

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

6-1-1952

Implications of the Iconoclastic Controversy for the East-West Schism

Warren G. Rubel

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_rubelw@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Rubel, Warren G., "Implications of the Iconoclastic Controversy for the East-West Schism" (1952).

Bachelor of Divinity. 919.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/919>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE ICONOCLASTIC CONTROVERSY
FOR THE EAST-WEST SCHISM

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Historical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Divinity

by

Warren G. Rubel

June 1952

Approved by:

Jacobs Pelton

Advisor

A. G. Merkle

Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	11
Chapter	
I. POLITICAL AND CULTURAL ORIGINS OF THE EAST- WEST SCHISM	1
General	1
West	6
East	9
II. ECCLESIASTICAL AND DOGMATIC ORIGINS OF THE EAST-WEST SCHISM	14
Ecclesiastical	14
Emperor	22
Dogmatic and Cultic	29
The Icon	41
Summary	45
III. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ICONOCLASTIC CONTROVERSY FOR THE EAST-WEST SCHISM	50
General	50
Political and Ecclesiastical	62
Cultural	67
Dogmatic	70
IV. CONCLUSION	84
BIBLIOGRAPHY	87

INTRODUCTION

For nearly a century and a half (726-842) there took place in the Eastern Roman Empire what is termed the Iconoclastic Controversy. This controversy, concerning the use of the icon in the cultic life of the Church, not only contained elements which had significance for the development of the Eastern branches of Christianity, but also brought to a head factors which were to be contributory to the final breach between Eastern and Western Christendom. It is the proposed task of the present thesis to suggest and trace the possible causes and factors which crystallized in the Iconoclastic Controversy and which eventually led to the East-West Schism.

CHAPTER I

POLITICAL AND CULTURAL ORIGINS OF THE EAST-WEST SCHISM

General

In terms of its historical development the Christian Church appears to have reached a decisive turning point in Constantine the Great's recognition and acceptance of Christianity as an approved religion of the State.¹ The essential

¹The significance of this turning point appears to be attested to politically: Cf. John P. Koehler, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1917), p. 91: "Konstantin hat die Kirche in der Folge zur Staatskirche gemacht und damit den Zaesaropapismus eingefuehrt. Das Organ, mit dem er die Kirche beeinflusste, war die Reichssynode, Arles 314, Nicsea 325." It is also attested to dogmatically: Cf. Reinhold Seeberg, Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte (Erlangen: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Dr. Werner Scholl, 1923), II, 1-2: "Man hat diesen Umschwung bis in unsere Tage sehr verschieden beurteilt. Die einen haben an den Anfang des tausendjaehrigen Reiches gedacht, die anderen haben den Beginn des Niederganges der Kirche in dieser Zeit gesehen. Aber die ungeheure Bedeutung dieses Umschwungs hat niemand in Abrede gestellt. Sie erstreckt sich auch auf die Dogmengeschichte, denn diese beginnt - im strengeren Sinn angesehen - erst mit der Regierung Konstantins." And in cultic and artistic areas: Cf. Ernst von Dobschuetz, Christusbilder, in Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Altchristlichen Literatur (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1899), III, 29: "Offenbar bezeichnet auch hier die Anerkennung des Christentums als Staatsreligion unter Konstantin den Wendepunkt. Wie man nunmehr statt Jes. 53 das Psalmwort (Ps. 45:3) von dem schoensten unter den Menschenkindern zum Leitstern fuer die Anschauung von Christus machte, so brach auch mit den jetzt in die weitgeoeffneten Thore der christlichen Kirche einstromenden Massen nicht nur gottesdienstliche Gebrauch, sondern zugleich die aberglaeubische Verehrung der Bilder in die christliche Kirche ein."

causes as to why such a development was realized at this time seem to revolve principally about the following considerations: the gradual ingression into Christian thinking of the *Bartheia* as an actual and tangible reality, later to be historically institutionalized in the Roman Catholic Church;² the decline of the substantial structure of classical Graeco-Roman culture with its inherent weaknesses,³ and its final capitulation to the Christian religion which Constantine would seem to have incorporated, however sincerely, to preserve the monomorphic character of the totter-

²Koehler, op. cit., pp. 8-9. "Durch Konstantin den Grossen ist die Kirche zur Staats- oder Reichskirche geworden. Das geschah nicht auf einmal. Es war unter den obwaltenden Umstaenden ueberhaupt auch nur dadurch moeglich, dass die Kirche schon vorher eine Entwicklung erfahren hatte, die schon stark von der biblischen Grundlage in Lehre und Leben abgekommen war. Es war der Gedanke der zentralen Regierung, der sich als Hauptgedanke durchgesetzt hatte. Es war nicht dieser Gedanke allein, der das geistige Wesen dieser Kirche ausmachte, sondern es gingen viele andere ueber Lehre und Leben damit in Verbindung. Alle haben die Richtung, das Evangelium von dem Heil in Christo hinter aeusseres Menschenwerk zurueckzustellen. Aber der Gedanke einer aeusserlich und innerlich fest gefuegten und nach aussen abgegrenzten Einheit mit ganz bestimmten aeusseren Anschauungen und Formen, die man die katholische Kirche nannte, ist der durchschlagende Gedanke."

³Cf. Charles N. Cochrane, Christianity and Classical Culture (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940). In the words of the author the underlying theme of this book is the following: "The fall of Rome was the fall of an idea, or rather a system of life based upon a complex of ideas which may be described broadly as Classicism; and the deficiencies of Classicism, already exposed in the third century, were destined to involve the system in ruin," p. 355. A brief definition of the chief error of classicism is found on page 97 of this book.

ing Roman Empire.⁴ Thus, while developing as an independent and virtually autonomous unit within the Empire for several centuries, the recognized status of the Church by the State proved to have serious consequences both for the Church and for the Empire. As a state religion Christianity lost her exogamous distinctions, the cultural and religious frictions diminished, and the Christian religion's previous antithetical character was absorbed in the exhilarating realization of its newly established status. As a recent authority has succinctly stated: "The point of turning consisted in the fact that the Empire and the Emperor became an order of Redemption rather than a merely tolerable order of Creation."⁵ It seems highly questionable whether this move was favorable for the Church or not, but from this time on the fortunes of the State and the fortunes of the Church appreciably intertwined and involved themselves with one another.

One of the significant moves that Constantine effected was the dedication of Constantinople as "New Rome" in 330

⁴Ibid. "Political absolutism, social and moral renovation, these were the keynotes of the era instituted by Constantine," p. 188. Cf. also p. 355 on the "renovationist" emperor's similarity in that they required of Christianity a definite subservient social and economic function. Koehler, op. cit., p. 91, says concerning Constantine: "Das Ziel seiner Politik war, die einheitliche Kirche in dem einheitlichen, einen Weltreiche, entsprechend den schon obwaltenden Papstgedanken."

⁵George H. Williams, "Christology and Church-State Relations in the Fourth Century," Church History, XX (September, 1951), 4.

A. D. His reasons are summarized by Charles Diehl:

Not only had Constantine no personal liking for the turbulent pagan city of the Caesars, but he also, and not without good reason, considered it badly placed for meeting the new exigencies with which the Empire was confronted. The Gothic peril on the Danube, the Persian peril in Asia, were imminent; and though the powerful tribes of Illyricum offered admirable sources for defense, Rome was too far away to make use of them for that purpose.⁶

Also, specifically since the time of Diocletian, there had been a new conception of the monarchy astir in the Empire, perhaps deriving its origins from the Oriental divine right of kings, but akin to the spirit of Hellenism and gradually tightened in the progressive history of the Empire.⁷ This too had its effect on Constantine insofar as he picked the site that he did, positioned as it was in the eastern sections of the Empire.⁸

The political significance of the founding of Constantinople as the new location of the imperial throne is perhaps found in the following result of the move: by the founding of Constantinople the Christian Byzantine Empire was inaugurated. Also, as a later development resulting from this move, and a direct consequence of the founding of

⁶ Charles Diehl, History of the Byzantine Empire, trans. by George B. Ives (New York: G. E. Stechert & Co., 1945), p. 3.

⁷ Cf. Cochrane, op. cit., concerning Diocletian, pp. 174-5. As to the relationship of the cult of the Caesars to Classicism and to the European mentality, see also p. 110.

⁸ Diehl, op. cit., p. 4.

Constantinople, there was to follow the bipartisanship of the Empire into two halves in 395.⁹ From this time there appear to arise elements indigenous to the East and to the West which were to substantially affect later conflicting relationships between the respective sections of the Empire, most important of which would appear to be the distinctively different developments of the Latin and Oriental Churches in their relationships with one another and with the State.

⁹ Cf. Karl Krumbacher, Geschichte der Byzantinischen Literatur (Muenchen: G. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1897), p. 2. "Was in politischen Hinsicht die byzantinische Zeit von der roemischen am greifbarsten scheidet, ist die Verlegung des Schwerpunktes vom Westen nach dem Osten und die daraus entstandene allmaehliche Verdraengung der lateinischen Sprache durch die griechische. Der Ausgangspunkt dieses Prozesses, durch welchen die ganze spaetere Geschichte des roemischen Reiches bestimmt worden ist, liegt zweifellos in der Gruendung der neuen Hauptstadt Konstantinopel (326) und in der mit ihr ursaechlich zusammenhaengenden definitiven Teilung des Reiches in eine westliche und oestliche Haelfte (395). Hiemit war die bleibende Trennung des griechischen Ostens und des lateinischen Westens besiegelt und hier liegt auch eine der Hauptursachen der alsbald hervortretenden Entfremdung der Griechen und Lateiner, die sich spaeter zu tiefster Abneigung und offener Feindschaft steigerte und im Laufe der Jahrhunderte unzashlmal in politischen und kirchlichen Zwistigkeiten zum Ausdruck kam. Der sprachliche und kulturelle Dualismus hatte schon die Gruendung von Neuron bestaetigt und durch die Teilung des Reiches erhielt er seine offizielle Bestaetigung, auf deren Grund er sich ungehindert weiterbilden konnte. Der Gegensatz wurde namentlich durch das schnelle Anwachsen der neuen Hauptstadt, welche der griechischen oder graezisierten Reichshaelfte einen politischen und geographischen, bald auch einen religioesen, gesellschaftlichen, literarischen, und kuenstlichen Mittelpunkt verlieh, gefoerdert und gestaerkt."

West

The barbarian invasions which had been threatening the West for a considerable time seem to have eliminated the power in that area through the agencies of Alaric as the leader of the Goths and Attila as the later leader of the Huns. The consequent results of the "migration of nations" which had been threatening and encroaching on the western portions of the Empire for well over a century, was that "um 500 war von der roemischen Herrschaft im Abendlande tatsaechlich nichts mehr vorhanden."¹⁰ Drastic as these invasions were for the Roman Empire, they appear to have placed the Bishop of Rome and Western Christendom in a unique position, for by the sweeping away of the old "Romanitas," Western Christianity became the bearer and imparter of the universal appeal of the Old Roman Empire. This is evidenced to a great degree by the Roman Church's assimilation of the polity and character of the State which fell, a development which was already in process long before, but which was now unchallenged by the presence of the State.¹¹ Indicative of

¹⁰Karl Heussi, Kompendium der Kirchengeschichte (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1937), p. 109.

¹¹Gr. F. Dvornik, National Churches and the Church Universal (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1945), pp. 26-7. "The bishop of Rome, who had so far waged an uneven struggle against the all-pervading power of the Emperors, suddenly found himself not only free from imperial interference, but almost in the place of the Emperor, and his Church rose above

the latter assimilation is the apparent linguistic factor that Latin became the liturgical language of the Western Church.¹²

The position of Latin Christianity was augmented also by the situation surrounding its growth, for as the con-

the ruins of the Western Roman Empire as the one rock that promised security and peace. The Pope and his Church actually took over the succession from the Emperors and the Empire. Quick to grasp the situation and its implications, the Romans soon looked to the Pope as their Dominus, a title that had so far been reserved to the Emperor, and began regarding his person and all things connected with him as sacer and sanctus, two imperial prerogatives. Henceforth the Roman Church considered it her duty to carry on the universal mission of the Empire, now combined with her own mission to preach the Gospel to all nations; and since none of the newcomers had any culture to offer nor any master to impose any; since the Church of Rome was the only cultural power left in the whole West embodying the traditions of the Roman Empire, the new nations expected from her nothing different from Christianity in the shape into which she had molded it." Cf. also Koehler, op. cit., pp. 143-4.

¹²Ibid., p. 29. "The Latin monopoly of liturgical expression in the West was due to the circumstances that preceded the advent of the new faith. The Western Church naturally took advantage of her opportunity to stress the notion of the universality of Christianity, when all her faithful were familiar with one single liturgical language, to maintain, for some centuries at any rate, doctrinal unity and orthodoxy throughout the West and to steer clear of the danger that afflicted the East, where differences in liturgical expression were soon after followed by differences in Creeds." The precedent circumstances were involved in the fact that: "Long before Christianity had reached the Western provinces of the Roman Empire, their inhabitants had learned to look upon Latin as the only respectable language in which priests could address the Deity enthroned in the Romans' gorgeous temples before their congregations of Romanized natives. The native tongue continued to survive in the homes, but it had lost its right of way into the temples," p. 27. However, cf. Karl Holl's reference to Theodore Zahn's observation that in the West too the national languages continued for many centuries.

quering peoples were absorbed into the superior cultural patterns of the conquered, they absorbed also its universal ideals as they became embodied in the Roman Church and in the growing prestige of the Pope. At the same time that this development was being realized in the West, however, there remained political and economic areas of friction which were to assume rather critical importance for factors involved in the relationship between the East and the West. The Eastern Emperors retained sections of land in Italy, and the Pope retained influence over the sees existent in Illyricum, Greece, and Crete. Both situations germinated into later difficulty.¹³ The circumstances surrounding the overlapping jurisdictions of the Pope and the Emperor were to become critical in the light of the later competition between the Lombards and the Frankish Kingdom for the Italian lands, the Pope being forced to assume the role of a type of political arbiter. At the same time the Donation of Pepin was to give to the Pope landed interests and to augment the nature of his later claims and political relationships with the rising kingdoms of the West and with the interests of the Eastern Emperor.

¹³On the cultural, political and economic significance of these areas cf. Charles Diehl, "Byzantine Civilization," Cambridge Medieval History (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1924), IV, 745 ff.

