*Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies 44 (1) 62–85*

# Representation as indwelling: Contextualizing Michael Psellos' *empsychos graphe* across artistic, liturgical, and literary theory

Roland Betancourt
*University of California, Irvine*
*roland.betancourt@uci.edu*

*Through terms that articulate the arts as the results of divine possession or inspiration, the writings of Byzantine thinkers repeatedly expressed the manner in which representation was believed to operate as a form of divine indwelling occurring beyond the skill and originality of the artist, writer, or performer. Beyond ideas of naturalism or style, the literary, visual, and performance arts arose through the event of divine participation. The goal of this article is to contextualize the concept of* empsychos graphe*, as articulated by Michael Psellos, within a longer and broader history of similar concepts across literary, liturgical, and artistic thought.*

**Keywords:** *empsychos graphe*; Michael Psellos; *entheos*; inspiration; *typos*

In art historical scholarship, the concept of "living painting" (ἔμψυχος γραφὴ) in the work of Michael Psellos has drawn attention to the implications of artistic representation as a form of indwelling or divine inspiration. At times, the term's usage has been signalled as unique to Psellos' thinking about the icon. However, the goal of the present article is to survey a wide range of sources that use *empsychos* and related words to conceptualize strategies of representation. By looking at this and other terms' handling by writers thinking about visual art, liturgy, theology, literature, and performance, the aim is to give readers a better sense of the variety and cohesion of this line of thought. The article by no means presents a comprehensive survey, but instead each section presents a microhistory of these terms in artistic, liturgical, and literary theory in the Middle Byzantine world. These three threads nuance our understanding of terms such as *empsychos*, *typos*, and *entheos,* by engaging their ancient and late-antique precedents in order to contextualize how learned authors, such as Psellos, would have understood the usage of these terms within secular and religious milieus, both Pagan and Christian. This article deliberately brings together an eclectic range of textual and visual evidence in order to show the consistency, continuation, and cohesion of this thinking. Moreover,


DOI: 10.1017/byz.2019.24

the conclusion demonstrates how these ideas come together in art to produce layered and complex images of the way in which divine and artistic representation intertwine.

Looking at the shared intellectual history of inspiration and indwelling in theories of representation, one can observe that, since the ancient world, the arts were seen as the by-products of acts of divine possession in their making and reception. Going back to Plato's *Ion*, we can observe a longstanding trajectory by which terms related to the inhabitation of the divine in earthly matter defined the production of artistic works, with the Muses being one example of this divine intervention. This inspiration moved the hand of the poet, the voice of the performer, and the brush of the painter. Nevertheless, the acts of seeing, spectating, and reading equally partook in this process, as audiences gave voice to texts, imagined the stories depicted, and invested themselves in worship.

Throughout the sources that I have surveyed from antiquity to the Middle Byzantine period, a plurality of interrelated terms exist that articulate the process of artistic representation as an event occurring within a medium, whether that medium be a reader, reciter, manuscript, or body. Terms such as ἔνθεος (divinely-inspired), ἔμψυχος (ensouled), ἔμπνους (breathing), ἔνυλος (material), ἔνσαρκος (incarnate), or ἔνοικος (indwelling) articulate the crucial terms of inspiration, life, and incarnation through the utilization of the prefix ἐν-/ἐμ- from the preposition ἐν (in). Here, the prefix does double-duty, suggesting both that an exterior condition or entity such as breath (ἔμ-πνους) or God (ἔν-θεος) dwells within a person or thing, and also the inverse, whereby a certain condition or entity, particularly the divinity, takes on material form such as flesh (ἔν-σαρκος) or matter (ἔν-υλος). By suggesting an *indwelling* rather than a *transformation*, these terms allow for the divine quality to co-exist as one with the material quality and to thus retain a dual nature, being simultaneously fully-material and fully-spirited. Not only does this rhetoric figure prominently in the justifications of John of Damascus and Theodore the Studite for the icon,[1] but this logic permeated throughout the various arts. In modern Orthodoxy, the intersection of divine inspiration and artistic production appears in the thinking of key theologians, such as Pavel Florensky and Paul Evdokimov.[2] While these ideas stretch back to ancient philosophy, they found prominence in their applicability to Christological doctrine. Therefore, they were an apt language to describe Christian forms of representation.

## Art: painting, perception, and ensoulment

The concept of *empsychos graphe* is given its most eloquent articulation in Michael Psellos' *Ekphrasis on the Crucifixion*, a careful description of the act of viewing an

1 See C. Barber, *Figure and Likeness: On the Limits of Representation in Byzantine Iconoclasm* (Princeton 2002).

2 See P. Florensky, *Iconostasis*, trans. D. Sherman and O. Andrejev (Crestwood 1996); P. Evdokimov, *The Art of the Icon: A Theology of Beauty*, trans. S. Bigham (Redondo Beach 1990).

https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2019.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press

icon of the Crucifixion, which appears at the end of a longer narrative on the Crucifixion itself. Addressing modern spectators of the Crucifixion, Psellos' text compels the audience to become witnesses to events being depicted in visual art and literature.

Focusing on Psellos' *Ekphrasis*, a variety of scholars have contributed to the articulation of *empsychos graphe*, perhaps most notably Hans Belting, Robin Cormack, Charles Barber, Bissera Pentcheva, Glenn Peers, and Paroma Chatterjee.[3] The key trope inherent in Psellos' *ekphrasis*, however, is that while representation is extolled for its vividness and clarity, these qualities affirm that art and rhetoric can only represent, but they cannot offer a real presence or life. As Psellos writes in a critical section of the text:

> While this living painting (ἔμψυχος… γραφή) exists as a result of component parts combined most felicitously, the entire living form seems to be beyond this, so that life exists in the image from two sources, from art (τέχνην) which makes a likeness and from grace (χάριν) which does not liken to anything else. Is this then a comparison of images and shadows? Yet I would not compare this painting to any other painting, neither those set up by past hands or that represented the archetype accurately, nor those from our own time or from a little before that had made some innovations in form. I declare this picture to be like my Christ in times past… Thus, it seems to me that Christ hangs in the delineated and coloured likeness. And I would not dispute that there is oversight that is beyond the painter's hand and that this overseeing mind had returned that painting to its prototype.[4]

3 H. Belting, *Likeness and Presence: A History of the Image Before the Era of Art*, trans. E. Jephcott (Chicago 1994) 261–96; R. Cormack, 'Living painting', in E. Jeffreys (ed.), *Rhetoric in Byzantium* (Burlington 2003) 235–53; C. Barber, 'Living painting, or the limits of pointing? Glancing at icons with Michael Psellos', in C. Barber (ed.), *Reading Michael Psellos* (Leiden 2006) 61–98, 117–18; B. Pentcheva, *The Sensual Icon: Space, Ritual, and the Senses in Byzantium* (University Park 2010) 191–98; G. Peers, 'Real living painting: Quasi-objects and dividuation in the Byzantine world', *Religion and the Arts* 16 (2012) 433–60; P. Chatterjee, *The Living Icon in Byzantium and Italy: The* Vita *Image, Eleventh to Thirteenth Centuries* (Cambridge 2014) esp. 1–29.

4 "ἔστι μὲν ἡ ἔμψυχος αὕτη γραφὴ ἐκ τῶν οἷς σύγκειται συντεθειμένων ὡς ἄριστα, τὸ δ' ὅλον ἔμψυχον εἶδος καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦτο δοκεῖ, ὡς εἶναι τῇ εἰκόνι διχόθεν τὸ ζῆν, τῷ τε κατὰ τέχνην ἐξωμοιῶσθαι καὶ τῷ κατὰ χάριν ἑτέρῳ μὴ ἐοικέναι. τί τοίνυν καὶ εἰκόνων καὶ σκιῶν ἐστι σύγκρισις; ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ταύτην δὴ τὴν γραφὴν οὐ πρὸς ἑτέρας γραφὰς παραβάλοιμι, οὔτ' εἴ τινες τῶν τῆς ἀρχαίας χειρὸς τοιαύτας ἀνεστηλώκασιν ἢ πρὸς τὸ ἀρχέτυπον ἀκριβῶς ἀπεικόνισαν, οὔτε μὴν εἴ τινες τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἢ τῶν ὀλίγον πρὸ ἡμῶν ἔνιοι τοιαῦτα εἴδη ἐκαινοτόμησαν· αὐτῷ δ' ἐκείνῳ τῷ ἐμῷ Χριστῷ ἀπεοικέναι ταύτην φημί… οὕτω γοῦν μοι κἀκεῖνος ἀπηωρῆσθαι δοκεῖ ἐν ὁμοίῳ τῷ σχήματι, ἐν ὁμοίῳ τῷ χρώματι· καὶ οὐκ ἂν διαμφισβητήσαιμι ὡς κρείττων ἐπιστασία τὴν τοῦ ἐξεικονίσαντος χεῖρα μετὰ καὶ τοῦ ἐπιστατοῦντος νοὸς πρὸς τὴν πρωτότυπον ἐκείνην ἀνήνεγκε γραφήν": Michael Psellos, *Orationes Hagiographicae*, ed. E. A. Fisher (Stuttgart 1994) 196–197 (ll. 862–79); trans. Barber, 'Living painting', 122. For varying translations, see E. A. Fisher, 'Image and ekphrasis in Michael Psellos' sermon on the Crucifixion', *Byzantinoslavica* 55 (1994) 44–55, esp. 55; C. Barber, *Contesting the Logic of Painting: Art and Understanding in Eleventh-Century Byzantium* (Leiden 2007) 76–77; Pentcheva, *The Sensual Icon*, 192.

https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2019.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Here, the language of *empsychos graphe* carries out crucial semantic work in shattering the myth of "living painting" as being a specific type of painting, a claim to mimetic naturalism, or a notion of true presence. While this passage was read by Hans Belting to suggest that Psellos is speaking about a new style of painting, we see here that Psellos is precisely stating that this is not an image regulated by the flows of stylistic difference, but circumvents style, artistry, and skill.[5] Psellos is reaffirming here the limits and bounds of representation.

