



International Conference

Byzantine iconoclasm and its resonance in the Christian tradition

8 May 2019

Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University
Warsaw, St. Wóycickiego 1/3 building 23, room 201



CARDINAL STEFAN WYSZYŃSKI
UNIVERSITY IN WARSAW

Uniwersytet Kardynała Stefana
Wyszyńskiego w Warszawie



INSTITUTE OF HISTORICAL SCIENCES
CHAIR OF ANCIENT HISTORY

Instytut Nauk Historycznych
Katedra Historii Starożytnej



NATIONAL PROGRAMME
FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF HUMANITIES

Narodowy Program
Rozwoju Humanistyki

Conference Schedule

9:30 – 9:45 Conference opening

Ks. prof. dr hab. Leszek Misiarczyk, vice dean of the Faculty of Historical and Social Sciences

Ks. prof. dr hab. Józef Naumowicz – project manager

9.45-11.15 session I, moderator: prof. Joanna Rapti

Bp prof. dr hab. Michał Janocha, University of Warsaw, Artes Liberales
Aniconism and Iconoclasm in the Culture of Europe. A short Overview

Prof. Stéphane Bigham (Montréal, Canada)

The Iconoclastic Arguments Against Icons and the Orthodox Answers

Prof. Emanuela Fogliadini, Facoltà Teologica dell'Italia Settentrionale, Milan

Theology of sacred image: from the council of Hieria to the council of Nicaea II

Discussion

11.15-11.30 Coffee break

11.30-13.00 session II, moderator: prof. Stéphane Bigham

Dr Vladimir Baranov, Novosibirsk State University, Russia

Short Survey of Iconographies Introduced or Modified Depending on Theological Arguments

Prof. Joanna Rapti, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris

Remembering iconoclasm: history, hagiography, identity in manuscript illumination from Byzantium and beyond

Ks. dr hab. Dariusz Klejnowski-Różycki, UO prof., University of Opole

“Nestorian aniconism” as the missionary context of Byzantine iconoclasm

Dr Magdalena Łaptaś, Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University, Warsaw

Did the Byzantine Iconoclasm Have an Impact on the Christian Nubia?

Discussion

13.00-14.00 lunch (1st floor)

14.00-15.00 session III, moderator: dr Magdalena Łaptaś

Prof. dr hab. Aleksandr Musin, Russian Academy of Sciences, Saint-Petersburg

How iconoclastic was iconodulism in medieval Rus' and modern Russia?

Dr Piotr Ł. Grotowski, Pontifical University of John Paul II, Krakow

Superstition and Prejudice – false axioms in modern scholarship in the thought on Iconoclasm.

Prof. dr hab. Waldemar Deluga, University of Ostrava, Czech Republic

Research on the Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Art in Austro-Hungarian Empire

Discussion

15.00 – 15.10. Coffee break

15.10 – 16.30 session IV, moderator: dr Piotr Ł. Grotowski

Mgr Justyna Słowik, Pontifical University of John Paul II, Krakow
Hiereia florilegia - the Church Fathers' thought at the service of Iconoclasm

Ks. dr Andrzej Kuźma, Christian Theological Academy, Warsaw
Rola patriarchy Tarazjusza w obradach Soboru Nicejskiego II (787)
[*The role of Patriarch Tarasios in the Council of Nicaea II (787)*]

Dr hab. Anna Palusińska, Catholic University of Lublin
Obraz i pierwowzór. Arystotelesowskie podstawy apologii ikon u Teodora Studyty.
[*Image and prototype. Aristotelian principles of iconic apology for Theodore the Studite*]

Ks. prof. dr hab. Janusz Królikowski, Pontifical University of John Paul II, Krakow
Proskynesis i kult obrazów w ujęciu Soboru Nicejskiego II
[*Proskynesis and the worship of images in the view of the Council of Nicaea II*]

Discussion

16.30-16.45 Coffee break

16.45 - 18.00 session V, moderator: prof. dr hab. Waldemar Deluga

Dr Irina Tatarova, University of Warsaw, Artes Liberales
Wizja ikonoklazmu w rosyjskiej myśli o ikonie XX wieku
[*The vision of iconoclasm in Russian thought about the icon of the twentieth century*]

Dr hab. Mirosław P. Kruk, prof. UG, University of Gdansk / National Museum, Krakow
Echa ikonoklazmu w nowożytnej Rzeczypospolitej
[*Echoes of iconoclasm in the modern Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth*]

Dr Justyna Sprutta, Polish Institute of World Art Studies, Warsaw
„Profanacje” a ikona - kontekst ikonoklasty
[*“Profanations” and icon – iconoclastic context*]

Ks. prof. dr hab. Józef Naumowicz, Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University, Warsaw
Source texts for the Byzantine iconoclasm and their Polish translations (presentation of the research project)

Discussion



Abstracts

Baranov Vladimir, *Short Survey of Iconographies Introduced or Modified Depending on Theological Arguments*

The Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy was not simply a political fight or theological debate – it was a struggle defending the fundamental perception of God revealing Himself to humanity in prophetic sayings, angelic revelations, the liturgy, and ultimately His Incarnation. The unfolding of the theological polemics led to changes in or creation of new, much more narrative rather than symbolic, contexts for several iconographic motifs, which in their modified form have become the standard for post-Iconoclastic Byzantine art, such as the Anastasis, Crucifixion with dead Christ on the Cross, and the image of Christ Not-Made-by-Hands. The theological rationale behind these iconographies will be presented in the paper.

Bigham Stéphane, *The Iconoclastic Arguments Against Icons and the Orthodox Answers*

The presentation will set out the eight main, theological attacks that the Iconoclasts of the 8th and 9th centuries made against Christian images. After the presentation of each Iconoclastic attack, the Orthodox answer will be shown.

Deluga Waldemar, *Research on the Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Art in the Austro-Hungarian Empire*

In the scientific studies of scholars from several research centres of the former Austro-Hungarian Empire, Byzantine and Post-Byzantine monuments were very popular. Governmental institutions organised expeditions to enable photographic and scientific documentations of medieval monuments.

Vienna was a very important scientific centre. Polish-Austrian scholar, Joseph Strzygowski (1862-1941), who was born in Bielsko Biala in Poland, promoted the theory of the

influence of Middle Eastern art in Europe. But his controversial theories and conflict with Max Dvořák (1874-1921) separated research done by various institutions.

The governmental structure (especially The Royal and Imperial Central Commission for Preservation and Research of Artistic Heritage, founded in Vienna in 1853) was important, as it had its representatives in small towns who sent reports to Lvov, Chernivtsi or Vienna. A lot of reports were published on the basis of these messages in Vienna. Authors discussed also the protection of Eastern Christian art. Exhibitions in Vienna, Cracow, Lvov, Chernivtsi, and the inventory work on the initiative of the Central Commission opened a discussion among Austrian, Czech, Polish, Ukrainian and Romanian scholars on the origins and development of the Orthodox Church painting in the late Middle Ages. Karl A. Romsdorfer, who worked for the government in Chernivtsi (Czernovitz), provided the documentation of Romanian and Ukrainian monuments. He published numerous articles in Austrian reviews. Furthermore, Romsdorfer organised the restorations of medieval churches, monasteries and castles in Bukovina. His reports can be found in the state archives in Vienna, along with documents and photographs. Another scholar in Chernivtsi was Władimir Milkowicz, the editor of Ukrainian documents (in 1888), who travelled to monasteries in Athos peninsula to compare Eastern Christian art in Central Europe and Greece.

Professor Władysław Podlacha published a book in 1912 on the study of wall paintings in Bukovina Orthodox churches. The book was written as an effect of many years of studies by this Lvov scholar, whose results had been published over the years in the German periodical *Zeitschrift für Christliche Kunst*. His book was widely respected amongst Polish, Austrian, Romanian and French scholars.