East

In the East, the seat of the Emperor, and the locale of all the early Ecumenical Councils called at the instance of the Emperor, the Church developed in a somewhat different manner. It is peculiar to the East that it early realized the possibilities of the national Church. Pertinent examples appear to be the nationalized Churches of Persia and Armenia, both of which were to suffer virtual extinction after the rise of the Sassanids, protagonists of Zoroastrianism, and of the Moslem faith which superseded the Christian religion in these areas several centuries later.¹⁴ The distinctive growth of the national Church in the East appears to find its chief cause in the precedent cultural circumstances from which the national Church evolved. Whereas in the West the Christian religion moved into areas colored by the singularly conservative character of Latinism, the situation in the East was comparatively different. As Dvornik proposes:

Hellenism, by nature far more tolerant than Latinism, never succeeded in imposing its language in the Eastern provinces, however ready the natives were to adopt its philosophy and culture. The Semitic races, together with the Egyptians and Iranians, never took to the Greek divinities, but stood by their own rites, which were

¹⁴Cf. Kenneth S. Latourette, A History of the Expansion of Christianity (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1937), I, 103 ff. See also Dvornik, op. cit., pp. 6-17.

better organized and more fully developed.¹⁵

In addition, as the cradle of East-Mediterranean culture - and specifically of Hellenistic culture - was found here in the East, the Church could not very well impose its universal character in as thorough a fashion as had been the case in the West and its collisions with the undifferentiated tribes of the invasions. It is indicative in this respect that Latin lost its use even as the diplomatic and legal language of the Eastern Roman Empire after the shift of the sphere of influence of the Empire to the East.¹⁶

For the impending difficulties which were to characterize the future relationships between the East and the West it would appear necessary to take into account also the comprehensive cultural development of the East over against the West. While the Christian West was to step into that period of history known as the "Dark Ages," the Christian East, as the Byzantine Empire, developed richly in art, architecture, literature, political administration, military strategy, and

¹⁵Dvornik, op. cit., p. 28. The various Eastern dialects were still very much existent during the sixth and seventh centuries, an important factor for the rise of the early sects and for the difficulties the Christian religion found in unifying the East-Mediterranean peoples. Cf. Karl Holl, "Das Fortleben der Volkssprachen in Kleinasien in nachchristlicher Zeit," Gesammelte Aufsätze (Tuebingen: J. G. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1928), II, 238-48.

¹⁶Cf. Diehl, History of the Byzantine Empire, pp. 48-9. See also Percy Neville Ure, Justinian and His Age (London: Penguin Books, 1952), p. 119.

religion, and much of this in the classical tradition of Hellenism.¹⁷ How this affected the later relationships between the two bodies is evidenced in the respective cultural, historical, and religious developments; not so much by the fact that the one denied the other, although this is perhaps part of it, but rather in the unfortunate element that the two areas appear to have developed somewhat independently of one another. This is clarified when taking into consideration the surrounding political circumstances which severed communication between the East and the West at a time when intercommunication and interchange appeared most essential. Whereas the Moslem threat in the West had been substantially eliminated by the victory of Charles Martel at the Battle of Tours in 732, in the East the rise of the Saracen powers stood as a constant threat to the welfare of the Empire. Dvornik suggests that:

The Arabs, by occupying the whole of North Africa, settling in Spain, securing a foothold in Sicily and threatening the very shores of Italy, became the real masters of the Mediterranean and made, for a vital period, all intercourse between East and West impossible...From the cultural and religious point of view, the situation was equally disastrous, as the Western Church was almost completely cut off from the East, where Byzantium was still the only center of civilization; and as the Slavs had cut off access by land to Byzantium by their occupation of the Balkans, there remained for several centuries no easy way for the East

¹⁷On the importance of the Byzantine Empire and its significance for an organic comprehension of the Middle Ages cf. Holl, "Die Kirchliche Bedeutung Konstantinopels im Mittelalter," Gesammelte Aufsätze, II, 409-17.

to share with the West its cultural treasures and feed the Western stores with its own Hellenistic inheritance.¹⁸

The contrast is thrown into sharper relief by the fact that the Western nations, and particularly the rising Frankish Empire, accepted Roman Christianity in its Roman form and with its Latin liturgical language; in exchange for this they could offer little save their youthful strength and good will. And what Rome had to offer in cultural achievements appears to have been decidedly limited at the time.¹⁹

Finally, in simple geopolitical terms, the very proximity of the Eastern sections of Christendom to the imperial throne over against the comparative distance of the Roman Pope from Constantinople would set in contrasting position the later political potentialities and limitations of the two areas of the Church in their inter-relationships with one another and with the Emperor.

A brief summary of this material appears to demonstrate the gradual development of frictional tendencies in the

¹⁸Dvornik, *op. cit.*, p. 32. Dvornik also proposes that this unfortunate isolation of the areas lent to the Renaissance the character of a cultural movement without religious roots, the very reverse of what had been the case in Hellenistic Byzantine civilization, p. 39.

¹⁹*Gf.* O. M. Dalton, Byzantine Art and Archeology (London: Clarendon Press, 1911). This book contains an apt description of the actual wealth of Byzantine culture in these areas. See also Koehler, *op. cit.*, pp. 8 ff., on the different characteristics of the Roman and Greek heritages.

political and cultural spheres peculiar to the Eastern and Western Churches. A new phase of the Church's historical development was realized with Constantine's recognition of Christianity as a "religio licita." Little more than a century later the Western portion of the Empire was to fall beneath the arm of the invading barbarians, and the Western section was to be governed chiefly through the agency of the exarch of Ravenna. The intervening centuries between 476 and 800 appear to mark an especial rise in the institutional developments and claims of the Latin Roman Church and the Roman Pope in the spirit of Old Roman cultural conservatism and external polity.

The Eastern Church, recognizing the Emperor as the *Basileus*, apparently found itself assuming a progressively more ancillary function in the affairs of State. While inheriting the cultural achievements of the Hellenistic world, this aspect of its character was to remain, for the most part, uncommunicated to the West; and with no communication between the two areas there was to follow the consequent divergent cultural character which finally gave to the East and the West different religious and life orientations. The ensuing events of the Iconoclastic Controversy were to crystallize and point up the contrasting elements that already existed, thus resulting in the final attrition and disruption of the "universal" character of the Church.

CHAPTER II

ECCLIASTICAL AND DOGMATIC ORIGINS OF THE EAST-WEST SCHISM

Ecclesiastical

A great degree of the Church's ecclesiastical development appears to be non parallel with the political and cultural developments mentioned previously. The Church also had internal problems and inner developments, however, which appear to have led to divergent ecclesiastical developments unique to the East and to the West.

One of the most significant developments in the Church, perhaps arising as a natural consequence of the death of the Apostles and early Disciples, appears to have been the rise of authority.¹ Moreover, the resultant need arising from

¹Gf. Karl Holl, "Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus in seinem Verhaeltnis zu der Urgemeinde," Gesammelte Aufsätze (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1928), II, 44-67. The person with the earliest authority appears to have been Peter. The earliest place of authority appears to have been Jerusalem, and here the person of James appears as significant. As a corrective to what may have become a static conception of the Church, Paul emphasized the authority of the living Christ who is always present in the Church. Essentially, this teaching of Paul appears to have broken the authority of Jerusalem. The death of James, the destruction of Jerusalem, and the ingression of overwhelming numbers of pagan gentiles, were the external circumstances which appear also to have led to the breakdown of the authority of Jerusalem. The breakdown of the authority of Jerusalem appears to have led to the development of the authority of Rome.

this realized loss of authority seems to have led to the gradual articulation of the place of Scriptural Canon, Apostolic Tradition, and of the respective functionary offices of those people active in the life of the Church.²

The problem of authority, however, appears to have involved itself in gradual altering ecclesiastical and dogmatic considerations as to the nature of the Church.³ This alteration in ecclesiastical and dogmatic considerations as to the nature of the Church seems to be evidenced by the

²Gf. John P. Koehler, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1917), pp. 39-40.

³Gf. Adolph Harnack, A History of Dogma, trans. by N. Buchanan (London: Williams & Norgate, 1905), II, 149. "In the process by which Christendom was united externally and ecclesiastically, we can distinguish in the East three, and in the West four, epochs. The first three were common to both the Churches of East and West. The first was characterized by the recognition of the apostolic rule of faith in opposition to the erroneous creeds of heretical associations, after a common ideal and a common hope had united Christians up until the middle of the second century. The *Κανὼν τῆς Πίστης* became the basis of *ἀδελφότης*. The second epoch, in which organization became already of supreme importance, was represented in the theory of the episcopal office, and in the creation of the metropolitan constitution. While thus struggling to establish itself among violent crises, the state of Constantine brought about the third epoch, in which the Church, by becoming completely political, was united, and thus arrived at an external and uniform unity, so that in it the essential nature of the Empire was continued. The Church became the most solid organization in the Empire because it rested on the imperial order of the ancient kingdom. It got no further than this organization in the East; indeed, several great provincial churches separated from it; for the creation of Constantine concealed germs of dissolution... In the West, on the contrary, the Roman Bishop began to engage in those enterprises which, favored by circumstances, succeeded in the course of the centuries in substituting a new and distinctively ecclesiastical unity for that created by the state."

fact that the Church progressively assumed the shape of an externalized organization and developed a sacramental system which served to channel the religious life of the individual members of the Church.⁴ Early indications of this externalizing direction appear in the writings of a man like Irenaeus who enunciated the principle of the growing episcopal office and at the same time furthered the purposes of the Roman Bishop by his witness to the prestige of the Roman congregation.⁵

From very early times the Church at Rome appears to have held a prominent position as a source of influence and

⁴Cf. Karl Heussi, Kompendium der Kirchengeschichte (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1937), p. 73, on the rise of the sacrificial aspects of the priest's office. The rise of the sacrificial office of the priest led to the distinction between lay and cleric. Cf. Dom Gregory Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1945), p. 480. See also Robert Frick, Die Geschichte des Reich-Gottes-Gedankens in der alten Kirche bis zu Origenes und Augustin (Giessen: Alfred Toepelmann, 1928), pp. 154-5. Frick appears to say that the externalization of the Church was realized in two ways: 1. the channeling of Grace by the Church, by which the personal relationship of the Christian with his God was lost; 2. that, at the same time, the Church lost its call to educate, and became rather an institution, the adherence to which assured the unity of the Church.

⁵On Irenaeus Cf. Carl Mirbt, Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des roemischen Katholizismus (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1924), pp. 17-21. See also Frick, *op. cit.*, pp. 56-7. John Koehler in a translated essay on the "Analogy of Faith," Faith-Life, XXV (March, 1952) makes the linguistic observation that the regula fidei of Irenaeus received greater ecclesiastical emphasis at the hands of Tertullian, the practical North African, who was averse to speculation, and like Cyprian and Augustine later on knew little Greek or Hebrew, p. 12.

regard among the Churches of Christendom.⁶ It was a natural result then that in Rome the first inclinations toward assuming a role of primal authority should find expression.⁷ Gradually there seems to appear a progressively developing claim, particularly in the West, that the chief source of authority is located in one place, and finally in the person of one man.⁸ At the Council of Constantinople (381), the

⁶Cf. Heussi, op. cit., p. 75. "Das Ansehen der roemischen Gemeinde beruhte 1. auf der Stellung Rom als Welthauptstadt, 2. auf der Groesse der Gemeinde, 3. auf ihren Beziehungen zu Petrus und Paulus, 4. auf ihrem Reichtum, der die Unterstuetzung zahlreichen auswaertiger Gemeinde ermoeeglichte. Bereits Ignatius ad. Rom., inscr., bezeichnet die roemische Gemeinde als 'προκαθημενη της εβραης' ...Der antignostische Kampf hat das Ansehen der roemischen Gemeinde noch vermehrt und ihr den Nimbus einer huesterin der apost. Tradition gegenueber den Gnostikern gegeben; vgl. die beruehmte, viel unstrittene Stelle bei Irenaeus, adv. haer. III, 3.1: 'Ad hanc enim ecclesiam (scil. Romanum) propter potentiores principilitaten (Principilitatis = *εvidencia*) necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ad his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quae est ab apostolis traditio.'

⁷Victor of Rome appears to be the first man to proclaim his authority as bishop of the Roman congregation. Cf. Mirbt, op. cit., pp. 15 ff. "Viktor v. Rom: Streit mit den Kleinasiaten ueber das Osterfest (192-194)." See also Koehler, op. cit., p. 59.

⁸George H. Williams, "Christology and Church-State Relationships in the Fourth Century," Church History, XX (December, 1951), 25, note 88, notes the observation of Dom Gregory Dix on the way the authority of the Holy Spirit passes from the whole Church at Pentecost, to the episcopate, then to the councils, and finally to the Bishop of Rome. See also Karl Holl's essay "Ueber Begriff und Bedeutung der 'daemonischen Persoenlichkeit,'" Gesammelte Aufsaeitze, III, 493-4. See also Harnack, op. cit., II, 67 ff.

The Council of Nicea (325) appears to have simply designated the local authority for the various episcopates. Cf. Mirbt, op. cit., p. 45. Pope Julius in a Roman Council of 340-341 attempted to retain the authority of the local Church

Bishop of Rome was to be given a place of honor before all other Bishops.⁹ At the Council of Chalcedon (451), the honor of the Bishop of Constantinople was to be raised to that of Rome's position.¹⁰ The latter decision of the Chalcedonian Council appears to have augmented the already developed rivalry between the two areas.¹¹

The real impetus towards developing and establishing a monarchical episcopate in Rome appears to find expression in the person of Leo the Great.¹² Leo maneuvered into a favorable position by his diplomatic relationship with the invading barbarians.¹³ By effectively crushing the ecclesiastical ideals of the Alexandrian Bishops to form an Alexandrian papacy, Leo secured even more firmly the position of Rome and the Roman Bishop in the eyes of the world. The latter defeat of the Bishops of Egypt, aside from the involved political considerations, appears to have been chiefly effected through the Tome of Leo which gave an answer to the

for making decisions. However, in case of problems, the matter was to be referred to Rome, not to any imperially coerced synod. Cf. Mirbt, op. cit., p. 48. See also Williams, op. cit., IV, 13.

⁹Mirbt, op. cit., p. 57, Canon 3.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 80, Canon 28.

¹¹Ibid., p. 45, notes 1 and 2. See also Walter Norden, Papsttum und Byzanz (Berlin: B. Behr's Verlag, 1903), p. 3.

¹²Cf. Koehler, op. cit., p. 145.

¹³Mirbt, op. cit., "Leo I. und Attila," "Leo I. und Geiserich," pp. 78-9.

dogmatic difficulties encountered at Chalcedon.¹⁴ Felix II, Pope of Rome, was to use his prerogatives as the Roman Bishop and excommunicate the Patriarch Acacius in 484, thus effecting the first real schism between the East and the West.¹⁵ By the time of Pope Gelasius (492-496), the Western Bishop was to state that the State is subject to the Church.¹⁶ At the same time Justinian the Great was to reaffirm the position of the Roman Pope as having the position of prime honor in the Church.¹⁷ Finally, Gregory the Great was to include in his person as Pope (590-604) "das Hauptresultat der Entwicklung der alten Kirche."¹⁸ A symptomatic indication of Gregory's objectives is found in his struggle with the Patriarch of Constantinople over the title "Ecumen-

¹⁴Cf. Jaroslav J. Pelikan, "Chalcedon after Fifteen Centuries," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXII (December, 1951), 926-36.

Aside from the orthodox dogmatic position of the Pope, his alliance with the Byzantine Emperor helped to secure the political and ecclesiastical position of Rome. With Cyril and Dioscurus condemned, Alexandria was to be eliminated as a possible rival. Also the Emperor had political interests in Egypt which perhaps dictated his alliance with Leo. Leo, however, never accepted the 28th Canon of the Council of Chalcedon. Cf. Henry Bettenson, Documents of the Christian Church (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947), p. 115. Thus Leo indicated both independence from the Counciliar decision on parallel jurisdiction and honor, and from Constantinople, the seat of the Emperor.

¹⁵Cf. Mirbt, op. cit., p. 84.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 85.

