

RESUMEN INGLES

Convened by emperor Justinian (527-565) in 532 was held in Constantinople a meeting between neocalcedonians and monophysite bishops to agree on the christological disputes that continued to rage in the big cities of the East. In fact, in the first half of the V century, Eutyches, the archimandrite of Constantinople monastery was professing the unique and divine nature of Christ after the incarnation. This doctrine affected the real humanity assumed by God through His Son at the moment of the Incarnation for the orthodox theologians. This doctrine was defined 'Monophysitism' and was condemned as heretical by the Council of Chalcedon (451).

Despite the council, the fracture remained unfixable and was made up in two parties: the so-called 'Chalcedonian' (Orthodox and 'duofisits') who adopted the complete doctrine of the dual nature of Christ decided by the council, and the 'Monophysites' or anticalcedonians, who continued to support the doctrines of Eutyches. This second faction was present mainly in the eastern cities which Antioch was the center among and whose charismatic leader was bishop Severus.

In Constantinople, the center of political and religious power, the emperors who expressed interest in theological disputes were very high. To summarize, after the Council of Chalcedon the emperor Zeno (425-491) issued the so-called *Henotikon* (482), 'conciliation tool' made to appease Monophysites and orthodoxes factions. This was not enough. This slight line was overtaken by the emperor Justin I (518-527), who repealed *Henotikon* (in 519, by the excommunication of Patriarch Acacius, who had planned it) and especially by his nephew and successor Justinian (527-565), who called the meeting, which just go down in history as *Collatio cum Severianis* (532).

Before the meeting, the Monophysite bishops, who gathered around the figure of Severus of Antioch, anticipated their reasons to the Emperor in a letter, putting their faith in the unique divine nature of Christ relying on the testimony of Dionysius the Areopagite. The representatives of the opposing faction accused them of being Apollinarists and, through the speech of their leader Hypatius of Ephesus, questioned the veracity of this source as well:

In fact, if it really came from him, would not have escaped the attention of Cyril. But why talk of Cyril when the blessed Athanasius, if he thought it was Dionysius, have offered these same testimonies concerning the consubstantial Trinity before everyone else at the Council of Nicea

against the blasphemies of Arius in different substance? But if any of the former he mentioned, I have no idea how you can prove that they were written by Dionysus (ACO IV 2, p. 173 , 12-17).

This is the first advent of Dionysius which is immediately indicated as a great ancient theologian and as an impostor at the same time. After the significant advances in the Dionysian studies, especially in the last century, it is possible to limit now the date of composition of the writings between 476-485 (as *terminus a quo*) and 518-528 (as *terminus ante quem*) . The author is still unknown.

Despite the traditional interpretations, it is crucial to approach the Corpus for his historical age: the late fifth and early sixth century. It is worth briefly reviewing the historical context.

In addition to the Christological disputes, in Middle East there were other heretical groups as the Origenists . First, since studies of Istvan Perczel and Roberto Fiori have shown, one could set some of the themes of *De Divinis Nominibus* (a treatise among the four which the corpus is composed by) in the context of so-called " Origenism ", spreaded in V century in monastic Syrian- Palestinian areas. During the first origenist controversy, Epiphanius of Salamis (393 c.ca) attacked some Egyptian monks (who spread Origen's 'dangerous' doctrines as the pre-existence of souls, subordinationism , denial of the resurrection of the flesh, the doctrine that angels can move freely from one order to another); Eusebius and Jerome followed Epiphanius attack, after have being proud supporters of the Adamantine's doctrines . Condemnation of the Patriarch Theophilus of Alexandria, after a disagreement with one of his brothers (Isidorus , who then took refuge with the origenists monksin Nitria) aimed entire literary output of Origen and his readers at a synod held in the Egyptian capital around the year 400 that included the *Kephalaia gnostica* of Evagrius, a great reader of Origen.

The so-called *second Origenism* started in the Palestinian monastic area around some monks who left the monastery of Great Lavra, and who founded then New Lavra. The anti - Origenists monks moved to the seat of the Patriarch of Constantinople to invoke the intervention of the Emperor who condemned the doctrines of adamantine in *Edictum contra Origenem* (543). Although the definition of "Origenism" may not be unique due to the heterogeneity of the doctrines supported by the people of this faction, it may be included in this historiographical category that group of theologians and monks whose spiritual and ecclesiastical center life was

the monastery and thanks to the works of Origen, whose thought was partly revised by Evagrius, the center of his thought became a strong intellectual component.