In my paper I want to address the history of research and reconstruct Austrian-Hungarian studies on the basis of the documentation found in different archives, dispersed in the last century.

Fogliadini Emanuela, *Theology of sacred image. From the council of Hieria to the council of Nicaea II*

The focus of my lecture will be first and above all an overview of the theological discussion that coincides with the so-called “Iconoclastic controversy” (726/730-843), and leads to the definition of the liturgical cult of Christian sacred images, especially in Eastern Christianity. In particular, an overview of the theological thought elaborated by the iconomaches in the Council of Hieria (754) and the one of the iconophiles in the Seventh Ecumenical Council of Nicaea (787) will be addressed. In that period, the meaning and role of sacred images in worship and doctrinal Christianity were seriously debated and the main question was about the opportunity or not to depict Christ, true God and true man.

The lecture will also consider the hermeneutical debate on the subject. In fact, the “Iconoclastic controversy” is often narrated by opposing voices and with different literary methods which led to an exultation or condemnation. Despite historiographical assumptions that have long given a key role to the imperial court in ratifying and disseminating a political iconoclast ideology, the dispute surrounding sacred images in the Byzantine East was essentially a theological and ecclesiastical matter. Now, certainly this debate went beyond the

confines of proper theology. But these power struggles were secondary to the Christological question, which was born and resolved within the Church itself. The debate had as its object the religious representations: the four councils confirmed that the problem was not political, but a reflection on the subject based on the dogma of Chalcedon and finally involved worship and devotion.

Grotowski Piotr Ł., *Superstition and Prejudice – false axioms in modern scholarship in the thought on Iconoclasm.*

Over a millennium had passed before the Iconoclastic heresy (not a controversy as Anglo-Saxons call it) was overcome and it has been a subject of investigation for almost a century. Nevertheless, false statements and simplifications still dominate the scholarly debate on this phenomenon. One can point out various reasons for such a situation. One of them is a libellous suggestion that the destruction of images was influenced by Judaism or Islam. This statement is deeply-rooted in the propaganda of the period, but is taken at face value, especially by scholars derived from the Orthodox background.

Another attitude, which shows much more distrust in the sources is often used to discredit inconvenient facts that not suit the ideal picture of iconoclasts. This method, common among researchers from protestant countries, leads to the creation of a distorted model that reflects rather contemporary religious practices and superstitions – unconsciously extrapolated to the medieval world – than real circumstances of the 8th and 9th century Byzantium. Only the awareness of these mechanisms can prevent us from repeating mistakes of the past.

Janocha Michał, *Aniconism and iconoclasm in the culture of Europe. A short overview* [Aikonizacja i ikonoklazmy w kulturze Europy. Krótki przegląd]

The paper is a review and synthesis and consists of two parts discussing the phenomenon of aniconism and iconoclasm.

The problem of aniconism goes back to the Hebrew tradition expressed in the second commandment of the Decalogue, understood as a theological and cultural paradigm, as well as the interpretation of this commandment in the ancient history of Israel. It appears in controversies around images in the early Christian period, then in the art of the Eastern Churches: Nestorian, Assyrian and Armenian. An example of aniconic tendencies in the Western Middle Ages are artistic realizations in Irish-Scottish miniature art, growing out of pre-Christian Celtic traditions, and Bernard of Clairvaux's concept of art, expressed in early Cistercian churches as a reaction to the rich figurative art of Benedictines. This problem arises in the context of the tension between the tendency towards rich art, expressing the majesty of God, and the art of poverty, referring to the poverty of Christ. This tension characterizes the entire history of sacred art in the Western Church. Its contemporary manifestations are aniconic tendencies in sacred art after the Second Vatican Council, present especially in the Churches of Western Europe, which oppose rich sacred art, alive especially in the poor Churches. The paper attempts a theological and socio-cultural interpretation of this phenomenon.

In the second part of the paper, the problem of iconoclasm in Byzantium is briefly recalled as an attempt to reform the Church, and at the same time an impulse to formulate a positive theology of sacred image. In this context of the Church reform the Protestant iconoclasm will be reminded, its theological background, and practical implementation, shown in two interpretations: moderate Lutheran and radical Calvinist. At the end, two anti-church and anti-Christian iconoclasms are addressed: those accompanying the French and Bolshevik revolutions, their goals, means, and effects.

[Referat ma charakter przeglądowo-syntetyczny i składa się z dwóch części omawiających zjawisko aikonizacji i ikonoklazmu.

Problem aikonizacji sięga tradycji hebrajskiej wyrażonej w II przykazaniu Dekalogu, rozumianego jako paradygmat teologiczno-kulturowy, a także interpretacji tego przykazania w starożytnych dziejach Izraela. Przewija się on w kontrowersjach wokół obrazów w epoce wczesnochrześcijańskiej, następnie w sztuce Kościołów Wschodu: nestoriańskiego, asyryjskiego oraz ormiańskiego. Przykładem tendencji aikonizacyjnych w zachodnim średniowieczu są realizacje artystyczne w iroszkockiej sztuce miniatorskiej, wyrastające z przedchrześcijańskich tradycji celtyckich, a także koncepcja sztuki Bernarda z Clairvaux wyrażona we wczesnych kościołach cysterskich, jako reakcja na bogatą figuratywną sztukę benedyktynów. Problem ten wyrasta w kontekście napięcia pomiędzy tendencją do sztuki bogatej, wyrażającej majestat Boga, a sztuki ubogiej, odwołującej się do ubóstwa Chrystusa. Napięcie to cechuje całą historię sztuki sakralnej w Kościele zachodnim. Jej współczesnym przejawem są tendencje aikonizacyjne w sztuce sakralnej po Soborze Watykańskim II, obecne szczególnie w Kościołach Europy Zachodniej, którym przeciwstawia się bogata sztuka sakralna żywa szczególnie w Kościołach ubogich. Referat podejmuje próbę teologicznej i społeczno-kulturowej interpretacji tego zjawiska.

W drugiej części referatu zostaje skrótowo przypomniany problem ikonoklazmu w Bizancjum, jako próba reformy Kościoła, a zarazem impuls do sformułowania pozytywnej teologii wizerunku sakralnego. W tym kontekście reformy kościelnej zostanie przypomniany ikonoklazm protestancki, jego zaplecze teologiczne i praktyczna realizacja, ukazana w dwóch interpretacjach: umiarkowanej luteranckiej oraz radykalnej kalwińskiej. Na koniec zostają przywołane i zestawione dwa ikonoklazmy antykościelne i antychrześcijańskie, towarzyszące rewolucjom francuskiej i bolszewickiej, ich cele, środki i skutki].

Klejnowski-Różycki Dariusz, “Nestorian aiconism” as the missionary context of Byzantine iconoclasm [„Bezikonizacja nestoriańska” jako kontekst misyjny bizantyjskiego ikonoklazmu]

The largest and most missionary Church of antiquity is the Apostolic Church of the East known as Nestorian. Just as the Roman Church was adjacent to Byzantium in the West, the Nestorians neighbored in the East, creating the closest pastoral and theological context. Its central place was today's Iran, and it created ecclesiastical structures in India and China.

This Church's Semitic roots, monuments, the theology of Theodore of Mopsuestia as well as the Persian school of Nisibis influenced the belief that the only “icon” in the full sense of the word – was the “glorious Cross” – a sign of the eschatological Advent of Christ. Hence,

the main iconographic monuments of this Church are crosses. Till today, the distinctive sign of Christianity in China is the Nestorian cross in the lotus flower.

[Największy i najbardziej misyjny Kościół starożytności to Apostolski Kościół Wschody zwany nestoriańskim. Tak, jak Kościół rzymski sąsiadował z Bizancjum na Zachodzie, tak nestorianie sąsiadowali na Wschodzie, tworząc najbliższy kontekst duszpastersko-teologiczny. Jego centralnym miejscem był dzisiejszy Iran, a stworzył struktury eklezjalne w Indiach i Chinach.