¹⁷Ibid., pp. 95-6.

¹⁸Koehler, op. cit., p. 160.

ical.¹⁹ At the sixth ecumenical council of Constantinople in 681, Pope Agatho, as Leo the Great before him, was to deliver the formula renouncing the Monothelite heresy of the East.²⁰ The Second Trullian Synod of 692, with its repeated condemnation of Monothelism, of Eastern discipline and Church practice, appears as an anticlimactic point of departure for ecclesiastical relationships between the East and the West.²¹ Although a temporary union was again effected, the ensuing Iconoclastic Controversy was once more to sever the relationships between the two sections of Christendom.

The rise of ecclesiastical supremacy in the West appears to have found its origins also in the dogmatic development which finally identified the *Papsttum* and the

¹⁹Cf. Charles Diehl, History of the Byzantine Empire, translated by George B. Ives (New York: G. E. Stechert & Co., 1945), p. 38. See also Mirbt, op. cit., "Gregor I.: Der Titel 'Ökumenischer' Patriarch," pp. 97-8, and "Gregor I.: Gleichstellung der Patriarchen," p. 99.

²⁰Cf. Harnack, op. cit., III, 157. See also Reinhold Seeberg, Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte (Erlangen: A. Deichertische Verlagsbuchhandlung Dr. Werner Scholl, 1923), II, 299.

²¹Cf. Kochler, op. cit., p. 165.

ἐκκλησία

.22 Karl Holl has shown that it was Augustine

who laid the groundwork for the later development in the Western Church:

Augustin betrachtet eine derartige Unterstuetzung der Kirche durch den Staat als einen Dienst, den der Staat der Kirche schuldet. Er beruft sich dafuer auf die alttestamentliche Verheissung, wonach die Koenige Christus dienen werden. Demgemaess haben die Herrscher die Pflicht, den rechten Glauben zu schuetzen, und die Beanten sind gebunden, in solchem Falle den Weisungen und Ratschlaegen der Vertreter der Kirche zu gehorchen. Augustin bringt dies sogar auf den scharfen Ausdruck: Die Kirche gebraucht, wenn sie die Staatsgewalt zu Hilfe nimmt, nicht eine fremde, sondern ihre eigene, die ihr von Christus verliehene Gewalt. Es ist Gott selbst, der durch den Kaiser in den Ketzersetzen gebietet. Und die Kirche tut, wenn sie den Ketzern gegenueber auf den Staat zurueckgreift, nur dasselbe, was Christus bei der Bekehrung des Paulus tat. Denn auch Christus hat den Paulus zuerst zu Boden geworfen, ehe er ihn durch sein Wort zum Apostel berief.

Von dieser Seite her betrachtet, erscheint Augustin wie das Urbild eines mittelalterlichen Ketzerverfolgers: Er hat in der Tat mit diesen Saetzen die Vorstellung des Christlichen Staats, von der das Mittelalter ausging, die Anschauung, dass die Kirche das Recht hat, fuer ihre Zwecke auch das brachium saeculare zu gebrauchen, und der Staat die Pflicht, ihr zu gehorchen, in allen wesentlichen begruendet.²³

The political circumstances which surrounded the Western Church fostered the final development of the medieval Papacy.

²²Gf. Karl Ludwig Schmidt on the brief historical survey of the *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ* in the Church Fathers in Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933), p. 595. Whereas the *βασιλεία* in the New Testament sense appears to portray chiefly an eschatological conception of the return of Christ to reign over his Church, by the time of Augustine the *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ* and the *ἐκκλησία* are set side by side.

²³Gesammelte Aufsätze, III, 91-2.

Emperor

Another aspect of the development of authority which was to further complicate the internal relationships of the Church at large appears to revolve around the person of the Emperor. Whereas Constantine had merely recognized Christianity as a "religio Licitis," by the time of Theodosius it became part of the Imperial policy to promulgate the faith.²⁴ This "identification" of the policies of the State with the life of the Church appears to have presented specific problems in the area of authority because the person and office of the Emperor carried with it a peculiar function and power. As the inheritor of the imperial office of the Classical Graeco-Roman commonwealth - a system constructed on what

²⁴Cf. Charles N. Cochrane, Christianity and Classical Culture (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940), p. 327 on Theodosius' edict from Thessalonica: "We desire that all peoples who fall under the sway of our imperial clemency shall profess the faith which we believe to have been communicated by the Apostle Peter to the Romans and maintained in its traditional form to the present day, the faith which is observed likewise by the Pontiff Damasus and by Peter of Alexandria, a man of apostolic sanctity; to wit, that according to apostolic discipline and evangelical teaching, we should believe in one deity, the sacred Trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, to be worshipped in equal majesty. And we require that those who follow this rule of faith should embrace the name of Catholic Christians, adjudging all others madmen and ordering them to be designated as heretics...condemned as such, in the first instance, to suffer divine punishment, and, therewith, the vengeance of the power that we, by celestial authority, have assumed."

appeared to be political principles with soteriological implications - an aura of divinity was cast around the person of the Emperor.²⁵ This "divinity" found its particular manifestation in the cultus of the Emperor, and specifically in the pagan worship and later Christian reverence shown to the imperial portrait.²⁶ By the time of Theodosius this practice, as performed by Christians, had grown to frightening proportions.²⁷

That the Church had to a great extent capitulated to the authority of the Emperor is attested to by the fact that

²⁵Cf. *ibid.* on the cult of the caesars, pp. 74 ff. The classical commonwealth is founded on political principles of a soteriological nature. Eternal Rome will bring about the unity of the world, establish its peace, and bring to all men concord, community, and freedom. The role of the emperor to the members of the cosmopolis becomes that of a 'Savior and Benefactor' (*Σωτήρ καὶ Ἐδωκεύς*), a kind of 'intermediate being' occupying the somewhat vague borderland which divides God from men and, from that exalted station, discharging the function of an earthly providence, passim, 89.

²⁶Cf. Harnack, *op. cit.*, p. 126. "Besides the worship of the saints, the cultus of the Emperor threatened in the fourth century to intrude itself in the Church. Philostorgius relates that Christians presented offerings to the picture of Constantine, and honored it with lanterns and incense; they also seem to have offered vota to him that they might be protected from calamities." Williams, op. cit., Church History, XX (September, 1951), 7 makes the observation that there were difficulties for the Christians in knowing just how to treat a Christian Caesar: "Before the conversion of Constantine, they had been unambiguous in rejecting the divine pretensions of the Emperors and in refusing them any kind of worship. But since they themselves understood salvation as a kind of deification, they could not deny to a Christian emperor what every Christian claimed for himself."

²⁷Cf. Cochrane, *op. cit.*, p. 321; as also Williams, op. cit., Church History, XX (September, 1951), 3. Note 48, p. 30.

all the general Ecumenical Councils were called by the Emperor.²⁸ In fact, the involvement of the Emperor in the theological and ecclesiastical life of the people was to become a characteristic part of Byzantine civilization.²⁹ From the time of the recognition of the Church by the State, the Churchmen had termed Constantine as *ἱεραποστολός*, thus placing the Emperor in an unique ecclesiastical position also.³⁰ Constantius was to usurp into his imperial office

²⁸ Cf. Karl Schwarzlose, Der Bilderstreit (Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1890), note 5, p. 242. "Die erste zu Nicaea 325 berief Konstantin 381 berief Theodosius der Grosse, die dritte zu Ephesus 431 veranlasste Theodosius II., die vierte zu Chalcedon 451 Marcian, die fuenfte zu Konstantinopel 553 Justinian, die sechste ebendasselbat 680 Pogonatus, die siebente endlich zu Nicaea 787 kam durch Irene zu Stande." Williams, op. cit., Church History, IV (December, 1951), 25, note 71 quotes Dvornik (The Christian East, XIV (1933), 98: "...in convoking the Ecumenical Councils the Emperors judged themselves not to be exercising a power delegated to them, but a power which was an attribute of and, as it were, emanating from their office as Emperor."

²⁹ Karl Holl says: "Nicht erst die toten Kaiser und Patriarchen waren miteinander in der Apostelkirche vereinigt; auch die Lebenden waren verbunden. Der Kaiser war sich seiner Pflicht bewusst, der Beschuetzer des orthodoxen Glaubens zu sein, und die Kirche fuehlte sich verpflichtet, den Staat mit allen Mitteln zu unterstuetzen. So innig wie nur moeglich haben sich deswegen die beiderseitigen Institutionen durchdrungen." Gesammelte Aufsaeetze, II, 415.

³⁰ Cf. Holl, op. cit., Gesammelte Aufsaeetze, II, 414. "Hier in Konstantins Stadt konnte man es nicht vergessen, was der erste christliche Kaiser fuer das Christentum bedeutet hatte. Die orientalische Kirche hat das in der bestimtesten Weise zum Ausdruck gebracht, indem sie Konstantin mit den Titeln des 'Apostelgleichen,' des '13. unter den Aposteln,' des 'Apostels unter den Kaisern' schmueckte. Seit ihm galt auch der Gegensatz zwischen Kirche und Roemereich als aufgehoben: das Reich ist nun christlich, und auf das Reich gehen jetzt Praedikate ueber, die bisher die Kirche sich beigelegt hatte." See also Schwarzlose, op. cit., pp.

definite theological prerogatives, pronouncing with dogmatic finality on the theological difficulties involved in the Arian controversy.³¹ Following the Chalcedonian formulations in which Leo and the West gained for the Latin Church, the Emperor Zeno was to issue his Henotikon as a rallying point for those championing the Monophysite cause and those who wished at the same time to check the growing power of the Roman Bishop.³² Justinian the Great was to shake the Empire by his vacillating policies toward the prevailing Monophysitism of the Eastern provinces, deposing Patriarchs at will, and swaying before the intentions of Theodora.³³ The Emperor Heraclius was to proffer his dogmatic proposals under the guise of Monotheletism.³⁴ Thus it appears that there developed in the Byzantine Empire a tightening caesaro-papistic tendency on the part of the Byzantine emperors. It was to be the radical action of the Iconoclastic Emperors to completely dismiss what was

242-3. The significance of Eusebius for the Arian and later Iconoclastic Controversy is dealt with in the respective articles of Williams, "Christology and Church-State Relations in the Fourth Century," Church History, XX (September and December, 1951) and in George Florovsky's "Origen, Eusebius, and the Iconoclastic Controversy," Church History, XIX (June, 1950).

³¹Cf. Williams, op. cit., p. 22, note 3.

³²Cf. Pelikan, op. cit., XXIII, 932.

³³Cf. Schwarzlose, op. cit., p. 252 on the emperor's use of Melchizedek.

³⁴Cf. Seeborg, op. cit., II, 288.

considered the orthodox religious tradition of their time and to attempt in their reforming programs, actions and procedure which were disrupting to the Church and Empire at large, and which were to demonstrate to a remarkable degree the culmination of the caesaro-papistic tendencies of the Byzantine Emperors.

It is important to remember that in contradistinction to the religious policies of the various emperors, the Pope at Rome was to remain the stabilizing orthodox force in the life of the Church. At a time when the traditions of the Fathers were considered inviolate, the Pope was to uphold the orthodox tradition against the heretical tendencies of the Eastern Emperors. The Pope became a type of unifying ideal for those members of the Christian Church in the East who were seeking to preserve the Orthodox Catholic faith and at the same time seeking to preserve some aspect of religious freedom for the Church from the Emperor.

Those members of the Eastern Church who were to uphold the principle of the freedom of the Church from the State appear to be found chiefly among the monks. It appears as significant for a later understanding of the Iconoclastic Controversy to consider the unique role of the monks in the Oriental Church.

Perhaps the classical expression of the piety and ideal of the Oriental monk is found in the Vita Antonii of Athanasius. The chief idea around which the monk's life

derived its meaning is found in Matthew 5:8. By the purification of the heart, a struggle against the flesh, the self, the demons, the Devil, and finally death, the pure in heart will see God. This is possible because the monk has access to God (1 John 3:21; 5:14). So long as the monk remains on earth, however, the possibility of failing to reach the ideal remains. But in the struggle, through the gift of the Holy Spirit which was promised by God, the monk gradually passes from one stage to another. He is given comprehensive views of the invisible world of the spirit; he becomes a friend of God; he finally sees God. With the purification of the heart goes a concomittant elevation to a higher level of being - "Unverweslichkeit," incorruption, for the epitome of evil appears to be death and corruption, the finiteness and decay of the creature. This basic idea, reaching back to passages of the New Testament, appears to have received fuller articulation in the writings of Clement of Alexandria and finally received its most refined description in the Vita Antonii of Athanasius.³⁵

Furthermore, to realize this ideal, it was necessary to renounce the world (the ascetic life is the intelligent means alone), for the Christian monk of the East had no abiding city here on earth. In fact, the Kingdom of God

³⁵cf. Holl, "Die Schriftstellerische Form des griechischen Heiligenlebens," II, 249-69.

lies in religious antithesis to the kingdoms of the world: *αὐτο-βασιλεία* is the word that Origen employed.³⁶ Thus it appears in general terms that the monks of the Eastern Church were to arise as an influence within and yet apart from the Byzantine Church and Emperor. The development in the Eastern Churches appears to demonstrate the fact that the growth of the Church in the East was more along gnostic-sacramental lines than hierarchichal-sacramental lines as was the case in the Western Church. This can be said because it appears that the real controlling element of the Church in the East was in the hands of the monks, and not in the hands of the priests as was the case in the West.

The influence of the monks in the common life of the Church comes to the foreground especially during the Iconoclastic Controversy. But there were also earlier incidents in the history of the Church which found the orthodox monks upholding the freedom of the Church from the authority of the State. Athanasius and the orthodox Nicene party were to protest against the arianizing tendencies of Constantius.³⁷ Ambrose was to withhold communion from Theodosius,³⁸ and at the same time prevailed upon Gratian to divest himself of

³⁶Cf. Kittel, *op. cit.*, I, 591.

³⁷Cf. Williams, *op. cit.*, XX (September, 1951), 25-6.

³⁸*Ibid.* (December, 1951), p. 5, note 4. See also Cochrane, *op. cit.*, p. 349.

the title pontifex maximus and to relinquish any control over churchly matters which the title implied.³⁹ Anastasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, came into dogmatic conflict with Justinian the Great, and stated, as Schwarzlose quotes: "Be-
weis, dass die priesterliche Wuerde gross und engelgleich ist und, dass ein Priester nicht von einem Laien, sondern nur von einem hoeheren Kirchenhaupt gerichtet werden kann."⁴⁰ Maximus Confessor was to contest the heretical tendencies of emperors of the Heraclian Dynasty.⁴¹ John of Damascus and Theodore of Studion were to carry the struggle for the freedom of the Church in the various phases of the Iconoclastic Controversy.

Dogmatic and Cultic

An attempt has been made to describe some of the political, cultural, and ecclesiastical origins of the schism between Oriental and Western Christendom. That impending hostile elements were both latent and expressed in the contrasted heritages and essential characters of the two areas seems fairly evident. These basically different orientations appear to manifest themselves in dogmatic and cultic areas also. If the West was to develop primarily

³⁹Ibid., p. 26. See also Cochrane, op. cit., p. 324.

⁴⁰Schwarzlose, op. cit., p. 246.

