Sophia see Paul J. Alexander, *The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople. Ecclesiastical Policy and Image Worship in the Byzantine Empire* (Oxford, 1958), 136-140 (cited below as Alexander, *Patriarch Nicephorus*). The Decree of St. Sophia was first reconstructed from the Patriarch Nicephorus' unpublished *Refutatio et Eversio* by D. Serruys (*École française de Rome, Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, XXIII, 1903, 345-351), and later by G. Ostrogorsky (*Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Bilderstreites*, Breslau, 1929, 48-51). I re-edited this text with some minor corrections and added the patristic *florilegium*. Cf. "The Iconoclastic Council of St. Sophia (815) and Its Definition (*Horos*)", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* VII (1953), 35-66, esp. 58-66 (henceforth cited as Alexander, *Iconoclastic Council*). In the following the Decree of St. Sophia will be cited from my edition. Several of the connections to be discussed in this paper became clearer to me after these publications were printed. In such cases I have stated my new views without specifically pointing out the differences from my earlier opinions.

2. The Decree of Hiereia with its appendices including a patristic *florilegium* was quoted *in extenso* and refuted, probably by the Patriarch Tarasius, in a work read at the Seventh Ecumenical Council of Nicaea (787). It will be cited from the *Acta* of the Council of Nicaea, I. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio* etc., XIII (Florence, 1767), 208C-356D. For an analysis of the Decree of Hiereia, see M. Anastos, "The Argument for Iconoclasm as presented by the Iconoclastic Council of 754", *Late Classical and Medieval Studies in Honor of Albert Mathias Friend, Jr.* (Princeton, 1955), 177-188. On the four parts of the Decree of Hiereia: Alexander, *Patriarch Nicephorus*, 237, also 138. Except for the Decree and its appendages, the *Acta* of Hiereia are lost. Most copies must have been deposited at the Patriarchal Library in Constantinople according to Canon 9 of the Seventh Ecumenical Council (Mansi XIII 430 A-B).