Semickie korzenie tego Kościoła jak i zabytki oraz teologia Teodora z Mopsuestii i perska szkoła z Nisibis wpłynęły na przekonanie, że jedyną „ikoną” w pełnym znaczeniu tego słowa jest chwalebny Krzyżem – znakiem eschatologicznego adwentu Chrystusa. Stąd też główne zabytki ikonograficzne tego Kościoła to krzyże. Do dzisiaj wyróżniającym znakiem chrześcijaństwa w Chinach jest nestoriański krzyż w kwiecie lotosu].

Kruk Mirosław P., *Echoes of iconoclasm in the modern Polish Republic* [Echa ikonoklazmu w nowożytnej Rzeczypospolitej]

On the wave of modern iconoclasm, which encompassed northern Europe, similar movements, or rather local iconoclast activities, were revealed in the Polish Republic wherever the voice of the dissenters, especially those representing the more radical factions of the Protestant communities, was louder. While the burghers of the cities of Pomerania sympathized with the teachings of Martin Luther, the Calvinist theses were more attractive for the nobles, much more confrontational, especially to the manifestations of the Catholic Marian cult. This is reflected in the numerous accusations in the sixteenth century that adoration of Marian images was idolatrous, and the criticism often touched the most venerated image in Poland – the image of Our Lady of Częstochowa. One can get the impression that the goal was chosen consciously – the criticism was directed towards the most precious for the Catholics image-relic in order to ridicule its cult and thus depreciate all other manifestations related to minor images. The likeness of Mary in the picture to the historical figure was questioned; also pure faith, uncontaminated by idolatrous worship was contrasted with the symptoms of idolatry, which was condemned. Let us look at the example of an interesting allegation of Erasmus Gliczner (1535-1603), who stated that the image of Częstochowa could not be a likeness of Saint Virgin because of the busy eyes that look with curiosity everywhere he stood. In his arguments against the paintings, the man referred to early Christian writers, i.e. Clement of Alexandria and Origen, whereas, for example, Krzysztof Kraiński (1556-1618) rejected the veracity of the Częstochowa image confronting it with Nikephor's description of Mary's appearance, according to whom Our Lady had “fair hair, white and long face, not wide, a joyful eye, and wore modest robes”, while the Częstochowa image in the opinion of Kraiński “is ugly, black, scary, splendid, great, a Tatar face, too long and fat nose, big eyes, curious, here and there looking”.

[Na fali nowożytnego ikonoklazmu, który objął Europę północną, podobne ruchy, czy raczej lokalne działania obrazoburcze ujawniły się w Rzeczypospolitej wszędzie tam, gdzie donioślejszy był głos innowierców, zwłaszcza reprezentujących bardziej radykalne odłamy środowisk protestanckich. O ile spośród mieszczan miast Pomorza rekrutowali się sympatycy nauk Marcina Lutra, o tyle dla szlachty bardziej atrakcyjne były tezy Kalwina, zdecydowanie bardziej konfrontacyjne zwłaszcza wobec przejawów katolickiego kultu maryjnego. Odbiciem

tego są mnożące się w XVI stuleciu zarzuty, iż adoracje wizerunków maryjnych mają charakter bałwochwalczy, zaś ostrze krytyki niejednokrotnie dotykało najbardziej czczonego wizerunku w Polsce – obrazu Matki Boskiej Częstochowskiej. Można odnieść wrażenie, że cel wybrany był świadomie – krytykę kierowano wobec najcenniejszego dla katolików obrazu-relikwii celem ośmieszenia jego kultu i tym samym zdeprecjonowania wszelkich innych przejawów odnoszonych do pomniejszych rangą wizerunków. Kwestionowano podobieństwo Maryi w obrazie do postaci historycznej, jak również piętnowano symptomy idolatrii, którą przeciwstawiano wierze czystej, nieskażonej kultem bałwochwalczym. Ciekawy był zarzut np. Erazma Glicznera (1535-1603), który stwierdził, że wizerunek częstochowski nie może być podobizną Panny świątobliwej z powodu ruchliwych oczu, które patrzą ciekawie zawsze tam, gdzie kto stoi. W swej argumentacji przeciwko obrazom ów autor odwoływał się do pisarzy wczesnochrześcijańskich, tj. Klemensa Aleksandryjskiego i Orygenesa, ale np. Krzysztof Kraiński (1556-1618) odrzucał prawdziwość wizerunku częstochowskiego przez jego konfrontację z opisem wyglądu Maryi u Nikefora, według którego Matka Boska miała „jasne włosy, twarz białą i podłużną a nie szeroką, oko wesole, i nosiła skromne szaty”, zaś obraz Częstochowski w opinii Kraińskiego „jest szpetny, czarny, straszny, strojny, świetny, twarz tatarską, nos nazbyt długi i gruby, oczy wielkie, ciekawe i tam i sam strzyżące”].

Królikowski Janusz, *Proskynesis and the worship of images in the view of the Council of Nicaea II* [Proskynesis i kult obrazów w ujęciu Soboru Nicejskiego II]

The Second Council of Nicaea and the prevailing question of the legitimacy of making sacred images and placing them in churches are an important element of the "theology of image" in the Church, which has received reasonable interpretations and proper reception. It seems, however, that among the many issues connected with paintings there is also the one of "worship" given to them. In the period of the first iconoclasm, this issue focused on the concept of *proskynesis*, which was also the subject of polemics and exploration of its nature. It is worth paying attention to this theological theme in the discussions about the image in the context of the Second Council of Nicaea, in order to extract its essential content, ecclesial significance and some political reasons.

[II Sobór Nicejski oraz dominujące w nim zagadnienie prawomocności wykonywania świętych obrazów i umieszczania ich w świątyniach stanowią ważny element „teologii obrazu” w Kościele, który doczekał się uzasadnionych interpretacji i odpowiedniej recepcji. Wydaje się jednak, że spośród licznych zagadnień łączących się z obrazami znajduje się także zagadnienie oddawanej im „czci”. W okresie pierwszego ikonoklazmu zagadnienie to koncentrowało się wokół pojęcia proskynesis, które również było przedmiotem polemik oraz poszukiwań dotyczących jego natury. Warto więc zwrócić uwagę na ten wątek teologiczny w dyskusjach o obrazie w kontekście II Soboru Nicejskiego, aby wydobyć jego zasadnicze treści oraz znaczenie eklezjalne, a także – przynajmniej pod pewnymi – względami polityczne].

Kuźma Andrzej, *The role of Patriarch Tarasios in the Council of Nicaea II (787)* [Rola patriarchy Tarazjusza w obradach Soboru Nicejskiego II (787)]

Tarasios, who became Patriarch of Constantinople in 782 thanks to the support of Empress Irena, played an important role in the process of renewing the cult of paintings at that

time. He contributed to the organization of the universal council in Nicaea in 787 and presided over it. Its program of renewing the image cult centred around three main theses: 1) the cult of images is a deeply rooted tradition of the Church, 2) iconoclastic synod in Hieria (754) misinterpreted the Old Testament ban on making the image of God, 3) the oldest Fathers of the Church clearly testify to the legitimacy of creating icons and worshiping them.

[Tarazjusz, który został patriarchą Konstantynopola w 782 dzięki poparciu cesarzowej Ireny, odegrał ważną rolę w ówczesnym procesie odnowienia kultu obrazów. Przyczynił się do zorganizowania soboru powszechnego w Nicei w 787 i jemu przewodniczył. Swój program odnowienia kultu obrazów skupił wokół trzech głównych tez: 1) kult obrazów stanowi głęboko zakorzenioną tradycję Kościoła, 2) ikonoklastyczny synod w Hieria (754) w niewłaściwy sposób zinterpretował starotestamentowy zakaz czynienia wizerunku Boga, 3) najstarsi Ojcowie Kościoła wyraźnie świadczą o zasadności tworzenia ikon i oddawania im czci].