⁴¹Cf. Seeberg, op. cit., II, 293 ff.

along organizational lines, the East appears to have made the major dogmatic contributions of the early centuries of the Church's development. This can be said in a general way because it appears that the East viewed the Trinitarian and Christological controversies in a more problematic fashion. At the same time the organizational development in the West can be understood in terms of the invasions which disrupted the political power of the Empire in the West and made the organizational concern a primary concern for the Western Church.

One of the significant contributory causes to the divergent dogmatic developments of the East and the West appears again to be a lack of linguistic communication between the two. Tertullian and Augustine knew little Greek or Hebrew, hence much of the thinking of the Greek Fathers was to be uncommunicated to them. Conversely, Augustine, the greatest of the Latin Fathers, was not to be translated until the thirteenth century, too late to drastically alter the already developed traditions of the East or the West.⁴² Adolph Harnack has briefly described the difference between Eastern and Western theological thought with the summary:

The element of speculative philosophy was as a rule weak in the system of religion in the West. In place of it, the West of Tertullian possessed a series of juristic "plans" which were destined to play a great

⁴²Cf. Karl Krumbacher, Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur (Muenchen: G. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1897), p. 3.

future.⁴³

In the Eastern Church the dominant theological considerations appear to revolve about the soteriological implications of the Incarnation. The essential cause of the Incarnation is directly involved with the effect of the Incarnation. This would appear to mean that God became man that man might become like God. This idea appears to find expression in the "Recapitulation" theory of Irenaeus.⁴⁴

"Vergötterung" (θεοποίησις) appears as the consequence of the Incarnation as it was finalized in the Atonement and Resurrection.⁴⁵ Deification is the result of the work of Christ, the elevation of corrupt and finite human creatures to a divine being.⁴⁶ Martin Werner makes the observation:

Origenes fuhrt diese Theorie einmal in einer traditionellen Symbolformen vor, in deren zweiten Artikel es heisst: *et surrexit a mortuis et deificavit quam*

⁴³Harnack, *op. cit.*, III, 122. See also Koehler, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

⁴⁴Cf. Martin Werner, *Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas* (Bern-Leipzig: Paul Haupt, 1941), pp. 477 ff. Cf. also Bettenson, *op. cit.*, pp. 42-3.

⁴⁵This is an oversimplification. It is merely selected as a possible key-word for a brief description of the main emphasis of East Christian thought. Cf. Harnack, *op. cit.*, III, 141 and 144-5.

⁴⁶Cf. Seeborg, *op. cit.*, II, 346-7. "Indem ein Glied des Menschheitsleibes (Der Mensch Jesus) unsterblich wird, wird es der ganze Menschheitsleib; καθάπερ ἐνός τινος ὄντος βίωσι πῶτος τῆς φύσεως ἢ τοῦ μέρους ἀνδραπίσ ἐπὶ τὸ πᾶν διεξέρχεται κατὰ τὸ συνεχές τε καὶ ἡνωμένον τῆς φύσεως ἐκ τοῦ μέρους ἐπὶ τὸ ὅλον συνεκδιδομένην (Greg. Nyss. cat. 32)."

susceperat humanum naturam.⁴⁷

Athanasius in his The Incarnation of the Word of God presented a classic example of the Atonement as viewed from this orientation.⁴⁸ It appears that this interpretation of the Atonement and the Incarnation was to become deeply involved in the cultic and dogmatic life of the Eastern Church.

Since man has been raised from the corruptible life of the flesh to the incorruptible life of divine being through the work of Christ, it is understandable why the Trinitarian and Christological controversies played such a significant role in the dogmatics of the East. Insofar as the work of Christ was to be effective it was essential that the Deity of Christ be substantiated, and this is perhaps why also the early Church showed more concern for the person of Christ than the work of Christ in its theological formulations.

One of the more drastic results of the Trinitarian and Christological controversies appears to have been a consequent abstraction of the living faith into a theoretical formulation to be believed.⁴⁹ The highly conceived definitions appear to have moved further and further away from the common

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 370.

⁴⁸Cf. St. Athanasius, The Incarnation of the Word of God (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947). See also Bettenson, op. cit., pp. 47 ff.

⁴⁹Cf. Seeberg, op. cit., II, 310.

piety and understanding of the people.⁵⁰ As a consequent reaction to these abstracting tendencies there appears to arise an understandable desire for more immediate religious experience, for the apparent discrepancy between the absolute transcendence of God, the sophisticated and formalized articulations of the councils, and the actual needs and level of the people, left a gulf between the two.⁵¹ The Cappadocian Fathers recognized the problem and in answer to the situation they appear to have encouraged the use of the Sacraments.⁵²

Added to the Sacramental apparatus of the Church, however, there seems to have arisen also the use of the symbol as a means toward experiencing something of the transcendental nature of religious experience. Karl Schwarzlose in his study of the Iconoclastic Controversy has demonstrated the importance that the symbol played in the thinking of men like Origen and Cyprian.⁵³ It was Neoplatonic thinking which was more firmly to secure the place of the symbol in the life

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 311.

⁵¹Loc. cit. "Neben dem offiziellen 'Glauben' entstehen neue verborgene Kanäle, die jenes Beduerfnis des Menschen speisen. So haben einst die alten Gnostiker neben ihre mythologische Theologie die Mysterien gestellt und auch Neoplatonismus hat immer staerker neben seiner Metaphysik die Mysterien gepflegt."

⁵²Loc. cit.

⁵³Schwarzlose, op. cit., pp. 12 ff.

of the Church and help solve numerous problems in the cultic and theological life of the people. The symbol became a more immediate means whereby the individual could at least experience by sight what had been abstracted by reason, for as Seeberg remarks:

Das Symbol - so dachte man es sich neuplatonisch - ist die Sache. Mit dem symbolischen Akt erhaelt man das Ding selbst...Im Bilde oder im Kreuz, im Wasser oder im Brot und Wein ist Christus selbst gegeben und gegenwaertig.⁵⁴

Neoplatonic thinking appears to have made its chief inroads into the life of the Eastern Church through the theological contributions of men like Cyril of Alexandria, Dionysius the Areopogite, and Maximus Confessor, finding expression in the theological and cultic writings of these men.

That form of Greek theological thought which was to best illustrate the primary inclination of the Eastern character appears to find expression in the distinctive doctrine and teaching of Monophysitism. Monophysitism appears to have derived its original impetus from the writings of Cyril of Alexandria.⁵⁵ Cyril's chief idea appears to be to

⁵⁴Seeberg, op. cit., II, 323.

⁵⁵This is not to say that Cyril of Alexandria was a Monophysite but rather that Cyril's controversy with Nestorius led him to over-statements concerning the person of Christ which were to result in an elimination of the significance of the humanity of Christ, the precise opposite of Cyril's original intentions. Cf. Seeberg, II, 311: "Aber die Homousie wie der Monophysitismus haben entgegen-Richtung gewirkt, als sie gemeint waren. Sie sollten Gott den Menschen nahe bringen, aber sie haben in Wirklichkeit seine Konkrete

emphasize the Godhead of Christ in the human Christ. Seeberg summarizes:

Was Cyrill will, ist hiernach klar. Er will die Gottheit in der geschichtlichen Gestalt Christi lebendig und konkret sehen und empfinden, keine logische Schranke soll diesem Beduerfnis nach lebendiger Anschauung entgegenstehen. Es ist die echt griechische Weigung - sie tritt spaeter bei dem Areopagiten ganz deutlich zutage und sie fuehrt schliesslich zur Bildertheologie - im Konkreten und Sinnlichen das Ewige und Goettliche zu schauen und zu spueren.⁵⁶

The Monophysite doctrine was to find conciliar expression in the "Robber Council of Ephesus" (431). It was to settle the Monophysite problem that the Emperor and the Pope coalesced in calling the Council of Chalcedon in 451. As was the case, however, although the Council of Chalcedon was to settle the question of the two natures of Christ conciliarly, it apparently did not eliminate the Monophysite persuasion from the spirit of the Eastern Church.⁵⁷

Offenbarung zurueckgeworfen in die Transcendenz der absoluten abstrakten Gottheit." See also Pelikan, op. cit., p. 929.

⁵⁶ Seeberg, op. cit., p. 226.

⁵⁷ Cf. Pelikan, op. cit., pp. 932 ff. See also Harnack, op. cit., III, 153: "This formula (Leo's Tome) was proposed and dictated by the West in the person of Bishop Leo and was approved by the Emperor; it was regarded in the West as the simple and unchanged creed of the Fathers, in the East as a compromise which was felt by some not to be sufficiently orthodox, and by others to require interpretation." Also, p. 154: "The disadvantages of the Chalcedonian formula made themselves felt in the first half of this (sixth) century. Great ecclesiastical provinces were in revolt, and threatened to secede from the universal Church. Greek piety everywhere showed itself to be unsettled by the decree of Chalcedon. Theology could not follow it; nay, it appeared to be

In the fifth century also the Neoplatonic concern for the symbol was to secure a firm hold in the theology of the East through the work of Dionysius the Areopogite. As Seeberg has shown, the work of Dionysius was not original; rather it was a type of rephrasing and reformulation of Neoplatonic thinking in Christian dress, a Christianized Platonism.⁵⁸

Dionysius the Areopogite established within the Eastern Church a hierarchy of religious values which was to have both cultic and dogmatic and ecclesiastical ramifications. Beginning with a conception of God in his transcendent Being as the "Urgrund," the "Unapproachable Light," impossible for man to experience in any real cognitive sense, the system of Dionysius falls into a hierarchical structure of triads and a triadic hierarchical process: *hieris*, consisting essentially of Purification, Enlightenment, and Unification. Because God is a transcendent God the epistemological problem of knowing Him is constantly present. The mystery and miracle of it all is that God has chosen to reveal Himself in created things. The difficulties of a sharp dualism and transcendental God are resolved in the monistic immanence of God in created things. This is always a *μυστήριον*; even

stified by the decision, while in Monophysitism life and movement prevailed."

⁵⁸Seeberg, op. cit., p. 315.

as the Incarnation, God becoming flesh and revealing Himself in a creature, remained the Great Mystery for the Eastern Church.⁵⁹ The real significance of the work of Dionysius is suggested by Seeberg:

Nicht in dem System des Areopagiten besteht seine geschichtliche Bedeutung. Sondern sie liegt darin, 1) dass er das Christentum als eine kultische Institution ansehen lehrt, 2) dass er dann diese Institution systematisch als symbolischen Ausdruck der neuplatonischen Anschauungswelt deutet, und 3) dass er in diesem Zusammenhang den kirchlichen Aemtern, besonders dem Episkopat, eine religioes fundamentierte Stellung von ueberberragender Bedeutung zuweist. An den kirchlichen Rang haengt die Faehigkeit, Gottes Gnadenkraefte der Menschheit zu bringen, und mit scharfer Betonung ordnet Dionys die Moenche den Hierarchen unter.⁶⁰

How Neoplatonic considerations, as they passed through the writings of Dionysius the Areopogite, and Monophysitism are related in inclination and ultimate objectives appears evident from the fashion in which both systems attempted to bring religion to the senses and not have religious experience found only in the exercise of the mind.

The Monophysite tendencies of the Eastern Church are reflected in the ensuing dogmatic difficulties which followed

⁵⁹Cf. Seeberg, op. cit., II, 317 ff.

The work of Dionysius the Areopogite was to remain in the Eastern Church until John Scotus Eregina translated the writings of Maximus Confessor, which contained the writings of Dionysius, into Latin in the ninth century. The use of the symbol appears to have become a part of the Western Church through the writings of the medieval mystics. Cf. Krumbacher, op. cit., pp. 43-4 and 63.

⁶⁰Seeberg, op. cit., II, 315.

the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon. In 482 Zeno the Isaurian was to publish his "Henotikon," indifferent to the Chalcedonian decrees, politically designed to effect a closer union with Egypt, and hostile to the Papacy at Rome.⁶¹ The result was more difficult in the East. Felix III excommunicated Acacius of Constantinople, thus effecting the first signs of real schism between the East and the West.⁶² The dogmatic controversies were to continue during the reign of Anastasius, and finally under Justinian were to break out again in the affair of the "Three Chapters." The resultant fifth ecumenical council in Constantinople (553) "rendered an official exegesis of the Chalcedonian formula in terms of the theology of Cyril."⁶³ Just previous to the dogmatic developments of the Iconoclastic Controversy Monothelism, the dogmatic offspring of Monophysitism, was to find an upsurge during the reign of the Heraclian Dynasty. It was vigorously contested by Maximus Confessor and condemned by Rome.⁶⁴ Monothelism was condemned officially at both Trullian Synods (680-681) and 692, marking an anti-climactic split between the East and the West, as Koehler

⁶¹Ibid., pp. 270 ff.

⁶²Ibid., p. 271. Cf. Mirbt, op. cit., p. 84. Cf. Pelikan, op. cit., p. 932.

⁶³Pelikan, op. cit., p. 933.

⁶⁴Cf. Seeberg, op. cit., II, 298 ff. See also Harnack, op. cit., III, 157.

points out.⁶⁵ Further dogmatic developments unique to the theology of Eastern Christendom were to find demonstration in the theological development that surrounded the Iconoclastic Controversy.

The suggested dogmatic differences between the East and the West appear to find expression also in the particular cultic developments of the Latin and Oriental Churches. In adjudging early liturgical practices it appears that the Eastern Church was to develop a fixed liturgical form, following in rather close harmony the earlier Hebrew customs. The Western Church, on the other hand, developed a liturgical year more elastic in expression, making concessions often to the particular culture in which it found itself.⁶⁶ The linguistic differences of the East and the West have been noted in the first chapter of the thesis.

From the time of the fourth century on the cultic developments of the East and the West show a progressively disparate character. In the Eastern rites there is noted at the time of the fourth century, and particularly from the time of Cyril of Alexandria in the fifth century, an in-

⁶⁵Koehler, op. cit., p. 165.

⁶⁶cf. J. H. Kurtz, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte (Leipzig: August Neumann's Verlag, 1890), I, 300.

gression into the liturgical ethos of "mystery" and "awe."⁶⁷ This development appears to find itself most clearly expressed in the contrasting Eucharistic practices of the Latin and Oriental Churches. Whereas in the West the Host was to be consecrated and offered before the congregation, in the East the dramatic action of the Eucharist was to take place behind the Iconostasis, hidden from the worshipping people.⁶⁸ The mystagogical concern of the Eastern Church was augmented in greater detail by the writings of Dionysius the Areopogite, Maximus Confessor, John of Damascus, and was to continue throughout the history of the Eastern Church.

Within the actual cultic life of the Church of the East the monks appear to have played a most significant part. The monks administered the Sacraments, heard confessions, and generally controlled the education of the Empire in the East.⁶⁹ It was the monks also who furthered the use of the symbol and the icon in the cultus of the East, exercising a

⁶⁷Cf. Kurtz, op. cit., p. 299. See also Dix, op. cit., p. 481: "The atmosphere of 'mystery' and 'awe' which is the special ethos of the Byzantine rites seems to be very largely a product of the local churches in Syria in the fourth century." P. 200: "St. Cyril in his Catecheses was the first one to begin to make use of the words 'awful' and 'terrifying,' and the 'language of fear' generally, in reference to the consecrated sacrament."