Among the Origenists doctrines, rejected by orthodox, there were scriptural allegory and angelology. It is well known that the controversy developed around the method of scripture prior to Clement of Alexandria and then to Origen. In Antioch authors point of view, the method which tried to reconcile the Old Testament and the New Testament through the search for a hidden meaning in the sacred writings was wrong and they preferred literal exegesis. Thus, besides other conflicts, Alexandrians and Sirians early centuries exegetical method fight was one of the most heartfelt and never resolved one. Regarding the discussion of angels, the Christian thought was extremely heterogeneous. In this context, especially the possibility that Origen gave to the angelic beings to change position within the ranks, (as a result of the descent of intellect, which reflects the pre-existence of the soul to the body), could not be accepted easily within Christian orthodoxy. These issues are a key (hidden) objective of the *On the heavenly hierarchy* as well as the treatise *On the ecclesiastic hierarchy* with the Epistle VIII (which admonished a monk to don't get on the altar) have aim the reorganization of the clergy as needed (especially together with a rough monasticism) the era which CD was written in.

Areopagus member converted by Saint Paul during his trip to the city of Athens (At. 17, 16-18) there are some writings attributed to Dionysius: (*On the angelic hierarchy, On the ecclesiastic hierarchy, On the Divine Names, On Mystical Theology* and ten *Letters*). In IX century these writings were received by Charles the Bald who commissioned the translation to John Scotus Erigena. From that moment not only the figure of Dionysius, a pupil of Saint Paul was merged with that of Saint Denis, the first martyr of Paris but the identity of the author had never been questioned until the Renaissance. This corpus had been read by Latins as a mystical journey of the soul from the world to the angel and from the heaven to God.

The *Celestial Hierarchy* (CH) shows, in fifteen chapters, the structure and operation of the angelic ranks between man and God (Chapter I- II). The role of the angels is essential because men are not allowed to directly understand the word of God. Therefore the "speaking images", or rather, descriptions of angels in Scripture, which is not casually *theologia* (word of God), are the material guides to raise the minds of men to the spiritual. The utility of these representations, in line with typical high esoteric Christian and philosophical speculation, is also to keep away from the profane higher truths. More than a treatise on the

angels, therefore CH is a treatise on the manifestation of angels in the Bible, in which the divine procession, interpreted as the path of the procession of the Neoplatonic One (First Principle), produced by symbols and images make the soul of man climbing until the end of the process to the Principle. First, it is exposed which is the purpose of hierarchies and what kind of benefits it brings to its members; second, hierarchies are celebrated according to the facts stated in Scripture; finally, it is presented how to interpret these forms up to them and avoid the literal interpretations by the majority (CH 136 C - D 5). The hierarchy is *episteme taxis kai kai energeia* (CH 164 D 1) and its aim is assimilation and union with God as is possible (Chapter III). The path that leads to union with God , after the lift (or assimilation), consists of three stages: purification , illumination and perfection. Therefore, each set is not only divided vertically into three groups just mentioned, but according to a "horizontal" order, and depending on the asset or liability, it is divided into ones who purified and ones who are purified; illuminated and dispensing the divine light; perfected and those who need perfection. (IV - V). Although among all beings involved in some way to God, only the heavenly intelligences deserve the appellation of angels. This is because "they directly participate in the divine form and a multiple" (CH 180 A 9) and reveal the secret of *Tearchia*. In fact, an immediate communication between God and man is not allowed; so the fathers (ie, the inspired writers) have been initiated into the divine mysteries through an angelic transmission which is the word of God.

The higher hierarchies possess all the virtues of the lower classes, but not vice versa. (Chapter VI).

Only God knows the exact number and the actual articulation of hierarchies, but Scripture said they are divided into three groups: the first is Seraphim, Cherubim and Thrones; the second of the Dominions, Virtues, Powers; third of Principalities, Archangels and Angels (VII -X). Each rank has infinite has got powers that are the first, middle and last. The author focuses on the meaning of their number (XIV). You can also called all (Chapter XI) heavenly powers (*dynameis ouraniai*), while the leaders of the human hierarchy may be called angels, because if it is true that only the heavenly intelligences everyone directly involved in the wisdom of God it is also true that the best of men involved, even partially, into the perfections of angels (chapter XII) and then the author describes the purification of Isaiah. The treatise concludes with an extensive

analysis of the allegorical figures of angels, invoking the biblical allegory elaborated in Chapter II (Chapter XV).