Łaptaś Magdalena, *Did the Byzantine Iconoclasm Have an Impact on the Christian Nubia?*
[Czy bizantyński ikonoklazm miał wpływ na chrześcijańską Nubię?]

The idea that Byzantine iconoclasm reached Christian Nubia appears from time to time both in publications and conference discussions. It seems that this topic has become more popular recently (as confirmed by the new publication by Stefan Jakobielski). Unfortunately, there are no source texts from the Nubian area that could shed any light on this phenomenon. However, did this phenomenon occur in Nubia at all? What would be the reason for this, considering that the Nubian kingdoms were ruled by the rulers independent of Constantinople? The aim of the presentation will be to initiate discussion on the issue of iconoclasm in Nubia, in the light of the preserved monuments, especially the wall paintings that originated in the period of iconoclasm in Byzantium.

[Od czasu do czasu, w publikacjach badaczy, jak i podczas dyskusji konferencyjnych pojawia się pogląd, iż bizantyński ikonoklazm miał wpływ na chrześcijańską Nubię. Ten temat wydaje się ostatnio szczególnie popularny (co potwierdza nowa publikacja Stefana Jakobielskiego). Niestety, nie zachowały się teksty źródłowe z terenów Nubii, które mogłyby rzucić jakiegokolwiek światło na podejście do tego zjawiska. Czy jednak zjawisko to w ogóle zaistniało w Nubii? Jakie miałyby być ku temu powody, zważywszy, że królestwami nubijskimi zarządzali niezależni od Konstantynopola władcy?

Celem wystąpienia będzie poddanie problemu ikonoklazmu w Nubii pod dyskusję, w świetle zachowanych zabytków, a zwłaszcza malowideł ściennych, których powstanie przypada na okres ikonoklazmu w Bizancjum].

Musin Aleksandr, *How iconoclastic was iconodulism in medieval Rus' and modern Russia?*

*Sub anno 852 the Primary Rus' Chronicle reports that in that year, 'the fifteenth year of the indiction at the accession of the Emperor Michael, the land of Rus' was first named'. Even if the chronology of the Chronicle was constructed *ex post* at the end of the 11th century, the 'providential' coincidence of the origin of Russia and the end of iconoclasm, divided by the gap of nearly ten years (843-852), did not escape the attention of historians of Russian culture:*

Russia had to accept Orthodoxy exclusively in its “iconodulic” version. The studies and speculations on this subject do not miss a possibility to stress the special role of the veneration of icons and pietism in the Russian religious culture. However, the analysis of the Orthodox material culture, the history of theological literature as well as the philosophical thought and religious ethnology show a very specific picture of the formation and development of the theory and practice of iconodulism in Russia. Newly converted Eastern Europe did not accept some of the special features of personal piety of Middle Byzantine Orthodoxy. The Slavonic translation of the *Ecloga*, adopted by iconoclastic emperors, spread out in Rus’ no later than in the early 12th century, while the works and translations of the protectors of icons (Maximus the Confessor, John Damascene, Theodore the Studite) hardly influenced Eastern European medieval literature.

The formation of the so-called ‘iconographic canon’ at the end of the 15th-17th centuries (epistle on the veneration of icons by Josef of Volotsk, Stoglavny Sobor, iconographical guides [*podlinniks*]) present an attempt of an external and artificial regulation of the icon painting, while normally the iconography was guided by tradition as living continuity. Later, the *pseudomorphosis* of Russian Orthodoxy in the 17th-19th centuries (expression of G. Florovsky) and “scholasticization” of theology led to the emergence of the so-called theology of icons (Ye. Trubetskoy, P. Florensky, N. Tarabukin, L. Ouspensky and their contemporary epigones). The “theology of icons” should be explained as a result of philosophical positivism and secularization. It can hardly be regarded as a heritage of the patristic thought. The criticism of the iconography of the 18th-19th centuries as non-Orthodox, “communist iconoclasm” of the 1920s-1930s, contemporary imposing of the Muscovite medieval art as a rule, and disputed popular practices, all of them combine to complete the contradictory picture of the veneration of icons in Russia. Several years ago Leslie Brubaker and John Haldon, in their breaking ground book, regarded the commonly accepted picture of Byzantine iconoclasm as an “invention”. Similarly, the history of veneration of icons in Russia may be characterized as an “invention” of Russian iconodulism.

Naumowicz Józef, *Source texts for the Byzantine iconoclasm and their Polish translations (presentation of the research project)*

In Poland, the problem of Byzantine iconoclasm is known mainly from studies, but there are no translations of source texts, although they are sought especially by historians of art or culture, theologians and, last but not least, Byzantine historians.

This gap is to be filled by a research project entitled *Ikonoklazm bizantyński - spór o koncepcję obrazu religijnego. Główne teksty źródłowe* [*The Byzantine iconoclasm - a dispute over the concept of religious image. Main source texts*] implemented since 2018 as part of the National Programme for the Development of Humanities [Narodowy Program Rozwoju Humanistyki].

Its aim is to translate from Greek and Latin, including oriental languages, together with the commentary of basic source texts on the Byzantine iconoclastic dispute of the 8th-9th centuries, i.e. its history, the subject matter of the dispute, the main protagonists, and the

breakthrough events of this long and famous controversy. The following volumes have been prepared:

1. John of Damascus, *On holy images*. The translation and commentary of three sermons on images together with a collection of *testimonia*.

2. *The first phase of iconoclasm (726-787) – source texts*. A commented translation of sources showing the circumstances of the outbreak of the iconoclastic movement and its initial history (fragments of the *Chronicle* of Teophanes and Nicephorus), patriarch Germanus' writings (three letters, fragments of *Speech in defence of images*), the reaction of Rome (writings of Pope Gregory II and Pope Gregory III), the problem of persecution of iconoduls (*Life of St. Stephen the Younger* and other hagiographic sources), religious issues of the dispute (writings of Constantin V and treatises attributed to him).

3. *From the Synod of Hieria to the Second Nicaea Council – source texts*. A collection of texts concerning the intensity of the iconoclastic theological discussion in the mid-eighth century (acts of synod from Hieria, *Nouthesia gerontos*), the actions of emperors (*Divalis sacra* or an imperial letter from Constantine and Irene to pope Hadrian) and Rome (fragments of acts of the synod in Gentiliacum 767 and Lateran 769, letters of Pope Hadrian to Emperor Constantine and Irene and to the patriarch Tarasios), circumstances of convening the Council of Nicaea II, fragments of life stories (*The Life of the Patriarch Tarasios* by Ignatios Deacon, *Life of the empress Irene*).

4. Theodore the Studite, *Writings against iconoclasts* (various polemical discourses connected with the question of image-worship, in particular *Antirrhetici adversus Iconomachos*, selected *Letters*, *Refutatio et subversio impiorum poematum*). The volume will also show the development of the theory of religious images, which has taken place since the times of John Damascene.

5. *Patristic testimonia in iconoclastic disputes*. A commented translation of Greek and Latin texts, on the place of holy images in Christian worship, starting from the first testimonies (II-III centuries), through the first disputes over images in the 4th century and further manifestations of controversies, to numerous testimonies showing the dissemination of images in the 5th -7th centuries. Patristic texts were often quoted and analysed during the Byzantine iconoclastic disputes.

Further volumes are planned for further projects, which will include a Polish translation of the acts of the Council of Nicaea II, the writings of Patriarch Nicephorus, the *Synodicon of Orthodoxy*, sources for iconoclasm II, Photius' writings, patristic and Byzantine ekphrases of works of art, texts relating to miraculous images (the Image of Camuliana, the Mandyllion of Edessa...) and to the cross, and so on.