⁶⁸Cf. Dix, op. cit., p. 482. See also Holl, op. cit., "Die Entstehung der Bilderwand in der griechischen Kirche," II, 225 ff.

⁶⁹Cf. Holl, op. cit., II, 270 ff., "Ueber das griechische Moenchtum."

strong influence on the women of Byzantine civilization who became, besides the monks themselves, the most powerful protagonists of the icon.⁷⁰

The Icon

That aspect of the cultic life of the Eastern Church which was to become of critical importance for the Iconoclastic Controversy in a singular and distinctive sense is found in the significance surrounding the icon. Ernst von Dobschuetz in his Christusbilder appears to have collected the materials available for an understanding of the rise of the picture in the Eastern Church. Dobschuetz's main thesis appears to demonstrate that the icon had its roots in pagan cultic beliefs related to Semitic and Greek religious practices, was transmitted to the Christian world through Hellenism, and was given a distinctive Christian interpretation by the Christian world.⁷¹

First evidences of the use of pictures for religious means appear in the gnostic Carpocratian sect.⁷² Alexander

⁷⁰Cf. Holl, "Der Anteil der Styliten am Aufkommen der Bilderverehrung," op. cit., II, 388-98. See also Schwarzlose, op. cit., p. 53.

⁷¹Ernst Von Dobschuetz, Christusbilder, in Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Altchristlichen Literatur (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1899), III, 263. Cf. Schwarzlose, op. cit., p. 17, also Holl, op. cit., II, 388.

⁷²Dobschuetz, op. cit., p. 27.

Severus also mentions the value of pictures, as do others of the time, but the special and particular use of pictures becomes more observable with the recognition of Christianity as a State religion.⁷³ Gradually a theology evolved about the icon. This theological importance of the icon is reflected particularly in those icons which were *εἰκόνες ἀχειροποίητοι*. Icons "not made with hands" arose parallel to the time when Justinian closed the philosophical schools in 529.⁷⁴ It was the Neoplatonic system which finally gave the icons theoretical justification in the religious cultus of the Oriental Church.⁷⁵

The importance of the icon for the Church and its particular theological significance became apparent, in contradistinction to the pagan use from which it was derived, in the unique Christological interest which centered in the icon. Dobschuetz says:

Das Christentum hat aus dem Diipeteglauben, den es von der Antike uebernahm, etwas anderes gemacht. Das zeigt schon der neue Name! Achiropoitos...Es ist die religion-geschichtliche Offenbarung. Darum steht im Mittelpunkt all seines Denkens und all seiner Verehrung die geschichtliche Person Jesu Christi. So sehr man das ewig-goetliche Wesen des Logos betonen moechte, entscheidend

⁷³Ibid., pp. 28-9. On the importance of Jamblich, see p. 22.

⁷⁴Ibid., p. 265. Cf. Holl, *op. cit.*, II, 393 on the cult of the *ἀχειροποίητοι* in Syria. See Schwarzlose, *op. cit.*, pp. 15-7 on the relationship of the *θεοτόκος* of Cyril to the *εἰκόνες ἀχειροποίητοι*.

⁷⁵Cf. Dobschuetz, *op. cit.*, p. 21 and 265.

blieb doch immer dessen geschichtliche Erscheinung in Jesus Christus, dem Gottmenschen. Diese Beziehung auf eine geschichtliche Personlichkeit unterscheidet die christliche Theologie, bei aller Mystik, grundlegend von der neuplatonischen Philosophie. Sie hat auch auf die Ausgestaltung des Achiropolitenglaubens entscheidend gewirkt.

Was man in dem wunderbar entstandenen Bilde suchte, war zunachst ein genaues und getreues Portraet der geschichtlichen Person... Viel natuerlicher aber war es, dasselbe mit der dargestellten Person in direkte Verbindung zu bringen. Christus selbst musste das Bild bei seinen Lebzeiten wunderbar hergestellt haben, und zwar - das war die von selbst dafuer gegebene Form - durch einen wunderbaren Abdruck.

So kommt in die Achiropolitenvorstellung ein doppeltes Moment von wesentlicher Bedeutung hinein: die wunderbare Entstehung durch Beruehrung mit der dargestellten Person und damit zugleich die Zurueckfuehrung auf deren Lebenszeit.⁷⁶

As the icon became involved with the miraculous portrayal of the historic Christ it gradually assumed a hieratic form, for in order to authentically reflect the original portrait as closely as possible it became necessary to copy, without innovation, the traditional forms handed down from tradition.⁷⁷ To substantiate the authenticity of the icons of Christ it appears that there arose the legend that it was St. Luke who had executed the original portrayals of Christ.⁷⁸

It is significant that the oldest icons of the sixth and seventh centuries were singularly icons of Christ. The

⁷⁶Ibid., pp. 268-9, passim.

⁷⁷Ibid., p. 271.

⁷⁸Ibid., pp. 272-3.

icons of Mary and the Saints were of later introduction in the Church, and they never received the same level of regard as did the icons of Christ.⁷⁹ With the rise of the icons of Mary and the Saints, however, there was a parallel decline in the religious concern for the Christological significance of the icon.⁸⁰ Consequently there was to arise aside of the Christological importance of the icon a general concern for the miraculous powers inherent in the picture.⁸¹ In the common folk piety it was the miraculous aspects of the icons which finally became of chief import.⁸² The miraculous aspect of the icon is seen clearly when considering that they were placed in many cities of the East as protective agencies to ward off the enemies of war, pestilence, or demon. A typical picture of the importance of the icon for Byzantine civilization is shown also in the observation of Karl Holl that it was the holy icons which led the returning triumphant armies through the streets of

⁷⁹Ibid., p. 275. Pictures and images of saints rather than of Christ were the more regular Western use, and, as Harnack says, whereas in the East image-worship grew out of Christology, in the West it was a part of a system of intercessors and helpers in need. Cf. Harnack, op. cit., p. 308.

⁸⁰Dobschuetz, op. cit., p. 278.

⁸¹Ibid., pp. 276-80.

⁸²Ibid., p. 279.

Constantinople.⁸³

Within the entire development of the Eastern Church there also remains to be mentioned the place that Tradition played in the life of the Church. The authority of Tradition for the Oriental Christian is reflected in the concern that all parties paid in most every controversy and council to the teachings of the Fathers of the Church. John of Damascus was to defend the adoration of pictures in a way that was characteristic of the spirit of Tradition when he exclaimed that not to show reverence to pictures was to break an Apostolic Tradition and rupture the Church in Schism.

Summary

Thus far it has been the attempt of the thesis to present a general description of the political, cultural, ecclesiastical, dogmatic, and cultic origins of the East-West Schism as these factors were to culminate in the Iconoclastic Controversy and finally effect complete schism between the Oriental and Occidental Churches of Christendom. We have seen how the Western Church, catholic in its use of Latin, conservative in theological speculation, and opportune in geographical and political location, was to develop along essentially organizational-ecclesiastical lines. As a defender of traditional orthodox teaching, the authority of

⁸³Holl, op. cit., II, 415.

the Roman Church was to be augmented by the role she assumed in contesting the various heresies which were to characterize the early years of the history of the Church. Men like Leo, Gregory, and Agatho were to influence the life and future of the Church and leave a lasting impress by their significant manipulations in the various conciliar decisions, in their diplomatic relationships with the invading peoples of Europe, and by their contributions to practical church life. We have seen in general fashion how the hierarchical-sacramental structure of the Western Church was gradually fixed, replacing the departed Old Roman Empire of the West with an essentially theocratic ecclesiastical organization. Therefore it appears possible to conclude that by the end of the seventh century, just previous to the Iconoclastic Controversy, the character of the Western Church was oriented along fixed lines of external organizational description.

Furthermore, we have seen how the Emperor in the Byzantine Empire was to become inextricably involved in the religious life of the Empire, evolving about himself an aura of divinity, expressed not only in political matters but also in ecclesiastical and dogmatic areas, which was threatening to disrupt the place of the Church in the Empire. On the other hand, the monks of the Eastern Church, existing ascetically apart from the common life of the State, were to exercise a corrective influence over against the growing caesaro-papistic inclinations of the various Emperors. In

their appeal for freedom from interference by the State the monks were to look to Rome as the primus inter pares, not only for reasons of theological orthodoxy, but also because Rome presented an ideal of the ecclesiastically free Church, exercising her authority apart from major interference by the State. Therefore it appears possible to conclude also that by the end of the seventh century, just previous to the Iconoclastic Controversy, there existed a pronounced tension between the Emperor and the Church, as the Church was particularly represented by the monks. This tension appears to have existed chiefly because the Emperor was the Emperor with specific imperial prerogatives, and because as Emperor he had political considerations of importance to the preservation of the Empire which dictated his ecclesiastical and dogmatic procedures. The opposition from the monks appears to find its basis in reaction to the heretical tendencies of the Emperors, and in an attempt to extricate the Church from imperial authority.

In dogmatic areas it has been the attempt to demonstrate that the corresponding developments of the Eastern and Western Churches progressed along different channels. We have seen to a certain extent that the fundamental disparity of language led to a consequent lack of communication between the two areas. We have seen how the East was to remain dissatisfied with the theological decisions of Chalcedon, articulating in the following centuries doctrines concerning the

nature of Christ which were particular to the problematics of the East. The East was to fasten its attention on the soteriological implications of the Incarnation. It appears plausible to project that the Western Church remained satisfied with the orthodox definition of Chalcedon, that in a disrupted Western Europe its primary need was organization, and that it did not become involved in the problematics of the East because it understood salvation with a somewhat different emphasis. It is noteworthy that there was no Christological controversy in the West from the time of Chalcedon to the Reformation.

In categories of cultic dimension we have seen how the two Churches were unique in their respective developments. The ingression of the symbol and the icon into the liturgical life of the Eastern Church was to be confirmed by Neoplatonic thinking, which systematized and justified the existence of the symbol and the icon in the Eastern Church. The mystery of icons "not made with hands" was to find further development in the history of the Church and was to be carried into Christological areas. The Eastern liturgical year was to become fixed while the Western Church was to develop more elastically in liturgical areas, making cultural concessions to the common practices existent in her territories. The language of the Eastern rites, however, was to remain primarily a matter of national or racial preference, thus not encouraging uniformity among the Eastern Churches themselves.

The West, preserving the uniform character of the Latin language, thereby also strengthened its organizational position as the Catholic Church. Thus it appears possible to conclude that in dogmatic and cultic areas also there arose differences in development which were later to affect the relationship between the Eastern and the Western Church.

CHAPTER III

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ICONOCLASTIC CONTROVERSY FOR THE EAST-WEST SCHISM

General

The Iconoclastic Controversy appears to cover a period of a little over one hundred years. From the time of its inception in 726 during the reign of Leo III (714-741),¹ it was carried on with particular stress by his son Constantine V (741-775), and with lesser harshness also by Leo IV (775-780). After the iconophile interlude of Irene's reign (780-802), and the consequent re-establishment of image worship by the Seventh Ecumenical Council of 787, ending the first phase of the controversy, iconoclasm again returned under Leo V (813-820), Michael II (820-829), and Theophilus (829-842). Finally, the icons were to find a permanent place in the cultic life of the Eastern Church under Theophilus' widow, Theodora, with the re-enactment of the decisions of the Seventh Ecumenical Council and the proclamation of the Festival of Orthodoxy.

¹On the dates of the first proscriptions of images cf. Gerhart Ladner, "Origin and Significance of the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy," Medieval Studies (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1940), II, 135, note 45.

The factors involved in the Iconoclastic Controversy appear complex. The controversy has been interpreted from social, economic, political, and religious perspectives, and each has received a different emphasis in the various works on the subject. In the light of recent historical research, however, it appears that aside from the included political, social, and economic factors involved in the controversy, the particular issue involved within Byzantium was a religious one. George Florovsky has summarized the current opinion:

Most scholars now recognize that the true problem under discussion was specifically religious, and that both parties were wrestling with real theological problems. The Iconoclastic debate was not simply ecclesiastical or ritualistic; it was a doctrinal controversy. Some ultimate issues of faith and belief were at stake. It was a real struggle for "Orthodoxy."

... This new conclusion should not deny or minimize the political and social aspects of the conflict. But these aspects are to be viewed in proper perspective. All doctrinal movements in the Early Church (and possibly, all doctrinal and philosophic movements) were, in some sense, "politically involved" and had political and social implications. In the Iconoclastic conflict the political strife itself had very definite theological connotation and the "Caesaro-papalism" of the Iconoclastic emperors was itself a kind of theological doctrine.²

It appears to have been theological considerations which motivated Karl Schwarzlose to state that the impending actions of the Iconoclastic emperors were the culmination of a

²George Florovsky, "Origen, Eusebius, and the Iconoclastic Controversy," Church History, XIX (June, 1950), 78-9, passim.

long history of doubts as to the possibility of harmonizing a strict monotheism with the adoration of pictures.³ How monotheistic criticism affected the iconoclastic policy of Leo III is difficult to determine,⁴ but the eventual issuance of an iconoclastic controversy appears as a critical point of reaction within the Byzantine Empire. The iconoclastic program of Leo III appears to have been directed as part of a wider reform program for the purpose of recreating a healthier Empire.⁵

If the immediate motives of Leo III were political, social, economic, and religious reform, the consequent effects of the iconoclastic edicts in the religious sphere were to have ultimate repercussions in all areas at home and throughout the Empire. The importance of the icon for Byzantine religious life has been touched upon in the previous chapter. Why the iconoclastic edicts had rather drastic

³Cf. Karl Schwarzlose, Der Bilderstreit (Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1890), p. 37.

⁴Ibid., pp. 38-42. See also Ladner, op. cit., pp. 129-34. This monotheistic criticism may have taken the form especially of Jewish, Mohammedan, or Paulician criticism. The only definite conclusions that can be drawn in this respect is that iconoclasm had its origins in the East, the chief protagonists were from the Eastern Asiatic provinces of the Empire; e.g. the iconoclastic Emperors and iconoclastic Bishops, and that the Nicene Council of 787 established a causal connection between Judaism, Mohammedanism, and the Iconoclasts.

⁵Cf. Charles Diehl in Cambridge Medieval History (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1924), IV, 1.

results can be seen then by some of the following factors:

1. Insofar as the iconoclastic edict was directed against the cultic use of icons it was directed also against the monks who, beside encouraging the use of the icon, were dependent on the icons for subsistence. In fact, monasticism itself was to become a main target of the Iconoclasts as will be seen later.
2. Moreover, because the monks played such an important role in the cultic life of the people, the monks' involvement in the controversy brought the iconoclastic struggle down to the level of the people, creating a definite antagonism between the Emperor and the people.⁶
3. The iconoclastic reaction found its roots in the higher classes of the clergy and society. For the people, the masses, who were instinctively faithful to time-honored traditions, the iconoclastic policies were only to further their sympathies for the monks and for icons.⁷
4. The iconoclastic Emperors by proscribing images were to run counter to what was considered orthodox religious tradition, and here they were to meet the protracted opposition of the Roman Pope, the defender of orthodoxy, whose position in the West had been augmented by the lessening political powers of the exarch of Ravenna.

⁶Cf. Schwarzlose, op. cit., p. 50

⁷Cf. Diehl, Cambridge Medieval History, IV, 9.