Charles Barber and Bissera Pentcheva represent two important camps regarding our understanding of the term. For Barber, the term suggests a system of representation outside the skill of the artist, whereby the image is motivated through grace in its production and reception; whereas, for Pentcheva, the term suggests the sensual effects of the metal-relief icon and the specificity of its (material) medium as enabling those aesthetic qualities. My contribution in this article comes by virtue of shifting the focus onto the concept's operation, not simply the term's meaning or the objects it could speculatively describe, as is found in Barber and Pentcheva's approaches, respectively. In other words, I am interested in how *empsychos graphe* works as a mechanism through which artistic representation is made possible. The gamut of terms around ensoulment and indwelling found in the primary sources outline two fundamental tenets: first, that the act of representation is an event akin to a performance or miracle; secondly, that representation always requires an earthly medium in which the divine might be represented.

To think through these problems in a deeper historical context, the questions explored in Psellos' *Ekphrasis* are best articulated in Plato's *Ion* dialogue. There, artists are described as being the medium for representing the divine *logos* through the event of their inspiration and performance; performance here encompasses both the act of composition and reception. As Plato has Socrates state in the *Ion*:

> For, as I was saying just now, this is not an art in you, whereby you speak well on Homer, but a divine power, which moves you like that in the stone which Euripides named a magnet, but most people call "Heraclea stone." For this stone not only attracts iron rings, but also imparts to them a power whereby they in turn are able to do the very same thing as the stone, and attract other rings; so that sometimes quite a long chain of bits of iron and rings is formed, suspended one from another; and they all depend for this power upon that one stone. In the same manner, the Muse also inspires (ἐνθέους μὲν ποιεῖ αὐτή) men herself, and then by means of these inspired persons (ἐνθέων) the inspiration spreads to others (ἐνθουσιαζόντων), and holds them in a connected chain. For all the good epic poets utter all those fine poems not from art

5 Paroma Chatterjee has also persuasively argued against the notion of sustained presence in the icon through the language of this "living icon" and turns this notion on its head by demonstrating how the "living icon" can also signify humans "endowed with the capacity *to become* an icon with all its powers and deficiencies." Chatterjee, *The Living Icon*, 8.

https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2019.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> (οὐκ ἐκ τέχνης), but as inspired (ἔνθεοι ὄντες) and possessed (κατεχόμενοι), and the good lyric poets likewise… For the poets tell us, I believe, that the songs they bring to us are the sweets they cull from honey-dripping founts in certain gardens and glades of the Muses – like the bees, and winging the air as they do. And what they tell us is true. For a poet is a light and winged and sacred thing, and is unable ever to indict until he has been inspired and put out of his senses, and his mind is no longer in him: every man, whilst he retains possession of that, is powerless to indict a verse or chant an oracle… For not by art do they utter these things, but by divine influence (θείᾳ δυνάμει); since, if they had fully learnt by art to speak on one type of theme, they would know how to speak on all. And for this reason God takes away the mind of these men and uses them as his ministers, just as he does soothsayers and godly seers, in order that we who hear them may know that it is not they who utter these words of great price, when they are out of their wits, but that it is God Himself who speaks and addresses us through them… For God, as it seems to me, intended him to be a sign to us that we should not waver or doubt that these fine poems are not human or the work of men, but divine and the work of gods; and that the poets are merely the interpreters of the gods, as each is possessed by one of the heavenly powers.[6]

In Plato's metaphor, *rhapsodes* who travelled, reciting the works of Homer, were merely a link in a long chain of divine inspiration/possession that came down from the

6 "ἔστι γὰρ τοῦτο τέχνη μὲν οὐκ ὂν παρὰ σοὶ περὶ Ὁμήρου εὖ λέγειν, ὃ (νῦν) δὴ ἔλεγον, θεία δὲ δύναμις ἥ σε κινεῖ, ὥσπερ ἐν τῇ λίθῳ ἣν Εὐριπίδης μὲν Μαγνῆτιν ὠνόμασεν, οἱ δὲ πολλοὶ Ἡρακλείαν. καὶ γὰρ αὕτη ἡ λίθος οὐ μόνον αὐτοὺς τοὺς δακτυλίους ἄγει τοὺς σιδηροῦς, ἀλλὰ καὶ δύναμιν ἐντίθησι τοῖς δακτυλίοις, ὥστ᾽ δύνασθαι ταὐτὸν τοῦτο ποιεῖν ὅπερ ἡ λίθος, ἄλλους ἄγειν δακτυλίους, ὥστ᾽ ἐνίοτε ὁρμαθὸς μακρὸς πάνυ σιδηρίων καὶ δακτυλίων ἐξ ἀλλήλων ἤρτηται: πᾶσι δὲ τούτοις ἐξ ἐκείνης τῆς λίθου ἡ δύναμις ἀνήρτηται. οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἡ Μοῦσα ἐνθέους μὲν ποιεῖ αὐτή, διὰ δὲ τῶν ἐνθέων τούτων ἄλλων ἐνθουσιαζόντων ὁρμαθὸς ἐξαρτᾶται. πάντες γὰρ οἵ τε τῶν ἐπῶν ποιηταὶ οἱ ἀγαθοὶ οὐκ ἐκ τέχνης ἀλλ᾽ ἔνθεοι ὄντες καὶ κατεχόμενοι πάντα ταῦτα τὰ καλὰ λέγουσι ποιήματα, καὶ οἱ μελοποιοὶ οἱ ἀγαθοὶ ὡσαύτως… λέγουσι γὰρ δήπουθεν πρὸς ἡμᾶς οἱ ποιηταὶ ὅτι ἀπὸ κρηνῶν μελιρρύτων ἐκ Μουσῶν κήπων τινῶν καὶ ναπῶν δρεπόμενοι τὰ μέλη ἡμῖν φέρουσιν ὥσπερ αἱ μέλιτται, καὶ αὐτοὶ οὕτω πετόμενοι: καὶ ἀληθῆ λέγουσι. κοῦφον γὰρ χρῆμα ποιητής ἐστιν καὶ πτηνὸν καὶ ἱερόν, καὶ οὐ πρότερον οἷός τε ποιεῖν πρὶν ἂν ἔνθεός τε γένηται καὶ ἔκφρων καὶ ὁ νοῦς μηκέτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐνῇ: ἕως δ᾽ ἂν τουτὶ ἔχῃ τὸ κτῆμα, ἀδύνατος πᾶς ποιεῖν ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν καὶ χρησμῳδεῖν… οὐ γὰρ τέχνῃ ταῦτα λέγουσιν ἀλλὰ θείᾳ δυνάμει, ἐπεί, εἴπερ περὶ ἑνὸς τέχνῃ καλῶς ἠπίσταντο λέγειν, κἂν περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἁπάντων: διὰ ταῦτα δὲ ὁ θεὸς ἐξαιρούμενος τούτων τὸν νοῦν τούτοις χρῆται ὑπηρέταις καὶ τοῖς χρησμῳδοῖς καὶ τοῖς μάντεσι τοῖς θείοις, ἵνα ἡμεῖς οἱ ἀκούοντες εἰδῶμεν ὅτι οὐχ οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ταῦτα λέγοντες οὕτω πολλοῦ ἄξια, οἷς νοῦς μὴ πάρεστιν, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ θεὸς αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ λέγων, διὰ τούτων δὲ φθέγγεται πρὸς ἡμᾶς… ἐν τούτῳ γὰρ δὴ μάλιστά μοι δοκεῖ ὁ θεὸς ἐνδείξασθαι ἡμῖν, ἵνα μὴ διστάζωμεν, ὅτι οὐκ ἀνθρώπινά ἐστιν τὰ καλὰ ταῦτα ποιήματα οὐδὲ ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλὰ θεῖα καὶ θεῶν, οἱ δὲ ποιηταὶ οὐδὲν ἀλλ᾽ ἢ ἑρμηνῆς εἰσιν τῶν θεῶν, κατεχόμενοι ἐξ ὅτου ἂν ἕκαστος κατέχηται." Plato, *Ion*, 533d1-535a1, ed. A. Rijksbaron, *Ion, or: On the Iliad* (Leiden 2007), 80–2; trans. W. R. M. Lamb, *Ion* (Loeb Classical Library 164. Cambridge 1925) 420–25. On the date and authorship of the *Ion* dialogue, see also J. D. Moore, 'The dating of Plato's *Ion*', *Roman and Byzantine Studies* 15:5 (1974) 421–39.

https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2019.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press

gods, through the Muses, onto the poets, and continuously down through lineages of reciters and listeners. As such, the transmission of information occurred through the distribution of textual corpuses and through human apparatuses, such as readers. To articulate this process, Plato uses a series of words that metaphorically articulate the inspiration and possession of bodies (ἔνθεοι ὄντες καὶ κατεχόμενοι) and their own proliferation and dissemination (ἐνθουσιαζόντων) through networks of transmission.