Palusińska Anna, *Image and prototype. Aristotelian principles of iconic apology for Theodore the Studite* [*Obraz i pierwowzór. Arystotelesowskie podstawy apologii ikon u Teodora Studyty*]

In my speech I will present the argumentation in defence of icons formulated by Theodore the Studite, focusing on philosophical themes that make up his concept of image,

symbol, and religious worship of icons. It is worth recalling that the Byzantine philosophy developed in two main currents. First of all, it was an academic philosophy that continued the commentary tradition of late antiquity and in the Neo-platonic paradigm combined Plato's metaphysics and the logic of Aristotle. Secondly, there was a philosophy in Byzantium that could be called Christian, because it was involved in resolving theological questions and doctrinal disputes. This second trend included the work of Theodore the Studite, who used Aristotle's metaphysics to formulate original responses to iconoclastic accusations. The theory of the icon, which we read from Theodor's writings, played a decisive role in Byzantine iconoclastic disputes, which is why it is worth bringing closer its background and value.

[W swym wystąpieniu przedstawię argumentację w obronie ikon, sformułowaną przez Teodora Studytę skupiając się na wątkach filozoficznych, które składają się na jego pojęcie obrazu, symbolu i religijnej czci ikon. Warto przypomnieć, że filozofia bizantyńska rozwijała się dwoma głównymi nurtami. Po pierwsze, była to filozofia akademicka, która kontynuowała komentatorską tradycję późnej starożytności i w paradygmacie neoplatońskim łączyła metafizykę Platona i logikę Arystotelesa. Po drugie, w Bizancjum rozwijała się filozofia, która można nazwać chrześcijańską, ponieważ była włączona w rozstrzyganie kwestii teologicznych i dysputy doktrynalne. Do tego drugiego nurtu należała twórczość Teodora Studyty, który korzystała z arystotelesowskiej metafizyki, aby sformułować oryginalne odpowiedzi na ikonoklastyczne zarzuty. Teoria ikony, którą odczytujemy z pism Teodora, odegrała decydującą rolę w bizantyńskich sporach ikonoklastycznych, dlatego warto przybliżyć jej podłoże i wartość].

Rapti Ioanna, *Remembering iconoclasm: history, hagiography, identity in manuscript illumination from Byzantium and beyond*

The controversy about the cult of religious images was a formative period and a turning point in Christian spirituality. Its impact was felt all over the Christian world and eventually revived with the Reformation. Among a wide range of sources, manuscript illumination bears eloquent visual testimonials to virulent polemics that shook the empire. Psalters with marginal illumination, the most important visual evidence for the iconoclastic controversy, kept being produced long after the end of iconoclasm through the late Byzantine period, when their impact was felt beyond the shrinking empire as witnessed in the Kiev psalter and the Greek-Latin Hamilton psalter. My paper will focus on the depiction of the iconoclastic controversy considering these manuscripts not as serial copies, but as individual artworks and will attempt to consider their illustration relevant to iconoclasm as perceptions of that historical time in the specific historical and cultural context of the manuscripts. Moreover, the miniatures will be considered with the broader framework of the iconographic repertory pertaining to the history of the Church in the late Medieval period.

I will discuss the depictions of iconoclasm in the Berlin Hamilton psalter, in the Slavonic 14th Kiev, Tomic and Munic psalters and the evocation of iconoclasm and iconophilia in two manuscripts from Cilicia.

Słowik Justyna, *Hiereia florilegia – the Church Fathers’ thought at the service of Iconoclasm.*

The polemical writings were employed by both parties to discredit the opponents’ arguments during the Council of Hieria, summoned to support the iconoclast standpoint in the Byzantine iconoclasm controversy. Florilegia – systematic (but interpreted in an unconstrained and individual fashion) collections of quotations from the works of the Fathers and other ecclesiastical writers, compiled with a view to serve dogmatic or ethical purposes – were first used during the Council of Ephesus in 431, but obtained a fully developed and definite form in the 7th century, subsequently contributing to the ultimate condemnation of the cult of images.

Sprutta Justyna, “Profanations” and icon – iconoclastic context [„Profanacje” a ikona – kontekst ikonoklastyczny]

The concept of “profanation” is inscribed in the Byzantine dispute around the icon and its cult. The profanation, as this paper will show, may be related to several perspectives. From the point of view of the iconoclast, it includes profanation of the holy prototype associated with its material presentation, but also the profanation of the iconic cult itself, expressed in its improper manifestations, such as the treatment of icons as godparents or decorating them with garments. For balance, a look at the icon from the iconodule’s perspective will also be presented, that is, the profanation of the icon as *sacrum* will be discussed.

[*W bizantyński spór wokół ikony i jej kultu wpisuje się pojęcie „profanacji”. Ta profanacja, jak pokaże to referat, może być dotyczyć kilku perspektyw. Z punktu widzenia ikonoklasty obejmuje profanację świętego prototypu, związaną z jego materialnym przedstawieniem, ale także profanację samego kultu ikony, wyrażającą się w jego niewłaściwych przejawach, jak chociażby traktowanie ikon jako chrzestnych czy zdobienie nimi szat. Dla równowagi zostanie też zaprezentowane spojrzenie na ikonę z perspektywy ikonodula, czyli omówiona będzie profanacja ikony jako sacrum].*

Tatarova Irina, *The vision of iconoclasm in Russian thought about the icon of the twentieth century* [Wizja ikonoklazmu w rosyjskiej myśli o ikonie XX wieku]

In the 20th century, extensive Russian-language literature about the icon was created as a phenomenon of culture. Almost every author who wrote about the icon in one way or another interpreted the texts, course and consequences of the 7th Council. In my paper I will talk about a specific vision of iconoclasm found in the works of some thinkers – Nikolai Tarabukin, Paweł Floreński, Sergiusz Bułgakow, Leonid Uspieński and others.

[*W wieku XX powstała obszerna rosyjskojęzyczna literatura o ikonie jako fenomenie kultury. Prawie każdy z autorów, piszących o ikonie w taki czy inny sposób interpretował teksty, przebieg oraz następstwa VII Soboru Powszechnego. W moim referacie będzie mowa o specyficznej wizji ikonoklazmu, jaką znajdujemy w pracach niektórych myślicieli – Nikołaja Tarabukina, Pawła Floreńskiego, Sergiusza Bułgakowa, Leonida Uspieńskiego i innych].*



Biograms of the Speakers

Baranov Vladimir works as a researcher in the Research Center at Novosibirsk State University of Architecture, Design and Fine Arts, Novosibirsk, Russia. His research interests include Byzantine philosophy, Origenism, Byzantine theology and art during the Iconoclastic Controversy.

He has published over sixty articles, book chapters, and encyclopaedia entries: *The Theological Background of the Iconoclastic Church Programmes*; *The Doctrine of the Icon-Eucharist for the Byzantine Iconoclasts*; *Unedited Slavonic Translation of the 'Apology on the Cross and on the Holy Icons' Attributed to Patriarch Germanus of Constantinople (CPG 8033)*; *The Second Commandment and 'True Worship' in the Iconoclastic Controversy*; *Origen and the Iconoclastic Controversy*; *Origen's Tradition and the First Responses to Iconoclasm in Byzantium: The Cases of Constantinople and Palestine, Amphilochia 231 of Patriarch Photius as a Possible Source on the Christology of the Byzantine Iconoclasts*; *Condensing and Shaping the Flesh...': The Incarnation and the Instrumental Function of the Soul of Christ in the Iconoclastic Christology*; *Instrument of Death and Tree of Life. Visual Meanings of the Cross in Some Late Antique and Byzantine Monumental Programs*, etc.

He is author of the chapter *The Iconophile Fathers*, in: *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Patristics*, ed. K. Parry, Oxford 2015, 338–352.