The immediate consequences of the proscription of images by Leo III are described by Charles Diehl:

At Constantinople, when the people saw an officer, in the execution of the imperial order, proceed to destroy the image of Christ above the entrance to the Sacred Palace, they broke out into a riot, in which several were killed and injured, and severe sentences necessarily followed. When the news spread into the provinces worse things happened. Greece and the Cuclades rose and proclaimed a rival Emperor, who, with the support of Agallianus, turmarch of the Helladics, marched upon Constantinople, but the rebel fleet was easily destroyed by the imperial squadrons. In the West results were more important. Pope Gregory II was already, owing to his opposition to the fiscal policy of Leo III, on very bad terms with the government.

— When the edict against images arrived in Italy, there was a universal rising in the peninsula in favor of the Pope, who had boldly countered the imperial order by excommunicating the exarch and denouncing the heresy (727). Venice, Ravenna, the Pentapolis, Rome, and the Campagna rose in revolt, massacred or drove out the imperial officers, and proclaimed new dukes; indeed, matters went so far that the help of the Lombards was invoked, and a plan was mooted of choosing a new Emperor to be installed at Constantinople in the place of Leo III.⁸

Further consequences of Leo's imperial policy was the deposition of the Patriarch Germanos and the appointment of Anastasius to his place.⁹ Leo also closed the schools and suppressed their teaching concerning images.¹⁰ Gregory II, Pope at Rome, protested in two letters to Leo III dealing

⁸Ibid., p. 9.

⁹Cf. Edward J. Martin, A History of the Iconoclastic Controversy (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1923), p. 34.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 36.

with a defense of images and his office.¹¹ These two letters of Gregory II appear to reflect that: 1. the use of images was of a different nature in the West; 2. the concern of Gregory II was primarily a concern for his position as Pope; 3. Leo III manifested his caesaro-papistic inclinations.¹² Gregory III, successor of Gregory II, was more articulate in his hostility to the Emperor, anathematizing the iconoclasts at a council in Rome in 731.¹³ As Edward Martin has pointed out, Gregory III was to issue his own coinage, signaling thereby his temporal independence from the Emperor and the Empire.¹⁴ Leo's reaction to the

¹¹Schwarzlose, op. cit., pp. 55 ff.

¹²Cf. Erich Caspar, "Papst Gregor II. und der Bilderstreit," Zeitschrift fuer Kirchengeschichte (Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1933), Heft I. The letters of Gregory II appear authentic in part, but in their content on the defense of images rely on the previous correspondence of the Patriarch Germanos with Thomas of Claudiopolis, one of the first iconoclastic bishops. The letters, while dealing with the matter of icons draw their chief apologetic from the fact that pictures in the West were used as devotional "reminders." The significant point of the letters appears to be found in the Pope's contestation of Leo's self appellation: *βασιλεὺς καὶ ἱερεὺς εἰμί*. The Pope responded on his own behalf: *παίδευσις τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν — τοῦς τῶν κοσμικῶν, ἡμεῖς τῶν χριστιῶ ἐχόμεν — πολεμικῶν χειρῶν τῶν ὃν ἔχεις καὶ πᾶχόν*. Caspar continues, p. 42: "Sie ist hier entsprechend dem verschiedenen Beweismasse nur auf einen anderen Gegensatz, naemlich den der geistlichen und weltlichen Gewalt, gewendet; die Polemik ist damit noch schärfer, indem der Papst diesmal die Grenze nicht zwischen 'uns Menschen' und dem Hoheren, sondern zwischen sich und dem Kaiser zieht."

¹³Cf. Schwarzlose, op. cit., p. 57.

¹⁴Cf. Martin, op. cit., p. 78.

policies of Gregory III was the detachment of Greek-speaking Calabria, Sicily, Crete, and Western Illyricum from Roman jurisdiction, placing them under the surveillance of the Patriarch of Constantinople.¹⁵

Leo's son, Constantine V, the arch-iconoclast, furthered the program of his father and carried it to a final extreme. He convened an Ecumenical Council at Hieria in 754 at which an official rendering of the Iconoclastic doctrine culminated in a complete revocation of images and a parallel persecution of those not following the decrees of the Council.¹⁶ The imperial policy also included a replacement of the sacred art and images with profane unfigured decorative art. If figured art was employed it derived its thematic material from the cult of the Emperor.¹⁷

Whereas Leo III had been primarily adverse to sacred images, Constantine V demonstrated a hostile attitude to the *áγιοι* appellation of the saints and martyrs. He refused the title of *θεοτόκος* to the Virgin Mary and claimed

¹⁵Cf. Walter Norden, Papsttum und Byzanz (Berlin: B. Behr's Verlag, 1903), p. 5.

¹⁶Cf. Schwarzlose, op. cit., p. 59.

¹⁷Cf. Ladner, op. cit., pp. 137 ff. The imperial coinage also substituted the imperial portrait for the accustomed use of images of Christ and the Virgin Mary.

that Christ was born a mere man as he was.¹⁸ The Council of 754 was followed by direct persecution of the monastics, and many monks and nuns suffered martyrdom for the iconophile cause. The monks and nuns were given the choice of marriage or death. The monasteries and convents were turned into arsenals, stables, or barracks.¹⁹

Constantine V also made overtures to Pepin, king of the Franks, seeking iconoclastic sympathies; and the council of Gentilly (767) aired the question but appears to have had no fundamental idea of the questions actually involved in the use or the abolishment of images.²⁰ Stephen III, then Pope of Rome, anathematized the iconoclastic council of 754 at the Lateran Council of 769, declaring the adoration of pictures a pious duty.²¹

Significant to consider is the role that the Frankish kingdom was assuming in the West at this time. In the first chapter of the thesis the growth of the Western powers was

¹⁸Cf. Georg Ostrogorsky, "Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Bilderstreites," Historische Untersuchungen (Breslau: M. & H. Marcus, 1929), Heft V, 33-38. See also Ladner, op. cit., p. 142.

¹⁹Cf. Ladner, op. cit., p. 141.

²⁰Cf. Martin, op. cit., pp. 80-1. It appears that this can be said of the West in general as far as its attitudes toward images was concerned. The West derived its teachings concerning images chiefly from Gregory the Great, and Gregory's concern for pictures rested more on practical considerations than formal doctrinal definitions.

²¹Ibid., p. 82.

touched upon. With the defeat of the Moslems at the Battle of Tours in 732, the Franks were to achieve supremacy in the West. Gregory III had friendly relations with Charles Martel. In 751 the exarchate of Ravenna, through which the Eastern Emperors governed Italy, fell to the Lombards. Pope Stephen II detached himself from the Franks who in the meantime had defeated the Lombards, and accepted from the victorious Pepin lands formerly belonging to Byzantium.²² The Donation of Pepin thence formed the temporal domain of the Papacy (754). In 774 Charlemagne confirmed the Donation of Pepin, an action which sealed the Pope's sympathies for the West and affirmed the lack of existing harmonious relationships between Byzantium and the West.

With reference to the political and economic and social reforms of the Iconoclastic Emperors it appears that despite their drastic measures in religious categories, their decisive defeats of the Moslems who were threatening to bring about the collapse of Byzantium herself, and their juridical and social reforms as embodied in the Ekloga of Leo III and perhaps also the *νόμος γερμανικός*, appear to have stayed the impending threats of the Moslems and gave to the Byzantine Empire a fresh impulse which lasted for several hundred

²²Cf. Charles Diehl, History of the Byzantine Empire, translated by George B. Ives (New York: G. E. Stechert & Co., 1945), p. 61.

years.²³ It is in the light of the Iconoclastic Emperors' political and military and economic reforms that the persecution of the monastics is better understood. The vita contemplativa of the ascetic monastics enervated and depleted the State of some of its potential personnel, vital for the preservation of the State. At the same time the Church's immunity from taxation appreciably reduced the income of the State. Also, within the social framework of the Empire, the authority that the monks exercised over the people in the use of icons, educational institutions, and moral guidance, led the Iconoclastic Emperors, whose primary concern was the establishment of an absolute military State, to carry their reform programs to the monastics.²⁴

The brief reign of Leo IV (775-780), during which he also followed the iconoclastic policies of his predecessors, was followed by the interim rule of Irene. As regent for her son, Constantine VI, Irene brought about the Seventh Ecumenical Council of 787, bringing to end the first phase of the controversy. At the Council of 787 the "Pseudo"-Council of 754 was branded heretical and anathematized, the

²³Cf. ibid. on the complete decadence which preceded the Isaurian Dynasty. The social, moral, intellectual, and religious level of the Empire had reached an extremely low level, pp. 51-2. See also Martin, op. cit., pp. 5-11. On the religious abuses of the images cf. Diehl, Cambridge Medieval History, IV, 9.

²⁴Cf. Diehl, Cambridge Medieval History, IV, 8.

images were re-established and more harmonious relationships were again brought about with Rome. The ensuing overtures and relationships with Rome in the person of Hadrian I and with the Frankish Kingdom in the person of Charlemagne appear to demonstrate that: 1. The concern of Hadrian was primarily with his temporal position. He wrote to Irene that he was satisfied with the decision of the Council on images, but that if the Papal Patrimonies were not restored along with the dioceses of Southern Italy and Illyricum, he would not consider Orthodoxy as revived in the East.²⁵ 2. Charlemagne, though at first conciliatory to Constantinople, reflected a marked theological hostility to the iconophiles in the Libri Carolini. In fact, the hostility of Charlemagne appeared strong enough to find the theology of the Seventh Ecumenical Council almost always wrong.²⁶

If in ecclesiastical realms Irene's re-establishment of images was met with approval, and even seen by some of the monks as an approximation of the ideal of the freedom of the Church from the State, her actions in other areas appear to have weakened the position of the Byzantine Empire. She

²⁵Cf. Martin, op. cit., pp. 90 and 223.

²⁶Ibid., pp. 224-8. See also Gerhart Ladner, "Der Bilderstreit und die Kunst-lehren der byzantinischen und abendlaendischen Theologie," Zeitschrift fuer Kirchengeschichte (Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1931), Heft I, 13, note 41.

overthrew dynastic precedent by deposing her son.²⁷ During her reign the Moslems were to threaten once more the shrinking Eastern bounds of the Empire, and Irene was to establish peace with the Moslems in 783 at a substantial loss to the Empire.²⁸ Also during Irene's reign an anticlimactic turning point was reached between the East and the West with the crowning of Charlemagne as the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire.²⁹ At the same time the Pope was to cease looking to Constantinople for ratification of his election, thus also severing the Western Church from any official relationships with Constantinople.³⁰ The Emperor Nichephorous pointed to this transaction as a defection of Rome from the Byzantine Empire.³¹

Irene was deposed by Nichephorous who assumed a status quo relationship to the question of images. His successor Michael followed a similar procedure. With the ascension of Leo V, the Armenian, however, iconoclasm was once more to find a protagonist. On Easter of 815 he convoked a council which annulled the decisions of the Seventh Ecumenical Council and reinstated the decrees of the Council of Hieria

²⁷Cf. Schwarzlose, op. cit., p. 66.

²⁸Cf. Diehl, History of the Byzantine Empire, pp. 62-3.

²⁹Cf. Norden, op. cit., p. 4.

³⁰Cf. Cambridge Medieval History, IV, 246.

³¹Cf. Norden, op. cit., p. 5, note 4.

of 754.³² Succeeding Leo V, Michael the Stammerer, who carried on correspondence with Louis the Pious, and his son Theophilus pursued a similar program.³³ In general terms, however, it appears that the second phase of the Iconoclastic Controversy had neither the spirit nor the violence of the first phase of the Controversy. Hardly had Theophilus died when his widow, Theodora, a friend of the iconodules, saw the final reinstatement of the images in the Church. The Patriarch Methodius convened another council at which the Seventh Ecumenical Council was reaffirmed and re-established. Both councils of 754 and 815 were condemned. Thus February 19, 842 became the day of the Festival of Orthodoxy (*ἡ κυριακὴ τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας*), assuring the final victory of the icons in the worship of the Church.³⁴

Political and Ecclesiastical

An evaluation of the political and ecclesiastical implications of the Controversy would appear to demonstrate that the political and ecclesiastical factors were intertwined with one another. The policies of the Iconoclastic Emperors appear to have effected in these areas: 1. the

³²Cf. Schwarzlose, op. cit., pp. 71-2.

³³Cf. Martin, op. cit., pp. 251-7, on the proceedings of the Council of Paris (823) which followed from the correspondence of Michael with Lewis.

³⁴Cf. Schwarzlose, op. cit., pp. 73-5.

loss of the imperial dominions in Italy; 2. the establishment of the temporal domain of the papacy; 3. the separation of the Eastern and Western Churches.³⁵ These results appear deducible from the actions of the Popes who, as the representatives of the Western Church, turned their ecclesiastical and political fortunes to the ascending Western powers of the Frankish kingdom. The action was confirmed by the Pope's crowning of Charlemagne in 800.

Within Byzantium herself the Iconoclastic struggle appears to have become an issue between the Church and the Emperor. The objectives of the Emperor appear to have been primarily the foundation of an absolute military state with the essential control in the hands of the Emperor who as both "King and Priest" controlled all constituent elements of the Empire.³⁶ The Church, as particularly represented by the monks, had the objective of freeing herself from imperial authority. John of Damascus and Theodore of Studion were the two monks who were to bear the burden of the issue.³⁷ In their struggle for freedom they were to appeal to the Pope. But, as Erich Caspar has shown, they appealed to the Pope on

³⁵As Martin, op. cit., p. 73.

³⁶Cf. Schwarzlose, op. cit., p. 241.

³⁷A brief biographical sketch of both of these men can be found in Karl Krumbacher, Geschichte des byzantinischen Literatur (Muenchen: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1897). John of Damascus: pp. 69-70; Theodore of Studion: pp. 146-50.

a conciliar basis:

Es kommt hinzu, dass in einem wesentlichen Punkt der Gedankengaenge beider (East and West as represented by John of Damascus and Gregory II.) nicht Harmonie herrscht, naemlich in dem einen der Kontrastglieder. Gregor II. stellt den Kaisern die pontifices gegenueber, Johannes aber die Synoden oder (nach Bibelzitataten) die "Hirten und Lehrer." Das ist der alte Unterschied zwischen roemisch-paepstlichen und ausser-roemischer, insbesondere orientalischer Kirchentheorie. Weit entfernt sich zu decken, stehen die beiden Aeusserungen jede in ihre eigenen Tradition. Wie Gregor II. auf Gelasius I. und der paepstlichen Theorie fusst, so kann man des Damascenus anticaesaropapistische Synodaltheorie ueber den Abt Maximus in 7. Jahrhundert auf den Afrikaner Ferrandus im 6. Jahrhundert zurueckverfolgen, bis sie dann in die augustinische Lehre von der Synode und der Aussage eines einzelnen ueber Dogmenfragen einmuetet.³⁸

In adjudging the final outcome of the contest between Church and State in Byzantium it seems that two answers can be projected. In a sense, the Church did gain her freedom from the State, for the victory of the images was in essence a victory of the Church over the State. That the Church did not gain her freedom from the State appears from the later history of the Byzantine Empire in which the objectives of the Emperors constantly included elements which ran counter to the idea of separation of Church and State. The Byzantine Church could not extricate herself from the mixed tradition which was hers. Gerhart Ladner suggests that the actual consequence of the Iconoclastic Controversy for Church-State

³⁸ Gaspar, op. cit., p. 62.

relationships in the East was a dyarchy.³⁹ This could mean that the Church, in the personage of such Patriarchs as Photius and Michael Cerularius, gained a significant voice in the affairs of the Empire. At the same time the later attempts at union between the East and the West appear to demonstrate the preserved mixed character of Church and Empire in Byzantium. The later Eastern Emperors wished to effect union with the West for political reasons; namely, preservation of the State from the Moslems. The Eastern Church also was desirous of union with the West, yet they were apprehensive and jealous of the West. The Popes, meantime, appear to have developed a type of "double-politic."⁴⁰ With political eyes cast toward the rising empires of the West, they also cast religious eyes towards the East, and when the Western Church dealt with the Eastern Church it appears to have had ideas of overpowering the influence of the

³⁹Ladner, "Origin and Significance of the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy," op. cit., p. 142: "As the persecution of the images had been implicitly and explicitly a persecution of the Church, the victory of the iconophiles meant also a great victory for the Byzantine Church. It has been said with good reason that with the end of iconoclasm Byzantine caesaropapism was replaced by a dyarchy of emperor and patriarch."