The *Church Hierarchy* (EH), which reflects the order of the angelic one, must bring humans to "assimilation and union with God as it is possible" (EH I). The liturgical functions of initiation into the Christian community (Chapter II), the Mass and the Eucharist (III), the consecration of the ointment (IV), the ordination of bishops, priests and ministers (V) and funeral rites (VII) is described and interpreted allegorically. Thus, the hierarchical structure of "our hierarchy" revives the "triple triadicity" of angelic: so for every three starters orders (bishops, priests, ministers) are addressed respectively the three orders of initiates (or therapists monks, holy and catechumens baptized), and the third triad must correspond to the sacraments. As in the upper hierarchy, the functions of the purification, the illumination and the initiators belong to perfection, in proportion to its range; according to the hierarchical law CH the highest ranks has got the skills of the lowest orders, but not vice versa. Therefore, it will be the prerogative of the bishops of the three levels of initiation; enlightenment and purification of the priests while ministers only have third (purification). This hierarchy is not only "image" (CH 121 C 2-4) of the celestial hierarchy, but a complement of the other and is intermediate between this location and the Old Testament: "a communication through intellectual contemplation with the other by the fact that it is adorned with the symbols of which is sensitive to work piously raised to God" (EH 2. 501 C-D). Compared with the hierarchy of men initiated into the Christian religion must be said, finally, it is true that as the celestial hierarchy, which is constructed, described and developed on the basis of the images, rather than on the opposition and difference.

The treatise *On the Divine Names* (DN) is the most difficult of the four. His doctrine of the Trinity, Christology and mystical theology follows the neoplatonic tradition of the *Commentary on the Parmenides*.

The chapter establishes the point of a deity that can not be found in any way and that it can learn. It is for this reason that "the sacred authors, knowing this, call Him 'unspeakable' and 'nameable'" (DN 6596 A). The Supreme Being of all things can only accept the speech or speeches that the words of the Scriptures present. Yet the sacred authors celebrate by many names (DN 1. 6-7). The divine, *anonymon* and *polynymon* at the same time, is especially known as 'Unity and Trinity'. Secondly, the name is defined by causality: when Dionysius speaks of the

names of Love, Wisdom, Power, Good and all those names that describe the movement of God which is given as causality. In this sense, the discourse has to do with God; cause of love, wisdom, goodness, the relationship is approached on a creation-casuality point of view. The analysis of these names also begin with the name of "Good" and ends with "One", retracing the steps of the master Proclus, the path from the divine manifestation to absolute transcendence The trinitarian and christological discourse is explicit and has a precise definition in the second chapter. First, it points to the names that does not refer to the first principle and, as such, remain unknowable and indefinable as the whole Trinity. Even better, one should think of the Trinity according to the concepts of union and distinction. According to the union of the divine persons of the Trinity can be called by the names of Being, Life, Wisdom, Well (all categories taken from the later Neoplatonism and analyzed in Chapters IV – XIII); can be considered, however , according to the distinction of the divine persons , only the names of Father , Son and Holy Spirit , because "it is quite possible to introduce these exchange and communion" (DN 640 C 1-3). Underlining the importance of prayer, (Chapter III) , begins the discussion of the divine names with the names of Good , Light and Love , Beauty (Chapter IV) before opening a long digression on the problem of evil according to the Proclus' *De malorum subsistentia*. Then move to Be (V) , Life (VI), Wisdom, Intelligence, Reason, Truth (VII), Power, Justice, Inequality (VIII), Size, Smallness , Identity, Diversity, Similarity , Dissimilarity , Stillness , Equality (IX), Omnipotence, "Old in days", Time and eternity (X).

Chapter XI begins the discussion on behalf of the Peace and has one of the most important points of the Dionysian metaphysics: the doctrine of paradigms, the first divine emanations or providential power of God", *autozoe* , *autoagathon*, *autosophon* , that they allow Dionysius to distance himself from the Proclus' *hen-ology*. In this way Dionysius avoids proliferation of lower grades, specific feature of Platonic metaphysics.