In 2004 he defended a PhD dissertation in the Central European University, Budapest, entitled *The Theology of Byzantine Iconoclasm (725/6–843): A Study in Theological Method*. In 2011 he defended a dissertation, *Philosophical Foundations of the Ideology of Byzantine Iconoclasm*, for the degree of the Candidate of Philosophical Sciences at the Institute of Philosophy and Law of the Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences. He is a member of International Association of Patristic Studies (I.A.P.S.); and Asia-Pacific Early Christian Studies Society (APECSS).

Bigam Steven is retired profesor of the Université de Sherbrooke, Campus Longueuil, Québec, Canada. His academic interests center around Orthodox iconology - the history and theology of icons - and his writings deal with various aspects of that discipline: *Early Christian Attitudes towards Images*; *Epiphanius of Salamis, Doctor of Iconoclasm? Deconstruction of a Myth*; *Eusèbe de Césarée et les images chrétiennes*; *The Image of God the Father in Orthodox Theology and Iconography* and others.

He is an Orthodox priest in Montréal (Québec). Married, with two children and one grandson.

Deluga Waldemar - lecturer at the University of Ostrava in the Czech Republic, focuses his research on the history of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine art and in the art in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. He published monographies: *Panagiotafitika. Greckie ikony i grafika cerkiewna* [Panagiotafitica. Greek Icons and Orthodox Church Graphics, 2008], *Grafika z kręgu Ławry Pieczarskiej i Kolegium Mohylańskiego* [Graphics form the Lavra Pecherska and Mohyla Academy, 2003] and others.

He is the author of scientific articles in Polish, English, French and German, among others, *Byzantine Frescoes in Latin Churches of Jagiellonian Age in Poland and Lithuania: History of the discovery*; *Polish-Ukrainian Research of the post-byzantine Art in 19th and 20th Centuries*; *Ukrainian Orthodox Iconostases from the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth*; *Sources latines de la gravure orthodox du XVIème et XVIIème siècles*; *Einblattdrucke aus dem 15. Jahrhundert in der Nationalbibliothek in Prag*; *Polish Woodcuts after 1900*; *Greek Patronage of the Arts in Lviv in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*; *The Influence of Dutch Graphic Archetypes on Icons in the Ukraine, 1600- 1750*; *Dutch rabbinic Portraits*; *Malarstwo i grafika cerkiewna w dawnej Rzeczypospolitej* [Painting and Orthodox graphic art in the former Polish Republic], *Sztuka iluminacji i grafiki cerkiewnej* [Art of the Orthodox Miniature and Graphic Arts, exhibition catalogue, National Library]; *Badania nad sztuką Ormian w Polsce* [Studies on the art of Armenians in Poland].

Habilitation 2002, Dissertation: *Orthodox painting and graphics from the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth* (in Polish); Ph.D. 1993, Dissertation: *Seventeenth-Century Graphic Arts of Caves in Kiev* (in Polish); MA in Art History 1987, Dissertation: *Iconography of Saint Nicholas in the 15/16th Icon Painting of Central Europe* (in Polish).

Founder and editor of the periodical: *Series Byzantina. Studies on Byzantine and Postbyzantine Art*. He was a lecturer at the Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University; conducted many lectures and seminars in numerous foreign academic centres.

Fogliadini Emanuela is expert of Byzantine-Orthodox theology and iconography; since 2014 Professor of Eastern Christian Studies at the Theological Faculty in Milan and Pavia. Her theological research focuses on the “controversy over sacred images”, in particular on the theology of the iconomachs and the ecumenical Council of Nicaea II.

She has published several essays: *Il volto di Cristo. Gli Acheropiti del Salvatore nella Tradizione dell’Oriente cristiano* (2011); *L’immagine negata. Il concilio di Hieria e la formalizzazione ecclesiale dell’iconoclasmo* (2013; French edition *L’image contestée. Le concile de Hieria (754) et la pensée théologique des iconoclastes* in 2017) and *L’invenzione dell’immagine sacra. Il secondo concilio di Nicea e la legittimazione ecclesiale dell’immagine sacra* (2015). With François Bœspflug, *Ressuscité. La Résurrection du Christ dans*

l'art (2016); *Dieu entre Orient et Occident. Le conflit des images: mythes et réalités* (2017); *La Fuite en Égypte dans l'art d'Orient et d'Occident* (2018); *Crucifixion. La Crucifixion dans l'art. Un sujet planétaire* (2019).

She earned her PhD in Theology at the Theological Faculty of Milan in 2014 and a PhD in History of Religions at the Sapienza University of Rome in 2017. Fellow at Dumbarton Oaks in 2012 and at Orthodox Christian Studies Center of Fordham University in New York in 2014, she completed her Byzantine studies at the Collège de France and at the École des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales in Paris.

Grotowski Piotr – art historian, Byzantinist, lecturer at the Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow, Chair of the History of Ancient and Medieval Art [Uniwersytet Papieski Jana Pawła II w Krakowie, Katedra Historii Sztuki Starożytnej i Średniowiecznej]. His scientific interests focus on problems related to early Byzantine architecture (VI-IX centuries), iconography of saints, theory of painting, presence of Byzantine-Ruthenian culture in the history of Polish art.

Author of monographs: *Arms and armour of the warrior saints: tradition and innovation in Byzantine iconography (843-1261)*, (Brill 2010); *Towards rewriting? New Approaches to Byzantine Archaeology and Art*. (2010), etc. et of many articles in English and Polish: *Metagraphe in Byzantine Art; Military Attire of Warrior Saints – between Iconography and Written Sources; O sztuce cytowania - chresis jako źródło w badaniach nad recepcją idei obrazu w Bizancjum [On the art of quoting - chresis as a source in research on the reception of the idea of an image in Byzantium]; Classicisation or representation? Mimesis in Byzantine pictorial arts as a derivative of style ; Defining the Byzantine Saint – Creating a Message in Orthodox Art; The Hodegon. Considerations on the location of the Hodegetria sanctuary in Constantinople; Jerusalem in the Sixth Century: Myth and Reality (Some Remarks on the Byzantine Hierotopia); Military Equipment as a Symbolic Form in Byzantium (Some preliminary observations); Military Attire of Warrior Saints – A Case of Speikon; The Legend of St. George Saving A Youth from Captivity and Its Depiction in Art; On the Margin of Meaning: Some remarks on gesture as depicted in the Orthodox frescoes of Roman Catholic churches in Poland; Memory of Scripture and Church Fathers in the Iconophile Polemics: The Case of Chresis* (paper in Congress in Leeds in 2018).

Born in 1973, a graduate of art history at the Jagiellonian University, he also studied at the University of St. Andrews (Scotland) and at the Aristotle University of Thessalonica. He conducted research, among others, at the Warburg Institute (School of Advanced Studies) and at Dumbarton Oaks in Washington.

Janocha Michał – art historian and theologian, professor at the University of Warsaw at the Department of *Artes Liberales*. He deals with the history and theology of Byzantine and Ruthenian art, the Orthodox tradition in the former Polish Republic, comparative iconography of the Christian East and West and contemporary religious art.

Author of the books: *Missa in arte polona. Ikonografia Mszy świętej w sztuce polskiej [Missa in arte polona. Iconography of the Holy Mass in Polish art, 1998]*, *Ukraińskie i białoruskie ikony świąteczne. Problem kanonu [Ukrainian and Belarusian festive icons. Canon problem, 2001]*, *Ikony w Polsce. Od średniowiecza do współczesności [Icons in Poland. From the Middle Ages to the Present, 2008]*, long interview *A piękno w ciemności świeci [And beauty shines in the dark, 2017]*, and over 180 scientific articles in Polish, English, Belarusian, French,

Lithuanian, Russian, Ukrainian and Hungarian languages. Selected recent articles: *Cóż wiesz o pięknie?* Pytanie o chrześcijańską teologię piękna [What do you know about beauty? A question about the Christian theology of beauty]; *Matka Boska Częstochowska na Watykanie* [Our Lady of Czestochowa at the Vatican]; *Ewolucja ołtarza i ikonostasu w sztuce cerkiewnej na terenie Rzeczypospolitej* [Evolution of the altar and iconostasis in church art in the territory of the Polish Republic].