In Psellos' *Ekphrasis*, the artist (like the *rhapsode*) is utterly struck out of his senses and possessed by the *logos* in order to undertake the act of representation of the divine scene. Crucially, the *Ion* clarifies that the *rhapsode's* recitation of epic poetry and even the poet's composition of said work is *not* an act of art or skill (τέχνη), but instead a result of being divinely-inspired and possessed (ἔνθεοι ὄντες καὶ κατεχόμενοι).[7] The parallels with Psellos' *Ekphrasis on the Crucifixion* are striking. At this point, it is worth noting that the three primary manuscripts of the *Ion* dialogue (modern sigla T, W, and F) date to around 950, the second-half of the eleventh century, and between 1280 and 1340 respectively, all with known or assumed origins in major scriptoria in Constantinople.[8] As Consul of Philosophers, Michael Psellos would surely have been intimately familiar with the text of the *Ion*.[9]

While it would be imprudent to assert a direct connection, it seems that Psellos' theorization of *empsychos graphe* is closely informed by Plato's notion that art is a product of divine-possession, betraying a grasp of the *Ion*'s consequences and

7 For a discussion on issues regarding skill and divine-inspiration in Plato's *Ion* and related works, see T. W. Boyd, 'Where Ion stood, what Ion sang', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 96 (1994) 109–21; S. B. Levin, *The Ancient Quarrel Between Philosophy and Poetry Revisited: Plato and the Greek Literary Tradition* (Oxford 2001) 82–88, 127–67; S. Lowenstam, 'Is literary criticism an illegitimate discipline? A fallacious argument in Plato's *Ion*', *Ramus: Critical Studies in Greek and Roman Literature* 22 (1993) 19–32; T. F. Morris, 'Plato's *Ion* on what poetry is about', *Ancient Philosophy* 13 (1993) 265–72; D. L. Roochnik, 'Plato's use of ΑΤΕΧΝΩΣ', *Phoenix* 41 (1987) 255–63; S. Stern-Gillet, 'On (mis) interpreting Plato's *Ion*', *Phronesis* 49:2 (2004) 169–201; P. Woodruff, 'What could go wrong with inspiration? Why Plato's poets fail', in J. Moravcsik and P. Temko (eds.), *Plato on Beauty, Wisdom, and the Arts* (Ottowa 1982) 137–50.

8 Rijksbaron, *Ion*, 28–29, 35–36. See also J. Burnet, 'Vindobonensis F and the text of Plato', *The Classical Review* 17:1 (1903) 12–14; A. Diller, 'Codex T of Plato', *Classical Philology* 75:4 (1980) 322–24; B. L. Fonkič, 'Notes paléographiques sur les manuscrits grecs des bibliothèques italiennes', *Thesaurismata* 16 (1979) 153–169, esp. 158; J. Irigoin, *Tradition et critiques des textes grecs* (Paris 1997) 69, 156, 162; J. A. Philip, 'The Platonic corpus', *Phoenix* 24:4 (Winter 1970) 296–308. See also G. Boter, *The Textual Tradition of Plato's* Republic (Leiden 1989) 25–64.

9 For example, Codex T (Venice, Marcianus graecus appendix classis IV, 1) was written in the mid-tenth century by a well-respected and prolific scribe known as Ephraim Monachus in Constantinople, while a couple of additional witnesses to the *Ion* are found in the collection of Cardinal Bessarion in Venice (Marcianus graecus 186 and Marcianus graecus 184), whose education in Constantinople and efforts towards the preservation of Greek learning attest to further textual families of the *Ion* available in Constantinople in fifteenth century. See Fonkič, 'Notes paléographiques', 158. On Ephraim Monachus, see K. and S. Lake, 'The scribe Ephraim', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 62 (1943) 263–68; J. Irigoin, 'Pour une étude des centres des copie byzantins', *Scriptorium* 13 (1959) 181–195, pl. 18–19.

https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2019.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press

implications. However, as I shall show, the model of inspiration set forth by the *Ion* cannot be reduced merely to Psellos' erudition. Nevertheless, what the text of the *Ion* offers us is a way of further articulating the operation of Psellos' *empsychos graphe* (and related terms) in a way that productively extends the concept past a theory of the icon specifically, but spans painting, sculpture, rhetoric, and performance (i.e. as in the liturgy or in the recitation of texts). Thus, we might come to understand the function of *empsychosis* as being a broader mechanism of representation that includes not only visual art, but also performance and recitation from literature to the liturgy.

While gazing upon the icon of the Crucifixion, Psellos reflects upon the image's creation, wishing to focus upon concerns beyond historical style or artistic quality. Psellos observes in particular: "Although this suffering brings Him [Christ] in due course to death, the power that moves the hand of the artist (τὴν τοῦ ζωγράφου κινήσασα χεῖρα) also animates the body that has breathed its last".[10]

This power (δύναμις) that animates the object is the grace (χάρις) of God, a function often associated with the Holy Spirit. The operation of divine *charis* lies outside the skill of artist's hand and, as Psellos points out later in the discourse, its actions may be witnessed even in images produced by the most unskilled artists. Moreover, it is *charis* that likewise dwells in the icon so as to enact it as an *empsychos graphe* for its users.

Like the magnetized chains of divine inspiration in the *Ion*, *charis* is the critical term in Psellos' thinking used to characterize the operation of divine inspiration. In the painting itself, *charis* is both responsible for its generation by the artist and its manifestation to the viewer. As Psellos writes early on in the *Ekphrasis*, "God inspires (ἐμπνεῖ) with His grace not only creatures who possess reason but also images that lack life (ἀψύχοις ἐνδάλμασιν)."[11] Psellos, in the excerpt cited at the beginning of this section, also refers to form as being endowed with the grace of the Holy Spirit, but, as pointed out by Barber, this presence is not inherent in matter. Instead, it emerges from the engagement of the viewer with the image, that "overseeing mind" (ἐπιστατοῦντος νοὸς) which connects the painting with the prototype. As such, the image emerges through the concerted mental disposition of the viewer toward the image through the functions of the visualizing faculties of the imagination.[12]

Bissera Pentcheva, however, sees the action of *charis* as emerging from the sensual varieties of the image's materials, which literally make the image appear as an animate person. Focusing upon Psellos' observations on the movement and variations of the

10 "Καὶ τὸ μὲν πάθος αὐτίκα τοῦτον ποιεῖ τεθνήξεσθαι, ἡ δὲ τὴν τοῦ ζωγράφου κινήσασα χεῖρα πρὸς τοῦτο δύναμις αὐτὸ μᾶλλον ψυχοῖ τὸ ἐκπεπνευκός." Michael Psellos, *Orationes Hagiographicae*, ed. Fisher, 192 (ll. 786–788); trans. Barber, *Contesting*, 78.

11 "οὐ λογικαῖς μόνον φύσεσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀψύχοις ἐνδάλμασιν ἐμπνεῖ τὴν χάριν θεός." Michael Psellos, *Orat. hag.* 3B.644–645, trans. Fisher and Barber, 'Ekphrasis on the Crucifixion', 293.

12 It is this quality which leads Barber to parallel Psellos' theory of painting with Hans-Georg Gadamer's hermeneutic cycle. See Barber, *Contesting*, 61–98, esp. 97–98. On the imagination, see R. Betancourt, *Sight, Touch, and Imagination in Byzantium* (Cambridge 2018); cf. R. Betancourt, 'Tempted to touch: Tactility, ritual, and mediation in Byzantine visuality', *Speculum* 91:3 (2016) 660–89.

https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2019.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press

image, she suggests that Psellos here is referring to a metal-relief icon that would have literally changed its form and appearance according to the movements and conditions of ambient light. While Pentcheva tries to distance herself from the Neoplatonic understanding of Psellos' work, one can cut across this debate in order to demonstrate that both Barber and Pentcheva's perspectives engage with the same aspects of Psellos' understanding of the icon.

In both these interpretations of Psellos, the icon is an event that becomes manifest only as the viewer contemplates it, moved either by the dynamics of the imagination or the lighting conditions and practices of the space. The icon always operates as a potentiality for representation, but it is only through its actualization that it can be said to be an image. Whether that source of activation is Barber's overseeing-mind or Pentcheva's flickering-flame becomes less important if one views this problem as being one regarding the mechanics of representation: that is to say, if one is interested more in the fact that *empsychosis* is a perceptual process motivated by divine inspiration both in the creation and reception of the icon, just as it was for the inspiration of Homer and the possession of the *rhapsode* in the *Ion*.