3. Decree of St. Sophia, frags. 2-6, 16.
4. Alexander, *Patriarch Nicephorus*, 138-140.
5. Alexander, *Iconoclastic Council*, p. 54 n. 20.
6. Decree of Hierieia (Mansi XIII 300 A): Ἰωάννης δὲ ὁ Χρυσόστομος διδάσκει οὕτως. Decree of St. Sophia (frg. 28): . . . ἐν ἐτέρῳ λόγῳ τῶν Ἐἰς τὸν δεσμοφύλακα ἐπιγραφομένων λέγει. Nicephorus makes it clear that this rubric is not his own but that of the bishops assembled at St. Sophia, cf. the ἐτι φασὶν ὅτι in my edition of frg. 28.
7. Decree of Hierieia (Mansi XIII 292 D): λέγει οὖν ὁ ἐν σημειοφόροις περιβόητος Ἐπιφάνιος ὁ Κύπρου. Decree of St. Sophia, frg. 30 A, about which Nicephorus remarks: προχειρίζονται οὖν ὡς δῆθεν Ἐπιφανίου Διαθήκην πρὸς τοὺς τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς αὐτοῦ τετυπωμένην . . . Nicephorus clearly does not accept the attribution which is that of the Iconoclasts (cf. ὡς δῆθεν).
8. Decree of Hierieia (Mansi XIII 301 D): Ἀμφιλόχιος ὁ τοῦ Ἰκονίου ψησίη. Decree of St. Sophia (frg. 22): . . . παρατιθέασιν Ἀμφιλοχίου τοῦ ἐξ Ἰκονίου λόγους ἐκ τοῦ πεπονημένου αὐτῶ Ἐγκωμίου εἰς τὸν μέγαν Βασιλεῖον. To judge merely from Nicephorus' wording the identification of Amphilochius' work might be due either to the drafting committee or to himself. However, in view of the instances discussed in the two preceding notes the former alternative is more probable.
9. Decree of Hierieia (Mansi XIII 301 D): οὐ γὰρ τοῖς πίναξι τὰ σαρκικὰ πρόσωπα τῶν ἁγίων διὰ χρωμάτων ἐπιμελὲς ἡμῖν ἐντυποῦν, ὅτι ἐχρήζομεν τούτων, ἀλλὰ τὴν πολιτείαν αὐτῶν δι' ἀρετῆς ἐκμμεῖσθαι. Decree of St. Sophia (frg. 22): Οἱ ἅγιοι οὐ προσδέονται τῶν διὰ γραμμάτων ἡμῶν ἐγκωμίων, ἐγγεγραμμένοι ἦδη τῷ βιβλίῳ τῶν ζώντων, ὡν ἡ δικαιοσύνη παρὰ τῷ θεῷ πεφύλακται. ἡμεῖς δὲ χρῆζομεν τῶν διὰ μέλανος γραμμάτων ὅπως ὁ νοῦς ἡμῶν διαγράφη τὴν τούτων μνήμην εἰς κοινὴν ὠφέλειαν καὶ ὤμην ἀκροσται τούτων, ὅταν διὰ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως τῆ ἀκοῆ παραπέμπωμεν. ὡς γὰρ ἐκ μεγάλου θησαυροῦ πρὸς οἰκονομίαν τὰς εὐεργεσίας λαμβάνομεν καὶ πληροῦμεν ἡμῶν τὰ ὑστερήματα ταῖς τούτων πολιτείαις (οὐ γὰρ πληροῦται ἀκοῆ δι' ἐπιθυμίας ἔχουσα ἀκούσαι τὴν τούτων τελειώσιν). ἀλλ' οὐ χρώμασι τοῖς πίναξι τὰ σαρκικὰ αὐτῶν πρόσωπα ἐπιμελὲς ἡμῖν ἐκτυποῦν ὅτι οὐ χρῆζομεν τούτων, ἀλλὰ τὴν τούτων ἀθλήσιν ἐκμμούμενοι καὶ τὰς ἀγαθὰς πράξεις δευτεροῦμεν καὶ τὴν πρὸς θεὸν ἀγάπην διαγράφομεν καὶ ἐσμεν μιμηταὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν πράξεων αὐτῶν, ἐντιθέντες τῇ γραφῇ τὰς τούτων μνήμας μετὰ θάνατον πρὸς τοὺς ἀκούοντας ὅπως γνῶσι τὴν ἐν κόσμῳ αὐτῶν ἀναστροφήν.
10. Decree of Hierieia (Mansi XIII 300 A): ἡμεῖς διὰ τῶν γραφῶν τῆς τῶν ἁγίων ἀπολαύομεν παρουσίας, οὐχὶ τῶν σωμάτων αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ τῶν ψυχῶν τὰς εἰκόνας ἔχοντες· τὰ γὰρ παρ' αὐτῶν εἰρημένα τῶν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν εἰκόνας εἰσὶ. Decree of St. Sophia (frg. 28): εἰ γὰρ εἰκόνα τις ἀψυχον ἀναθεῖς παιδὸς ἢ φίλου ἢ συγγενοῦς νομίζει παρεῖναι ἐκεῖνον τὸν ἀπελθόντα καὶ διὰ τῆς εἰκόνας αὐτὸν φαντάζεται τῆς ἀψύχου, πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἡμεῖς διὰ τῶν γραφῶν τῆς τῶν ἁγίων ἀπολαύομεν παρουσίας, οὐχὶ τῶν σωμάτων αὐτῶν τὰς εἰκόνας ἔχοντες ἀλλὰ τῶν ψυχῶν· τὰ γὰρ παρ' αὐτῶν εἰρημένα τῶν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν εἰκόνας εἰσὶν.
11. Decree of Hierieia (Mansi XIII 277 D): οὐ θεμτὸν γὰρ τοῖς ἐλπίδα ἀναστάσεως κεκτημένοις Χριστιανοῖς . . . τοὺς τοιαύτη μέλλοντας δόξῃ φαυδρύνεσθαι ἁγίους ἐν ἀδόξῳ καὶ νεκρῷ ὕλῃ καθυβρίζειν. Decree of St. Sophia (frg. 30 B, Epiphanius): πᾶς οὖν τοὺς ἐν δόξῃ μέλλοντας φαυδρύνεσθαι ἁγίους ἐν ἀδόξῳ καὶ νεκρῷ καὶ ἀλάλῳ θέλει ὄραν; cf. Ostrogorsky, *Studien* etc., 100.
12. Decree of Hierieia (Mansi XIII 277 D): ἡμεῖς γὰρ παρὰ τῶν ἄλλοτρίων οὐ δεχόμεθα τὰς ἀποδείξεις . . . Decree of St. Sophia (frg. 27, John Chrysostom?): ταῦτα δὲ εἰρηται ἵνα οὐ τοῖς πιστοῖς δι' Ἑλληνικῶν γίνηται ἡ πίστις· ἡμεῖς παρὰ τῶν ἔξωθεν οὐ δεχόμεθα τὰς ἀποδείξεις.