Born in 1959 in Warsaw, auxiliary bishop of the Archdiocese of Warsaw, chairman of the Council for Culture and the Cultural Heritage of the Polish Bishops' Conference [Rada do Spraw Kultury i Dziedzictwa Kulturowego Konferencji Episkopatu Polski].

Klejnowski-Różycki Dariusz – head of the Chair of Dogmatic Theology at the University of Opole. Founder and Rector of the Silesian School of Iconography [Śląska Szkoła Ikonograficzna]. In his research he focuses on Chinese theology and on the theology of the icon.

He studied dogmatic theology, iconography and sinology in Lublin, Krakow, Paris, Versailles, Beijing and Taipei. In addition to numerous works on Chinese theology, he also published *Z tajemnic Rosji. Historia, teologia i estetyka ikony Trójcy Świętej świętego Andrzeja Rublowa i wpływ świętego Sergiusza Radoneżskiego na jej powstanie* [From the Mysteries of Russia. History, theology and aesthetics of Saint Andrew Rublov's icon of the Holy Trinity and the influence of Saint Sergei Radonezhsky on its creation, 2010]; editor of the volume, *Rytuał ikonopisarski. Obrzędy poświęcenia ikon. Modlitwy na poszczególnych etapach pisania ikony: rytę błogosławieństw ikonopisarzy. Instrumentum laboris* (2016) [Iconographic ritual. Icon consecration rites. Prayers at different stages of icon painting: rites of blessings of iconographers. Instrumentum laboris]. Author of articles, a.o., *Kult obrazów według Reformatorów: Marcina Lutera i Jana Kalwina* (2017) [The cult of images according to the Reformers: Martin Luther and John Calvin].

He is an iconographer. His selected iconographic works (icons on a board, egg tempera): *Anastasis: Descent into the Abyss; Christmas; Etoimasia, altar icon; Birth of the Mother of God from the series Prazdniki; Rublov's Trinity; Pentecost from the series: Prazdniki*.

Królikowski Janusz – professor of theology at the Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow. Author of numerous works in the field of Mariology, Ecclesiology, Trinitarian theology, but also theology of religious image, Council of Nicaea II, relationship of liturgy and art or complementarity of the word and image, which was expressed, a.o., in two volumes: *Nieme słowo. Teologia w sztuce; Widzialne słowo. Teologia w sztuce* [Silent word. Theology in art; Visible word. Theology in art].

Born in 1962, he studied theology in Tarnów, then in Rome at the Pontifical University of St. Cross and the Pontifical Eastern Institute (patristic-dogmatic theology). He lectured as a visiting professor at several universities in Rome.

Kruk Mirosław Piotr – historian of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine art, head of the Department of the History of Medieval Art at the Institute of the History of Art at the University of Gdańsk [kierownik Zakładu Historii Sztuki Średniowiecznej w Instytucie Historii Sztuki Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego].

Research topics: Culture and history of art in Europe of the Middle Ages and modern times, especially of Slavdom and Byzantium; the history of the Eastern Church in the former

Polish Republic, especially the history of iconic painting with reference to other centres of orthodox painting. Author of dissertations: *Ikony-obrazy w świątyniach rzymsko-katolickich dawnej Rzeczypospolitej* [Icons-paintings in Roman Catholic churches of the former Polish Republic, 2011], *Zachodnioruskie ikony Matki Boskiej z Dzieciątkiem wieku XV-XVI* [West Ruthenian icons of the Mother of God with the Child of the 15th-16th century, 2001], and over 160 articles and book chapters, among others, in English: *The Byzantine Gem with Christ Pantocrator from the Church of the Virgin Mary Queen of Poland in Kruszyn; Rome, Constantinople and Newly-Converted Europe. Archaeological and Historical Evidence* (2012); *Three Categories of the Reception of the Classical Antiquity in the Old Rus Art* (2012).

Born in 1967. A certified curator, curator of the Collection of Orthodox Art in the Department of Old Art of the National Museum in Krakow. Curator of several exhibitions at the National Museum in Krakow.

Kuźma Andrzej - lecturer of patrology and canon law at the Christian Theological Academy [Chrześcijańskiej Akademia Teologiczna] in Warsaw and the Orthodox Seminary in Warsaw. Author of the doctoral dissertation titled *Św. Patriarcha Tarazjusz i jego wkład w odnowienie kultu ikon* [St. Tarasios Patriarch and his contribution to the renewal of iconic cult, unpublished] and articles about iconic worship.

Łaptaś Magdalena works in the History of Art Institute at the Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw [Instytut Historii Sztuki w Uniwersytecie Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego w Warszawie]. Her main field of research is the Mediterranean mediaeval art with a special focus on the iconography of paintings acquired during Polish excavations in Sudan. Since 2001 she has participated in the excavations at Banganarti (Sudan), and was also a member of the restoration missions in Kaftun and Ma'ad (Lebanon).

She is a co-author of the study: *Pachoras (Faras). The wall paintings from Cathedrals of Aetios, Paulos and Petros (PAM Monograph Series 4, 2017)* and author of many articles, among others in English: *Archangels as Protectors and Guardians in Nubian Art; The Holy Protectors of the Nubian Rulers and Symbolism of Numbers in the Upper Church in Banganarti; The Heritage of the Christian Art and Architecture in Medieval Lebanon. Report; A Feast of the Archangel Michael. A New Interpretation of the Mural Painting from Old Dongola; Representation of the Angelic Hierarchy in a Nativity Scene from Faras Cathedral; Paintings from the Faras Cathedral. The "Colour" Classification Method.*

She belongs to scientific organizations and associations: *Coptic Society; Nubian Society; Sudan Research Archaeological Society; International Center of Medieval Art.; Verein zur Förderung der Christlichen Archäologie Österreichs.* She is currently preparing materials for the 24th International Byzantine Studies Congress in Istanbul (2021), during which she will chair the round table entitled *Christian Nubia as a Bridge between Byzantium and Africa.*

Musin Aleksandr - Senior Research Fellow at the Institute for the History of Material Culture (Russian Academy of Sciences, Saint Petersburg, Russia). His research focuses on cultural transfers between Eastern Europe, Latin West and Byzantine East, detection of social markers in historical texts and material culture, and the relationship between history and archaeology. He is also interested in the criticism of "Great narratives" and national myths as the late medieval (re-) construction of local history. Other fields of his research interests are linked to

the protection of Christian cultural heritage, theological works of archbishop Basil (Krivocheinne, 1900-1985), and use and abuse of Orthodox iconography in social and political life of modern Russia. His approaches are based on the reappraisal of contemporary medieval sources: written, material, and visual, and they were developed during the realization of a series of international projects.

He was born and educated in Saint Petersburg. He studied medieval history and archaeology at Saint Petersburg University where he obtained his MA in 1992 with a study on archaeological evidence of Christianization of Eastern Europe. He received his first doctoral degree in Orthodox Theology, Church History and Christian Archaeology from the Theological Academy, St. Petersburg, 1995, with a thesis on the relationship between Church, State and Society in the 1st-3rd centuries. The next PhD was granted to him at the Institute for the History of Material Culture, Russian Academy of Sciences, Saint Petersburg, in 1997 with the thesis "Christian material culture of Early Rus' in 9th-14th centuries as reflected in burials customs". The habilitation thesis was proposed at the same Institute in 2003 and concerned the study of Christian urban medieval Russian communities as Novgorod and Pskov in 11th-15th centuries in the light of historical and archaeological data.