An important aspect, however, that must be addressed regarding Pentcheva's argument is that this perspective at times allows metaphor to translate into material realities, rather than using metaphor to articulate the conceptual mechanics of representation. Compare Michael Psellos' text on the Crucifixion icon to the inter-relations of these various terms, for example, in the sixteenth anathema from the iconoclastic Council of 754:

> If anyone ventures to set up profitless figures of all the saints in soulless, speechless images (ἐν εἰκόσιν ἀψύχοις καὶ ἀναύδοις) made of material colours (ἐξ ὑλικῶν χρωμάτων) – for this is a vain invention and the discovery of diabolical craft – and does not, on the contrary, reproduce their virtues in himself as actually living images (ἐμψύχος εἰκόνας), with the aid of what has been recorded about them in books, in order to be stimulated to zeal like theirs, as our inspirited fathers (οἱ ἔνθεοι) have said, let him be anathema.[13]

Although it is a pro-iconoclastic text from the mid-eighth century, this source does offer us a useful comparison for the terms discussed in this article. Here, the iconoclastic decree argues that the force of ensoulment should lie within the user who takes to the type of the image delineated in the texts of the divinely-inspired (ἔνθεοι) Evangelists and Church Fathers, rather than diluting this process through an image or, even worse, letting it end with a misguided animistic belief in the image itself. In the sixteenth anathema, one may witness that the debate over the *empsychos* image is not

13 "εἴ τις τὰς τῶν ἁπάντων ἁγίων ιδέας ἐν εἰκόσιν ἀψύχοις καὶ ἀναύδοις ἐξ ὑλικῶν χρωμάτων ἀναστηλοῦν ἐπιτηδεύοι, μηδεμίαν ὄνησιν φερούσας. ματαία γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ἐπίνοια, καὶ διαβολικῆς μεθοδείας εὕρεσις. καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον τὰς τούτων ἀρετὰς διὰ τῶν ἐν γραφαῖς περὶ αὐτῶν δηλουμένων οἷόν τινας ἐμψύχος εἰκόνας ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἀναζωγραφεῖ, καὶ πρὸς τὸν ὅμοιον αὐτοῖς ἐκ τούτου διεγείρεται ζῆλον, καθὼς οἱ ἔνθεοι ἡμῶν ἔφησαν πατέρες, ἀνάθεμα." *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, vol. 13, ed. J. D. Mansi (Paris 1902) 345 CD; translation from M. V. Anastos, 'The ethical theory of images formulated by the iconoclasts in 754 and 815', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* (1954) 151–60, esp. 155.

https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2019.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press

medium specific, nor is it limited to the eleventh-century, as Hans Belting believed when he read the term iconographically, nor has the term ever been limited to the icon alone, but through various forms of religious and secular representation.

## Liturgy: performance, typology, and indwelling

A similar language of *empsychosis* is pervasive in texts regarding how representation works in liturgical practices as well. In the late eleventh-century, liturgical commentary of the *Protheoria*,[14] its authors Nicholas and Theodore of Andida, write, following a reference to the Last Supper:

> Therefore, in this way, the blessed ones continue to make remembrance of that man [Jesus], just as both the body remembers through the Divine Symbols and suitably performs what is due, intelligible and living (ἔννουν καὶ ἔμψυχος), by the leavening thrown into the mixture [of the Eucharistic bread], and according to the fulfilling essence being of the divinity.[15]

Here, the justification against unleavened bread (coming in the wake of the Great Schism and the debates with the Latin Church over the *azymes* controversy) is articulated through the same language of indwelling deployed for divine inspiration. Unleavened bread had been associated by the Greeks with the Latin heresies, and especially with the Monophysite liturgy of the Armenians, and thus often associated with the single-nature heresy.[16] The unleavened bread (ἄζυμα) was understood as being lifeless and was described as soulless (ἄψυχος), whereas the leavened bread was properly living and ensouled (ἔμψυχος). Thus, the latter was capable of manifesting the wholly divine and wholly human nature of Christ according to orthodox Chalcedonian Christology.

In a related liturgical commentary in verse from the twelfth- or thirteenth-centuries, derived from the *Protheoria* and formerly attributed to Michael Psellos, the anonymous author writes, at the moment of the consecration of the Eucharistic gifts, that through the action of the Prayer of the Anaphora and the *epiclesis*, "the things that were concealed before, now have been revealed through the in-dwelling (διὰ τῆς ἐνδημήσεως) of the God-man Logos."[17] The prayer of the *epiclesis* in the Divine Liturgy precisely calls for

14 The text was written in the late eleventh century by Nicholas of Andida and subsequently revised by Theodore of Andida, Προθεωρία Κεφαλαιώδης, Περὶ τῶν ἐν θείᾳ λειτουργίᾳ γινομένων συμβόλων καὶ μυστηρίων (*PG* 140: 418–468). For more information on the text, see R. Bornert, 'La Protheoria', *Les commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie du VIIe au XVe siècle* (Paris 1966) 181–213.

15 "Οὐκοῦν οὕτως ἔσπευσαν οἱ μακάριοι ποιεῖσθαι τὴν ἐκείνου ἀνάμνησιν, ὡς καὶ τὸ σῶμα διὰ τῶν θείων συμβόλων σῶον καὶ ἄρτιον ἀποτελεῖν, ἔννουν καὶ ἔμψυχον, διὰ τῆς ζύμης ἐμβαλλομένης τῷ φυράματι, καὶ θεότητος κα'οὐσίαν πεπληρωμένον: ὥστε τοὺς ἀξίως μεταλαμβάνοντας ἁγιασμοῦ καὶ χάριτος ἀξιοῦσθαι, καὶ μεγάλων παθῶν ἴασιν δέχεσθαι" (*PG* 140: 420C).

16 Andrew Louth, *Greek East and Latin West: The Church AD 681–1071* (Crestwood 2007) 305–16.

17 "τὰ κεκρυμμένα πρότερον νυνὶ φανερωθέντα/διὰ τῆς ἐνδημήσεως τοῦ θεανθρώπου Λόγου." P. Joannou, 'Aus den unedierten Schriften des Psellos: das Lehrgedicht zum Messopfer und der Traktat gegen die

https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2019.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the descent and visitation of the Holy Spirit upon the bread and wine so as to transform them into the veritable body and blood of Christ. Hence, contemporaneous writings on the liturgy acknowledge, support, and deploy these terms in order to construct a liturgical model of representation, whereby the divinely intelligible forms became perceptible to humanity through their indwelling in the material world.

Unlike the Incarnation itself, however, the manifestation of *typoi* through images, rhetoric, or liturgical performance do not simply occur through pure, unadulterated indwelling of divine presence or transformation, except of course for the Eucharist. In art and rhetoric, there is not a full transformation of earthly matter into that of the archetypes they seek to represent, but they still become perceptible through the manifestation of those prototypes as "completed" (τελευταῖος) or "fulfilled" (πλήρης) *typoi*, such as when the reader recites the divinely-inspired Gospels from a lectionary or a painter depicts the image of Christ through earthly colours. Nevertheless, those qualities were revealed by the icon through the material form's "relative participation" in the divine, as Theodore the Studite describes it.

As the liturgical poem states, in another instance, after the Creed, the "angel crying, 'Let us stand well, and with fear," represents (εἰκονίζει) the Divine Resurrection, [as the angel] proclaims the Anastasis through the deacon."[18] The intermediary action of the deacon as an instrument distinguishes this process from actual presence. Images, rhetoric, and performance can represent typologies that direct their audiences toward the divine archetypes, even if they cannot represent them. Hence, the priest leading the Divine Liturgy, for example, is described as a "*typos* similar to" (ἰσότυπος) Christ: that is to say, his function and performance take to the image of Christ as a *likeable type*, but not an *actual* image of Christ.[19]

In order to properly conduct the Divine Liturgy and undertake the Eucharistic rite to its completion, the author delineates the following process:

> Now, learn how one consecrates this body:
> First, it is necessary to become a man in [the holy] life in all ways.
> Second, it is necessary for words to be in communion with the discourse
> Third, the bread and the wine mixed with water [are necessary],
> Just as we received it from the Holy Side.[20]

Vorbestimmung der Todesstunde', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 51:1 (1958) 1–14, esp. 7 (ll. 164–65). For full translation and study, see R. Betancourt, 'A Byzantine liturgical commentary in verse: Introduction and translation', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 81 (2015) 433–72.

18 "Κἀντεῦθεν τὴν ἀνάστασιν τὴν θείαν εἰκονίζει/στῶμεν καλῶς ὁ ἄγγελος βοῶν καὶ μετὰ φόβου/καὶ κηρύττων τὴν ἔγερσιν διὰ τοῦ διακόνου." Joannou, 'Aus den unedierten', 7 (ll. 146–48).

19 Cf. "The Priest leading the Divine Liturgy is appointed a similar-type to that of the divinely-incarnated Logos (Ὁ δ' ἱερεὺς ἀρχόμενος τῆς θείας λειτουργίας/ἰσότυπος καθέστηκε τοῦ θεανθρώπου Λόγου)." Joannou, 'Aus den unedierten', 5 (ll. 88–89).

20 "Τὸ δὲ πῶς ἁγιάζεται τοῦτο τὸ σῶμα μάθε:/πρῶτον μὲν πάντως ἄνθρωπον ἐν βίῳ δεῖ γενέσθαι,/δεύτερον δέ γε γράμματα πρὸς λόγου κοινωνίαν,/τρίτον ἄρτον καὶ οἰνόν τε ὕδατι κεκραμμένον,/καθάπερ παρελάβομεν ἐκ πλευρᾶς τῆς ἁγίας…" Joannou, 'Aus den unedierten', 4 (ll. 26–30).

https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2019.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In this outline, one can observe the process whereby the officiant must first become wholly human (i.e. primed for the task), and then fulfil the discourse of the liturgy in accordance with its written text. This is later echoed in the poem in which a parallel is structured through the metaphor of a house, whereby first "it is necessary to harmoniously lay down the foundation" (τὸν θεμέλιον ποιεῖν ἐναρμοζόντος), then a house for God must be built upon that foundation, after which all earthly things must be set aside, and then finally the Holy Gifts and the liturgy may be undertaken to completion.[21] Hence, the body of the celebrant is not to be avoided or purged, but rather nurtured as the medium through which the divine becomes temporarily perceptible.

The importance of this language of inspiration, representation, and possession in liturgical texts draws our attention prominently to the intertwined aspects of performance, recitation, reading, and writing around the literary arts. As a performance and re-enactment of both liturgical and Biblical texts, the Divine Liturgy has made us aware of the importance that an underlying mechanism for divine inspiration and possession plays in thinking about the act of reading and its oral recitation. Notably, however, these ideas were by no means limited in the Middle Byzantine world to religious texts or recitations. In fact, this approach to thinking about textual performance as a form of spiritual possession has been associated with acts of both reading and writing since the ancient world. This emphasis of the body as being a medium is critical in literary performance and recitation practices from antiquity through to Byzantium, and thus merits further attention in the subsequent section.