⁴⁰Cf. Norden, op. cit. The book deals with a thorough explication of the political and ecclesiastical-political problems involved in the various attempts of union between the East and the West.

East as a Church.⁴¹

The protracted schisms between East and West during the time of the Patriarchs Photius (867) and Michael Cerularius (1054) engendered the hostility which had developed between East and West.⁴² The Crusades, which in a sense epitomized the temporal objectives of the Popes, appear to have furthered the growing hate of the Eastern peoples for the West. The Fourth Crusade (1204) in which the East-Christian Constantinople was pillaged and sacked by the West-Christian crusaders appears to have ingrained this hate deep in the hearts of the Eastern Christians.⁴³ The later attempts at union at the council of Lyon (1274) and the council of Florence (1439) appear as fleeting anticlimactic endeavors

⁴¹Cf. ibid., p. 64, on the objectives of the First Crusade; e.g. "Von Bedeutung, und zwar der weittragendsten, ist nur dieses: Die Kreuzfahrer, man vergesse nicht: des Ersten Kreuzzuges, rufen hier den Papst herbei, nicht etwa in erster Linie gegen die Tuerken und zur Fortsetzung der Kreuzfahrt nach Jerusalem, sondern vielmehr, um unter seiner Fuehrung und gestuetzt auf seine Autoritaet die christlichen Haeretiker, vor allem die Byzantiner, zu bekaempfen, sie abzuwehren, in letzter Hinsicht sie aber sich selbst und dem Papsttum zu unterwerfen."

⁴²F. Dvornik in his National Churches and the Church Universal (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1945), pp. 48-50, proposes that the Patriarch Photius evolved a solution to the problem of the universal Church which has never been appreciated by East or West. The Byzantine solution, as represented by Photius, allows for the recognition of the Pope but also speaks for the autocephalous Church as part of the universal whole. What effected the Photian Schism was Photius' objection to the Pope's claim of complete jurisdiction over the Eastern Church. His opposition was the Pope Nicholas I, the first Pope to forcefully express the claims of the medieval papacy.

⁴³Cf. Cambridge Medieval History, IV, 415-31.

in the light of the final capitulation of Constantinople and the Byzantine Empire in 1453 to the Turks.

Cultural

The cultural implications of the Iconoclastic Controversy for the East-West Schism appear decidedly limited. As mentioned in the first chapter of the present thesis, there was a decided lack of communication between the East and the West in this respect. The actual cultural significance of the Iconoclastic Controversy for the East-West Schism appears to have importance by implication and not by definition; this is to say, the West never understood the theology of the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy. Insofar as the West did not comprehend the problems involved in the question of images it did not see the Christological implications of the controversy for the Eastern Church, nor did it see the significance of the conflict as a struggle which dealt also with the problem of the relationship of the Incarnation, the Church, and theology, to culture and creation. The Incarnation, for the Eastern Orthodox iconophile, made it necessary for man to have and venerate the icon of Christ. Or conversely, to do away with images was to call into question the actuality of the Incarnation; for since God had come in the flesh the Christian could adore pictures as part of the "new creation" in Christ.

The view of the West which saw images only as devotion-
al reminders or educators of the illiterate saved the West
from the sensual abuses of the image which the theories of
the "identity" and "relativity" of the image to the proto-
type, of the East, led to in the common life of the people.⁴⁴

It appears also that for the East, worship, theology,
and art met in the icon. The inner relationship of religion
and art was only later developed in the Western Roman
Catholic Church.⁴⁵

The Iconoclastic Controversy had its effect in Eastern
culture, however, for the controversy by its encouragement
of profane art brought about an artistic creativeness which
was to flower for several centuries. Within the Church the
Iconoclastic Controversy arrested the development of the

⁴⁴Gf. Ladner, "Origin and Significance of the Byzantine
Iconoclastic Controversy," op. cit., p. 148.

⁴⁵Gf. Ladner, "Der Bilderstreit und die Kunst-Lehren
der byzantinischen und abendlaendischen Theologie," op. cit.,
p. 14: "Eine so lebhaftere theoretische Erörterung der Be-
ziehungen zwischen Religion und Kunst wie bei den griech-
ischen Theologen hat im Abendland während des ganzen Mittel-
alters ueberhaupt nicht stattgefunden, geschweige denn,
dass jene Fragen eine so gewaltige politische Auswirkung ge-
habt haetten wie im byzantinischen Reich. Dafuer haben hier
die Kunstlehren eine langsame stetige Weiterentwicklung er-
fahren, während in Byzanz seit Theodor von Studion die
Theorie im wesentlichen unverändert blieb."

It appears to have been St. Thomas Aquinas who later
saw the relationship of the Incarnation to art when he stated
that one of the three reasons for the use of pictures was:
"Ut incarnationis mysterium et sanctorum exempla magis in
memoria essent, dum quotidie oculis repraesentantur," p. 19.

liturgical idea as it had progressed throughout the centuries from early Christian symbolism, through the historical style, to the liturgical idea which directed both the mind and the eye of the worshiper to the contemplation of the sacred mysteries. The restoration of the images, however, once more continued the process of uniting liturgy and art.

Dalton remarks:

The triumph of the venerator of images under Irene and Theodora restored the union between liturgy and art. From the second half of the ninth century the concordance between the spoken word and its translation into visible form becomes more and more precise, until in about one hundred years the final phase of Byzantine iconography was established in all its essential features.⁴⁶

Because the icon retained the naturalism of Hellenistic figure art, its form, with the added Christian feeling, lent to the sacred figures a

majestic severity and slightly melancholic beauty. This transfiguration created perfect figures of tremendous religious earnestness and saintly loveliness; it included a certain abstraction from nature, a certain schematization; yet it never led to such a sovereign and finally still more creative contempt of naturalism as in early medieval occidental art.⁴⁷

Another result of the Iconoclastic Controversy was the hieratic or static form which the iconography of the East finally assumed. This stabilization of form was the direct

⁴⁶O. M. Dalton, Byzantine Art and Archeology (London: Clarendon Press, 1905), p. 648.

⁴⁷Ladner, "Origin and Significance of the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy," op. cit., p. 147.

consequence of the theology which surrounded the icon. Because the icon was to represent a historical personage there came into being certain stereotyped representations which permitted little freedom to the artist as executor. The ultimate question of the icon was a historical question and it was the historical import of the icon which froze the style and form of the icon.⁴⁸ Sculpture in the round disappeared from the Eastern Church also as a consequence of the controversy. So the icon form was to be preserved to the Tradition and cultic life of the Eastern Church. From Byzantium it was passed on to the embryonic Russian civilization where it received added development and execution.

Dogmatic

An overview of the dogmatic developments of the Iconoclastic Controversy would seem to demonstrate that in theology also the controversy separated itself into two distinct phases. The first phase, falling within the time from the first iconoclastic edicts to the Seventh Ecumenical Council, was primarily concerned with the problem of idolatry. The iconoclastic party which brought the charge of idolatry against the iconophile party consisted of factions including those who were opposed to any images as such and those who, while accepting the devotional and educational

⁴⁸Cf. Florovsky, op. cit., p. 92.

use of the pictures, were opposed to the adoration of the pictures.⁴⁹ The defense of the images during the first phase of the controversy rested primarily with the writings of John of Damascus (ca. 700-750) who, while living outside of the Empire under Moslem rule, communicated in writing with the iconocules of Byzantium.

During the second phase of the controversy from the time of the iconoclastic revival to the final establishment of images in 842 the issue of idolatry was more or less eliminated and the problem moved further into the area of Christology. In this stage the apologetic for the defense of icons was best reflected in the writings of the Theodore of Studion (759-828) who amplified in greater detail the considerations of John of Damascus.

The theology of both the iconoclastic and iconophile parties arose out of controversy. It appears that the iconoclastic emperors first issued their edicts proscribing images and then, to meet the consequent effects of their actions or to substantiate future action against the images, developed a theology as a type of platform on which to defend their policies. At the same time it appears that the

⁴⁹ Cf. Schwarzlose, *op. cit.*, p. 80. Florovsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 94 ff. projects the possibility that the friction within the iconoclastic party and between the iconoclasts and the iconophiles rests on different Neoplatonic strains of thinking concerning the corporeal world and consequently between the valid and invalid use of images.

icon was first to find its way into the Church and only later, specifically during the Iconoclastic Controversy, did the iconophiles develop a fully articulated Christological defense of icons.⁵⁰

The arguments of both parties were based essentially on the same sources: 1. Old Testament, 2. New Testament, 3. Tradition, 4. Speculation. In their defense of images the iconophiles were also to refer to the place of images in the Church on the basis of their use, and to the power of the icons over demons.⁵¹ It appears that the chief problems involved were: 1. What is an image, and in connection with this question, were the iconophiles guilty of idolatry? 2. Did the use of images in the iconophile sense of the word violate the Chalcedonian formulations concerning the natures and person of Christ? 3. Were the references to Tradition on the part of either party authentic?⁵²

One of the basic problems involved in the Iconoclastic Controversy was the problem concerning what an image (*εἰκών*)

⁵⁰Ostrogorsky, on the basis of newly discovered manuscripts, argues that before the seventh century there were no Christological arguments for images. He cites especially the apologetic of Leontius of Cyprus, a defender of images against Jewish criticism in the seventh century. Cf. Ostrogorsky, *op. cit.* However, see also Norman H. Baynes, "Icons Before Iconoclasm," *Harvard Theological Review*, XLIV (April, 1951), 93-106.

⁵¹Schwarzlose, *op. cit.*, contains the most thorough presentation of the various aspects of the controversy.

⁵²Cf. Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 112.

is. In answer to this question it is Georg Ostrogorsky's supposition that one of the fundamental points of misunderstanding between the two parties was the epistemological problem related to a proper definition of what an image was and what its function consisted of. While Ostrogorsky's "oriental-magical" interpretation has been questioned, the fact that the iconoclasts and iconophiles did not agree on the definition and function of the image still appears to remain fundamental for an understanding of the controversy.⁵³

It appears that for the iconoclast the image always remained an image in the simple sense of the word for the Eastern mentality. The iconoclasts saw no degree of difference between the icon and the subject represented by the icon: "...ein wahres Bild mit dem Gegenstand, den es darstellt, wesengleich zu sein hat (...εί καλώς ὁμοούσιον αὐτήν (sc. εἰκόνα εἶναι τῷ εἰκονιζομένῳ))."⁵⁴ The iconophiles,

⁵³Ostrogorsky's "oriental-magical" interpretation rests on the belief that, because of the powerful influence of the Arabic, Moslem and Semitic cultures during the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries on East-Mediterranean areas, the consequent view of images from a Semitic viewpoint, namely, that between the image and the subject represented there is no difference, influenced also Christian thinking. Cf. Ostrogorsky, op. cit., pp. 59-60. This interpretation is criticized by Ladner, "Der Bilderstreit und die Kunst-Lehren der byzantinischen und abendlaendischen Theologie," op. cit., p. 6, note 20. Florovsky, op. cit., p. 83, feels that the differences did exist, but that they are to be interpreted as frictions existing within Neoplatonism and not on the basis of Ostrogorsky's interpretation completely.

⁵⁴Ostrogorsky, op. cit., p. 41.

however, drew a fine distinction between the image and the subject the image represented. The different conceptions of the two parties is reflected in their contrasted views of the Eucharist. For the iconoclast the only possible image of Christ was the Eucharist. For the iconophiles the Eucharist was not an image in their sense of the term precisely because it was a case of absolute identity between the image and the subject represented.⁵⁵ For the iconoclast the relationship of the archetype to the thing represented was *ὁμοούσιον* or *τυπὸν*. The iconophile, on the other hand, sharply distinguished the relationship existing between the Archetype and the image as a relationship which existed *ὁμοίωμα*, *κατ' ὁμοίωσιν*.⁵⁶ The icon is the bearer of the prototype by a relative relationship, not by absolute identity. This idea is borne out by John of Damascus and Theodore of Studion in several different ways: The image does not portray the subject represented according to its essence (*ὄν κατὰ οὐσίαν*) but portrays a relationship *κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα* or *κατὰ κλησίαν*. It is because the picture represents the prototype in relative fashion that the honor payed to the image passes to the prototype. Because the iconoclasts only saw an

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 42.

⁵⁶Cf. Schwarzlose, *op. cit.*, p. 179. See also Ostrogorsky, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

absolute identity between the subject represented and the subject itself they could and did bring up the charge of idolatry against the worshipers of images.⁵⁷

It appears that for this same reason, namely, that between the image and the prototype or archetype there existed an absolute identity, that the iconoclasts brought the controversy into Christological areas also. Because it was impossible to depict the true nature of the ascended Lord with material stuff the iconophiles became guilty of two heresies which had been condemned at Chalcedon. If the iconophile made images of Christ they either so separated the Divine and human natures of the person of Christ that they fell into the Nestorian heresy which so emphasized the humanity of Christ that the unity of Christ's person was threatened. Because the iconophiles falsely portrayed Christ in their images they dislocated the unity of Christ's person and thereby introduced a fourth person into the Trinity, for the ascended Lord in His full glory cannot be circumscribed (περιγραφή) by material stuff. For the same reason, the iconoclasts charged, the iconocules are guilty of Monophysitism. To circumscribe God who is not circumscribable was to so unite the two natures of Christ

⁵⁷Cf. Schwarzlose, op. cit., pp. 99 ff. See also Ostrogorsky, op. cit., p. 45.

that the Deity of the ascended Lord was violated.⁵⁸

It was Theodore of Studion, following in the path of John of Damascus who attempted to meet this Christological question. Relying chiefly on Neoplatonic thinking as it was particularly enunciated in the writings of Dionysius the Areopogite and John of Damascus, Theodore amplified more fully the implications of the hierarchical structure of the universe as it passed from the incomprehensible God to God's immanence in created things. He particularly fascinated on the possibilities of the *περιγραφή*, articulating the potentialities of the circumscription of the Incarnate Christ in highly developed form.⁵⁹

The reason why Christ could be depicted in artistic form was because the whole structure of the universe was a structure of images and prototypes: Christ as the image of the Father, man as the image of God, Old Testament events as prototypes of New Testament, the *προορρημοί* or ideas as prototypes in God of the things, and icons as images of Christ and the saints.⁶⁰ Theodore of Studion's particular

⁵⁸Cf. Ostrogorsky, op. cit., p. 17; Schwarzlose, op. cit., p. 96; Ladner, "Origin and Significance of the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy," op. cit., p. 135.