Despite being the shortest, *Mystical Theology* (MT) has a very high speculative significance. Chapter I presents the path to union with God and the importance of negative theology, as the cause of all things, and is totally different from all things, can not share any feature with them. So God is beyond all. The author follows Moses who represents the way of knowing God, ie , the total ignorance that is obtained by the introduction of divine darkness. Retrieving the same speech (Chapter II), the author explains the difference between negative and positive theology as a problem of method: if the first is a movement of knowledge, from the

bottom up, the second proceeds in the opposite direction. Third chapter is about the entry into the darkness is the absence of speech and thought which is union with God. Chapters IV- V are the mystical heart of the Treaty. It is here where the total transcendence of God above all things, sensitive (IV) and everything intelligible (V) states. Through a negative process the divinity of all that he talk about during the treatise *On the divine names*, both from the point of view apophatic (denials) that the catafatico (assertions) is refused . This paradox is engraved the figure of Dionysian mysticism. "Building a natural statue, throwing everything overlaps the pure vision of the hidden figure " (MT 1025 B 1-2) . The objective of the MT seems to be to bring the discursive reason.

The letters consist of ten Epistles (EP) where is founded, more than any other writing, the apostolic framework that the author (or those who had the opportunity to enter the text to edit) trying to build. Seems to assume the task of clarifying some theoretical points are not developed in the course of the four treaties or, according to the features of some of them, from letters derive important points of other treatises. First four letters are addressed to the monk Gaius and speak respectively of the importance of being able to separate the light from the dark; the relationship between participation and non-participation of God; the mystery of the Incarnation, despite the incarnation of Jesus; the nature of Jesus, true man and true God, while still somewhat unknown to man . In the fifth, to the Minister Doroteo, it is confirmed no investigation into the divine darkness . The sixth hopes Christian worship keep out of the controversy with other religions, which is on the path of truth and error trying to avoid this route. The seventh partially covers this argument by proposing the famous doctrine that truth as such is revealed by oneself. This letter contains the only mention of the name of Dionysus, at the mouth of the sophist Apollophanes, with which the author, according to a clear pattern of rhetoric, would have witnessed a solar eclipse in the city of Heliopolis happened while the passion of Christ. In the eighth, Demofilus, he welcomed an invitation from his interlocutor not to override the hierarchical laws and stay in the nest; the order can not be reversed and the superior can only review the lower, and not vice versa . Very important is the appointment of the tripartition of the soul according to Plato did. The ninth letter is like an argument for biblical allegory, as chapters II and XV of the celestial hierarchy. This letter contains the seeds of doubt that the symbolic theology that the author claims to have made but not kept by tradition, however, this may not be

sufficient to identify the two works. The tenth is reserved for John the Evangelist, which predicts the end of the exile of Patmos and his return to Asia.

The treaties, as in the *Epistles*, the author refers to other works in the back missing manuscript tradition: *Symbolic theology*, which was followed by the DN ; *Elements of Theology*, to which you climb the steps of DN 2.1 , 2.4 and 2.9 ; *Properties of the angelic orders* ; *On the Soul* , in which the features are listed soul ; *In the just judgment of God*, a speech that "slap" the false statements about God; *In the hymns of God*, on the treated angelic hymnody ; *In the intelligible and sensible things* , in which he dealt with the difference between angels and men to think of God.

Scholars have always been divided on the value attributed to these works, despite the similarity to some of the works of Proclus suggests one of the many tricks introduced by the author to create, as in the case of teachers who Hierotheos attributed to the *Elements of theology* (Proclus procliana work), the literary device.

There are two possibilities: the actual composition of the works then we would not have received, or a new invention of the author. And yet, in the case of the latter, we should think about the reason that could have pushed the author to create fictitious values . In fact, if the literary context in which the author attempts to recreate somehow apostolic space and time, refers precisely to the characters of the first centuries, what meaning is attributed to a work ever written?

E. R. Dodds believes that elements of theology are fiction, while HU von Balthasar extends over the content of these writings and their relation to which the works come to us.

From new acquisitions, I tried to address historical and doctrinal issues from the CD 'imaginal lexicon' or 'iconographic language' that characterizes the CD. Language and historical context in which the author composed his writings: these components reduce the problems inherent *Corpus Areopagiticum*, as is clear from the preceding pages.