13. Of the reviews of Ostrogorsky's work (listed in Alexander, *Patriarch Nicephorus*, 277) that of F. Dölger is most important for present purposes: *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1929, 353-372, esp. 367-370. Dölger suggests that the Seventh Ecumenical Council may have deleted the iconoclastic quotations attributed in the Decree of Hierieia to Epiphanius (except the *Testament*).

14. Mansi XIII 221 C: Πάλιν δὲ ταύτης . . . κλήσει ἐπονομαζόμενον is a quotation from Gregory of Nyssa's *Enkomion on Basil* (P.G. XLVI, 796 B-C).

15. This fact was noticed, however, by the Patriarch Tarasius in his refutation read at the Seventh Council of Nicaea, cf. Mansi XIII 221 B: κεκλοφότες πατρικὰς φωνὰς ὡς οἰκείας προτίθενται.

16. Quotation from Theodotus of Ancyra in Decree of Hierieia: Mansi XIII 309 E-312 A. Anathema of the same council: Mansi XIII 345 C-D. Quotation from Theodotus of Galatia in Decree of St. Sophia (frg. 20). This relation between quotation and anathema was discovered by M. Anastos, "The Ethical Theory of Images formulated by the Iconoclasts in 754 and 815", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, VIII (1954), 150-160, esp. 155, 160. Ostrogorsky, *Studien*, 100 had pointed out a similar case: the language of the earlier Council's first anathema agrees with a fragment from Epiphanius' *Dogmatic Epistle* (frg. 3 Ostrogorsky).

17. Above n. 14. Cf. Nicephorus, *Contra Eusebium et Epiphaniidem*, LXIII (J. B. Pitra, *Spicilegium Solesmense*, Paris, 1852, I 472f.). In the same section (p. 476) Nicephorus mentions that Constantine's *florilegium* contained one excerpt from Cyril of Alexandria's *Commentaries on the Prophet Isaiah*. I know of no other reference by Iconoclasts to this work and in spite of much searching have been unable to connect any of its passages with the Decree of Hierieia. The information on the content of Constantine's *florilegium* is discussed in Ostrogorsky, *Studien*, 13 n. 4 and Alexander, *Patriarch Nicephorus*, 174f. and 175 n. 1.

18. For the general practice, see P. van den Ven, "La patristique et l'hagiographie au concile de Nicée", *Byzantion*, XXV-XXVI-XXVII (1955-56-57), 325-362 (does not consider the iconoclastic councils). At Nicaea Gregory Bishop of Neocaesarea and Theodosius of Amorium declared that a passage from Nilus' *Letter to Olympiodorus* and another from the apocryphal *περίοδοι τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων* had been read at Hierieia (Mansi XIII 37 A-C and 173 D). Neither passage appears in the *florilegium* of the Decree of Hierieia.

19. The information on this imperial drafting committee is collected in Alexander, *Patriarch Nicephorus*, 126f.; on John the Grammarian, 235f.

20. P.G. CVIII 1025 A-B.

21. The only manuscript of the *Scriptor Incertus*, Paris. Gr. 1711, saec. XI, seems to read τῶ συνοδικῶ which was emended by Goar (?) into τὸ συνοδικόν. In view of what C. de Boor, in his edition of Theophanes (Leipzig. 1885, vol. II, 38of.) says about abbreviations and ligatures in this manuscript, a misreading or corruption of a case ending is not surprising. At any rate the τούτου, which follows, excludes readings such as τὴν συνοδικήν or τὰ συνοδικά.