## Literature: writing, reading, and divine inspiration

Perhaps one of the most eloquent contemplations on these matters comes from Jesper Svenbro's textual anthropology of reading in antiquity where he considers in depth the manner in which writing, reading, and recitation operated as forms of spiritual possession. Focusing on the Ancient Greek world, Svenbro articulates a model of recitation that engages with the process as an almost violent practice of bodily possession, whereby the agency of the reader's soul (ψυχή) is suspended and the text temporarily takes hold of them as an inspirited instrument (ὄργανον ἔμψυκον).[22] Reading was, in the Ancient Greek world, as in the Byzantine world, primarily an oral and aural act on the part of the reader and their audience. The body of the reader served as an apparatus or medium. I define medium throughout here as being any

21 "It is necessary to make a harmonious foundation first, and then to build a house for above, and to set aside the stuff of every other action, and then to undertake to completion the matter at hand [the Holy Gifts and the Liturgy] (Δεῖ πρῶτον τὸν θεμέλιον ποιεῖν ἐναρμοζόντος/καὶ τότε πρὸς ἐπάνωθεν οἶκον οἰκοδομῆσαι/καὶ παντὸς ἄλλου πράγματος ὕλην προϋποστῆσαι,/καὶ τότε τὸ προκείμενον εἰς πέρας παρεισάγειν)." Joannou, 'Aus den unedierten', 5 (ll. 60–63).

22 J. Svenbro, *Phrasikleia: An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece*, trans. Janet Lloyd (Ithaca 1993) 142.

https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2019.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press

intermediary site – whether it be performance, painting, text, speech, or so forth – through whose operation the divine is made manifest.

This theorization of recitation resonates with the supernatural description of reading and listening captured by Michael Psellos in his learned encomium for the Monk Ioannes Kroustoulas, who recited the saints' *Lives* at Hagia Soros in the Chalkoprateia neighbourhood of Constantinople.[23] There, Psellos writes:

> Such was the charm dripping from his lips, so harmonious was his voice, in such a way he enchanted (κατέθελγε) his listeners and cast a spell (κατεκήλει) on those willing, that, even if someone… were to receive the tribulations of Odysseus, even such tribulation would fill his entire heart with joy.[24]

Even drawing parallels with the recitation of and listening to Homeric epic, Psellos alludes to a notion of recitation that takes hold of the listener by enchanting and casting a spell over them. Here, it is the willing and consenting listener who gives himself up to be possessed and enchanted by the reader's words, just as the divine took hold of the reader in Plato's *Ion*. Reading, in other words, is a process of inspiration in which the listener, reader, text, and divine are all caught in a chain of divine possession and inspiration.

These aspects are aptly emphasized by Psellos' characterization of Kroustoulas as being an "instrument of the Spirit" (πνευματικὸν ὄργανον), resonating with Svenbro's observations upon these processes in the ancient world, and furthermore suggesting once again Psellos' intimate familiarity with the lessons of Plato's *Ion*. Elsewhere, Michael Psellos even speaks to a letter's hold over its reader, writing, "in what way did it not attract the reader, like a magnet does to iron?"[25] Extolling the pleasures of receiving a letter and reciting its words, Psellos addresses the reader's possession by the text in what must be an allusion to the *Ion's* metaphor of the magnet, where divine inspiration moves the *rhapsode* like "the stone which Euripides named a magnet," as quoted above.

Similar notions of reading as divine possession are repeatedly articulated in Middle Byzantine texts.[26] For example, in the *Life of Nikephoros of Miletos* from around

23 See S. Papaioannou, 'Encomium for the monk Ioannes Kroustoulas who read aloud at the holy Soros', in C. Barber and S. Papaioannou (eds.), *Michael Psellos on Literature and Art: A Byzantine Perspective on Aesthetics* (South Bend 2017) 218–44.

24 "τοσαύτη γὰρ χάρις τῶν τούτου χειλέων ἀπέσταζε καὶ τοιοῦτος ὑπῆρχε τὴν φωνὴν ἐναρμόνιος καὶ οὕτως κατέθελγε τοὺς ἀκούοντας καὶ κατεκήλει τοὺς εὖφρονας, ὥστε, κἂν εἴ ποτέ τις… τὰς τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως εἶχε κακότητας ἀπολαβεῖν, αὐτὰς αὐτίκα καὶ θυμηδίας ἐμπλῆσαι τὴν ψυχὴν ἅπασαν." Michael Psellos, *Encomium for the Monk Ioannes Kroustoulas*, trans. Papaioannou, 'Encomium for the Monk Ioannes Kroustoulas', 231; ed. A. R. Littlewood, *Oratoria minora* (Leipzig 1985) 37.159–164.

25 "Μᾶλλον δὲ τίνι οὐκ ἐφείλκετο τὸν ἀναγινώσκοντα ὥσπερ μαγνῆτις τὸν σίδρον;" Michael Psellos, *Letters*, 2, ed. E. Kurtz and F. Drexl, *Michael Psellus. Scripta minora magnam partem adhuc inedita II*, *Epistulae* (Milan); modified trans. Papaionannou, 'Readers and their pleasures'.

26 See S. Papaioannou, 'Readers and their pleasures', in S. Papaioannou (ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Literature* (Oxford forthcoming). I thank Stratis Papaioannou for sharing this text with me.

https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2019.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1000,[27] Ioannes Sikeliotes spectacularly describes the act of witnessing the holy figure read, stating: "If you heard him read (as those who had heard him attest), you would say that he was snatched away (ἁρπάζεσθαι); with his soul suspended from the words, and he journeyed towards heaven."[28] The act of reading is one akin to "abduction" or "rape" (ἁρπάζεσθαι), a forceful possession of a person's body. Additionally, earlier, Gregory of Nazianzus even described his reading of Basil the Great as being a transformative experience that caused him to be "transformed and brought into harmony, and to become another from another, being changed by a divine alteration."[29] Reading, for Gregory, is a divine transformation (θείαν ἀλλοίωσιν), and one that happens precisely through the harmony and rhythm (ῥυθμίζομαι) of reading, understood both melodically and intellectually.

The use of the term *entheos* across these sources is of particular interest. Usually translated as "divinely-inspired," the term could be literally rendered (albeit awkwardly) as "engodded" or "possessed" in order to emphasize that this act of inspiration operates through a form of divine in-dwelling. In the second century, Maximus of Tyre even describes Homer's prudent qualities, beginning with his "submission to his inspired nature" (φύσει τε κεχρημένος ἐνθεωτάτῃ).[30] In Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, the term appears when Aristotle recounts the appropriate expressions to be used for an emotional or enthused orator. There, he notes that much of this style shares in that of poetry, "for poetry is possessed" (ἔνθεον γὰρ ἡ ποίησις), meaning that poetry emerges from an inspired and frenzied form of speech. Both these instances demonstrate *entheos* as being a creative and artistic force. This is akin to our understanding of "inspiration," but this modern notion lacks the frenzied force alluded to in Aristotle's comparison between an impassioned speaker and poetic tropes.

In its ancient usage, the inspiration described by *entheos* does not easily translate, given that *entheos* does not merely connote a sense of possession or inspiriting, but has this clear denotation associated with religious rites and divine frenzy. The followers of Bacchus are described in Sophocles' *Antigone* as being "possessed women" (ἐνθέους γυναῖκας),[31] and the warmongering warrior in Aeschylus' *Seven*

27 See S. Papaionannou, 'Sicily, Constantinople, Miletos: The life of a eunuch and the history of Byzantine humanism', in T. Antonopoulou, S. Kotzabassi, and M. Loukaki (eds.), *Myriobiblos: Essays on Byzantine Literature and Culture* (Berlin 2015) 261–84.

28 "Εἰ δὲ διήκουσας ἀναγινώσκοντος, ὡς οἱ ἀκηκοότες φασίν, εἶπες ἂν ἁρπάζεσθαι τοῦτον καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἀποκρέμασθαι τῶν λογίων καὶ πρὸς οὐρανὸν μετεωροπορεῖν." Ioannes Sikeliotes, *Life of Nikephoros of Miletos*, 28.5–7, trans. Papaioannou, 'Readers and their pleasures'; ed. H. Delehaye, "Vita S. Nicephori," *Der Latmos. Milet* 3.1 (Berlin 1913) 157–71.

29 "μεθαρμόζομαι καὶ ῥυθμίζομαι καὶ ἄλλος ἐξ ἄλλου γίνομαι, τὴν θείαν ἀλλοίωσιν ἀλλοιούμενος." Gregory of Nazianzus, *Orations*, 43.67, ed. F. Boulenger, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours funèbres en l'honneur de son frère Césaire et de Basile de Césarée* (Paris 1908) 58–230.