Naumowicz Józef – historian of early Christianity and Byzantium, patrologist and classical philologist, head of the Chair of Ancient History at the Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University [kierownik katedry Historii Starożytnej na Uniwersytecie Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego].

He published monographs, including *Wczesnochrześcijańscy pisarze aleksandryjscy w Bibliotece Focjusza* [Early Christian Alexandrian writers in the Library of Photius]; *Filokalia – teksty o modlitwie Jezusowej* [The Philokalia – texts on Jesus' prayer]; *Geneza chrześcijańskiej rachuby lat. Historyczno-teologiczne podstawy systemu Dionizego Mniejszego* [Genesis of the Christian calculating the years: The historical-theological foundations of Dionysius Exiguus' system]; *Prawdziwe początki Bożego Narodzenia* [The real beginnings of Christmas], (the last two books are ready to be published in English), etc.

Selected articles: *Hypatiusz z Efezu o kulcie obrazów* [Hypatius of Ephesus on the cult of images]; *Leoncjusz z Neapolis i jego apologia chrześcijańskich obrazów* [Leontius of Naples and his apology of Christian images]; *Posąg Chrystusa z Paneas w źródłach patrystycznych i bizantyńskich* [The Statue of Christ of Paneas in patristic and Byzantine sources]; *Dydaktyczna rola obrazów religijnych według Grzegorza Wielkiego* [The Didactic Role of Religious Images according to Gregory the Great]; *Les symboles des quatre Évangiles chez Chromace d'Aquilée et chez les autres auteurs patristiques*; *La question de la perigraphe du Christ chez Théognoste d'Alexandrie d'après la Bibliothèque de Photius*; *Les oeuvres de St. Basile le Grand dans la "Bibliothèque" de Photius*.

Palusińska Anna – lecturer at the Department of History of Ancient and Medieval Philosophy at the Catholic University of Lublin [Katedra Historii Filozofii Starożytnej i Średniowiecznej na Katolickim Uniwersytecie Lubelskim]. Her research interests include late Antiquity philosophy, the thoughts of the Church Fathers and Byzantine philosophy. The most important issues that she undertakes are: the *fides et ratio* relationship, the evaluation of ancient philosophy by Christian authors, the theory of the icon and the doctrine of divinization in the teaching of hesychasts.

Her most important monographs: *Filozofia ikony u Teodora Studyty i Nicefora* (2007, published doctoral dissertation), [Iconic Philosophy at Theodore the Studite and Nicephorus];

Hierarchiczność i partycypacja jako filozoficzne kategorie teorii ikony (2017, published habilitation dissertation) [*Hierarchy and participation as philosophical categories of icon theory*]. Other publications, including a chapter *Filozofia bizantyńska*, w: *Przewodnik po filozofii wczesnośredniowiecznej* [*Byzantine Philosophy*, in: *A Guide to Early Medieval Philosophy*], 2012, pp. 79-96.

Rapti Ioanna – Professor of Art History and Archaeology of the Byzantine world and the Christian East at the *École Pratique des Hautes Études (Section des Sciences Religieuses)* in Paris and Director of the *Collection chrétienne et byzantine – Photothèque Gabriel Millet*. Her research themes: Byzantine, Armenian and Georgian art, book illumination and liturgy, text and image, cross-cultural relations.

Her publications concern Armenian art and miniature painting and manuscript illumination mainly in the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia (also in the Crimea and Cyprus), Christian art in the Pontos and the history of Byzantine Studies. She has been co-curator of the Louvre exhibitions *Armenia Sacra* (2007) and *Sainte Russie* (2010) and co-editor of the catalogues and had participated to several exhibition catalogues. Selected titles of her publications in revues or collective works: *Displaying the Word: words as visual signs in the Armenian architectural decoration of the monastery of Noravank (14th century)*; *Featuring the King. Rituals of Coronation and Burial in the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia*; *Le mécénat des princesses arméniennes*; *La peinture dans les livres au royaume des Lusignan*; *Les images intérieures de Grégoire de Narek*; *Image et rite dans l'enluminure arménienne du Moyen-Age*; *Image et liturgie à la cour de Cilicie : le lectionnaire du prince Het'um (Matenadaran ms 979)*; *Image et monnaie dans le royaume arménien de Cilicie*; *Un tétraévangile arménien de 1313 et ses miniatures géorgiennes*; *Images du Christ, reliques des saints: un triptyque géorgien inédit*.

Słowik Justyna – art historian. She defended her master's thesis on the files of the Synod of Hieria of 754 under the supervision of dr P. Grotowski and continues her research in this area.

Sprutta Justyna – theologian and art historian, she focuses her research on the themes of the Byzantine and Ruthenian icon, theology and philosophy of icons, iconography and Christian symbolism, ancient philosophy, Byzantine art, etc.

She published articles: *Le culte et l'iconographie de Saint Théodore dans la tradition byzantine*; *Translations of the Warrior Saint Dragon—Slayers' Relics in Byzantium* as well as numerous articles in Polish periodicals: *Kanon w ikonie a jej niekanoniczność* [*Canon in the icon and its non-canonicity*]; *Przedstawialność Chrystusa w obrazie. Ikonoklazm jako spór o bóstwo i człowieczeństwo Chrystusa* [*Representation of Christ in the image. Iconoclasm as a dispute over the divinity and humanity of Christ*]; *Wizja chrześcijańska sztuki religijnej w „Księgach Karolińskich”* [*Christian vision of religious art in the “Libri Carolini”*]; *Ikonoklazm w Bizancjum – do soboru nicejskiego II* [*Iconoclasm in Byzantium - to the Nicaea Council II*]; *Ikonoklazm bizantyjski. Faza druga* [*Byzantine iconoclasm. Phase two*], etc.

She is a doctor of theological sciences (specialization: theology of icon) and doctor of humanities (specialization: history of art). She conducts classes commissioned at the Faculty of Theology of the Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań. Affiliation: Polish Institute for World Art Studies - branch in Warsaw [Polski Instytut Studiów nad Sztuką Świata - oddział w Warszawie].

Tatarova Irina – lecturer at the Faculty of "Artes Liberales" of the University of Warsaw. Fields of scientific research: culture and art of the Byzantine tradition, Eastern Christian culture and theology, the phenomenon of icons, film.

Co-editor of the volume: *Byzantium and Renaissances : dialogue of cultures, heritage of antiquity : tradition and modernity (Bizancjum a renesansy. Dialog kultur, dziedzictwo antyku. Tradycja i współczesność, 2012)*. She published articles, a.o., *Renesans a tradycja bizantyjska w rosyjskojęzycznej myśli o ikonie pierwszej połowy XX wieku [Renaissance and the Byzantine tradition in Russian-language thought about the icon of the first half of the twentieth century]*; *Odrodzenie malarstwa ikonowego w XIX-XX wiek [The revival of iconic painting in the 19th-20th centuries]*; *Ikona miejscem spotkania. Ikona i artysta [Icon as a meeting place. Icon and artist]*.

She is the head of the scientific research committee “Speculum Byzantinum”, studying the broadly understood Byzantine-Slavic tradition, its historical, philosophical, theological, literary, spiritual and artistic aspects.



Komitet organizacyjny
[Organizing committee]

Przewodniczący: ks. prof. dr hab. Józef Naumowicz

dr Helena Karczewska, dr Judyta Krajewska, ks. prof. dr hab. Tadeusz Kołosowski,
dr Magdalena Łaptaś, ks. prof. dr hab. Leszek Misiarczyk, ks. dr Tomasz Skibiński

Obsługa medialna i promocja konferencji:

dr Milena Kindziuk - Instytut Edukacji Medialnej i Dziennikarstwa UKSW
mgr Małgorzata Starzyńska – dyrektor Biura Promocji UKSW, rzecznik rektora UKSW