⁵⁹Cf. Ostrogorsky, op. cit., p. 45; Schwarzlose, op. cit., pp. 174 ff.; Ladner, "Origin and Significance of the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy," op. cit., p. 143.

⁶⁰Cf. Schwarzlose, op. cit., p. 175; Ladner, "Der Bilderstreit und die Kunst-Lehren der byzantinischen und abendlaendischen Theologie," op. cit., p. 9.

contribution to the entire system was the formulation that between the *πρωτότυπον* and the *εἰκόν* there existed a relationship by the very nature of the creative involvement (*δυνάμει*) of the prototype in the image which was a necessary relationship.⁶¹ The relationship between the two, as far as the material stuff of the image is concerned, is not an absolute relationship. On the other hand, the only thing that separates the image from the prototype is the material substance of the image.⁶² The image is the necessary outgrowth of the prototype, to be compared to the shadow which the human figure casts, to the impression of a seal. The prototype includes its image potentially. But because there is a distinction between the material stuff of the image, the relationship of identity to the prototype, and the essence of the prototype itself, the Christian who worships images, worships images *προσκύνησις τιμητική* and not *προσκύνησις λατρευτική* which only belongs to God in his true essence.⁶³

The relative identity of the image to the prototype
κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα or according to the person (*καθ' ὑπόστασιν*)

⁶¹Cf. Ladner, "Origin and Significance of the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy," *op. cit.*, p. 145.

⁶²Cf. Schwarzlose, *op. cit.*, p. 184.

⁶³*Ibid.*, p. 183.

necessarily stabilized the form of the icon.⁶⁴ The *εἰκόνες ἀχειροποίητοι* with their historical implications, as seen in the second chapter of the present thesis, involved themselves very neatly with the iconophile doctrine of Theodore of Studion, for the "icons not made with hands" did preserve a stable form and did claim a date of origin contemporary with Apostolic times. Thus the preservation of the relative identity of the prototype and the image was grounded on a "historical" basis also.⁶⁵

The arguments of the iconophiles centered chiefly on the significance of the Incarnation, however. "The Incarnation gives us the right to image representation."⁶⁶ Christ did not come only in the form of a man (*ἐν εἴδει ἀνθρώπου*) but He came as a man *κατ' οὐσίαν*.⁶⁷ Because Christ came

⁶⁴Cf. Ladner, "Origin and Significance of the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy," *op. cit.*, pp. 146-7. See also Schwarzlose, *op. cit.*, p. 186.

⁶⁵Florovsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 92-3 considers the question of the historical Jesus the final question in controversy in the entire Iconoclastic conflict. "The Iconoclasm was not just an indiscriminate rejection of any art...Yet, in the main, it was rather a resistance to one special kind of religious art, namely the icon-painting, an 'icon' being a representation of a true historical person, be it our Lord or a saint. Its birthplace was probably in Syria, and its distinctive mark was, as Louis Brehier put it recently, 'la recherche naive de la verite historique' - a special emphasis on historic truth," *passim*.

⁶⁶John of Damascus as quoted by Schwarzlose, *op. cit.*, p. 188.

⁶⁷*Ibid.*, p. 189.

as a man all of the material world is capable of artistic circumscription (*περιγραφή*).⁶⁸ Particularly Christ Himself can be painted because He was a Man, since whoever cannot be portrayed in images is no man. For this reason also the historical Jesus is capable of representation.⁶⁹ If one denies the possibility of the *περιγραφή*, the humanity of Christ is placed in question, for Christ was indeed the *καθόλου ἄνθρωπος*.⁷⁰ To deny the possibilities of the circumscription of Jesus was to fall into the error of the Jews who had no Incarnation, or to fall into the heresies of the Manicheans or Valentinians and claim that Christ came only *ἐν δοκῆσει καὶ φαντασίᾳ*.⁷¹

The image, because it does not relate itself by substance to the archetype, and is only a relationship *ἐν ὁμοίᾳ μίμητι καὶ σχήματι*, is necessary. Who denies the use of images denies the full significance of the Incarnation, of the Word become flesh, and thereby questions the validity of the *οἰκονομία τοῦ Χριστοῦ*.⁷²

In general it appears that the iconoclastic arguments were essentially of a simple nature and lacked the complexity

⁶⁸Ibid., p. 190.

⁶⁹Ibid., p. 191.

⁷⁰Ibid., pp. 195-6.

⁷¹Ibid., p. 199.

⁷²Ibid., p. 200.

of formulation that the iconophile doctrine possessed. This simplicity of the iconoclasts was the source of their strength and weakness.⁷³ In their arguments from Scripture both parties cited passages favorable to their own positions.⁷⁴ The references to Tradition on the part of both parties was in general rather indiscriminate and uncritical.⁷⁵ On the other hand, both parties had ample witness on either side to substantiate either the use or disuse of art and symbols.⁷⁶ The added arguments of the iconophiles from pedagogical and devotional use, from the power of the images over demons, and from the "unwritten tradition" buttressed the persuasiveness

⁷³Ibid., pp. 76-101, "Partei und System der Bilderfeinde."

The arguments of the iconoclasts from Scripture were based chiefly on those passages (John 14:9; 2 Cor. 5:7; 2 Cor. 5:16) which attempt to say that the Christian lives by faith and not by sight. However, developed as the formulations of the iconophiles were, another strong argument of the iconoclasts rested on their protestation that the common people could draw no difference between the worship offered to images and the worship offered to God alone.

⁷⁴Ibid., pp. 126-42, "Die Theologie der Bilderfreunde." The arguments of the iconophiles from Scripture appears to have rested primarily on those passages (Heb. 1:1; Gal. 3:25; Matt. 22:16-21) which when liberally interpreted allow for a more general application of their implications.

⁷⁵Cf. Martin, op. cit., p. 133.

⁷⁶Cf. Ladner, "Der Bilderstreit und die Kunst-Lehren der byzantinischen und abendlaendischen Theologie," op. cit., p. 1. Cf. Schwarzlose, op. cit., ch. 1, "Entstehung und Geschichte der Bilder." See also H. Richard Niebuhr, Christ and Culture (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951).

of their apologetic.⁷⁷

The dogmatic implications of the Iconoclastic Controversy for the Eastern Church is perhaps found in the fact that the controversy brought to a point the tensions existing between the Emperor and the monks. For while most of the iconoclastic policy of the Byzantine Emperors may have been reflected in political areas, the attestation of the iconoclastic councils of 754 and 815 to the person of the Emperor,⁷⁸ the arch-iconoclast Emperor Constantine's denial of the *εἰκόνας*, his replacement of the sacred icons with the promulgation of the cult of the imperial portrait, and his monastic persecutions, appear to demonstrate that there were also theological inferences to be drawn from the actions and policies of the iconoclastic emperors. The idea was suggested by Karl Schwarzlose when he suggested that one of the main factors involved in the Iconoclastic Controversy was the struggle of the Eastern Orthodox Church for her freedom (Freiheit) from the caesaropapism of the Byzantine Emperors.⁷⁹ Since the time that Schwarzlose wrote his study of the period, however, the antithesis between the Church as represented by the Orthodox monks, and the iconoclastic Emperors has been more sharply drawn. This has led the

⁷⁷Cf. Schwarzlose, op. cit., pp. 142-74.

⁷⁸Cf. Ostrogorsky, op. cit., p. 29.

⁷⁹Schwarzlose, op. cit., p. 265.

Benedictine nun, Gerhart Ladner, to affirm: "...iconoclasm was but an outgrowth of the caesaropapistic theory and practice of the State."⁸⁰ Ladner has arrived at this conclusion because in her words:

...the truth is that iconoclasm was from its beginning an attack upon the visible representation of the Civitas Dei on this earth. Not only because the images had such an important place in the Byzantine Church, theologically and liturgically, that an attack against them was ipso facto an attack against the Church but also still more because...the emperors showed unmistakably that even in maintaining the belief in the supreme, supernatural government of Christ, they did not wish to permit on this earth any other but their own image or more exactly the imagery of their own imperial natural world.⁸¹

Coupled with the struggle of the Church for its freedom was the development of its own unique theology (Eigenart) and cultus as reflected in the Orthodox Christology surrounding the icon.⁸² The West, as already suggested in the section treating the cultural implications of the Iconoclastic Controversy for the East-West Schism, could not follow the actual arguments of the iconophile doctrine. This is demonstrated particularly in the Libri Carolini which, aside from the political antagonisms involved, showed no

⁸⁰Ladner, "Origin and Significance of the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy," op. cit., p. 140.

⁸¹Ibid., p. 134.

⁸²Cf. Schwarzlose, op. cit., p. 266.

sympathy for the iconophile position.⁸³ In matters of theology the Pope stood between the iconoclastic sympathies of the Franks and the iconophile position of the Eastern Orthodox. The Popes, receiving their essential teachings concerning images from Gregory the Great, never really saw the Christological implications of images for the Incarnation. The Popes' concerns in relationship to the controversy in general was a concern for his ecclesiastical office and patrimonies.

The Iconoclastic Controversy brought to what might be termed a final point in the Christological significance of the Incarnation as it found expression in the concern for images "not made with hands." One senses throughout the presentation of the iconophile defense of images a profound appreciation of the words: " *καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο* ."

⁸³Cf. Martin, op. cit., ch. 13, "Iconoclasm and the Franks - Charles the Great," for a presentation of their reactions to the Seventh Ecumenical Council.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

It has been the task of the thesis to trace the respective origins and developments of the East-West Schism as they were to culminate in the Iconoclastic Controversy and finally result in complete schism between the Oriental and Occidental Churches. An attempt has been made to demonstrate that from earliest times, and particularly from the time of Constantine the Great, the two Churches developed more or less indigenously because of geographical, political, cultural, ecclesiastical, dogmatic, and cultic differences. The differences between the two areas crystallized with the passing centuries and were brought to a decisive point during the Iconoclastic Controversy.

It appears that it can be concluded that there were four factors involved in the controversy itself: 1. the monks who defended the Orthodox position concerning images and contested for the freedom of the Byzantine Church; 2. the Byzantine iconoclastic Emperors who as bearers of the caesaropapistic idea wished to strengthen their positions as Emperors within the Empire; 3. the Popes who were organizationally and ecclesiastically concerned for the universal position of the Latin Church and for their own specific position within the Christian Church; 4. the Franks who

were ascending in political supremacy in the West and thus became a rival empire of the Eastern Roman Empire.

It has been shown that the monks gained their objectives in the dogmatic and cultic contest for images and also, to a great extent, gained the freedom for the Church from the caesaropapism of the Byzantine iconoclastic Emperors. It has been proposed that the caesaropapistic and iconoclastic policies of the Byzantine iconoclastic Emperors resulted in the political severance of Italy from the Empire, the founding of the temporal domain of the Pope, and the East-West Schism. It has been suggested that the Western Church in the person of the Pope, turned its back on the Eastern sections of the Empire, perhaps necessarily, and cast its fortune with its own future potentialities and with the rising Frankish Kingdom of the West. It has been propounded that the Franks took over the political hegemony of the West, that they demonstrated a marked theological hostility to the East, and that they finally became the Holy Roman Empire. The process was completed with the crowning of Charlemagne in 800.

Therefore, it appears possible to conclude on the basis of the materials available that the Iconoclastic Controversy had definite implications for the schism between Eastern and Western Christendom.

The history of the period is still in process. Perhaps another generation will see more clearly the inclusive im-

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Athanasius. The Incarnation of the Word of God. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947.
- Baynes, Norman H. "Icons Before Iconoclasm," Harvard Theological Review, XLIV (April, 1951), pp. 93-106.
- Bettenson, Henry. Documents of the Christian Church. New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.
- Cambridge Medieval History. IV. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1924.
- Caspar, Erich. "Papst Gregor II. und der Bilderstreit," Zeitschrift fuer Kirchengeschichte. Heft I. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1933. Pp. 29-71.
- Cochrane, Charles. Christianity and Classical Culture. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.
- Dalton, G. M. Byzantine Art and Archeology. London: Clarendon Press, 1905.
- Diehl, Charles. History of the Byzantine Empire. Translated by George B. Ives. New York: G. E. Stechert & Co., 1945.
- Dix, Dom Gregory. The Shape of the Liturgy. Westminster: Dacre Press, 1945.
- Dobschuetz, Ernst Von. "Christusbilder," Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Altchristlichen Literatur. III. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1899.
- Dvornik, F. National Churches and the Church Universal. Westminster: Dacre Press, 1945.
- Florovsky, George. "Origen, Eusebius, and the Iconoclastic Controversy," Church History, XIX (June, 1950), pp. 77-96.
- Frick, Robert. Die Geschichte des Reich-Gottes-Gedankens in der alten Kirche bis zu Origenes und Augustin. Glessen: Alfred Toepelmann, 1928.
- Harnack, Adolph. History of Dogma. I, II, III, V. Translated by Niel Buchanan. London: Williams & Norgate, 1905.

- Heussi, Karl. Compendium der Kirchengeschichte. Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1937.
- Holl, Karl. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte. II, III. Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1928.
- Kittel, Gerhard. Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. I. Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1933.
- Koehler, John P. Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1917.
- Krumbacher, Karl. Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur. Muenchen: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1897.
- Kurtz, J. H. Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte. I. Leipzig: August Neumann's Verlag, 1890.
- Ladner, Gerhart. "Der Bilderstreit und die Kunst-Lehren der byzantinischen und abendlaendischen Theologie," Zeitschrift fuer Kirchengeschichte. Heft I. Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1931. Pp. 1-23.
- "Origin and Significance of the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy," Medieval Studies. II. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1940.
- Latourette, Kenneth S. A History of the Expansion of Christianity. I. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1937.
- Martin, Edward J. A History of the Iconoclastic Controversy. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923.
- Mirbt, Carl. Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des roemischen Katholizismus. Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1924.
- Norden, Walter. Papsttum und Byzanz. Berlin: B. Behr's Verlag, 1903.
- Ostrogorsky, Georg. "Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Bilderstreites," Historische Untersuchungen. Heft V. Breslau: M. & H. Marcus, 1929.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav J. "Chalcedon After Fifteen Centuries," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXII (December, 1951), pp. 926-36.
- Schwarzlose, Karl. Der Bilderstreit. Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1890.

- Seeberg, Reinhold. Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte. II. Erlangen: A. Deichertische Verlagsbuchhandlung Dr. Werner Scholl, 1923.
- Ure, Percy N. Justinian and His Age. London: Penguin Books, 1952.
- Werner, Martin. Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas. Bern-Leipzig: Paul Haupt, 1941.
- Williams, George H. "Christology and Church-State Relations in the Fourth Century," Church History, XX (September and December, 1951), pp. 3-33 and 3-26.