30 Maximus of Tyre, *Dissertationes*, 26.4, ed. M.B. Trapp, *Maximus Tyrius Dissertationes* (Leipzig 1994).

31 Sophocles, *Antigone*, ll. 963–964, ed. H. Lloyd-Jones and N.G. Wilson, *Sophoclis fabulae* (Oxford 1990) 182–238.

https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2019.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press

*Against Thebes* is the one "possessed by Ares, who raves for battle like a frantic woman" (ἔνθεος δ' Ἄρει βακχᾶι πρὸς ἀλκήν, θυιὰς ὥς).[32] Here, the use of the verb βακχᾶι denotes the warrior's rage as being literally a Bacchic frenzy, emphasized by the comparison to a "frantic woman" (θυιὰς), namely a maenad, one of Bacchus' female followers. Moreover, in Euripides' *Hippolytus*, the chorus asks, "Are you possessed, girl?" (σὺ γὰρ ἔνθεος, ὦ κούρα),[33] then proceeding to speculate upon the various gods under whose influence she might be. Once again, the term denotes a literal loss of human control and possession by a divine power.[34]

This language was particularly important for the Church Fathers to articulate orthodox Christological doctrines and distinguish them from their heretical adversaries. In his *First Letter to Kledonios*, Gregory of Nazianzus positions himself against Apollinarius by emphasizing the place of the Theotokos as the site *in* which (ἐν αὐτῇ) Christ was formed, lest the Theotokos be understood as merely a channel *through* which (διὰ σωλῆνος) Christ passed unchanged.[35] Through the juxtaposition of the prepositions διὰ (through) and ἐν (in), Gregory carefully distinguishes between orthodox and heretical Christologies. The use of these constructions in the key texts on pre-iconoclastic Christology and post-iconoclastic image theory articulates the representation of the icon as a process of containment or indwelling, whereby the image occurs as an actualization of the prototype within an earthly and material substrate.

The term *entheos* similarly came to the foreground around the Christological debates and Apollinarius' use of the word to claim that there was nothing inherently divine in Christ's own nature, but rather that he was merely an "inspired man," an *anthropos entheos*, claims refuted by Gregory of Nyssa's *Antirrheticus* against

32 Aeschylus, *Seven Against Thebes*, ll. 497–498, ed. D. L. Page, *Aeschyli Septem Quae Supersunt Tragoedias* (Oxford 1972) 45–87.

33 Euripides, *Hippolytus*, l. 141, ed. J. Diggle, *Euripidis fabulae*, vol. 1 (Oxford 1984) 207–71.

34 Given its ability to capture frenzied desire and action, the term has a prominent place as well in the context of erotic love, such as when Xenophon, in his *Symposium,* describes pleasing lovers as "the ones possessed by a prudent love" (οἱ δ' ὑπὸ τοῦ σώφρονος ἔρωτος ἔνθεοι). Moreover, the term's ravaging and overpowering connotations are even attested well into the middle Byzantine period in the epic *Digenis Akritis*, where in one instance the Emir returns to his beloved and embraces her, the text telling us that "the Emir became as if possessed" (ὁ ἀμιρᾶς γέγονεν ὥσπερ ἔνθους). Notably here, *enthous* is used, which is the contracted form of *entheos*, and which allows the author in a sense to secularize the form of possession occurring in this instance so as to not confuse it with a divinely-inspired possession. This suggests precisely the force of these terms to denote not simply acts of staid inspiration, but that they still carried with them the sense of a potent overpowering; that is to say, still speaking to that act of being struck out of one's senses that Plato described in the case of the *rhapsode*. See Xenophon, *Symposium*, 1.10, ed. E. C. Marchant, *Xenophontis opera omnia*, vol. 2, 2nd edn. (Oxford 1921). See also *Digenis Akrities*, 3.279, ed. and trans. E. Jeffreys, *Digenis Akritis: The Grottaferrata and Escorial Versions* (Cambridge 1998) 60–1.

35 "Εἴ τις ὡς διὰ σωλῆνος τῆς Παρθένου διαδραμεῖν, ἀλλὰ μὴ ἐν αὐτῇ διαπεπλάσθαι λέγοι θεϊκῶς ἅμα καὶ ἀνθρωπικῶς (θεϊκῶς μέν, ὅτι χωρὶς ἀνδρός: ἀνθρωπικῶς δέ, ὅτι νόμῳ κυήσεως), ὁμοίως ἄθεος." Gregory of Nazianzus, Orat. 101.16, ed. P. Gallay, *Lettres théologiques* [Sources chrétiennes 208] (Paris 1974) 36–68, esp. 38; trans. L. Wickham, 'First letter to Cledonius', *On God and Christ: The Five Theological Orations and Two Letters to Cledonius* (Crestwood 2002) 156 (101.5).

https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2019.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Apollinarius.[36] Although the term *entheos* continues to be used in this text to describe the divinely-inspired scriptures, the problem of its applicability to Christ is what is fundamentally at stake in this article: namely, that *entheos* presupposes a material, earthly medium in which God indwells and that he possesses, but it does not allow for the union of divine and human natures requisite for the incarnation – in other words, to be divinely inspired is not the same as the divinity becoming incarnate. Thus, *entheos* is a specifically human and material experience of the divine. It is overpowering in its ability to take control of a person and strike them out of themselves, but it does not divinize or transform the person that it inhabits.

As we have seen, in ancient literature *entheos* explicitly indicates a frenzied possession intertwined with religious performances. However, in this context, connections are also drawn to artistry and rhetoric, particularly regarding actions that exceed human craftsmanship, skill, and art, just as *empsychos graphe* operated for Psellos. In Aeschylus' *Eumenides*, praising the oracular oratory of Apollo and his oracles, he writes that "Zeus made his mind possessed with the art" (τέχνης δέ νιν Ζεὺς ἔνθεον κτίσας φρένα).[37] Here, the divinely-inspired art (τέχνης) is an indication of prophetic abilities, as in *Agamemnon* where Aeschylus' chorus asks Cassandra, "Were you already overcome by the divinely-inspired art?" (ἤδη τέχναισιν ἐνθέοις ἡιρημένη;).[38] These uses of the term endure well into late-antiquity given that the application of *entheos* to describe the Psalms, together with both the Old and New Testaments more generally, speaks to the term's associations not only with divinely-inspired texts, but also those that are prophetic in nature.[39]

As such, the term in Byzantium is often used to describe sacred texts as well, their material embodiments, and holy figures, such as the Evangelists or Church Fathers.[40] This language was crucial to the understanding of early Christian asceticism, whereby the Holy Spirit dwells or indwells in the soul of the ascetic. In the Pseudo-Macarian writings, emerging around the Messalian controversy of the fourth to fifth centuries, the language of "dwelling" (οἰκέω) and "indwelling" (ἐνοικέω) is used in Greek, together with *'mar* in Syriac, to denote both the indwelling of the Spirit as well as of sin.[41]

36 Gregory of Nyssa, *Antirrheticus adversus Apollinarium*, ed. F. Mueller, *Gregorii Nysseni opera*, vol. 3.1 (Leiden 1958) 131–233.

See C. A. Beeley, *The Unity of Christ: Continuity and Conflict in Patristic Tradition* (New Haven 2012) 199–201.

37 Aeschylus, *Eumenides*, l. 17, ed. D.L. Page, *Aeschyli Septem Quae Supersunt Tragoedias* (Oxford 1972) 247–86.

38 Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, l. 1209, ed. D. L. Page, *Aeschyli*, 139–198.

39 See G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford 1961) 474–75.

40 For a general discussion of Byzantine authorship and divine inspiration, see C. Rapp, 'Holy texts, holy men and holy scribes: Aspects of scriptural holiness in Late Antiquity', in W. Klingshirn and L. Safran (eds.), *The Early Christian Book* (Washington DC 2007) 194–222; D. Krueger, *Writing and Holiness: The Practice of Authorship in the Early Christian East* (Philadelphia 2004), esp. 1–14.

41 C. Stewart, '*Working the Earth of the Heart': The Messalian Controversy in History, Texts, and Language to AD 431* (Oxford 1991) 203–33, cf. 294–96.

https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2019.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Columba Stewart has articulated the careful nuances of these metaphors, particularly how the "indwelling sin" (ἡ ἐνοικοῦσα ἁμαρτία) is metaphorically described as dwelling in the home of the spirit like a thief.[42] Not all early Christian writers were comfortable with the understanding of sin as partaking of the same dynamic of indwelling given the language's positive associations with the fulfillment and completion of the ascetic soul.[43] Thus, following Biblical precedent, many of them emphasized instead the action of the indwelling of the Spirit in the soul, including Clement of Alexandria, Cyril of Alexandria, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, Evagrius, and Mark the Monk.[44]

Focusing upon word-image relations in material culture, one can observe that the *entheos* often appears in conjunction with miniatures and epigrams associated with Biblical texts, as in the epigram surrounding one of the opening miniatures in the eleventh-century Berlin Psalter (Berlin, Berlin University's Christian Museum, 3807, fol. 2v; now at the State Hermitage Museum in Moscow) [Fig. 1].[45] In the top register of this miniature, the Virgin and Child are depicted flanked by the archangels Michael and Gabriel. Below them, in the bottom register, Saints Nicholas, John Chrysostom, and Basil are depicted bearing their sacred codices. Immediately below this scene, the inscription reads: "The foremost of the prelates, all three of them, holding the inspired books in their hands (τῶν ἱεραρχῶν ἀκρότης οἱ τρεῖς πάνυ: ἐν χερσὶ βίβλους φέρουσιν ἐνθέος)."[46] In this opening image, the artist plays with the chains of divine-inspiration that motivate religious writing: from God, through incarnation in the Theotokos, on to the Evangelists and theologians, their scribes, and so on. In the divine space of the top register, the Christ-child looks to His mother, and loosely drops his right hand bearing a scroll, which directs one's eye down to the field of the Church Fathers below.