For this reason, this thesis aims to clarify some aspect of that exception constituted by the Dionysian language, focusing on its essentially *imaginific* structure and makes use of a certain Dionisio 'aesthetic doctrine' borrowed, as I try to demonstrate, by late Neoplatonism. Moreover, if a macroscopic level the CD to a single large fresco painted by Dionysius the fact remains that each treaty consists of a mosaic of quotations from earlier writers, both Christian and Neoplatonic seems .

The aesthetic value of the Dionysian and language emerged in the Iconoclast era (VIII century). Iconophiles used the patristic testimonies to opposing the iconodules. For example, before the *Horos* of Hieria (754) and then their opponents the Council of Nicaea (787) refer to the same patristic testimonies to demonstrate opposing views .

The *De Doctrina Patrum of Incarnatione verbi*, iconofil collection of patristic texts (c.ca 685-730) presents a reinterpretation which strongly corroborates the role of Christ as the image of the Father in the Trinity. This paper presents two pillars of iconophilia: 1) the close relationship between the archetypal image and self- image worship; 2) the standard deviation (inevitable) between the two prevents idolatry.

Among these texts include fragments of the works of Dionysius the Areopagite: things are visible manifestations of the invisible (EP X 1117a); the leaders of the human hierarchy are empowered in their role as *theomimetoï* (EH 477A); the description of the relationship between the archetype and the image is processed according to the rules of a spiritual painting (*ibid.* 473B)

The *Codex Parisinus Graecus 1115* anthology of texts iconoduls quote full the first two chapters of CH . The similarity between the archetype and model and the rise of the visible to the invisible are replaced by the language of the dissimilarity. The same John of Damascus, one of the strongest voices raised in defense of the legality of the worship of images, in the three *Orationes* and *De Fide Orthodoxa* quotes Dionysius to build a theology of images: icon understood as a holy experience, as *ta ton horata aoraton* , is the sign of material contemplation - in body and spirit (*theoria kai asomaton noeta*) .

Regardless of later interpretations, however, this paper seeks to demonstrate the presence of a theology of the image perfectly fulfilled already in the works of the Areopagite despite the subsequent interpretations.

To give life to intangible angelic intelligences, liturgical symbols, but also for the entire vocabulary of light that permeates the four works , Dionysian discourse is characterized by plasticity and materiality of language.

Last, the effort of the author to give a superlative tone throughout his speech, cannot be reduced to the attempt to build an almost pompous Baroque style, but tends to give all the "idea of the height and intensity". Many times it seems that the author will describe looking paintings

on the walls of the church, sometimes their language corresponds nearly to such an architecture as can be found in the churches of Constantinople.

So in *Hagia Sophia* and the *Sacred Apostles* church, the eye is forced to follow the lines leading up to look at the height of the ceiling light and the process designed by Dionysius leads the intellect lost in the ineffable, where each word goes. In addition, the substantial simplicity of the concepts expressed in a complex but not pompous way reflects the harmony between painting and architecture are inextricably linked in the Byzantine basilica. Piero Scazzoso, the scholar who more than others realized this aesthetic interest corpus, author says:

Il senso aulico, regale imperiale, che pure nella semplicità del linguaggio è insito ad ogni parola del corpus, trova il suo riscontro nell'oro, nella luce, nella preziosità ornamentale bizantina. La liturgia *imperiale* dello pseudo-Dionigi nei riguardi di Dio si riflette nelle figurazioni artistiche, dove Dio è concepito come *imperatore* e agli angeli come ministri e dove il trono o vuoto o occupato da Cristo è indice di tale concezione di sacra regalità.

If the comparison with Byzantine architecture seems to account for the structure of the corpus, and vice versa, it will still be more binding comparison with the iconography of the same era that seems to incorporate, in image form, so that the word in second CD includes letters and syllables.

Justinian began the evolution of the icon, and then finished in the iconoclastic position, a symbolic and didactic story in liturgical and inherently sacred because if they were the first icons object of contemplation but not reverence, the back instead became almost an intermediary between God and man, so that through them you prayed.

The author then passed since the Platonic to Christianity aesthetic, he makes writing a work of art at the same time the Emperor Justinian gave his capital a new face through the promotion, who missed from the time of Constantine, the architectural appreciation urban and religious. Just inside the CD can be seen, therefore, as my analysis aims to show the features of the theology of the icon that receive considerable influence under Justin II (520-578) and then spread out in' VIII century when iconoclast Armenians emperors promoted fight against image. In this sense, my work is to show how, far from considering these differences as a " imperial madness" or contingent causes, but completely irrelevant (historiography still unanswered questions about the causes of the outbreak of iconoclasm), draw the face of a theology and

doctrine of the image on the CD that includes the same way, the Christological aspect, liturgical, angelic, exegetical.