22. Thus Photius in his *Bibliotheca* regularly refers to manuscripts of conciliar *Acta* as πρακτικόν or πρακτικά, cf. *Bibliotheca*, codd. 16-20 (ed. I. Bekker, p. 4f.), Robert Devreesse, *Introduction à l'étude des manuscrits grecs* (Paris, 1954), 70, also the passage from the Patriarch Nicephorus cited below n. 25. But see A. Michel, vo. "Synodikon", *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, IX (Freiburg i. Br., 1937): Synodikon kann einen einzelnen Synodalakt oder eine Sammlung von solchen bezeichnen.

23. For the purposes of this enquiry it is immaterial whether Constantine's *florilegium* or the *Acta* of Hierieia are meant by the *Scriptor Incertus*. In view of the Emperor Constantine's influence upon the Council of Hierieia, it is virtually certain that any passage cited in Constantine's patristic *florilegium* was considered at Hierieia and consequently mentioned in the *Acta*.

24. P.G. C, 1124 A-B. In this passage Constantine himself refers to the Decree as τὸν τῆς ὀρθοδόξου ἡμῶν συνόδου ὄρον (but note the ἡμῶν: the Council was the Emperor's, the Decree was the Council's) while his emissary Kallistos transmits the message as concerning τῶν βασιλέων τὸν ὄρον.

25. Nicephorus, *Apologeticus Minor*, 9 (P.G. C, 845 A-B). In Nicephorus' view no clerical person (ἐκκλησιαστικὸς ἄνθρωπος) can be permitted to discuss the Emperor Constantine's views on religious images or the quotations collected by him. He continues: ἐὰν δὲ ἐκ τούτων τῶν χρήσεων τινὰ βιβλία πρακτικὰ εὑρέθησαν περὶ εἰκόνων τι διαγορεύοντα, διὰ τὴν εἰς τὸν εὐσεβέστατον βασιλέα ἡμῶν πληροφορίαν δέχεσθαι ταῦτα [ταύτην cod.] τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν καὶ ἐπιλύεσθαι [sc. καλῶς ἔχειν δοκεῖ]. The βιβλία πρακτικὰ are clearly the *Acta* of Hierieia which Nicephorus seems to realize have been discovered (cf. εὑρέθησαν), presumably in the Patriarchal Library. On this passage see Alexander, *Patriarch Nicephorus*, 163-165, 182.

26. Gregory of Neocaesarea and Theodosius of Amorion declared at Nicaea that at Hierieia patristic passages, particularly a quotation from Nilus' *Letter to Olympiodorus*, were read from tablets (πιττάκια) not from the manuscripts (βιβλοί, Mansi XIII 37 B-D). The same bishops stated in connection with a passage from the apocryphal *περίοδοι τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων* that at Hierieia no manuscript of patristic texts was brought before the Council and that "lying tablets" only were produced. See Mansi XIII, 173 D: βίβλος ἐν μέσῳ ἡμῶν ἢ σύγγραμμα πατρικὸν οὐκ ἐφάνη, εἰ μὴ τὰ ψευδοπιττάκια προεκόμισον. . . The bishops of Neocaesarea and Amorion had attended the Council of Hierieia.

27. P.G. CVIII 1026 B: donec in manus venit synodus sub Constantino Isauro et Caballino habita ex qua occasione accepta coeperunt in libris auctoritates invenire etc.

28. Note 26 above.

29. The Seventh Ecumenical Council of Nicaea was in the habit of identifying the works from which it quoted by their ἀρχή, cf. for example, Mansi XIII 21 A (Ἐκ τοῦ μαρτυρίου τοῦ ἁγίου Ἀναστασίου τοῦ Πέρσου οὐ ἡ ἀρχή); 21 C (Ἐκ τῶν θαυμάτων τοῦ ἁγίου μάρτυρος Ἀναστασίου ὧν ἡ ἀρχή); 37 E (Ἐκ τῶν κινήθων δογμάτων. . . ὧν ἡ ἀρχή). Cf. Devresse, *Introduction*, 78, 181.

30. The *Scriptor Incertus* may have oversimplified the events. It is improbable that theologians of John the Grammarian's caliber should have been unable to discover any (cf. οὐδὲν) patristic quotations without the help of the *synodikon*. It may also be that the Imperial Committee obtained more from the *synodikon* than the *incipits*. It must have learned from this text of the existence of many "hidden quotations" in the "doctrine" of Hierieia.