In particular, John Chrysostom stands in the centre directly beneath Christ. As is typical, John Chrysostom's name is heavily abbreviated using the Chi-Rho ligature for the Chryso- (Χρυσο-) of his epithet "John, the golden-mouthed" (Ἰωάννης ὁ Χρυσόστομος) that praised his rhetorical skill. Heightened in this particular context, there is a playful intervisuality that connects the Chi-Rho of Χρυσόστομος with the Chi-Rho monograph of Christ (Χριστός). Graphically, Christ is manifested here as

42 Stewart, '*Working*', 206.

43 As Stewart goes on to demonstrate, this metaphorical language lays the foundation for a model of spiritual perfection constructed around the notion of fulfillment/ completion and certainty (πληρόω and πληροφορία), partly derived from Luke. Similar to its uses in theories of representation, the action of divine inspiration is perceptible in its state of fulfillment, just as *typoi* are "completed" (τελευταῖος) or "fulfilled" (πλήρης) in the liturgy. See Stewart, '*Working*', 223–227.

44 Stewart, '*Working*', 208–210. See also D. A. Keating, 'The two-fold manner of divine indwelling in Cyril of Alexandria: Redressing an imbalance', *Studia Patristica* 37 (2000) 543–49; N. Russell, *The Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition* (Oxford 2004) 192–97.

45 G. Stuhlfauth, 'A Greek psalter with Byzantine miniatures', *The Art Bulletin* 15:4 (1933) 311–26. See also Y. Pyatnitsky and N. Kvarus-Hoffmann, *The Hermitage Psalter: The Amazing Journey of an Exceptional Byzantine Manuscript* (Ann Arbor 2020, forthcoming).

46 Cf. Stuhlfauth, 'A Greek Psalter', 316 (fig. 7), 321.

https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2019.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Fig. 1. Berlin, Berlin University's Christian Museum, 3807, fol. 2v.

dwelling within the name of the divinely-inspired Chrysostom who is directly below His image. This play is heightened by the word order of the inscription's last line, where the act of bearing the inspired books "in their hands" (ἐν χερσὶ) is paralleled by the

https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2019.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press

"in-spiration" (ἐνθέος) of the books themselves through the *epanalypsis* of the line, "ἐν χερσὶ βίβλους φέρουσιν ἐνθέος," poetically stressing the "in" (ἐν) at the beginning and end. This rhetorical device literalizes the notion of indwelling suggested by the term ἔνθεος through the metaphor of carrying a book in one's hand, while likewise demonstrating the long chain of divine-inspiration that occurs through the action of the Logos's indwelling within the Virgin's flesh, on into the Evangelists and Holy Fathers, then into their books, and eventually their present readers and listeners.

These chains of inspiration, however, operate in the literature beyond mere metaphor, demonstrating a profound concern with the bodily indwelling of texts in bodies for their transmission. Take, for example, another use of the term ἔνθεος, evidenced in an eleventh-century Gospel book in Paris (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, gr. 219), which bears an opening inscription parallel to that of Michael the Monk's Gospel in Istanbul (Istanbul, Ecumenical Patriarchate, Cod. 3).[47] Here, the term appears as part of a longer poem written in large, gold uncials within a decorated border. Although absent in the Istanbul version, the Paris Gospel uses ἔνθεος to describe Gospel text itself. The relevant lines read,

> You, who gush forth the unfathomable of God-inspired words (ἐνθέων λόγων),
> Which flow forth from the tongue of your initiates as if from a fountain
> To water all the minds and my dry soul in the time of judgment,
> May you grant a new immortal drink that
> Which you once told the disciples to drink.[48]

Here, the *engodded logos* (ἐνθέων λόγων) is paired with the imagery of an endlessly flowing fountain, whose streams satiate humanity's thirst, analogous to the blood of the Eucharistic wine.[49] The inspiration chain is articulated through a process of bodily ingestion, literalizing the operation of the term *engodded* as being a physical insertion of the divinity within human flesh.

The play with indwelling evidenced here appears repeatedly in the Akathistos Hymn, attributed to Romanos the Melodist. The Akathistos is replete with metaphors of indwelling, inspiration, and containment to describe the Incarnation. Most pertinently,

47 R. Nelson, 'Michael the monk and his gospel book', *Actes du XVe Congrès International d'Études Byzantines*, vol. 2 (Athens 1981) 575–582, esp. 580–81.

48 "Ἀλλ'ὦ βλύσας ἄβυσσον ἐνθέων λόγων/ὡς ἐκ κρήνης ῥεύσασαν σῶν μυστῶν γλώττης/Ψυχὴν ἐμὴν ἄκιμον ἐν καιρῷ δίκης/Ἔιης ποτίζων καινὸν ἄμβροτον πόμα/Ὅ σούς μαθητὰς εἶπας ἐκπίνειν τότε." Nelson, 'Michael the monk', 580 (n.b. this transcription has minor errors).

49 The trope of Logos's inspiration as an efflorescent fountain is attested across epigraphic and iconographic evidence. For epigraphic evidence, see A. Kominis, 'Συναγωγὴ ἐπιγραμμάτων εἰς τοὺς τέσσαρας Εὐαγγελιστάς', *Ἐπετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν* 21 (1951) 254–79. For iconographic examples, see G. Galavaris, ' "Christ the King": A miniature in a Byzantine gospel and its significance', *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 21 (1972) 119–26; T. Velmans, 'L'iconographie de la 'Fontaine de Vie' dans la tradition Byzantine a la fin du Moyen Âge', in A. Grabar and J. Hubert (eds.), *Synthronon* (Paris 1968) 119–34; P. Underwood, 'The fountain of life in manuscripts of the gospel', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 5 (1950) 41–138.

https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2019.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the verse, "Hail, womb of the divinely-inspired incarnation (Χαῖρε, γαστὴρ ἐνθέου σαρκώσεως)."[50] This line resonates with the hymn's characterization of the Theotokos as the "ensouled temple" (ἔμψυχον ναόν) or the "container of the uncontainable God" (θεοῦ ἀχωρήτου χώρα).[51] Similar metaphors are found throughout the hymnography and homiletics of the eighth and ninth centuries, wherein the Theotokos' body is repeatedly likened to a container, such as the temple, tabernacle, ark, and gate.[52] This language emerges around the period of iconoclasm and immediately afterwards, during which not only does the cult of the Theotokos coalesce, but she also serves as a metaphor and justification for the icon's representation of Christ in material form.[53] These lines connect the womb and the temple to the incarnational topography of the Virgin's flesh and through their diction liken such sites to the bodies of the holy persons who bear forth the *logos* through their divinely-inspired writings or through the recitation of the latter's texts.

Compare these interconnected metaphors and diction to a miniature from the 'Menologion' of Basil II (976–1025), depicting Romanos the Melodist receiving the inspiration for his hymn on the Birth of Christ. In this image, the Theotokos literally inserts words into the composer's mouth by giving him a scroll to eat (Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, gr. 1613, p. 78) [Fig. 2]. This follows in a tradition whereby Romanos was believed to have been fed the words to his hymns by the Virgin, as is attested by an epigram on the silver revetment of an icon of the Theotokos *Kyriotissa*.[54] The preserved poem reads:

> In the past, you, Mistress, gave to Romanos,
> Thy servant to eat the written scroll,
> Now, fill up my cup, O Virgin,
> With the sweet drink of wisdom.
> For I am thirsty of it, make me drink profusely
> Because it will moisten my parched brain.[55]

50 L. Peltomaa, *The Image of the Virgin Mary in the Akathistos Hymn* (Leiden 2001) 4–5 (1.15).

51 Peltomaa, *The Image*, 18–19 (23.2), 13–14 (15.6).

52 For a survey of these tropes, see J. H. Olkinuora, *Byzantine Hymnography for the Feast of the Entrance of the Theotokos*, Studia Patristica Fennica 4 (Helsinki 2015) 70–90.

53 See N. Tsironis, 'The Mother of God in the iconoclastic controversy', in Maria Vassilaki (ed.), *Mother of God: Representations of the Virgin in Byzantine Art* (Milan 2000) 27–39; M. B. Cunningham, 'Mary as intercessor in Constantinople during the iconoclast period: The textual evidence', in L. M. Peltomaa, A. Külzer and P. Allen (eds.), *Presbeia Theotokou: The Intercessory Role of Mary Across Times and Places in Byzantium, 4th-9th Century* (Vienna 2015) 139–152; I. Kalavrezou, 'Images of the Mother of God: When the Virgin Mary became *Meter Theou*', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 44 (1990) 165–72.

54 On the inspiration of Romanos, see T. Arentzen, *The Virgin in Song: Mary and the Poetry of Romanos the Melodist* (Philadelphia 2017) 1–6.

55 "Ῥωμανῷ δέσποινα, τῷ λάτρει πάλαι/τόμον φαγεῖν δέδωκας ἐγγεγραμμένον,/ἐμοῦ δὲ τὸν κρατῆρα πλῆσον, παρθένε,/τῶν τῆς σοφίας γλυκερῶν κερασμάτων./Δίψω γὰρ αὐτοῦ ἐκροφῆσαι πλησμίως,/ὡς ὑγρανεῖ μου τὴν κατάξηρον φρένα." S. Lampros, "Ὁ Μαρκιανὸς κῶδιξ 524," *Neos Hellenomnemon* 8 (1911) 181 (No. 344);

https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2019.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Fig. 2. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, gr. 1613, p. 78.

In this example, the body of Romanos becomes a vessel and container for the Logos, just as that of the Theotokos before him. Similar to the Paris Gospel's opening poem, scenes are attested where audiences literally drink from the streams that flow from the writings of the Church Fathers and this iconography often appears along with the canon tables of the Four Gospels.[56] These examples demonstrate literalized forms of ingestion as being metaphors for divine-inspiration.