The aim of my work is, therefore, to show what were the sources of Dionysian aesthetic conception and the way they are getting changed by the author into a new (and christian) point of view.

The main source is Proclus, as the historiography teaches.

Proclus' philosophical system is based on two important elements: tri-hypostatic division (One - Intellect - Soul) and the transcendence of First principle. Proclus multiplies every hypostasis in three. As a result there are different types of relationships between different levels of reality. The relationship between two or more realities within the noetic world is that of participation, while in the transition from the world of *nous* to the *kosmos* (ie, from the purely intelligible to the material), an operation in which forms are copied into mimetic image is carried out.

The relevant methodological and epistemological doctrine is this metaphysical symbolism made of two different methods: the divine reality can be represented only by *symbola* and can be understood only by the initiated, while *simpliciores* can approach the truth easier, in a way expressed through *eikonas*. At the level of theological speculation Proclus applies the same dichotomy as seen by one of his most important works, *the Commentary on the Republic*, in trying to defend the poets and poetry of allegations that Plato had made against Homer, Hesiod and Orpheus are (according to Proclus) not only poets but also theologians as to them the truth manifests expressing under the veil of myth and who was revealed directly by the divine.

Their poetry for Plato is obscene and morally harmful because of *teratologic* character, most inspirational, therefore worthy of embrace the divine; this type of poetry is symbolic and is suitable for an audience of initiates; the easiest poetry, by contrast, is suitable for education. On the basis of the *Sophist* (236 C), the poet is compared to the painter who took over as production rule, the perfect mimesis between the artifact and the archetype.

The author of the CD builds the hierarchies just inspired by these two principles which governing the proclian aesthetic: symbolic and iconic. CH is based on images of scripture while EH is based on symbols (sacraments or ritual acts) liturgical.

Scripture images are absurd, obscene and complicated and refer to a model that is out of them, like the symbolic myths of Proclus, while the symbols of EH are mimetic and carry in

themselves their own cause - model. Thus Dionysius brings in christian theology proclian aesthetic. While CH is the place of initiates who can read symbolic images, EH is the place of the "young", new initiates to the Christianity, and, as such, requires simple and understandable images (in fact, mimetic). Thus, neo - Platonic *kosmos* made *eikonas* is reduced (in the Dionysian perspective) "ecclesiastical kosmos". Thanks to the Platonic contribution, therefore, Dionisysus is able to:

- Create an exegetical method which could be defined "ontological symbolism" and exceeds the secular opposition allegoric method - literalism between Alexandria and Antioch;
- Angelic space is reduce to Scriptures space only, doing a great work of selecting patristic traditions, pushing away the confusion within the angelic origenian orders; so he founded, thanks to the Neoplatonic tools, angelology as independent science from anthropology and theology;
- Redefining the sub -lunar space (to use an Aristotelian term that fits poorly with Platonism) as a uniquely human space, leaving aside the speculation and identifying the naturalistic world with the ecclesiastical hierarchy; contravening the fundamental Neoplatonic matter whichever simplicity (as opposed to multiple fragmentation) is itself exclusively of divine spheres, points to the Church as a artwork, based as it is on the symbols have their own archetype (divine) within them.

Given the silence of the sources of the two centuries between the first appearances of the corpus and the outbreak of fighting on the worship of image, and the absence of accurate connections between the aesthetic impulse present in the reign of Justinian and the VIII century interest in icons, one can be seen in the CD the manifesto of a theology of the image that follows two specific tracks (so far ignored) that could fill the apparent void between two eras: the image as absolute dissimilarity is related to Scripture and exegetical method, always in an angelic speech; image as *mimesis*, as a true copy of the model, is constructed in the liturgy and so the sacrament is a similar symbol.

Both doctrines are a Christian dionysian innovation conducted through his neo – Platonic tools; both fall in the Western imagination (from the Councils of VIII- IX century on) as a valid justification for the veneration (hence the truthfulness) of the image. Both have to do with these

conflicting areas of Christian thought that tries to pacify the whole CD, especially the post-Chalcedonian Christology .