In revetment of the Theotokos *Kyriotissa*, it is her icon that enables the profuse flow of drinkable wisdom, which shall conversely inspire further deeds and divinely-inspired works. As Bissera Pentcheva has argued, these visual and textual metaphors of ingestion and pregnancy resonate with representations of the Evangelists and Church Fathers in manuscripts and icons, as well as with liturgical spaces and their architecture, where

translated in B. Pentcheva, 'Visual textuality: The Logos as pregnant body and building', *RES: Aesthetics and Anthropology* 45 (2004) 225–38, esp. 232.

56 Velmans, 'L'iconographie', 119–127; Underwood, 'The fountain of life', esp. 41–138.

https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2019.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Fig. 3. Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, A 172 sup., fol. 263v.

the *logos* is continually born through the Divine Liturgy.[57] These examples demonstrate a critical fact, which is that the act of being *entheos* is ultimately temporal and temporary. To be *etheos*, to be *empsychos*, or to fulfil/complete a *typos* are all events whereby the divine partakes in a human actor, text, or work of art, but the grace of being endowed is neither permanent nor does it inherently divinize the medium that has been possessed.

57 Pentcheva, 'Visual textuality', 225–38.

https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2019.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press

## Conclusion

The self-conscious visualization of the processes at work in this article are wonderfully visualized in a twelfth-century manuscript of John Chrysostom's homilies on the Pauline epistles (Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, A 172 sup., fol. 263v) [Fig. 3]. The illumination opens the first homily on Ephesians, featuring John Chrysostom in the style of an Evangelist author-portrait with Paul speaking to him from behind his seat.[58] The dual inspiration of John, both from Christ and Paul, is articulated through the two inspirations on the writer. The figure of Christ in the heavenly sphere gestures down toward John and the ray of light shining from his hand animates the hand of John as he writes the opening words of the homily. Similar to the *charis* that moves the hand of the artist in Psellos' *ekphrasis*, here the artist has visualized this process as John's hand is moved by Christ's light. Over his slanted writing desk, the scroll trails off, transforming into streams of water from which the huddled congregation drinks. As such, the scene carefully structures the divine-inspiration of John Chrysostom from Paul and Christ, while it is the grace of God that rouses his hand to write the text. The fact that it is being written on a scroll is notable because they are used by the priests for the recitation of prayers in the liturgy. Thus, the scroll stresses the homily as being a cue for speech that is to be made manifest through its recitation in the liturgy before that congregation that is huddled around his desk and drinking those sonic words.

John Chrysostom was known for preaching his homilies from the ambo so as to be better understood, rather than from the *synthronon,* as was customary, a fact that was noted by Socrates Scholasticus in his *Ecclesiastical History*.[59] Sozomen's *Ecclesiastical History* likewise notes that he placed himself in the midst of the people, who eagerly crowded around him pressing against one another.[60] Hence, we can imagine the huddled masses in the image, bumping up against his desk as a reference to this very

58 It is worth noting that Margaret Mitchell in her study of John Chrysostom and Pauline interpretation cites the *Ion* dialogue in passing in her conclusion as a manner of characterizing John Chrysostom's relation to Paul as a "hermeneutics of inspiration." Mitchell deploys the *Ion* as a summarizing metaphor for the relationship between John Chrysostom and Paul that she has carefully articulated throughout her work. Particularly, Mitchell provides an extensive argument (especially in chapters 3 and 5) regarding John's fascination with Paul's chains, which at times take hold of him and drag him away, as in his homily on Ephesians 9 (*PG* 62:69), and his belief that Paul might be "taking possession (κατέχειν)" of him, as in his homily on Isaiah 45 (*PG* 56:146). See M. Mitchell, *The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation* (Louisville 2002) 408, cf. 176–85, 69.

59 "Ὁ οὖν ἐπίσκοπος…καθεσθεὶς ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄμβωνος, ὅθεν εἰώθει καὶ πρότερον ὁμιλεῖν χάριν τοῦ ἐξακούεσθαι…" Socrates of Constantinople (Scholasticus), *Histoire ecclésiastique*, ed. P. Maraval and P. Périchon, Vol. 3. Sources chrétiennes 505. Paris 2004–2007) 22–354 (6:5).

60 "τοσοῦτον δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν τὸ πλῆθος ἐκεχήνεσαν καὶ τῶν αὐτοῦ λόγων κόρον οὐκ εἶχον, ὥστε, ἐπεὶ ὠστιζόμενοι καὶ περιθλίβοντες ἀλλήλους ἐκινδύνευον, ἕκαστος προσωτέρω ἰέναι βιαζόμενος ὅπως ἐγγὺς παρεστὼς ἀκριβέστερον αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ἀκούοι, μέσον ἑαυτὸν πᾶσι παρέχων ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος τῶν ἀναγνωστῶν καθεζόμενος ἐδίδασκεν." Sozomen, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. J. Bidez and G. C. Hansen (Berlin 1960) 1–408 (8:5).

https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2019.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press

action. Paul the Silentiary, for instance, describes the manner in which the people clustered around the ambo and the *solea* as if they were waves crashing upon an isthmus in a sea, particularly as the priest passed on his return from the ambo holding the Gospel book in hand. As the crowds try to kiss and touch the manuscript, Paul writes that "the countless waves of the surging people break around."[61] As such, the flowing waters of John's divinely-inspired homily spill onto the multitudes, just as those multitudes crash back onto them as waves.

The artist in the Ambrosiana miniature cleverly slanted John's writing desk so that it carries an added resonance with liturgical recitation, rather than the act of writing itself. In the late-antique world, and perhaps up until the ninth-century, scribes customarily wrote either on a wooden tablet held on their laps or on their knees. This is attested by colophons that make reference to the work's production, stating "the reed wrote me, right hand and knee" (κάλαμος μ᾽ ἔγραψε, δεξιὰ χεὶρ καὶ γόνυ),[62] and is also a common visual motif in Evangelist portraits who carry the blank or in-progress folios on their knees, while the text being copied stands upon the lectern. The lectern upon which John is writing resembles the wooden stands from which the Evangelists read, often bearing this coiling, spiraling woodwork on its shaft. Keeping in mind that reading (even by an Evangelist in his study) would have been an oral act, such lecterns seem to index an oral recitation.[63] John Chrysostom's lectern also bears this notable spiral woodwork on its stand, suggesting a popular motif for this type of contemporary church furnishing used for the recitation of texts. As such, one can surmise that here the artist is capturing the doubled act of writing and reciting in one image: the text that John is writing on one side of the lectern is also orally flowing from his desk in waves for his listeners to consume on the other side. In this manner, the miniature not only plays with these intricate understandings of inspiration, writing, and recitation, but also with John's personal history as a famed orator and his association with the trope of the "Fount of Wisdom."[64] The liturgical homily is depicted as spreadable media through its proliferation via textual transmission and constant re-performance,

61 "ἔνθεν ὑποτροπάδην χρυσέην εὐάγγελος ἀνὴρ/βίβλον ἀερτάζων διανίσσεται. ἰεμένης δὲ πληθύος, ἀχράντοιο θεοῦ κατὰ μύστιδα τιμήν, χείλεα καὶ παλάμας ἱερὴν περὶ βίβλον ἐρεῖσαι, κύματα κινυμένων περιάγνυται ἄσπετα δήμων." Paul the Silentiary, *Prokop. Werke*, ed. O. Veh, Vol. 5 (Munich 1977) ll. 247–51; trans. C. Mango (1986), 95.

62 B. M. Metzger, 'When did scribes begin to use writing desks?', *Historical and Literary Studies: Pagan, Jewish, and Christian* (Leiden 1968) 121–137.

63 This is emphasized by a miniature of Christ speaking to the Apostles from such a lectern in one eleventh-century lectionary (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Palat. 244, fol. 30v). Nelson has discussed this image at length, focusing precisely on the manner in which the unique miniature self-reflexively references the lectionary's recitation, with Christ performing the task of the reader. See R. S. Nelson, 'Empathetic vision: Looking at and with a performative Byzantine miniature', *Art History* 30:4 (2007) 489–502.

64 Andreas Xyngopoulos, ''Ιωάννης ὁ Χρυσόστομος, "Πηγή Σοφίας"', *Archaiologike Ephemeris* 81–83 (1942–44) 1–36.

https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2019.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press

bearing the neat chains and layered complexities of inspiration and possession that have been surveyed herein.[65]

* * *

The goal of this article has been to show the prevalence of this logic of indwelling across various media of representation. Rather than considering *empsychos graphe* as being either a term unique to the icon or to the writings of Michael Psellos, there is a clearly attested and longstanding importance given to this and related ideas across art and rhetoric. Beyond the specificity of a single term or concept, however, this article cautions us to understand that this complex of ideas posits artistic representation as being a by-product of divine indwelling, appearing in various formulations across ancient, late-antique, and Byzantine texts. What is at stake in contemplating the manifestations of this representational logic is that the arts – in their various forms – are premised upon the notion that a material, earthly medium is always necessary in order to provide a site in which the manifestation of forms is possible. Whether this be the mind of the poet, the voice of the *rhapsode*, the hand of the painter, or the imagination of the audience. Each one of these links are part of a longer chain of representation, and each one of them is led back to the prototype being represented through this process.

65 I use "spreadable media" here in an allusion to recent work on new media, which emphasizes the manner in which information spreads through cultural networks by virtue of the intention and volition of users, not just through a passive theory of self-proliferating "virality." See H. Jenkins, S. Ford, and J. Green, *Spreadable Media: Creating Value and Meaning in a Networked Culture* (New York 2013).

https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2019.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press